UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 94—PART 7

JUNE 15, 1948, TO JUNE 19, 1948
(PAGES 8229 TO 9352)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MAR 5 '49

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1948

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who are the guiding wisdom in the life of men and nations, we pray that Thy servants may be blessed with clear minds and courageous hearts as they take counsel together for the building of a better world. Grant unto them insight and inspiration as they frame policies and enact laws which shall lift our own beloved country into nobler and happier ways of living.

Help us to put forth a more heroic effort in behalf of a social order in which there shall be a finer spirit of brotherhood and all the members of the human family shall seek one another's welfare.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) welcoming the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States for its conference in Detroit, Mich., in May 1949.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6247. An act to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6411. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in furtherance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be approved without reading.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to expedite in every possible way the business of the Senate, but I have examined the RECORD this morning, and there is considerable confusion as to the exact parliamentary status, as to what shall transpire this morning in the morning hour. I dislike to invoke the consequences of the application of rule VIII, but unless there can be arranged an appropriate unanimous-consent agreement which will carry out the seeming understanding of the Senate as to the order of business, I shall feel constrained to object to dispensing with the reading of the Journal. I should dislike very much to take that step.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the unfinished business is the so-called long-range agricultural bill. It was definitely made the unfinished business yesterday afternoon by unanimous consent, no objection being registered. So certainly the status of that bill has been cleared up. The intention this morning is to have a call of the calendar from the beginning. The reason why I did not ask unanimous consent for a call of the calendar was the fact that there are some Senators on both sides of the aisle who have bills they would like to ask to have considered and voted on, and following the adjournment taken last night the calendar would be called automatically during the morning hour. We may just as well be frank about it; that is why an adjournment was taken last night.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator from Georgia has the floor. Will he yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have the floor, and I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator's objection based on the fact that this is not Monday, and would the Senator be satisfied with a unanimous-consent agreement that the calendar be called as if this were Monday?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the calendar may be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, with the understanding that no motion may be made to proceed to the consideration of a bill to which there is objection, I shall not insist upon the reading of the Journal.

Mr. TAFT. What is the Senator's objection to such a motion? After all, the consideration of a measure taken up on motion would come to an end at 1 o'clock. Certainly I think the Senator would have no difficulty with an agreement that the unfinished business would not be displaced during that time, if that is what the Senator is concerned about.

Mr. RUSSELL. There may be some doubt, from a reading of the RECORD of yesterday, as to what is the unfinished business. I am perfectly aware of the fact that the Chair ruled last evening that the unfinished business, or at least the business that would be before the Senate, would be the long-range agricultural bill. The Senator from Georgia was present last evening when the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the Government corporations appropriation bill, and that bill was brought before the Senate by motion. The Chair ruled last evening—not the present occupant of the chair, but the presiding officer at the time—that inasmuch as he heard no "no" votes, he considered that as being a unanimous-consent agreement. But, Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference, in parliamentary effect, between a unanimous vote of the Senate and a unanimous-consent agreement.

This matter might be submitted to the Members of the Senate on an appeal, in the present situation. I prefer to have the business of the Senate, during this period, conducted by unanimous consent. I think it will expedite the business of the Senate to a very great extent if we proceed as we have recently done, under unanimous-consent orders.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The situation at the moment is that the Senator from Nebraska has asked unanimous consent for approval of the Journal. The Senator from Georgia has objected, and requests the reading of the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have reserved the right to object.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have just come into the Chamber, and I heard the Senator

state what he might do if he could have unanimous consent that no Senator would move to proceed to the consideration of a bill on the calendar to which objection was made. It had been my intention to make such a motion. There is a bill on the calendar to which I am quite sure objection will be made. I have had no opportunity to discuss it. It is impossible to discuss it under the 5-minute rule, and it is my intention—it has been, at least—to make a motion to take the bill up, in the hope that at the conclusion of the calendar, when there would be some time remaining, the Senate might proceed to the consideration of this particular bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no assurance that the Senator from New Mexico will be recognized for the purpose of making the motion which he has in mind.

Mr. HATCH. I am quite sure the Presiding Officer, whoever he may be, will be courteous to any Senator, and give him the recognition to which he is entitled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot hear what courtesy is to be extended.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Georgia will yield, I may say that the Senator from Georgia just observed that he had no assurance that the Chair would recognize the Senator from New Mexico to make a motion, and I observed that I was quite sure that whoever was presiding over the Senate at the time would accord to the Senator from New Mexico or any other Senator the courtesy to make any motion which was within the rules of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I refuse to permit the Senator from New Mexico to put me in the position of casting any aspersion on the Presiding Officer. I know that in the concluding hours of a session there are many Senators who are anxious to make motions to proceed to the consideration of bills, and the Chair is bound by the rules to recognize the Senator he first sees rise and address the Chair, and since 10 or 12 Members of the Senate might rise and address the Chair for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of some measure, I cannot afford to gamble with the hope that the Chair would recognize the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot be put in the position, either, of being committed to recognize the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. In keeping with the time-honored custom of the Senate, the Senator from New Mexico now states publicly that when Calendar No. 802, House bill 3834, to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes, is reached, if objection is made, he will seek to make a motion, at the conclusion of the call of the calendar, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill, and he respectfully asks that the Presiding Officer look in the direction of the Senator from New Mexico when he rises for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The rules provide a regular method by which the calendar shall be called. It is sometimes called by a different method, by unanimous consent, and some doubt results because of the calendar being called differently on Mondays from the way it is called on some other days.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is quite a great difference.

Mr. TAFT. I wondered if the Senator would be satisfied if the unanimous-consent agreement should provide that the calendar would be called as if this were Monday, and, second, that there be unanimous consent that the unfinished business would in no case be set aside by motion during the morning hour, before 1 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be perfectly willing, if the Chair would further rule that there is unfinished business coming over from the previous day. I think that would be adequate protection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Ohio restate his proposal?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the call of the calendar is reached in the morning hour, that it be called as if this were Monday; and, second, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 o'clock, under any circumstances, we return to consideration of Senate bill 2318, a bill to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, as the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The unfinished business is the bill to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, even though it is so restated in the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that that is so.

Mr. WHERRY. And will automatically come up at 1 o'clock regardless of what happens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I am not familiar with what the difference is between the calling of the calendar on Monday and on any other day.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that on Monday the calendar must be called in order, and objection to any bill may be made at any time. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. And no motion to proceed to consideration of any bill out of order is in order.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair make the situation plain. When the calendar is called on Monday and a bill is objected to when it is reached in order on the calendar, it is in order to move to proceed to the consideration of the bill at that point.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if that be the case I shall have to object, because I had understood that if the motion were made, when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, or 1 o'clock when the Senate meets at 11 a. m., the bill under discussion would go back to the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. And it is the holding of the Chair that if the unanimous-consent request be agreed to, and a motion be made on the call of the calendar to proceed to the consideration of any bill on the calendar, the motion itself is not debatable, but the bill is debatable, and then upon the arrival of the hour of 1 o'clock the bill under discussion returns to its place on the calendar and the unfinished business is laid down.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the state of the situation, as the Chair understands it, and that is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of that statement by the Chair, I withdraw any objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not hear the proposal by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is asking unanimous consent that the calendar be called as under rule VIII on Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. I mean my objection will be withdrawn if the unanimous consent is obtained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair so understands.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do I correctly understand that under the rule with respect to the call of the calendar on Monday, if a bill is called and it is objected to it may then be moved that it be considered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I regret very much that I shall have to object.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am not going to assume the attitude of tying up the business of the Senate. I know full well the condition that prevails. If I should make a motion to take up the Fort Sumner project bill perhaps the motion would be defeated, and if not, the debate would be continued until the end of the morning hour. I would gain nothing by such procedure except to delay the business of the Senate. That, Mr. President, I do not propose to do at this time. So, in order that the business of the Senate may be conducted expeditiously, I shall not make the motion to take up House bill 3834, Calendar No. 802. If the fear that I shall do so is what causes the Senator from Texas to object, I now suggest that he withdraw his objection on my assurance that I shall not make the motion before the end of the morning hour, but before the Senate adjourns I shall by amendment to some pending bill seek to have the matter thoroughly discussed in the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the ruling, as appears from the RECORD of yesterday, that a motion to which there is no objection is comparable to a unanimous-consent agreement? Is that the precedent laid down by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not consider that that is a precedent. The Chair accepts the net result which the RECORD discloses, that the agricultural bill is the unfinished business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Regardless of how it was set aside?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no precedent involved in the pending matter, if I correctly understand the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; that does not affect the question. It solely affects the question whether a motion could be considered equivalent to a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I express the hope that that may not be regarded as the permanent ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair makes the same statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all know that there is quite a difference between making a motion and asking unanimous consent temporarily to set aside the unfinished business, in order that another bill may be taken up, which action does not displace the unfinished business. A motion to proceed to the consideration of another bill, even though it is unanimously agreed to without opposition, does automatically displace the unfinished business, and I doubt very much whether the Chair can interpret the maker of a motion as being in the attitude of asking unanimous consent.

I do not object to this procedure now. I think it is the best way out of the difficulty, but I hope it will not be regarded as the permanent ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair state that that is precisely the state of mind of the Chair. The Chair is not going back into that question. He is simply accepting the fact that the so-called long-range agricultural bill is the unfinished business of the Senate on the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is true, I may say, that sometimes a Senator makes a motion to take up a bill, when he does not really mean it; he means to ask unanimous consent; because certainly in this case he would not want to displace the unfinished business.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand further that the request of the Senator from Ohio brought in the long-range agricultural program bill as the unfinished business regardless of the ruling of the Chair last evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Let the Chair submit the unanimous-consent request.

The first unanimous consent is the request of the Senator from Nebraska to approve the Journal. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit that I should prefer to have approval given to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. Without objection, the Chair will submit the second unanimous-consent request first.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if any decision has been reached with regard to bringing up the bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine?

Mr. TAFT. No. We have reached no decision as to what bill will follow the long-term agricultural program measure. It is anticipated that bill will take several days, with the various appropriation bills which will have to be considered. No decision has been reached as to the next bill to be taken up on the calendar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask further if any decision has been made by the policy committee with regard to the closing of the session of Congress?

Mr. TAFT. Whether or not what?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Whether the session of the Congress will be continued beyond Saturday?

Mr. TAFT. We hope we shall be able to reach that on Saturday without the necessity of coming back, but we cannot be certain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour the calendar be called under rule VIII.

Mr. RUSSELL. At the conclusion of morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; that at the conclusion of the morning business the calendar shall be called under rule VIII, as it is on Mondays, and that at 1 o'clock, when the morning hour is finally concluded, the unfinished business, to wit, Senate bill 2318, shall be laid before the Senate. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Now the Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Journal be approved without reading. Without objection, the Journal is approved.

Morning business will therefore be pursued.

CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representative to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, which was in line 10, to strike out all after "exceed" down to and including "$10,500" in line 11, and insert "$11,000."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. O'CONOR conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PRODUCTION AND PROCUREMENT OF COPRA AND PALM OIL IN THE NETHERLANDS INDIES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, an agreement entered into by and between the Government of the Netherlands Indies and the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the Government of the United States, relating to the production and procurement of copra and palm oil in the Netherlands Indies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a memorial signed by sundry members of the Department Store Union, CIO, Local No. 3, of the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt un-American activities bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FARWELL (NEBR.) IRRIGATION CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Farwell, Nebr., irrigation district, in annual meeting assembled at Farwell, Nebr., favoring the enactment of legislation to bring about early construction and completion of the irrigation work in that district.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Farwell Irrigation District in annual meeting assembled, That we fully realize the advantages and necessities of irrigation in this territory; that we hereby wholeheartedly endorse the splendid work thus far done by your Bureau in this district, and that we hereby urge you to take speedily any and all steps necessary to bring about the early construction and completion of the irrigation district planned for this territory; be it further

Resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent immediately to each Senator and Congressman from Nebraska.

Respectfully submitted.

President of Farwell Irrigation District.

Attest:

ALEX WM. LAMB,
Secretary.

The foregoing resolution was unanimously passed this 28th day of April 1948.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate the 14th instant,

Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, reported it on June 14, 1948, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1626) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2816. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 1628).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1627).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2504. A bill for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1667); and

H. R. 6454. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1668).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 4917. A bill to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken; without amendment (Rept. No. 1680);

H. R. 6089. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134); without amendment (Rept. No. 1679); and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of girl scouting in the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 1681).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 4690. A bill to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1629).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1301. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felice; with amendments (Rept. No. 1630);

S. 1872. A bill for the relief of Jose Babace; without amendment (Rept. No. 1631);

S. 1973. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 1632);

S. 2050. A bill for the relief of Gracy Mariluch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1633);

S. 2054. A bill for the relief of Engebert Axer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1634);

S. 2075. A bill for the relief of Wisia Paryzenberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635);

S. 2235. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic; Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1636);

S. 2360. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; without amendment (Rept. No. 1637);

H. R. 333. A bill for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 1649);

H. R. 371. A bill for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1658);

H. R. 564. A bill for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1659);

H. R. 700. A bill for the relief of Anthony Arancio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1650);

H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado; without amendment (Rept. No. 1651);

H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1652);

H. R. 1409. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik; without amendment (Rept. No. 1638);

H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader; without amendment (Rept. No. 1660);

H. R. 1930. A bill for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1642);

H. R. 2009. A bill for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1653);

H. R. 2372. A bill for the relief of George Cleve Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1643);

H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1654);

H. R. 2551. A bill for the relief of William R. Ramsey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1644);

H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1655);

H. R. 2732. A bill for the relief of Dennis Stanton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1645);

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Henry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1661);

H. R. 2889. A bill for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston; without amendment (Rept. No. 1662);

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 1646);

H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1656);

H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Petrol Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1647);

H. R. 3937. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; without amendment (Rept. No. 1663);

H. R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Edmund Huppler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1639);

H. R. 4441. A bill for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency; without amendment (Rept. No. 1648);

H. R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Douglas L. Craig; without amendment (Rept. No. 1664);

H. R. 4518. A bill for the relief of Gerald S. Furman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1665);

H. R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey); without amendment (Rept. No. 1640);

H. R. 4590. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1657);

H. R. 5886. A bill to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1641); and

H. R. 6224. A bill for the relief of John Watkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1666).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2850. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1669);

S. 2851. A bill to authorize temporary increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose pay is fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1670);

H. R. 5047. A bill to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1671);

H. R. 6295. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1672); and

H. R. 6452. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1673).

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6087. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1674); and

H. R. 6598. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 1675).

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4635. A bill to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1676);

H. R. 6327. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette; without amendment (Rept. No. 1677); and

H. J Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1678).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds of the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1682).

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 15, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 260), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $2,500 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MAGNUSON) introduced Senate bill 2863, to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2864. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2865. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; and

S. 2866. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Spano and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with an emergency bill which I am now introducing in behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and myself.

Yesterday the Senators from Washington and Oregon had a long conference with representatives of various Government agencies in regard to the very serious emergency which exists in the Portland area as a result of the flood. I shall be very brief. I know that only a brief statement is necessary to apprise the Senate of the seriousness of the situation which confronts more than 30,000 people this very hour in the Vanport area.

As the result of the report which General Fleming, Mr. Foley, and Mr. George Field presented to us yesterday in regard to that very serious situation, we are introducing an emergency bill, for immediate reference, we understand, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is Chairman, in the hope that the bill will be considered immediately, and that we may have an immediate report, or an early report, to the Senate, for action prior to Saturday night.

Briefly, Mr. President, the bill authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster. It provides briefly as follows:

First. A $30,000,000 Vancouver-Portland area flood disaster fund to be made available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator through the issuance and sale of notes to the Secretary of the Treasury.

I point out that we are dealing here with the destruction of what was, after all, a Federal city. Vanport was a war city, built by the Federal Government in order to meet the emergencies of war production.

Second. The bill authorizes the Administrator to make loans to public and private agencies to enable them to construct and sell or rent dwelling accommodations for families deprived of their homes by the disaster with a first preference to families who had been tenants in the Vanport housing project. One hundred percent loans based on necessary current cost would be available for both sales and rental housing, at a 4-percent interest rate in the case of private corporations or persons and a 3-percent rate in the case of loans to public bodies.

Third. Loans to public agencies cannot be made without the prior approval of the local governing body. To enable such housing to be made available to low income families deprived of their homes by the flood disaster, the Administrator may agree to waive principal and interest payments during the first 5 years of occupancy to the extent necessary to permit adjustment of rentals, provided that the State, municipality or other local public body or agency shall similarly agree to make a contribution to the project for such low-rent purposes in the form of cash, land, community services or facilities for which a charge is usually made, or tax remissions or tax exemptions in an amount not less than 20 percent of the amount of the principal and interest payments waived by the Administrator.

Fourth. Loans for housing built for sale may not exceed 25 years and the aggregate amount of the loan and any other obligation shall not exceed: (A) $7,500 if such dwelling is designed for a single-family residence, or (B) $12,500 if such dwelling is designed for a two-family residence, or (C) $16,000 if such dwelling is designed for a three-family residence, or (D) $18,500 if such dwelling is designed for a four-family residence.

Fifth. Loans for rental housing shall have maturities satisfactory to the Administrator and shall not exceed $7,500 per family unit for such part of the property or project attributable to dwelling use.

Sixth. In addition to the usual administrative provisions and authority to issue and sell notes to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator is authorized to make necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act, and he shall maintain a separate set of accounts for this program and report to the Congress annually on the program authorized by the act.

Seventh. No loan shall be made under the act after March 31, 1949, except pursuant to a commitment to make a loan issued before March 31, 1949.

I wish to point out that the bill has the endorsement and support of the Senators from both Washington and Oregon. A companion bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives this morning by Mr. ANGELL, from the Portland district.

I want to stress, Mr. President, that we are introducing this bill as an emergency bill, because all the heads, so-called, who have been working on this problem since this terrible tragedy has afflicted our section of the country—and it is the worst disaster in all the history of the Pacific Northwest—all the heads, I say, who have been working on it have come to the conclusion that the passage of this bill is of vital importance if we are going to bring the relief or sustenance and the help to these thousands of fellow Americans who have been wiped out, so far as their worldly possessions are concerned, by this tragic flood.

I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire will see to it that the bill receives early consideration by the committee, and I am convinced that, if the committee does consider it, it will receive a favorable report, and if it receives a favorable report I cannot imagine the Congress of the United States adjourning on Saturday night without having taken action on this meritorious bill.

On behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], I now introduce the bill and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2863) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administration to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to assist in relieving the critical housing emergency in the Vancouver-Portland area resulting from the flood disaster, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to make loans (including advances thereon) to public and private agencies, as hereinafter provided, to enable them to undertake the construction and sale or rental of dwelling accommodations for families deprived of their homes by said disaster: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made under this act unless the Administrator finds that adequate financing at reasonable rates and terms is not available from other sources, and that no loan shall be made to a public agency without the prior approval of the local governing body.

SEC. 2. (a) No loan shall be made under this act unless—

(1) it involves, in the case of a property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for residential use for not more than four families in the aggregate, a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount which, together with the amounts of the principal obligations of

any loans obtained for the development of the property or project from other sources, does not exceed the Administrator's estimate of the necessary current cost (including the land and such initial service charges and such appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) of the property: *Provided*, That such aggregate amount shall in no event exceed—

(A) $7,500 if such dwelling is designed for a single-family residence, or

(B) $12,500 if such dwelling is designed for a 2-family residence, or

(C) $16,000 if such dwelling is designed for a three-family residence, or

(D) $18,500 if such dwelling is designed for a four-family residence.

(2) it involves, in the case of properties not covered by paragraph (1) hereof, a principal obligation in an amount, which, together with the amounts of the principal obligations of any loans obtained for the development of the property or project from other sources, does not exceed—

(A) the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost of the completed property or project, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incidental to construction and approved by the Administrator;

(B) $7,500 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use:

Provided, That in the case of a loan on any such property to a private agency, the Administrator may, in his discretion, require the borrower to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation;

(3) it has a maturity satisfactory to the Administrator, but not exceeding in the case of properties on which loans are made under paragraph (1) hereof, 25 years from the date of the loan;

(4) it contains complete amortization provisions satisfactory to the Administrator and provides, in a manner satisfactory to the Administrator, for the application of the borrower's periodic payments (exclusive of the amount allocated to interest) to amortization of the principal of the loan: *Provided*, That in the case of housing undertaken by a State or local public agency, the Administrator may, in order to enable such housing to be made available in whole or in part to families of low income who have been deprived of their homes by the flood disaster, agree to waive principal and interest payments on the loan during the first 5 years of occupancy to the extent necessary to permit adjustment of the rentals charged such families to the amounts such families can reasonably afford: *Provided further*, That the State, municipality, or other local public body or agency shall likewise agree to make a contribution to the project or housing for such purpose (in the form of cash, land, community services, or facilities for which a charge is usually made, or tax remissions or tax exemptions) in an amount not less than 20 percent of the amount of the principal and interest payments waived by the Administrator hereunder;

(5) it bears interest at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed 3 percent per annum on such amount in the case of a loan to a State or local public body or agency;

(6) It contains such terms and provisions with respect to security, which may include a second mortgage, insurance, repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, default reserves, delinquency charges, foreclosure proceedings, anticipation of maturity, prior or other additional liens in other parties, and other matters as the Administrator may in his discretion prescribe.

(b) The Administrator shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to assure to families deprived of their homes by the flood disaster, preference or priority of opportunity to purchase (and at a down payment of not more than 10 percent) or rent properties with respect to which loans are made under this act: *Provided*, That first preference shall be given to families who had been tenants in the Vanport housing project of the Federal Government.

(c) The Administrator may at any time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the borrower from his liability under the mortgage or the credit instrument secured thereby, or consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage, and the mortgage may provide for any such release: *Provided*, That the borrower shall not be released from such liability in any case until the Administrator is satisfied that the property has been sold to a purchaser satisfactory to the Administrator.

(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this act from taxation by any State, or any political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 3. The total amount of loans (exclusive of advances and temporary loans made in anticipation of definitive loans) made pursuant to this act shall not exceed $30,000,000. The Administrator may, on and after the effective date of this act, issue, from time to time, notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, in such amounts as may be necessary to obtain funds for such purposes (and advances thereon) and for administrative expenses of the Administrator in carrying out the program authorized by this act. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

SEC. 4. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this act, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law—

(1) shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

(2) shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That loan transactions of the Administrator hereunder and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government;

(3) shall include in his annual report to the Congress a report with respect to the program authorized by this act;

(4) may delegate his functions, powers, and duties hereunder to such agencies, officials, or personnel as he may designate, and may authorize redelegation by such agencies, officials, or personnel; may utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any State or local public body or agency; and may utilize, and exercise any powers through, the facilities, officers, and employees of the Federal home-loan banks, or of any department, agency, corporation, or establishment of the Government; and may (without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended) contract with any such agency or any other agency or individual or private corporation for the furnishing of any services or facilities, including appraisal, management, title, and other work in connection with property, and contract to make payment or reimbursement for any services or facilities;

(5) may sue and be sued;

(6) may foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale, or obtain by voluntary conveyance, or otherwise acquire, any housing project, or part thereof, in connection with which he has made a loan pursuant to this act: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive the State or any political subdivision thereof of its civil jurisdiction in and over such a property or impair the civil rights under the laws of the State or any local law of the inhabitants on such property. Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power to deal with, complete, operate, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease, in his discretion, any properties conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him pursuant to this act; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or otherwise, all claims against borrowers;

(7) may sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix; and may obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

(8) subject to the specific limitations in this act, may consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term, of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this act; and may include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this act such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this act will be achieved. No provisions of this act shall be construed or administered to permit speculation in land holding.

(b) Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or

held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this act shall be available for any of the purposes of this act, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Administrator under this act (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(c) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this act if the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyances, deeds of release, assignments, and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act, may be exercised by the Administrator or by any Assistant Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the Administrator from delegating such power by order or by power of attorney in his discretion, to any officer, agent, or employee he may appoint.

SEC. 5. No loan shall be made under this act after March 31, 1949, except pursuant to a commitment to make a loan issued before March 31, 1949.

Mr. CAIN. In my opinion, Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has just stated the disaster needs and requirements in the Portland-Vancouver area both well and fully. Because of the lateness of the hour I simply join with him and others from that stricken area in hoping that time will permit our colleagues in the Senate to give consideration to this meritorious disaster need legislation within the confines of the few days yet remaining.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF S. 2388

Mr. WHITE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 261), which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of S. 2833, a bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and that said bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—AMENDMENT

Mr. JENNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6777) to extend the coverage of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

EXPLANATION OF STATEMENT IN THE RECORD

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I note on page 8036 of yesterday's RECORD the following statement—the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is speaking:

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, with whom I am in perfect agreement regarding his amendment on reciprocal trade agreements as being the best thing and the wisest thing we can do at the present time—I call his attention again to the fact that the Democratic platform of 1932 said:

"We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue, with a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference."

I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if that is not exactly what we are advocating in this amendment?

The junior Senator from Colorado replied:

That is exactly what we are advocating in this amendment.

The junior Senator from Colorado intended only to give approval of that part of the platform which was read, which referred to a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Finish the Job," published in the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune of June 9, 1948, and an editorial entitled "Congressional Recess," published in the Washington Post of June 15, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL GRAVY—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Political Gravy," published in the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. BROOKS, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted senatorial and newspaper comment on the life, character, and public service of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appear in the Appendix.]

MURDER OF GEORGE POLK IN GREECE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted on May 27, 1948, by the standing committee of the United Nations correspondents and editorial comment on the murder of George Polk in Greece, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE OMINOUS ATOM—POLITICS AND THE ATOM—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial The Ominous Atom, published in the Hartford (Conn.) Daily Courant of Friday, June 11, 1948, and an editorial entitled "Politics and the Atom," published in the New York Times of June 15, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the calendar under rule VIII, as of Monday.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 669) to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) amending rule XXII relating to cloture was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 354) to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 402) to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF RECLAMATION LAWS TO STATE OF ARKANSAS

The bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. A number of Senators are absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Feazel	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	White
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. CHAVEZ) is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The clerk will again call Calendar No. 169, Senate bill 299.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the name "Arkansas" to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902, as amended and supplemented, are hereby extended so as to include and apply to the State of Arkansas: *Provided*, That the generation by, and the disposal and marketing of electric energy and power from, any Federal reclamation project in the State of Arkansas shall be administered by the Bureau of Reclamation through, and in accordance with, the Federal reclamation laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1179) to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 140) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 18) to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 518) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1038) to amend the Federal Airport Act was annuonced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to this measure, because I believe in it. However, I will say to Members of the Senate that it provides for the inclusion of all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 493) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 84) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 as amended was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 116 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3051) to amend the act of July 19, 1940, and to amend section 2 and repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 430) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm loan associations and production credit associations. was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3978) to provide for the temporary advancement in ranks and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia serving as supervisors of certain squads was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 968) to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of taxicabs licensed and operated in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4042) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1653) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1015) to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal savings deposits to 1 percent per annum, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO

The bill (H. R. 3834) to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we have again reached Calendar Order No. 802, relating to the Fort Sumner project. Under the 5-minute rule, it will be impossible to discuss that project as I greatly desire to do.

I presume it is useless to request the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] not to object, as he has previously done. Yesterday evening, a friendly and neutral Senator in this war between the States rather facetiously said to me, "You have used both vinegar and oil on the Senator from Texas. What do you propose to do tomorrow?"

Today, Mr. President, I expect to use neither vinegar nor oil. I shall merely say to the distinguished statesman who has so well and ably represented his State and the Nation in his long service in this body as a Senator from the State of Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that I still cling to the hope—vain and as hopeless as that hope may be—that he will not object today, that he will permit this measure to pass, and that we may, at the next ses-

sion, obtain the necessary appropriation to begin the necessary rehabilitation and repair of the Fort Sumner project, which will in no sense injure or hurt the great State of Texas or any of its projects.

Standing only upon the undisputed and uncontradicted facts, I make this appeal to the Senator from Texas, without bitterness and without expressing sweet sentiments which I do not honestly feel, and shall today but remind the Senator from Texas that preventing the doing of this work, so essential to the welfare of the little irrigation district at Fort Sumner, can only impoverish that district and the already overburdened farmers who reside therein, and can and will in no sense or manner benefit or enrich the great State of Texas.

In short, stopping this work, preventing the passage of this bill, helps neither Texas nor New Mexico and only hurts that small district and tends to disturb and perhaps destroy the neighborly accord and harmony which should exist between our two States, which in the past have held so much in common and have worked together for the mutual benefit and advantage of each.

I earnestly hope that the Senator from Texas will not object.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas very much regrets that the Senator from New Mexico makes this sort of appeal. The Senator from Texas is doing no more than is the Senator from New Mexico——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. He is trying to represent the interests of his State and his people. That is my duty, and I must do it.

Mr. HATCH. On another occasion—it was during the consideration of the Mexican treaty—when the projects on the lower Rio Grande in Texas were vitally affected, the residents of my State thought that treaty would injure them, and they objected and protested, and asked me to do the same. But, Mr. President, I believed that those projects in Texas were necessary. So I joined the State of Texas and the distinguished Senator from Texas and supported the Mexican treaty, over and against the protests and objections of citizens of my own State.

So I ask the Senator to do today what I did under similar circumstances when his State was affected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no animus toward New Mexico or its projects. On a former occasion I agreed to a bill which related to this project, and which provided that $60,000 be taken out of the reclamation fund and turned over to this district. But the bill did not pass in the House of Representatives. I have been agreeable to its being revived to that extent here in the Senate.

However, the bill to which we are presently addressing ourselves provides for the permanent establishment of this project under the Reclamation Service I hold in my hand a report of the Bureau of the Budget which is adverse to this project. I have before me the protest of my Governor and all the water engineers of my State.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, not of all the water engineers, for I hold in my hand a report signed by some of the water engineers.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator please not to take up all my time.

Mr. HATCH. But the Senator used the word "all."

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, I have an official report here.

Mr. HATCH. I also have an official report here, signed by your engineers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not by all of them.

Mr. President, I have an official protest signed by the Governor, and by the board of water engineers, and others.

All we want to do is ask New Mexico to agree to a compact with us. Twice we have agreed so far as the engineers were concerned, but twice New Mexico refused to ratify the compact. Once the refusal was by the legislature, and once by the Governor. They are now sitting at Santa Fe, trying to get a compact. If they get it, our troubles will be over.

But New Mexico insists upon proceeding unilaterally and gathering all the water she can, without a compact. Every gallon of water taken by New Mexico reduces the amount of water which can come to Texas. We in Texas are dependent upon having the water come down the Pecos River to our projects. We have a project there that is practically useless now because it cannot get water, because water is taken out of the river by New Mexico.

I hate to object, but it is my duty to object; I must object. I hate to be at cross purposes with the Senator from New Mexico. I have voted for projects here—at least, in the committee I recently so voted—and I have agreed with him on a project on the same river, at Carlsbad, N. Mex. At this session I agreed with him on a project called the Middle Rio Grande project. I am not out of harmony with him. But when it comes to the point where I have to represent my people and my State and make an objection, and when I am fortified by a report by the United States Bureau of the Budget adverse to this project, I do not see how I can be blamed for making objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in order that the record may be made clear and complete, I wonder whether the Senator from Texas will put into the RECORD the letters and telegrams he has from his people in Texas; and I also wish to say at some time I shall advance this proposal as an amendment to a bill when we can discuss it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill is passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

NATIONAL FREEDOM DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, in line 3, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and requested"; and in line 10, after the word "America", to strike out "and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and thanksgiving", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating the 1st day of February of each year as National Freedom Day for the purpose of commemorating the signing by President Abraham Lincoln, on February 1, 1865, of the joint resolution adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2142) to make the Government-owned alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, available for processing agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 984) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1989) to provide for the payment of certain Government employees for accumulated annual leave in cases involving transfers to other Government agencies under different leave systems was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3538) to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on project for reclaiming lands by drainage was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2173) to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreement and orders was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REPEAL OF ALASKA RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

The bill (S. 2326) to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29,

1936, is applicable was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask that this bill be temporarily laid aside until we see about certain matters in connection with it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LANDS IN OREGON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 580) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 3, after line 18, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Nothwithstanding any provisions of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), or any other act relating to the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, all of such revested or reconveyed lands, except power sites, shall be open for exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the mineral land laws of the United States, and all mineral claims heretofore located upon said lands, if otherwise valid under the mineral land laws of the United States, are hereby declared valid to the same extent as if such lands had remained open to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under such laws from August 28, 1937, to the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That any person who under such laws has entered since August 28, 1937, or shall hereafter enter, any of said lands, shall not acquire title, possessory or otherwise, to the timber, now or hereafter growing thereon, which timber may be managed and disposed of as is or may be provided by law, except that such person shall have the right to use so much of the timber thereon as may be necessary in the development and operation of his mine until such time as such timber is disposed of by the United States: *Provided further*, That locations made prior to August 28, 1937, may be perfected in accordance with the laws under which initiated.

And on page 4 to strike out:

SEC. 4. The owner of any unpatented mining claim located upon any of such lands shall file for record in the United States district land office of the land district in which the claim is situated: (1) Within 180 days after the effective date of this act, as to locations heretofore made, or within 60 days of locations, as to locations hereafter made, a copy of the notice of location of the claim; (2) within 60 days after the expiration of any annual assessment year, a statement under oath as to the assessment work done or improvements made during the previous assessment year, or as to compliance, in lieu thereof, with any applicable relief act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the act entitled "An act relating to the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, situated in the State of Oregon," approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the administration of the revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands shall be deemed to extend to, among other lands, all the unpatented lands in the odd-numbered sections included within the indemnity limits of the grant made to such railroad by the act of July 25, 1866 (14 Stat. 239), as amended, and for which payment was made by the United States to such railroad or its successors in interest under the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. 218), except the portions of such unpatented lands which have been specifically placed under the jurisdiction of an executive department (other than the Department of the Interior) since June 9, 1916, by an act of Congress.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized and directed, as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, to exchange administrative jurisdiction of revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands or reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands lying within the boundaries of any national forest, and national-forest lands of approximately equal aggregate value, when by such exchange the administration of the lands will be facilitated: *Provided*, That the said national-forest lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, shall be excluded from the national forest and shall become subject to administration under the same provisions of law as the revested or reconveyed lands in exchange for which they were transferred and the revested or reconveyed lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture, shall become a part of the national forest within the boundaries of which they are situated and subject to administration under the laws applicable to such national forest: *Provided further*, That the revested or reconveyed lands and the national-forest lands, administrative jurisdiction of which is exchanged in any county, shall be approximately equal aggregate value: *Provided further*, That those certain revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands, described in the acts of February 11, 1920 (41 Stat. 405), September 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1019), and June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1460), shall, for the purpose of exchange under the terms of this section, be deemed to be revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands and subject to exchange for national-forest lands. The exchanges provided for herein shall in each case be evidenced by an order signed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and such orders shall be transmitted to the Division of the Federal Register for filing and publication.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTMASTERS AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 1949) to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am very much interested, and I know that thousands of others are also interested, in knowing what action we can expect on this bill before the end of the session.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand, the House has now agreed to give a rule for a bill on this subject, amounting to a $450 increase, with some additional revenue provisions to make up in part for the increased expenditures resulting from the bill. It is my understanding that the House will act first. I can assure the Senator that action will be taken at this session by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me add that I also am interested in this bill, as all of us are. I appreciate the attention the Senator from Connecticut has given it and the comments he has made in the RECORD, and also the comments which have been made by the Senator from Ohio. I feel that this bill must be given our consideration before this session of Congress concludes. I hope the House bill comes to us promptly. If it does not come to us within the next day or so, I think we are duty bound to consider this proposed legislation before the session concludes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, with the statements of the able chairman of the majority policy committee and also that of the acting floor leader, I am greatly reassured.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, before the bill is passed over, I merely wish to express my thorough agreement with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and by the acting leader of the majority. I sincerely hope that this so-called must legislation of which the Senator from Connecticut has spoken, will become law and will be a reality before this session of Congress recesses or adjourns, as may be determined upon. I think it most unfortunate that these employees, who are faced with the high cost of living and the other conditions with which they have to contend during these difficult years, have not previously received a sufficient increase in salary to enable them to take care of themselves and their families.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1537) to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments, and of other officers, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

FREE IMPORTATION OF LIMESTONE FOR MANUFACTURE OF FERTILIZER

The bill (H. R. 5275) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the bill contains the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska with reference to baler twine.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry that it does not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1113) to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4725) to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1686) to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1687) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ALLIED AVIATION CORP.

The bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp. was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator who objected will withhold his objection for a moment, to permit me to make an explanation.

The persons mainly affected by this bill are not constituents of mine, so far as I know. I am not on the committee which considered the bill. The chairman of the subcommittee was the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

However, a small wartime plant was located in the State of Maryland; and because of that circumstance the persons affected by the bill came to me and asked me to look into the bill. The main claimants, I believe, are residents of New York, as I understand.

I have looked into the bill; I have read the committee report through carefully. In my opinion, a grave injustice will be done if relief is denied these persons further. The counsel of the Navy Department admits the justice of their claim, as shown in the report of the House committee.

I likewise read an exact excerpt of a telephone conversation between the general counsel of the Navy Department and my office. It is as follows:

> Mr. HILL. The Navy Department is not going to take any position in active opposition to a bill for the relief of this company.
>
> We know they lost money and we will not act to prevent their recoupment. We cannot grant relief on the authority we have.

Further than that, a concern in New York which had a contract identical to that of the claimant named in this bill has obtained its relief.

There should be a rule of uniform justice. I submit it is not fair to give the New York company compensation for its losses and deny the Allied Aviation Corp. equal compensation for identical losses. As a matter of fact this particular company, the Allied Corp., did perform a service. It made planes. The planes were accepted by the Navy, and the company received no compensation for its loss. However, the New York company did not make any planes, its models were not approved, and it was paid in full.

I appeal to the fairness of the Senate as a matter of simple justice that these claimants have their day in court and get their money. The Senator from Kentucky has written a very comprehensive report. They are not constituents of mine, but my sense of justice is strongly urged to rally to the support of the bill. I hope very much that Senators will not deny these claimants their losses and opportunity for compensation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should also like to state that the Small Business Committee is very much interested in this claim. Was there an objection made? I could not hear.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My objection was the result of a mistake. I was not objecting to this particular bill. I was on a committee some time ago that investigated the particular bill and I think it should be passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I am sure the favorable attitude evidenced toward the consideration of this measure by people who have no interest in it from the standpoint of constituents, should make an appeal, particularly since the overwhelming evidence shows the claimants are entitled to their day in court. This is a House bill. It has already run the gamut of the House, and the Senate should not deny the relief at this late hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments: On page 1, line 7, to strike out "$108,753.13" and insert "$234,195.20", and in line 9, before the word "in", to insert "under contract No. S-92657."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2285) relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in navy yards was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY (and other Senators). Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over. I want the RECORD to show I make the objection on behalf of other Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2216) to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2426) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

PLACING A CERTAIN PORTION OF IDAHO IN THE THIRD TIME ZONE

The bill (S. 2547) to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is identical with Calendar No. 1408, House bill 6318, and without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill and will now be considered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6318) to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when this bill was formerly reached on the call of the calendar I

objected, but I have no objection to Senate bill 2547.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the House bill will be amended as the committee proposed the Senate bill should be amended.

The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 10, strike out "That the Union Pacific Railroad Company may use Pocatello as the point at which it changes from mountain time to Pacific time and vice versa, and may conduct all its operations on its main and branch lines west of Pocatello on Pacific time," and insert "That common carriers within such portion of the State of Idaho may conduct their operations on Pacific time."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The bill (S. 2688) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator who objected to the bill will withhold his objection if he feels he can do so. Last year under the Unification Act the Central Intelligence Agency was established. It is now functioning as a part of the general unification scheme. In order to conduct its business properly with the other agencies of the Government it should have a seal of its own and the necessary authority to act in the ordinary way other bureaus of the Government act. The bill is essentially for that purpose. It gives the Agency several advantages over other departments, because of the confidential nature of its undertaking and of the necessity of many of its employees being located in foreign countries under circumstances not open to disclosure.

The Committee on Armed Services considered the bill very carefully, and spent several days on it. I believe if we want the Unification Act to function, if we want the Central Intelligence to have full opportunity to take its proper place in the activities of the Government at this stage, particularly in our relations with other countries, and in obtaining knowledge from other countries, the bill should become a law at this time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was the one who raised the objection, and I want to assure the Senator from Massachusetts and the other members of the committee that the objection I have is not captious. I have assured Senators that as soon as the information I have requested is available, I trust the whole matter can be worked out. The people who have indicated an interest in this bill—and they were of rather responsible character—were not in town and were not back until this morning. I did not realize the calendar was going to be called. I hoped to be able to adjust the matter and that my objection will be of only a temporary character.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1390) to broaden the cooperative-extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5310) to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam and make them racially eligible for naturalization was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am quite satisfied that those interested in this legislation would not want it to pass on the call of the Calendar. I ask that the bill go over for the time being.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2664) to authorize the Indian Claims Commission to hear and determine certain claims of the Indians of California was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4112) to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the National Weather Service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4427) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY (and other Senators). Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have no objection to Calendar 1421, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162). I was mistaken in the calendar number. I ask that the Senate revert to a consideration of it.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the objection the Chair just heard an objection to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162).

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, did Calendar 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162, go over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I inquire who made the objection?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT AND SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AND NATIONAL BANK ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2636) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is on the table an amendment which has been reported from the committee by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 17, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. In order that the Congress may from time to time review the operation and effect of the provisions of this act, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems shall transmit to the President and to the Congress special reports on the operation and effect of the provisions of this act as hereinafter in this paragraph provided. The first report shall be made not later than 2 years after the approval of this act and a report shall be made every 2 years after the making of the first report. Each report shall cover and include the extent to which the exemptions herein provided for have accomplished their purposes; the operations and the policies of the bank in the marketing of obligations issued or guaranteed by it; the extent to which such exemptions have aided the bank in the marketing of such obligations; the extent, if any, to which modifications of this act may be advisable in the opinion of said Council in order adequately to protect the interests of investors and securities dealers; and the recommendations of said Council with regard to the advisability of continuing, modifying, or terminating such exemptions, with particular reference to the extent to which the discontinuance or modification of such exemptions may affect the bank in respect of the aid which it may be able to afford under its articles of agreement in the financing of European recovery and the reconstruction and development of the economic resources and facilities of its members. Before making any such report said Council shall afford to any association of brokers or dealers which shall be registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a national securities association under section 15A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 an opportunity to present to said Council its views with regard to the matters to be covered and included in such report as herebefore provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRICKER subsequently said: Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate today passed the bill, S. 2636, to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the National Bank Act. It is calendar No. 1435.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The motion will be entered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is this a motion to reconsider?

Mr. BRICKER. It is a motion to reconsider.

Mr. AIKEN. Or did the Senator ask unanimous consent for reconsideration of the bill?

Mr. BRICKER. No; I made a motion to reconsider.

Mr. AIKEN. I object to the motion.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. I have been requested by some friends of mine connected with institutions affected by the bill to do what I can to see that the bill is passed. I ask if the Senator from Ohio is objecting to the passage of the bill?

Mr. BRICKER. I voice my objection to the passage of the bill now. I have moved that the vote by which it was passed be reconsidered. The bill was passed on the call of the Consent Calendar. I was not present in the Senate Chamber at the time the bill was reached on the calendar and passed. I am opposed to the bill. I think we should have hearings in committee on it. There have been no hearings held on the bill. The bill deals with a matter of too great importance to have the bill pass on the call of the calendar without any hearings having been had on the bill in the Senate committee, and without any debate upon the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. I will say that various groups in the State of New Jersey are embarrassed because of their inability to deal in these securities, because of the situation which now exists. I have been asked to do what I can to assist in relieving the situation in which they find themselves. I think it is important that the bill be enacted into law.

Mr. BRICKER. I take the opposite view, and I think most of the people of my State do.

Mr. SMITH. I was not aware of any such opposition. I desire to obtain the facts, if I can, so that we may see where we are.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the motion made by the Senator from Ohio is acted on, will it not mean that the pending business, the Government corporations appropriation bill, will be permanently laid aside until a new motion is made respecting it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from Ohio submitted a privileged motion, and his motion was entered. The mere entering of the motion does not affect the status of the pending business.

Mr. AIKEN. But if there is any effort made to act upon the motion, I should have to ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No action on the motion has been asked.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5708) to exempt civilian members of the permanent Joint Board on Defense, United States and Canada, from certain statutory restrictions on outside activities was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2155) to transfer jurisdiction over certain school buildings in Vanport, Oreg., to Federal Works Administrator was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2417) to adjust the premium charge of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REORGANIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF PROCUREMENT, UTILIZATION, AND DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

The bill (S. 2754) to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have consideration of a proposed amendment to this bill, which I have taken up with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. My amendment is acceptable to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2754) to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment I offer is as follows:

On page 29, line 21, before the letter (g), insert the letter (a), and after the letter (g), insert the letter (h); on the same page, line 24, delete the following language: "(a) and."

My amendment is acceptable to the author and sponsor of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is a bill which transfers the War Assets Administration to the Bureau of Federal Supply of the Federal Works Administration. The reason for this transfer is that the War Assets Administrator estimates that it will not be very long before it will be costing more than a dollar to sell a dollar's worth of surplus property. It provides for the disposal of surplus property which any of the agencies of the Government may have. It also provides that the Federal Works Administrator shall perform the functions of the Bureau of Federal Supply in the matter of making purchases for various agencies of the Government. The reason for consolidating the two agencies is to make sure that one agency of the Government is not disposing of certain articles of property while another agency of the Government is attempting to buy the same things.

Mr. PEPPER. Does this bill put the War Assets Administration out of existence on the 1st of July?

Mr. AIKEN. The functions of the War Assets Administration are transferred to the Federal Works Administration. The Administrator of War Assets recommends that action. That is one administration of Government which has come before the Congress and recommended that it be abolished. The provisions of law now pertaining to the War Assets Administration will carry over for the length of time which is provided by the law, which is next year.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it not a fact that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments went quite fully into the problem and were unanimous in the opinion that the proposed change would be to the benefit of all concerned?

Mr. AIKEN. That is quite true This is a committee bill. It was worked over for several weeks with the Federal agencies involved and was reported as a committee bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that this bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCORPORATION OF VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

The bill (S. 1183) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, there was objection made to the consideration of the bill on the previous call of the calendar, but that objection has been removed.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] asked me to object.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Delaware has withdrawn his objection and filed a statement in the Appendix of the RECORD of yesterday, explaining his position.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill 1183?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1183) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, The Virgin Islands Company shall continue as an agency of the United States until

the close of business June 30, 1949. It is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall loan to it upon the request of its president, such sums as may be required to carry out its operations until such date, not exceeding in the aggregate $950,000. Each loan shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to know if The Virgin Islands Company is to be a permanent corporation, or whether there is any time limit set?

Mr. BUTLER. The time for a permanent extension for the life of this corporation was dropped entirely. The bill is merely a limitation agreed upon by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate in order to legalize the operations of the corporation for a term of 1 year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue The Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 286) to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2680) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic system was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, referring to Calendar No. 1479, Senate bill 286, I have amendments I desire to offer. At the last call of the calendar the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] objected to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator is speaking of the wrong number. It was Calendar 1480.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Both bills have gone over.

DISCLOSURES OF INFORMATION OF THE CRYPTOGRAPH SYSTEM

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate do return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1480, Senate bill 2680.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2680) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic system.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, at the last call of the Calendar the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] objected to the consideration of the bill. Since that time we have worked out a series of amendments which meet with his approval. I should like very much to have those amendments considered, unless there be further objection to the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, is the Senator speaking of calendar 1480?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is correct. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2319) to provide for a survey of physically handicapped citizens was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF TRACT OF LAND TO JOHNSON CITY, TENN.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2580) to authorize the Administration of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the following language:

Provided, That Johnson City shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of its property, to be determined by the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair notes that Calendar 1611, House bill 6443, is a similar bill. The Chair inquires whether it is the desire of the Senator to consider the House bill and that his amendment be offered to the House bill.

Mr. MORSE. That is the desire of the Senator from Oregon, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to considering House bill 6448?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

Mr. MORSE. I offer my amendment to the House bill. The amendment is as follows:

Provided, That Johnson City shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of its property, to be determined by the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H. R. 6448.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 23, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 2. It shall be made a condition of the deed of conveyance that the tract of land so conveyed shall be maintained by such municipal corporation only for fairground or other recreational purposes. If such municipal corporation ceases to maintain such tract for such purposes or attempts to alienate all or any part of such tract, title thereto shall revert to the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. The tract of land authorized to be transferred by the first section of this act shall be used by the grantee for fair grounds and recreational purposes; and the deed of conveyance of such lands shall contain (1) the provision that all such property shall be used and maintained for the purposes for which it was conveyed for a period of not less than 20 years, and that in the event such property ceases to be used or maintained for such purposes during such period, or is alienated or an attempt is made to alienate such property during such period, all or any portion of such property shall in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and (2) such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2580 is indefinitely postponed.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) to continue the Joint Committee on Housing beyond March 15, 1948, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAX

The bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the bill objected to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to be recognized under the 5-minute rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words regarding the bill. I think that the Policy Committee, in refusing to place the bill on the agenda, must assume full responsibility for killing the bill, if it is killed at this session. It was reported unanimously by the Finance Committee. I want to read for the RECORD the last sentence of the report:

In the opinion of the committee, the bill (H. R. 2245) is in the public interest and should be enacted without delay.

As the Senate well knows, after long discussion of this bill on the question of referral, its past history, and the way it had been bottled up by one committee after another in the House, and had been refused a hearing in the Senate because such a bill must originate in the House, finally now we have the bill on the calendar, after some 62 years, and

we have an opportunity now to vote on it. Yet the majority of the committee, although the chairman of the committee has approved the bill in committee, refuses to let the Senate vote on it on its merits.

Apparently the only way a vote can be had is by having the bill offered as an amendment to some other bill, and I suggest now to the policy committee, and the majority leadership, that I assume, in view of the statement made a few moments ago, there being no hope of getting a vote in any other way, the bill will have to be offered as an amendment to the long-range farm bill.

I dislike to offer this bill as an amendment to any bill, because on its own bottom it has passed the House by better than a 2-to-1 vote, the vote being 260 to 106, and in the Senate it received a vote of 47 to 30, which I think could be interpreted as a vote on the merits in many respects, the vote being on the question of referring the bill to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, this whole matter has been very erroneously interpreted by the margarine people. What is happening is that the margarine manufacturers are profiting greatly by the favorable publicity that has arisen from the controversy in the Senate and the House. The only ones who are suffering are the housewives, the ordinary citizens, who, because of the great demand, because of the refusal to give relief from the taxes, are having to pay more, while at the same time the production of margarine has doubled within the past 3 or 4 years. It is not to the interest of the margarine manufacturers particularly, in fact, I doubt if at all, that the bill be passed, but it certainly is to the interest of the millions of housewives and ordinary citizens.

I think it is disgraceful, after all the effort which has been put on this bill in the House and in the Senate, that it should be simply shoved aside in this manner, and the Senate prevented from voting on it on its merits. Twice before in recent years, notably in 1944, the same proposal was before the Senate, and we could not get a vote on the merits. It had to be offered as an amendment to a bill. I well recognize that Senators are loath to vote a bill of this kind as an amendment to another bill in which they have an interest, because it does add a controversial feature, and it may very well deter some Senators from voting on it because of its effect on the main bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator should take the course he has suggested, I would say the amendment would be germane to the agricultural bill, because, after all, the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, as the Senator will recall, decided definitely that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is where the oleomargarine repeal bill belonged. While the Senate on an appeal overruled the decision, nevertheless the bill has agricultural features.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator that it would be germane to the farm bill. My only reservation about attaching it to that bill is the probability that in conference the conferees of the House would be the same members of the Committee on Agriculture who have bottled it up, and who have recently bottled it up by a vote of 16 to 10. The House later evidenced its approval of the bill by a vote of 260 to 106. The action in bottling it up for so long a time is perfectly indefensible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to add my approval to what the Senator from Arkansas has said. This bill was called up last week and was objected to. It was called up again today and objected to, and I imagine every time it is called it will be objected to.

I have come to the conclusion that the oleomargarine manufacturers do not want the bill passed. I have come to the further conclusion that the dairy interests are rather foolish not to let the bill pass. Every time the bill is called, every time a statement is made in the Senate about it, millions upon millions of dollars worth of publicity is given free to Nucoa and to oleo and other products made from soy beans, cottonseed, and other agricultural products.

So, Mr. President, in view of the fact that this bill is objected to, I intend to object to all the other bills on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stennis
Cooper	Lodge	Stewart
Cordon	Lucas	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Feazel	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1485, House bill 2245, to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion is in order, and is not debatable.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House bill 2245, Calendar No. 1485. On the motion the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the motion prevails will the result be to displace the unfinished business, or merely to displace it up to 1 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only until 1 o'clock.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is unavoidably detained and is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official committee business. If present and voting the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who would vote "nay," if present.

On this vote the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from

Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "nay," if present.

I announce further that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Bridges	Hoey	O'Daniel
Brooks	Holland	O'Mahoney
Buck	Ives	Pepper
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Cooper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Downey	Lodge	Smith
Eastland	Lucas	Sparkman
Ecton	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	McFarland	Stewart
Feazel	McGrath	Taft
Flanders	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
Green	Magnuson	Umstead
Hatch	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hawkes	Murray	Williams

NAYS—26

Aiken	Dworshak	Millikin
Ball	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Jenner	Thye
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Watkins
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Capper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Young
Donnell	Martin	

NOT VOTING—13

Bushfield	Moore	Wagner
Chavez	Reed	White
George	Taylor	Wilson
Gurney	Thomas, Utah	
McCarran	Tobey	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion until I make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Has the suggestion of the absence of a quorum been withdrawn?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it has not been withdrawn.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Mississippi will withhold his request I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. I want to ask how long consideration of the oleomargarine bill may continue before reverting to the unfiished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Until 1 o'clock.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must recognize the call for a quorum whenever it is made.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Barkley	Bridges
Baldwin	Brewster	Brooks
Ball	Bricker	Buck
Butler	Hoey	Myers
Byrd	Holland	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	O'Daniel
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Connally	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Cordon	Knowland	Russell
Donnell	Langer	Saltonstall
Downey	Lodge	Smith
Dworshak	Lucas	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarthy	Stennis
Ecton	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McFarland	Taft
Feazel	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McKellar	Thye
Flanders	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Umstead
Green	Malone	Vandenberg
Hatch	Martin	Watkins
Hawkes	Maybank	Wherry
Hayden	Millikin	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Morse	Williams
Hill	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to House bill 2245.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate. The committee amendment will have to be considered first.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the amendment, which is as follows:

At the proper place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. 201. To guarantee, insofar as it lies within the constitutional power of the Congress so to do within the subject matter of this act, (a) that each and every citizen of the United States be secured in the equal protection of the laws of the United States, and of the several States, and (b) that no citizen of the United States be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, the Congress, in the exercise of all powers which it possesses, does hereby legislate with respect to the crime of lynching as hereinafter defined.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. Any assemblage of two or more persons which shall, without authority of law, exercise or attempt to exercise, by acts of physical force against person or property, any power of correction or punishment over any person, who is (1) in the custody of any peace officer or (2) charged with or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, or (3) suspected by such assemblage of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of preventing the apprehension or trial or punishment by law of such person, or of imposing a punishment, shall constitute a lynch mob within the meaning of this act. Any such exercise of power or attempt to exercise power by a lynch mob shall constitute lynching within the meaning of this act.

"CONSPIRACY BETWEEN MEMBERS OF LYNCH MOB AND FEDERAL OR STATE OFFICERS

"SEC. 203. Whenever a lynching occurs, any member of the lynch mob who conspires with any officer or employee of the United States or of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who is charged with the duty or possesses the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching or to protect the person lynched, and any such officer or employee who conspires with any member of the lynch mob, to commit, instigate, incite, organize, aid, or abet the lynching shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 20 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"PUNISHMENT UPON STATE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR WILLFUL FAILURE TO PREVENT LYNCHING

"SEC. 204. Whenever a lynching shall occur, any officer or employee of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof, who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority of such officer or employee to prevent the lynching, but shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to do so, and any officer or employee of a State or governmental subdivision thereof who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by the law of such State, shall have had custody of the person lynched and shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"PUNISHMENT UPON FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR WILLFUL FAILURE TO PREVENT LYNCHING

"SEC. 205. Whenever a lynching shall occur, any officer or employee of the United States, (1) who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to prevent the lynching, but shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to do so; or (2) who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by the law of the United States, shall have had custody of the person lynched and shall have willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching; or (3) who, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, shall willfully fail or refuse to make all reasonable efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute any person who violates section 3, section 4, or this section, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"DUTY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 206. Whenever a lynching of any person shall occur, and information on oath is submitted to the Attorney General of the United States that any officer or employee of the United States or of a State or any governmental subdivision thereof who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee to protect such person from lynching, or who, under authority or duty granted or imposed by the law of the United States or of such State, respectively, shall have had custody of the person lynched, has willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to protect such person from lynching or that any officer or employee of the United States, in violation of his duty as such officer or employee, has willfully failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute any person who has violated section 3, section 4, or section 5 of this act, the Attorney General of the United States shall cause an investigation to be made to determine whether there has been any violation of this act. The duty imposed by this section shall be in addition to all other duties of the Attorney General.

"CIVIL ACTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS LYNCHED

"SEC. 207. (a) Any individual who is lynched as defined in this act, and who suffers injury to his person or damage to his property as a result of the lynching, or the next of kin of any such individual if such injury results in death, shall be entitled to maintain a civil action for damages for such injury, damage, or death against any person violating section 3 section 4, or section 5 of this act with respect to such lynching: *Provided*, That the satisfaction of judgment against

one person who may be liable shall bar further proceedings under this section, by the individual who has obtained satisfaction of his judgment, against any other person who may also be liable.

"(b) Actions provided by this section shall be brought in the United States District Court for the judicial district of which the defendant is a resident. Any such action may be brought and prosecuted by the Attorney General of the United States or his authorized representative in the name of the United States for the use of the real party in interest, or, if the claimant shall so elect, by counsel employed by the claimant, but in any event without prepayment of costs. If the amount of any such judgment shall not be paid upon demand, payment thereof may be enforced by any process, and to the extent, available under the State law for the enforcement of any other money judgment against the defendant. The cause of action occurring hereunder to a person injured by lynching shall not abate with the subsequent death of that person before final jurgment but shall survive to his next of kin. For the purpose of this section the next of kin of a deceased victim of lynching shall be determined according to the laws of intestate distribution of the State of domicile of the decedent. Any judgment under this section shall be exempt from all claims of creditors."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is it in order to move to dispense with further reading of the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion is not in order, because the reading is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not require unanimous consent to read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asked that the amendment be read at the desk. The Journal does not disclose unanimous consent to that effect, but the Chair states that the reading is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there no way, under the ruling, to dispense with the further reading of the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the Senator could object to its present reading. Of course, when it is brought up for consideration by the Senate, it will have to be read.

The Chair suggests to the Senator that if he wishes to object to the continuation of the reading of the amendment, he can do so at the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I object to the continuation of the reading of the amendment at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question, then, is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether it would be appropriate to hear the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, beginning in line 15, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the sale of colored oleomargarine without clear identification as such or which is otherwise adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act depresses the market in interstate commerce for butter and for oleomargarine clearly identified and neither adulterated nor misbranded, and constitutes a burden on interstate commerce in such articles. Such burden exists, irrespective of whether such oleomargarine originates from an interstate source or from the State in which it is sold.

(b) Section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331), is amended by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"(m) The serving of colored oleomargarine in violation of section 407 (b)."

(c) Chapter IV of such Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 341 and the following), is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"COLORED OLEOMARGARINE

"SEC. 407. (a) Colored oleomargarine which is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced shall be subject in the same manner and to the same extent to the provisions of this act as if it had been introduced in interstate commerce.

"(b) No person shall serve colored oleomargarine at a public eating place, whether or not any charge is made therefor, unless, (1) each separate serving bears labeling identifying it as oleomargarine, and (2) a notice that oleomargarine is served is displayed prominently and conspicuously in such place.

"(c) Colored oleomargarine when served with meals at a public eating place shall at the time of such service be exempt from the labeling requirements of section 403 (except 403 (f) if it complies with the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) For the purpose of this section colored oleomargarine is oleomargarine having a tint or shade containing more than one and six-tenths degrees of yellow, or of yellow and red collectively, but with an excess of yellow over red, measured in terms of Lovibond tintometer scale or its equivalent."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I inquire if this opera bouffe ends at 1 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Whatever it is, it ends at 1 o'clock. [Laughter.]

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

TIME FOR A CHANGE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after coming to the Chamber a few moments ago, I recalled a statement made by Abraham Lincoln, and I quote it at this time:

The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. * * * As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves.

That statement was made by Abraham Lincoln in his message on December 1, 1862. Those words of a Republican President point the way to the American people today to the solving of some of their problems.

THE NATION NEEDS AND WANTS REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE ADMINISTRATION AND IN THE CONGRESS

History teaches us that the very worst thing that can happen to a nation is for it to fail to make a change in leadership when such a change is long overdue. The election in November 1948 presents the American people with a challenge to make such a change, which has been so long overdue. America must disenthrall itself; it must think anew and act anew, with courageous Republican leadership. America must reject a fifth term to the Democratic Party.

Since March 30, 1933, the Nation has been burdened by a Democratic administration which has boasted of looking forward, but which in large measure has really looked backward to the days of the regimentation of man by the state. For 14 years, up until January 1947, the Nation had also been burdened by a Democratic Congress. Fortunately, the past 2 years have seen a long-overdue replacement of Democratic control of the Congress by Republican leadership.

NATIONAL WELFARE REQUIRES CHANGE

Mr. President, I do not make this plea now for a change in the national administration and for continuation of Republican control of the Congress merely on the basis of partisan feeling or as a partisan matter. Of course, I am a Republican, and I am proud of it. However, I appeal not only to Republican voters but also to Democratic voters and, most important, to independent voters, to assure Republican leadership during the next fateful period of American history. My appeal is not only on the basis of the aspirations of my party but on the basis of the needs of our country.

NEED FOR A NATIONAL AUDIT

Mr. President, why should there be a change? The first reason is because we feel that there should be a national audit, an audit of every bureau and agency in the Federal Government, an audit of its operations and of its personnel. There can be no such audit until there is a Republican in the White House and Republican leadership throughout the administration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I prefer not to yield at this time, please.

Mr. President, during the past 2 years, when we Republicans have nominally been in charge of the Congress, where we have had a slim majority, we have been confronted again and again by opposition and obstruction on the part of the administration to our demands for cleaning out the dry rot in the Federal Government. We cannot clean out that dry rot unless the Republicans are given the helm of the national administration.

Mr. President, what I have to say on this point is far more important than some of the subjects which recently have been interjected into the proceedings on the floor of the Senate.

TOO LONG A RULE BY ONE PARTY MEANS RUIN

Mr. President, the second reason for the need for a national change is the one which was given by Franklin Roosevelt himself when he was campaigning aginst the Republicans in 1932. I wish Senators to pay particular attention to the language he used at that time. In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt quoted President Calvin Coolidge as follows:

For one reason or another even a wisely led political party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people, and when it does so fail to express the will of the people, it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party—and certainly better for the state—that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of government. This condition appears to have arrived in America.

After referring to that statement by Calvin Coolidge, Mr. Roosevelt said:

That, my friends, is the sober conclusion of a cautious public man, not long ago President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge. With every word of it I heartily agree.

Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senate that if oleomargarine or butter or a contest between the two becomes an issue on this floor, I shall have something to say on that subject, too. I am hoping that what I am interjecting here will be a little oil on the troubled waters.

Let me say at this point, parenthetically, that I have quoted Franklin D. Roosevelt and I have quoted President Coolidge. I ask Senators to bear in mind that the very heart of that salient statement was that any party, I care not which it is, that has possession of government over a long term of years becomes literally debilitated so far as performance is concerned and so far as doing a good job is concerned. That was the consensus of the two ex-Presidents.

GIVE OPPORTUNITY TO NEW LEADERS

A third reason for a change in the administration is to give opportunity for the new leadership which has developed in the Nation since 1933, but which has not had the chance to express itself because of the Democratic monopoly in the administration. During these 16 years, the overwhelming proportion of appointments in the executive branch and in the judiciary have been assigned to Democrats. While some few of the President's appointments during these years have been on a merit basis, most of them have been on a spoils basis. Many appointees have been cheap political hacks from corrupt Democratic municipal machines. It is time for a change to a merit basis. I do not have to refer simply to Republican criticism. Democratic Members of the Senate, time and time again, have mentioned the conclusion that I have just stated, that civil service has been corrupted. There is no longer a question of a constructive operation of the civil-service rules. And we have seen it demonstrated here on the floor of the Senate in relation to postmasters before the Republican Party came into control. We have had to fight on the floor of the Senate, and the Senator who is speaking has had to fight, to see to it that civil-service rules were not violated in the interest of political hacks. It is time to allow efficient Republican leadership to assert itself, to allow the new generation of leaders the opportunity to work out its constructive role for the good of the Nation, not on the basis of spoils but on the basis of proven merit.

PROUD RECORD OF GOP CONGRESS

There is another reason, Mr. President, the next reason for a change. The next reason for a change is the Republican record. I say to you, Mr. President, that in spite of the impediments, in spite of the road blocks, in spite of the obstruction, that record stands. You and I know that each of us has ideas about some particular bill or project which we might have hoped this Republican Congress would pass, but which hopes have not been realized. It is almost impossible to satisfy everyone, and yet we know that the Republican Party has conscientiously tried to satisfy the needs of the Nation by its record during these last 2 years in the Congress. I need only mention a few of the laws which we have passed as an indication of our constructive work:

The tax-reduction law.

The Taft-Hartley labor law.

Overseas-information law.

Commission on reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

Portal-to-Portal Pay Act.

Bill for increasing subsistence allowances for disabled veterans.

Bill for increasing on-the-job training ceilings for veterans.

Terminal Cash Pay Act for enlisted men.

The unification bill for the armed forces.

Many foreign-aid measures to control communism and prevent a third world war in addition to a number of other bills.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of a motion?

Mr. WILEY. For what purpose?

Mr. BRICKER. For the purpose of making a motion to reconsider.

Mr. WILEY. No; I desire to finish this talk at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, while the Senator is interrupted, would he yield for the purpose of my proposing a unanimous-consent agreement to return to the calendar for the remainder of the morning hour?

Mr. WILEY. No. I want to finish. I was caught unawares by certain activities, which is apparent, and I am going to talk until after 1 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator yield for an announcement, please?

Mr. WILEY. I will yield for a question, providing I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to take the floor away from the Senator, but Senators have asked what is the program when 1 o'clock arrives. I should like to say, if the Senator will permit, that at 1 o'clock the unfinished business, which is the long-range agricultural program, will then automatically be laid before the Senate. It will be our purpose to get unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the farm bill and take up and conclude consideration of the Government corporations bill.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I should like to say in conclusion, there will be a session of the Senate tonight.

Mr. WILEY. As I say, there are many bills on which action was not completed and which I personally would have liked to see pass, just as my listeners and readers would. We recognize, however, the staggering burden on this first Republican Congress in over 14 years in trying to set a new path of economy, of efficiency, in place of the Democratic mismanagement which characterized the previous decade or more. Anyone who has ever tried to clean up a dusty attic which has been untended to for 14 years knows the job we Republicans faced.

NEED FOR ECONOMY

Another reason for change is that the Republican Party needs to take the helm if we are to achieve true Government economy. I know that many of our citizens feel that the expenditures in the Eightieth Congress have been excessive, and in many instances, I am inclined to agree with them. But Mr. President, we have a 50-cent dollar. As I said the other day on the floor of the Senate, I think that by and large when we come to analyze the expenditures of the Congress in the light of the 50-cent dollar, in the light of pressure from foreign parts, and in the light of pressure internally upon our national income and capacity, history will record "well done." Even though I voted against some of the appropriations, my associates felt they were justified. I feel that the strength of America is not in our being able unanimously to agree to everything, but rather, that the strength of America is to be found in the fact that strong men can meet and exchange ideas in this forum, and then agree that to the majority the spoils do not belong, but the victory.

Some Republicans have, unfortunately, caught the spending fever. We recognize, however, the heavy financial costs imposed upon us by the need to combat communism abroad and the need to build up our national defense. All of the money that we are using in this national defense program consists of 50-cent dollars—costs of construction have increased all along the line, and that has served to increase the cost of Government and defense.

Still the Republicans have made great advances, have watered down some of the administration's bloated budget requests, have balanced the budget, and have assured several billion dollars to reduce our national indebtedness.

Another reason for a change—a change that is necessary—in addition to the reasons set forth in the five previous points, including the statements of President Coolidge and President Roosevelt—that after a long period of political domination by one party conditions arise requiring a change—there is the sixth point.

VIGILANCE REQUIRED IN ATOMIC AGE

Another reason for a change is that the Republican Party can assure for the Nation the vigilance at home and abroad against every menace, particularly the menace of communism. The Democratic Party, with its record of secret diplomacy, its record of the appeasement of communism and of building up the forces of communism at home and abroad, cannot assure for the Nation that adequacy which is so indispensable in this atomic age. America has been precipitated to leadership among the nations of the earth and she must be vigilant in the careful exercise of that leadership.

CARRYING THROUGH GOP PROGRAM

Continued Republican leadership of the Senate and House of Representatives is necessary if we are to carry through on the constructive program which we have begun in this Eightieth Congress, and in order to carry through on those items for which time was not available to complete. The question of high prices

is still with us; the question of labor difficulties and of many other problems are still to be solved. The fact that these were not solved during the brief time that we have had available to us is not an indication that we were inadequate to our responsibility, and that from every angle it appears will be thrust upon the party next January; rather it is an indication that we need more time, plus leadership of the national administration, in order that we might complete the job that the Nation has assigned to us. We have been working night and day on thousands of bills; we have not shirked our responsibility in any sense.

The Republican Party does not appeal to the Nation on the basis of making glib promises about accomplishing the millennium. We know that our national economy is so complicated that Congress alone cannot do the job and cannot, by itself, assure national prosperity. The Republican Party does promise the Nation, however, that it will create a climate, an atmosphere of freedom which will give to the farmer, the businessman, the laboring man, to commerce, to transportation, and to every other segment of our economy that freedom, that encouragement which they have so long missed during the last 16 years of Democratic control—the era of bureaucratic bossing, of crisis psychology, of planned emergencies.

Mr. President, what I have said today expresses my earnest personal conviction as to why I think there is a need for a change. I have just returned from a visit to my own State, where I attended the Republican convention. I talked to many persons representing a fine cross section of the people who represent the grassroots of that great State, which produces 50 percent industrially and 50 percent agriculturally. It is a State filled with the common people, of whom Lincoln said, "God Almighty must have loved them, he made so many of them." I have come back encouraged, because I find that much of the fear, the doubt, and the worry we hear expressed on the floor and elsewhere regarding the future of this great Nation is not lodged in the breasts of the men and women of my State who produce, build, and construct. They have a hope, and they are equal to the task which is before them. They have faith that we shall come through the crisis and meet the problems of today and tomorrow as we have met every problem and every crisis which have arisen in the history of this great country. They are the people who build the Nation. Back in the grassroots sections they are working. They are not striking. They are aware of the fact, Mr. President, that from the villages, small cities, and farmsteads will come the direction which will guide us. Were I to listen to all the fears and doubts expressed through the press and over the radio I would think this country were going to hell. But when I listen to the voices of the commen men and women, I am strengthened and encouraged to face, without doubt, the problems which we have to solve.

I learned a little philosophy in politics while I was at home, Mr. President. I heard of a Scotchman who went from the Isle of Ayr to London. When he returned, a friend said to him: "Sandy, how did you like it in London?" Sandy replied, "I didna like it. I don't like those Londoners. Mon, they are a queer people, a very queer people." His friend said, "What do you mean, Sandy?" Sandy said, "I went up to my room in the hotel at night. I had my bagpipes along, of course. But those Londoners are queer people. They pounded on the ceiling, on the floor, and on the walls." His friend inquired, "What did you do, Sandy?" Sandy replied, "I didn't let them upset me. I didn't pay any attention to the knocking; I just kept on playing my bagpipes."

Mr. President, I think that both parties might very well, in this election campaign, as they go out through the country, play their own bagpipes. If they do so, they will make a great contribution to the thinking of the American people. From my own little experience in politics I have found that never to mention my opponent is good politics. Never to indulge in personalities regarding individuals is good politics. I found it to be so, because the common people know it is so. They do not like folks who indulge in manure-spreading. They do not like that kind of tactics. The people are looking for more light. Light is what they want. It was Goethe who, when he was about to die, uttered the words, "More light." A friend who was standing by his bed said, "He wants a candle." Another friend said, "No. He is passing through the vestibule between this existence and the next existence, and wise men say that when a man goes through that vestibule he can look both ways." Goethe was looking both ways and saw that what the world needed was more light. Yes, Mr. President, more light. That is also what the grass-roots people want. They do not want our Executive or our candidates to go about spreading murkiness. They want to know the facts; they want to become acquainted with the light.

I respectfully submit, therefore, that when the voters go to their voting booths on November 2, 1948, they should cast their ballot for a Republican President, for Republican Senators, and Republican Representatives. Where they feel that they cannot vote the straight party ticket, because there are some individuals in the Democratic Party who merit their support, I fully respect their judgment. But I do feel that it is the Republican Party to which the Nation must look for the vision and leadership that is so necessary during these chaotic and confused times, but also glorious times.

It is time for a change, Mr. President. It is time for GOP leadership of the national administration and for continued GOP guidance at the helm of Congress.

America must disenthrall itself from the Democratic clutch. We must think anew and act anew, as Lincoln advised us.

The choice is before us, freedom under Republicans or regimentation under Democrats; economy or extravagance; merit or spoils; constitutional Americanism or alien collectivism.

I am sure America will make the correct choice.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the pending bill will be returned to the Calendar and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 1673, House bill 6481, the Government corporations appropriations bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it has become very clear that there will not be time at this session of Congress for favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 200, which is a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment so that in electing a President and Vice President the electoral votes shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote. This proposal has been unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress, and is an extremely meritorious legislative proposal. It would prevent such a situation as has arisen three times in our history, when the candidate who received the largest popular vote was not elected.

Mr. President, if we shall return after the session on Saturday, I serve notice now that I shall attempt to bring the joint resolution up. In any case, I shall renew my effort to get it before the Congress at the next regular session.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret very much to hear the Senator from Massachusetts state that he does not think the joint resolution can be considered at this session. I know of no more important legislative proposal, and I hope the circumstances will permit the Senate to consider the joint resolution at an early date.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator. I am glad he feels as he has stated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD several articles and editorials which have been printed in support of this very important reform, an editorial from the Recorder-Gazette, of Greenfield, Mass., an editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, one from the Lawrence (Mass.) Tribune, an article by Blair Moody from the Boston Globe, an editorial from the Jamestown Shopping

Guide, of Jamestown, N. Y., and an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette of May 4, 1948]

"ELECTION MACHINERY"

The 1948 campaign will decide who will be President of the United States for the next 4 years. It also has provided impetus to make drastic changes in both Federal and State election machinery. The Federal change would increase the degree of democracy; the State would reduce it. However, those values are not the measure of Government efficiency or effectiveness under the two proposals.

The State proposal is to end direct Presidential primaries and to return to the convention system of electing delegates to the national-party conventions, as was done prior to 1912. Theoretically, the direct primary gives the people direct and decisive voice on who shall rule them. It might be actually so if, as in some States, delegates ran pledged to specific candidates or if they were bound to follow an order of preference expressed by the voters.

Under the Bay State system the direct primary has been a farce. The legislature would not permit voters to express a choice for President. Such delegate contests as appeared reflected local political rivalries rather than national issues. So the great majority of voters, and even of those enrolled in parties, stayed away from the polls.

Even in a three-way contest for delegates at large, as the Democrats had this year, there was not even a suggestion of nominating anyone other than President Truman. The convention system is at least inexpensive to the taxpayers, even if it reflects no more of the people's choice. It would be interesting to know, incidentally, if Mayor James M. Curley (seeking his first political post since his liberation from jail) would have placed second on the slate from a Democratic State convention as he did in the direct primary.

The Federal change, if effected, would be vastly more important. It would end the solid South. It would end such landslides as swept Hoover and F. D. Roosevelt (among others) into the White House.

Now a State's representation (proportionate to the number of its registered voters) in the electoral college is bound to vote for the man who attains a majority of the popular vote, even if the majority consists of a single vote in a million ballots. The decision has never been so close, but 40 or more electoral votes have several times been delivered by popular majorities of only a few thousand.

It is now proposed that the electoral vote of each State be counted for candidates in the proportion of the popular vote they receive. A bill to accomplish this has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee and is awaiting admission by the rules committee. An identical bill, submitted by Senator LODGE, was approved 6 to 1 by the Senate Judiciary Committee yesterday, and LODGE is pressing the Republican policy committee for early floor action. But even if Congress approves, it must be ratified by 36 States.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of May 24, 1948]

"ELECTORAL REFORM"

Thus far the opponents of Senator LODGE'S plan for reforming the Electoral College have not produced any weighty arguments against it. Under his proposal, the electoral votes of a State would no longer be cast as a unit; instead, they would be divided in proportion to the popular votes. This has caused alarm among the advocates of so-called State sovereignty. They argue that a State ought not to be compelled to split its electoral votes; that it ought to give them all to one party if it wants to do so.

That, however, is not really an appeal for State authority. The voters in a State are not worried about its "sovereignty" in regard to Presidential elections. They are thinking in terms of advantage for their own political parties. A Democrat is not going to burst with State pride because all of the electoral votes of his State go to a Republican nominee even if the popular majority in favor of the Republicans is very small.

Further, our party system has turned our Presidential electors into mere party agents or rubber stamps. Thus there is a wide gap between theory and practice, and this gap ought to be closed.

Full debate may show the need of some changes in the Lodge plan itself. But Americans have long been too complacent about electing their Presidents by one method while solemnly pretending to do it by another.

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Tribune of May 18, 1948]

PRACTICABLE SUGGESTIONS

In the past year, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, has taken leadership in two moves of outstanding importance in connection with the office of President of the United States that unquestionably appeal to innumerable Americans regardless of the political parties to which they belong. They seem so sound and sensible as to merit substantial support.

Under the provisions of the Constitution, all the electoral votes of a State are credited to the candidate whose electors get the largest number of votes at the polls on the day of the Presidential election, no matter how small their winning margin may be. The minority of the electorate that barely loses gets no credit whatever for its vote and that definitely does not seem fair. Senator LODGE has a bill before Congress to correct that condition by dividing the electoral vote of a State proportionately on the same basis as the popular vote is cast and that seems sound and just. The measure has a long way to go, because if approved by Congress it would have to be submitted to the legislatures of the various States for action as an amendment to the Constitution. The proposal merits acceptance, however, and ultimately should be accorded the approval it deserves.

A special commission led by ex-President Herbert Hoover is making a study of the possible reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and Senator LODGE has called its attention to the fact that while the Constitution clearly and efficiently outlines the procedure to be followed in the event of the death of a President, there is nothing there regarding the course to be taken if the President is incapacitated by illness. He urged the Commission to study this serious situation most carefully and make a recommendation for its correction.

Although the Bay State Senator cited the poor health of the late Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt toward the end of their final terms of office to support his contention, the case of the former probably provided the strongest argument for specific procedure under such circumstances. In the closing months of his administration, President Wilson made no public appearances for a prolonged period and was kept closely guarded in such complete seclusion that even delegations from Congress were unable to get any information to support or refute prevailing rumors regarding the serious nature of his illness. A situation of that sort is much too dangerous to the best interests of the United States and its people to be risked indefinitely. Most Americans will agree that official procedure should be established to enable Congress to determine if or when a President is physically incapable of performing the duties of his office and then to follow the course of action prescribed by law.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Globe of May 9, 1948]

NEW SYSTEM OF ELECTING PRESIDENT GAINS MOMENTUM

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—A proposal for drastic and fundamental reform of the system of electing the President of the United States, is gaining momentum in Congress as the possibility of a 1948 electoral college mess begins to take shape.

Judiciary Committees of both Senate and House have now reported favorably a revolutionary constitutional amendment on which Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts, and several House colleagues have been quietly plugging for several months.

This scheme would wipe out the system under which all the electoral votes of a State are plunked for the candidate who wins the State, however narrow his margin.

Instead, an automatic system of splitting the electoral vote of each State, in proportion to the actual popular vote cast, would be substituted. It would be tantamount to a direct popular election of President, but retain the electoral-vote device as a protection against a situation where fraud in one State nullified honest votes in other States.

The whole system of adding up the votes that actually elect a President would be changed. The electoral college itself would be abolished. There would be no opportunity for an "elector" to cast the votes of several hundred thousand people according to his individual whim.

Here is how the change would work:

In 1944, Michigan cast slightly over 2,200,000 votes for President, with Roosevelt getting 22,000 more votes than Dewey. In electoral college, Roosevelt got 19 votes, Dewey none.

Under the Lodge amendment, Roosevelt would have won 9536 votes from Michigan, Dewey 9343.

Massachusetts cast about 2,000,000 votes giving Roosevelt a margin of 114,000. Instead of all 16 Bay State votes going to F. D. R., Lodge would have split them 8448 to 7618.

The 1944 nation-wide vote was 25,602,505 for Roosevelt, 22,006,278 for Dewey. The electoral vote was 432 to 99.

The new scheme would have made the electoral vote exactly in proportion to the popular vote—300,726 for Roosevelt and 223,529 for Dewey.

CITE ALABAMA ELECTION

The Senate Committee acted following this week's election in Alabama, where 11 Democratic Presidential electors were chosen who, had pledged themselves to vote against President Truman or any other "civil rights" nominee.

If this pattern is followed in other Southern States, as expected, there is strong prospect that the Democrats will lose 60 electoral votes which otherwise they would surely get under the South's one-party system.

In a close election, this could take the election out of the hands of the people entirely and throw it into the hands of the House of Representatives. The electoral college chooses the President only if it casts a majority for one man.

Few observers think this will happen this year because of the anticipated Republican Presidential victory. To vitiate the popular election, Mr. Truman would have to carry the country by a margin less than the total

electoral votes of which rebel electors were depriving him.

Only if the President reversed all the forecasts through an uexpected show of strength or the nomination of a GOP candidate the people would not accept could this situation develop this year.

PRIED OUT OF COMMITTEE

But the Alabama high light of the antiquated electoral system gave Lodge his opportunity not alone to pry his amendment out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, but to get a promise of serious consideration from the GOP Senate Policy Committee. Representatives GOSSETT, Democrat of Texas and LEA, Democrat of California had already obtained a unanimous vote from the Judiciary Committee.

LODGE argues his amendment will not only assure the people's votes of being counted as they are cast, but would eliminate many evils long considered inherent in our political "game," which in fact are based on the system itself.

It would, for example, end the balance-of-power system in which a narrow margin of votes in a big State can mean more in an election than many more votes cast in less pivotal States.

LODGE says, it would also end the system under which minority votes in a State are disenfranchised. It would make a vote in a small State as potent as one in a big State. It would end the situation where Presidential candidates are drawn almost invariably from large doubtful States where their local appeal will help tip a big electoral bonus into the party basket.

It would, above all, end any danger that the candidate receiving a popular majority might be shut out in the electoral college. This happened three times in our history—when John Quincy Adams was counted in over Jackson in 1824, Hayes over Tilden in 1876, and Harrison over Cleveland in 1888.

RANKIN AGAINST IT

No one of influence in Congress has come out against the Lodge-Gossett proposal, its most easily audible opponent being Representative JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi. Several Republican leaders, however, are looking on it with skepticism.

Senator TAFT and House Majority Leader HALLECK suspect it might have an adverse effect on the Republican Party, since big Northern States would ordinarily split their electoral votes almost evenly while Southern States ordinarily cast an overwhelming vote for the Democratic candidate.

LODGE is endeavoring to lift consideration above the partisan level. He suggests to his party leaders, whose support is needed to pass the measure, that while Texas would cast a more lopsided electoral vote than New York, and South Carolina than Massachusetts, a system of making every vote count might ultimately smash the one-party system in both heavily Democratic and heavily Republican States.

[From the Jamestown (N. Y.) Shopping Guide of May 13, 1948]

"REAL DEMOCRACY AT HOME"

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, has returned from the wars overseas to his own private war to do away with the electoral college and let total majority votes do the electing of President and Vice President. Such a change, of course, would require a constitutional amendment, and up to now it has been thought impossible to get an amendment ratified, because all or most of the small States would refuse. Their argument would be that since each has as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives, each small State, which has just as many Senators as each large State, really has more votes in the college in proportion to population than a larger State.

There is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary a joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution so that in future Presidential elections the electoral votes of the States shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote. That will remedy one of the most serious defects in our present system of electing a President.

It would make the popular vote decisive. In the 1944 Presidential election Governor Dewey carried Ohio. He received 1,582,293 votes. President Roosevelt received 1,570,763 votes. That was a difference of only 11,530 votes. Yet Governor Dewey chalked up all of Ohio's electors. In other words, 11,530 voters determined the election so far as Ohio was concerned, and more than one and one-half million Democratic voters were in effect disfranchised.

If 2,000,000 people in New York State vote for one candidate for President, and 2,000,500 vote for another man, there is no reason why 500 votes should swing the whole 2,000,000 votes to the other man. But that is the way it now stands, and it is high time to change it, since we are out to wet nurse the world on democratic breakfast food.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of June 5, 1948]

IMAGINE! REAL GOP VOTES CAST IN THE SOLID SOUTH!

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, June 4.—Picture the Republican nominee for President of the United States campaigning for electoral votes in deepest Alabama and Mississippi—and getting them.

Picture his Democratic opponent confidently stumping Maine and Vermont for votes in the same election race—and getting them.

Picture Negroes voting in large numbers in the South—and their votes counting.

Picture it, because it can happen here—and because the chances are better than you think of its happenings in the next few years.

Senate Joint Resolution 200 is the little known piece of legislation which would break down once and for all the solid South and the one-party monopoly States of the North.

It actually has gotten as far as approval by the Senate Judiciary Committee, while a companion measure has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee. Its sponsor is Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts.

The legislation will get no further this time but maybe next year, in the Eighty-first Congress, it will catch fire and roll through to passage. Sentiment for it has been growing strongly in Congress, even among southern Democrats.

In a Presidential election year, Senate Joint Resolution 200 is a mighty interesting piece of legislation. It proposes a constitutional amendment to wipe out the archaic electoral college system, which today is no more use to the body politic than an appendix is to the human body.

Unlike other proposed repealers of recent years, the resolution would not wipe out the 531 electoral votes and throw the election open on a national across-the-board basis, depending upon the total popular vote. (That proposal would never get anywhere because the small States say they would lose their importance completely.)

Here is what it would do:

It would continue the present 531 electoral votes. They would be divided among the States as at present—one for each Member of the House and one for each Member of the Senate from the State.

But they would be divided proportionately depending upon the division of the popular vote among the candidates. In 1944, for example, Pennsylvania cast 1,940,479 votes for Franklin D. Roosevelt. It cast 1,835,048 votes for Thomas E. Dewey. Yet all of Pennsylvania's 35 electoral votes were given to Roosevelt. But in the State of South Dakota, in which he received 135,265 votes, Dewey got the 4 electoral votes. Thus, Dewey got more electoral votes in South Dakota than he received in Pennsylvania which gave him about twelve times as many popular votes.

Under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 200, the 35 Pennsylvania votes would be divided as follows: Roosevelt, 17.897 electoral votes; Dewey, 16.924 electoral votes. In South Dakota, on the basis of the vote cast, Dewey would have received only 2.333 electoral votes; Roosevelt would have received 1.666.

All of these votes from all the States would be added together. The winner would be the man with the most.

Go back to 1944 again. Nation-wide, Roosevelt received 25,602,505 popular votes which brought him 432 electoral votes. Dewey, with 22,006,278 popular votes, received only 99 electoral votes.

Under Senate Joint Resolution 200—carrying through the State by State break-down—Roosevelt would have gotten 300,726 electoral votes. Dewey's share would have been 223,529. The small discrepancy between these figures and 531 total is taken up by the small third party votes.

Here is what would happen in the South. Whether Mississippi cast 250,000 popular votes in a general election for President or only 60,000, it would still have the same number of electoral votes—nine.

But for the first time since it became a one-party State all of whose fights are settled in the primary, there would be real incentive to turn out a big vote in the general election. The moribund Republican Party of the State would come alive. Even though its vote were small, it would count for something toward the total electoral votes of the Republican nominee. And, in order to keep the Democratic ratio very large, the Democrats in their turn would turn out a bigger vote.

The same would be true in all the other Dixie States. And the Democrats there who have fought to keep Negroes out of the Democratic primaries would watch Southern Negroes march to the polls in the general election to vote the Republican ticket—knowing that every vote so cast would help the GOP nominee. Southern Democrats favor the plan, too. They say their party would no longer take them for granted, but would have to woo them.

Of course, in solidly Republican Maine and Vermont, the reverse would be true, with the Democrats the gainers.

Hence, for the first time, everybody's vote would count. No territory would be sure territory. Candidates would pursue voters in places where the nominees have never bothered to go before.

Democracy would really be in action in our Presidential elections.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu; and

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6556 to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to each of the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation; and

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, and Mr. GORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the middle district of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Georgia, for the use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 5524. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; and

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I understand that the Senate is now considering the committee amendment to House bill 6481, which is in effect an amendment to increase by $4,000,000 the appropriation in the bill so as to provide for the construction of one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. Am I correct in my understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 7, after the word "vehicles," it is proposed to strike out "$27,389,061", and insert in lieu thereof "$30,972,061."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, when the Tennessee Valley Authority was created in 1933 it was established to improved the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River, to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley, to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley, to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes.

The President's budget message for the fiscal year 1948 contains language summarizing the specific congressional authority granted to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I read from that message:

To accomplish these purposes the corporation was specifically authorized to construct such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries as will provide and maintain a 9-foot channel in the river from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and control destructive flood waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi drainage basins.

Then the statement goes on further to say:

Insofar as may be consistent with these navigation and flood-control objectives, it was directed to provide and operate facilities for the generation and sale of electric energy.

In other words, at all times the generation of electric energy as a result of this great public work was of a secondary and incidental consideration.

I would be the last one to say that in a development so gigantic as this we should not use every advantage we can obtain from it. In other words, when the Federal Government enters upon the task of developing a great natural resource it seems to me altogether proper that we should develop that resource to the ultimate use to which it can be put, that is, as a natural resource.

In this particular situation—and there are many others like it throughout the United States—there are natural resources which cannot be developed by private capital, which cannot be developed in any other way than by the Government stepping in and providing funds for the development. That was done in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, my objection to the committee amendment is based upon the fundamental proposition that it is now proposed by the amendment to go further than was ever originally intended. It seems to me that we have reached the place where we must make a very important decision in the matter of policy. It is perfectly proper for the Federal Government to develop the Nation's natural resources and use them to their utmost advantage. But the proposition now appears to be this: There is in prospect the probability that there will be a demand for electric power over and beyond what can be provided as originally intended in the act. There is in prospect a demand for more than the ordinary and proper development by the Government of these natural resources, can provide. It was essentially considered that the hydroelectric energy generated would be developed exclusively and entirely as a result of the construction of the various dams and the improvement of the rivers; but now it is proposed to go a step further. It is proposed to take the step of supplementing with steam plants, built at Government expense, the deficiencies in the water-power potential.

The result of such a policy is bound to be that the Government having undertaken to develop a natural resource when it is found that the cheaper power provided is in great demand, and that the demand exceeds the potential of the hydroelectric development, the Government will then take Federal funds and proceed to tax all the taxpayers in the United States in order that the companies which are attracted to the Tennessee Valley by cheap power may enjoy the subsidy of cheaper power.

It seems to me that that is a very marked departure from what was the original intention. It is a marked departure from the apparent and announced purpose of the act in all the years from the time the enterprise was first conceived up until now. It puts the Government into the field of supplying public power, no matter how it may be supplied, whether by the development of a natural resource or by the development of a steam plant at tremendous expense.

This is only an initial appropriation of $4,000,000. I understand that the total will reach an additional $54,000,000 for the steam plant. So eventually we shall have invested there a very substantial sum.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. In addition to the $54,000,000, does not the project involve

an expense of many million dollars more, which would bring the total up to approximately $85,000,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. $84,000,000.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in accord with what the Senator from Connecticut is saying. I am not against this appropriation because I believe that some other part of the country ought to have it instead of Tennessee. I would not be standing here on that basis. There may be a good argument on that basis; but I am against the proposal as being a fundamental invasion of the private enterprise system of the United States. To me it means the very thing which Chief Justice John Marshall had in mind when he said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. I think that is what the Senator from Connecticut is talking about. If we can tax the people all over the United States and put the Government in business in one section with that tax money, and putting it in business in that section interferes with the free competitive enterprise system, we are getting away from what made America. Is that what the Senator had in mind?

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator for his comment. This is a deliberate step in that direction.

The proponents of this measure say that those who oppose it are protecting the power interests. But the issue goes a good deal further than that. It goes to the extent of providing cheaper-power subsidies at the expense of the Federal taxpayers, subsidies which I believe will have the effect of taking industries from other parts of the country and moving them to this particular area.

It appears from the record in this particular case that the demand for power in this area, so far as industrial use is concerned, is not a demand from a great many small industries. It is a demand from several large industries which have gone there.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Last night I had in mind a point which I did not have an opportunity to bring up. I believe that the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], a very dear friend of mine, stated that the TVA power had not attracted any new industry. He asked anyone to name the new industries which had been attracted.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that even if it did not attract any new industry, but made the industries which are there grow and develop at the expense of other industries in competition with them in other parts of the Nation because the industries in the favored section obtained power more cheaply than anyone could furnish it at any other point in the United States because of the use of the taxpayers' money in producing power at a cheaper cost, that would not change my position.

No one in the world knows exactly what the cost is. I have heard the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] argue that the books and accounting records did not tell us what the cost of the power was in the TVA. I have heard him argue that point time and again.

So I say that in justice to the rest of the Nation, we should support what I believe is the foundation upon which the whole country rests, the protection of the right of the private individual to invest his funds in private business and serve the people in competition with other private individuals, rather than in competition with the Government, which takes tax money out of the pockets of the people through the power to tax. That is the thing which the Senator and I must protect if we are to preserve the American system, the greatest system in the world, to which system th whole world has come twice in the past 25 years for relief from slavery.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator is correct, and I thank him for his comment.

Mr. President, I was saying that those who propose this amendment, and those who object to the position which the junior Senator from Connecticut has taken, are prone to cry that we are trying to protect the power interests.

The issue goes much deeper than that. We are not primarily concerned in protecting the power interests of our State or any other. They have done a great job for the economy of the country. They have been well able to take care of themselves. What I am primarily interested in is this: If the industries in any section of the country—in Connecticut, other States of New England, the Northwest, or any other part of the country—are attracted away from those areas by cheap subsidized power in any other part of the country, then the people in the territories from which those industries are withdrawn, or in the territories to which no new industries come, will be without employment. In my own State we are now faced with the prospect in my home town of the removal of a large industry to another part of the United States. We recognize that because of the nature of this industry and its requirements, it probably will have to go to some other part of the country as a matter of policy. But the result will be to leave 7,500 people in that small community without employment which many of them have been accustomed to have over a period of 20 years. So many of those people will be out of work; they will lose their jobs, or else they will have to pull up their roots and move to some other part of the country.

I am primarily interested in that phase of the matter, Mr. President.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. From what I heard the Senator say last night, and also from what he has said today, I believe he is no more interested in protecting the private power industry per se than I am. The Senator from Connecticut wishes to see the power industry, as a part of the American free enterprise system, get a square deal.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. And the Senator wishes to see the people generally get a square deal, by not having taxes taken from all over the Nation and used in only one locality in a way that is opposed to the people's fundamental interests.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree with the Senator as to that. I hold no more brief for that industry than I do for any other segment of the economy of the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey is correct. The private power companies employ hundreds of thousands of people, and they represent the investments of literally millions of people.

So we have great conflicting interests here. When the Government steps in, as is proposed to be done in this case, under the guise of developing a natural resource, and then after that development is made, proposes to subsidize something really incidental to the development of that natural resource, the Government is going too far.

There is no more reason why this amendment to make an appropriation for a steam plant in Tennessee should be made than there is that the Congress should enact a bill providing an appropriation for a steam plant in any other part of the United States where additional power is needed; and there are other sections of the United States where the power load now is too heavy for the facilities at present provided.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that his observation, which has been repeated several times, that there is a possibility that industry will be drawn from other sections of the United States into the Tennessee Valley is, I think, based upon an improper predicate, because of the fact that, as I am advised, there is nothing on which he can base such a statement. I inquired rather carefully whether the presence of cheap power, as we call it, in the Tennessee Valley, by reason of the TVA, had attracted outside industries; and I was advised that that had not occurred.

As has been pointed out by the Senator from New Jersey, no doubt there has been some growth of industry in the valley by reason of the establishment of new industries, starting from scratch, so to speak. The Senator has pointed to that several times. I agree with the Senator that I do not wish to see the United States Government indulge in any activity which will give any section of the United States an undue and improper advantage over any other section. But I do not believe that will be the case in this instance.

Mr. President, for the past 25 or 30 years, and, indeed until the advent of World War II, it has been historically true that in the part of the Southland now served by the TVA, and also in other sections of the South, the youth of our land have been attracted to the large, highly-industrialized centers of the East. They have gone there by the hundreds of thousands. Those whom we had hoped would be our future citizens, those whom we had hoped would build our communities in the years ahead, have left our part of the country, and have gone to the industrialized sections of the East, because in those highly industrialized sections, employment existed in

a manner and to an extent not common in the South.

In the South we have come up from an utterly impoverished state to a sort of mediocre industrial activity, and now we are beginning to taste just a little of the better things related to industries. But for 25 or 30 years we saw the youth of the South, both white and black, go to the industrial centers of the East, because of the fact that sufficient industrial employment was not available in the South.

I wish to state one of the reasons for that situation, and it is one of the inequalities which has existed for 25 years. I have fought it with all the power and ability at my command, and many others have fought equally hard to have that situation corrected. Today we are just beginning to see it corrected. I refer to the inequality of the freight rates in the South and Southeast and in the area generally south of the Ohio River. We paid a freight rate on manufactured goods approximately 30 or 40 percent higher than the rates paid in the industrial East. In other words, in Chicago there is a great market for shoes and in New York there is a great market for shoes, because there are more people there. However, a shoe factory in Nashville, Tenn., could not sell to the people in those areas in competition with a factory located in Ohio or in a place as far from that market as Ohio is, for the freight charges from Nashville were approximately 30 percent more on that manufactured article. That was an unfair condition. It was a subsidy to the manufacturers in the industrial East.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. That has been corrected; has it not?

Mr. STEWART. It is in the process of correction, and I understand from the Interstate Commerce Commission that possibly 60 to 70 percent of that condition has already been corrected.

I prefaced my remarks with the statement that I do not believe in subsidies and I do not believe in one section of the United States being given by its Government an unfair advantage over another section. Of course, we are certainly entitled to take advantage of natural conditions which exist.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee that I have no objection whatever to having the Government take advantage of natural conditions which exist, and the Government already has taken advantage of the natural conditions which exist there, to the tune of millions upon millions of dollars. What I do object to is having Federal funds used to add artificial, mechanical means to supplement the natural ones; and that is what this proposal is.

If we adopt this policy in connection with the development of every natural resource, eventually we shall supplement our natural resources with artificial, mechanical supplementation, until finally we shall have made that which was at first incidental of primary importance and have completely subsidized the power business in the United States.

If we wish to do that as a matter of policy, of course, it can be done; but I wish to point out to the Senate that that is the direction in which we are about to set out, under the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Connecticut that I do not seek any unfair or unjust advantage at all. I do not wish to have the Government subsidize the power interests in that valley.

In order that we may find a common ground on which to stand, let me ask this question of the Senator: He agrees, does he not, that there is proper justification for the improvement of the valley by the building of these dams?

Mr. BALDWIN. I absolutely do.

Mr. STEWART. They are built, of course, for multiple purposes—for flood control and navigation; and, as the Senator pointed out a moment ago, power is incidental.

Then it seems to me that the Government and the people are entitled to have manufactured at those dams such amounts of electrical power as can be manufactured by the hydroelectric elements there.

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree as to that.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose in normal times, by the erection of these dams, we can supply 18,000,000,000 kilowatts, or whatever the number might be, of power; but suppose a drought comes along and cuts down to 15,000,000,000 kilowatts the amount of power which can be generated. That makes for an uneconomical condition; does it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. As I read the charts which were submitted at the hearing, there is yet a tremendous margin of possibility for the development of the hydroelectric potential there. I would say that if we have to have more development of a hydroelectric nature there, let us have it along those lines, but let us not step in with a steam plant to supplement it.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, last night it was suggested that in order to make an economic balance—I believe that is the way it was expressed—the relation of steam power to hydroelectric power should be about 25 percent, in order to come out on the proposition and make it economically practical. At least that is the way businessmen figure it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Exactly. Now, let the businessmen treat it that way. Let it be dealt with that way, because we went into this undertaking, not primarily for the purpose of developing hydroelectric energy; we went into it primarily for the purpose of a navigation program, of a flood-control program, and things of that kind. Those were the primary purposes of the project.

Mr. STEWART. But it has become a business, and we are now confronted with the proposition of only 17 percent steam power, and with the completion of other dams, I am advised this morning it will be cut down to about 12 or 13 percent.

Mr. BALDWIN. I understand there is a steam plant down there now standing idle. It could be very well used.

Mr. STEWART. Yes. That was brought out I understand. I endeavored to find that testimony, but the Senate was about to adjourn at that time, and I did not inject myself into the argument because I was not sure about it. That is an old antiquated steam plant which would not produce enough electricity to burn half a dozen old Mazda bulbs, speaking figuratively. It is at Memphis, practically ready to be dismantled. Sixty percent of its output, at the least, I believe, was sold to the electric power company in Arkansas, and I think it has about 40 percent more, but it is not practical to use that plant at all. It is an out-of-date plant located in the heart of the city of Memphis. It could not be expanded. It would not be practical to use it, and I do not think it ought to play any part in the consideration of this suggestion at all, because it could not generate enough electricity even to begin to relieve the situation. The TVA is getting 20 percent of its capacity now.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, to finish my statement in connection with this subject, I should first like to have the correct figures in the RECORD as to the amount of money it would cost. The appropriation is $4,000,000. The total ultimate cost is estimated at approximately $84,000,000. The justification offered for the construction of such a generating plant, as testified in the hearings by the chairman of the TVA, is based upon alleged obligations of the TVA to supply all power demands no matter how great, of the Tennessee Valley area. There is where we have got to make a decision, Mr. President. Are we going to invest Federal funds to furnish all the power for the Tennessee Valley, no matter how great the demand for it may be?

The testimony of the officials of the TVA further indicates that the Authority recognizes that although substantial additional power can be generated by the installation of new hydro generators, it is approaching the limit of the amount of electricity which can be generated by water power harnessed primarily for purposes of flood control and navigation. Therefore, Mr. President, the original purpose, the original intention for which millions of dollars of Federal funds have been poured into this Authority, is going to be changed, it is going to be diverted, it is going to be enlarged. It is something else than we intended originally it would be.

> The proposal to construct this steam plant is based upon the recognition of these two factors, and is intended to provide additional generating capacity to meet the currently estimated requirements of the foreseeable future for electric power in the Tennessee Valley area.

That last paragraph I read directly from the House committee report.

It was originally contemplated that the electric energy generated here would be sold to municipalities and private users and people who were listed as preferred customers, and I think, Mr. President, that is a perfectly laudable thing in the

development of a natural resource of this kind.

The point I make is that the reason why the present capacity is overloaded now is because of some big industries that are going there and some other big industries that may very well be attracted there, that will leave people in other parts of the country without employment or else require them to move into this section of the country and compete for jobs with the people already there.

The report goes on to state:

> There is no necessity whatsoever for the installation now or in the foreseeable future of the proposed steam plant so far as the preferred class of customers is concerned.

Reading still further from the report:

> In fact, at the present time less than a third of the power generated by TVA is used by the preferred customers. The balance is sold to industrial users and private public utility companies, including such companies as the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., Victor Chemical Works, Reynolds Metal Co., etc.

Mr. President, I strenuously object to taking money from the taxpayers in other parts of the country, particularly from my own New England, and my own Connecticut, to subsidize power to be sold at cheap rates to these tremendously large corporations, and that is why I am speaking in opposition to the provision in the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. COOPER, Mr. McKELLAR, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may say to the Senator from Michigan, I should like to be permitted merely to finish my remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at this time?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Connecticut does not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator evidently did not hear the testimony taken in this very case. The statement was made time and time again that we would take into the Valley business and industries from other parts of the country. Then the witnesses would be asked the question, "Whom do you know that has gone from your State or from anywhere else down to the Tennessee Valley? Who is it? What business has been lost to your part of the country? Can you name a single one?" Without exception, and I ask those who are on the committee to confirm what I say—the witnesses replied they did not know of a single concern that had moved to the Tennessee Valley from another part of the country. The Senator from Connecticut is mistaken in his facts. The testimony is not that way. The testimony is the other way.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator for his comment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I know the Senator from Connecticut wants to make a speech, and I hesitate to transgress, but the Senator is reading a report from the House committee, which report I very earnestly submit was based on misinformation, on untruths and half-truths submitted by the power companies through their representatives here in Washington, Mr. Purcell Smith, and others. Mr. Smith, himself, in a meeting of the Senate committee, with the charts and graphs which he had presented to the House committee, and which he brought to the Senate committee, admitted they were not true, were not accurate. On page 269 of the hearings, the Senator will find that admitted when I asked Mr. Smith some questions. I merely want to read this question, addressed to Mr. Smith:

> Senator HILL. Then the truth is these graphs that you have here really—may not be your fault—but they do not present a true picture. do they?
>
> Mr. SMITH. Certainly not.

I suggest to the Senator that he, in my time, analyze the graphs and charts presented by the power people. He will then see wherein they are misleading, wherein they are not true, wherein they are false. I submit that the report from which the Senator is now reading was based upon those misleading and untrue charts, and, therefore, the report is not a correct report, because it is based on incorrect information.

Mr. BALDWIN. What is right and what is wrong is often a matter of opinion, but the fundamental fact remains, Mr. President, that when at the expense of customers who pay the rates and stockholders who advance the money and others who are willing to invest in the enterprise, all the facilities have to be built by private means in one part of the country, and then like facilities are constructed out of public tax funds in some other part of the country, the price of the power which is generated by the investment of public funds is bound to be cheaper. It is just as simple as that. That is exactly the direction in which we are moving here. We are moving in the direction of subsidizing power. If we want to do that, it is a matter of policy. We can do it, but we should know what we are doing before we undertake it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I always have great admiration for the logic Senator, but in this instance I submit that his argument is based upon a misapprehension and an unjustified assumption. He assumes that Congress is being asked to appropriate money to build this plant solely for the purpose of supplying anticipated demands in the Tennessee Valley. I know the Senator is a good lawyer, and I want to ask him if it is not true that Congress has authority to appropriate money to build this plant if its construction is necessary to balance and firm the power generated by the dams in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think the Government has the power to spend the taxpayers' money for any reasonable public purpose. The question with which we are concerned is not a question of legal power. I am not attacking this amendment on the ground of constitutionality, but on the ground of national policy. I say that when we subsidize power in one part of the country, eventually we shall retard the development of other parts of the country where the people generate their own power and its generation is not supported by Federal funds.

Mr. COOPER. I address the Senator now upon the question of policy. Would the Senator say that it is good policy to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to construct dams and to develop hydroelectric power, and yet to deny it the authority to construct sufficient steam plants to firm and sell efficiently the power developed at the dams?

Mr. BALDWIN I would say that when the Federal Government embarks upon the appropriation of millions of dollars for the ostensible purpose of flood control, improvement of navigation, and incidentally supplying hydroelectric power to municipalities and private owners, and then embarks upon another tremendous program of constructing steam generating plants in order to supply electricity to some other part of the country, it is a marked departure from what was originally intended.

Mr. COOPER. I submit that the Senator has not answered my question. I asked the Senator if he thought it good policy to appropriate money to build dams and permit the distribution of power from the dams, and yet deny the Authority the power to build sufficient steam plants to market efficiently the power developed at the dams. I think the Senator will admit that private companies producing hydroelectric power find it necessary to build steam plants. Does the Senator think that it should not be done by the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. BALDWIN. I say, very definitely, that as a matter of policy it should not be done. The Tennessee Valley Authority started as a navigation proposition, a reforestation proposition, a flood-control proposition. The power-generating feature was incidental. If, in order to make the power element efficient, we have to appropriate Federal funds, there will be no end to it. If a steam-generating plant costing $84,000,000 will not supply sufficient power, we will have to have another $84,000,000 plant, and then another, ad infinitum, to supplement the hydroelectric development. I have no objection to a steam plant being erected, but let it be paid for in the same way it is done in other sections of the country.

Mr. COOPER. I again submit that the distinguished Senator has not answered my question. The point I am making is this: The courts and the Congress have said that money can be appropriated to build dams and that there is authority to dispose of the power developed at the dams. If there is the right to dispose of the power, there is authority to do so efficiently, and of electric energy developed there, it follows that we should appropriate sufficient

money to build such steam plants as will enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to efficiently dispose of the power. There is a distinction between my point and the statement of the Senator from Connecticut a few minutes ago.

Mr. BALDWIN. There is nothing in the bill which says that.

Mr. COOPER. The facts developed show that the steam plant is to be constructed to secure sufficient power to balance and firm the power produced at the dams. There is a great difference between such an objective and the objective of supplying large industries, which the distinguished Senator states is the purpose of the appropriation.

I desire to correct my good friend on his reference to $84,000,000 as the cost of the project. If he will study the testimony of Mr. Clapp, he will find that Mr. Clapp makes it clear that the cost of the steam plant is $54,000,000, to be expended on three sections, and that the first section to which the pending appropriation would apply will cost $22,500,000.

Mr. BALDWIN. The amount is not of primary importance; so far as the principle is concerned, it is more or less incidental. I took the figure of $84,000,000 from page 12 of the House report on the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to reply to the Senator from Kentucky. As I understand his argument, it is that if the United States Government erects in a river valley a large dam for the purpose of flood control, and there is a flood, the maximum amount of water in the dam at the peak is used as a basis for the computation, and if for 2 or 3 days power is generated at that peak, after that they are entitled to erect steam plants or oher plants to generate that amount of power the remainder of the year until the next flood comes. That is exactly the argument here.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is exactly it.

Mr. COOPER. I disagree. I say there is a second question involved: Is it good policy? In the case stated by the Senator from Michigan, no one would say it is good policy to construct steam plants.

Mr. FERGUSON. In what part of the year do they generate the peak?

Mr. COOPER. In the case of TVA, we have spent millions of dollars. We have appropriated year after year money to construct dams. It is evident that the construction of this steam plant is required to balance the production of power in the valley, and it is good policy in this case.

Mr. FERGUSON. I heard the testimoney and I have read it. The testimony does not bear out that statment. The testimony is the cities intend and expect to grow in the next 2 or 3 years, and if power were generated from the steam plant it would be available for the industry that is coming in.

Mr. COOPER. I do not want to disagree with the Senator as to what he heard. I suppose it is written down in the record. I should like, however, to read what Mr. Clapp said on this point.

Mr. FERGUSON. We have had experience with Mr. Clapp's testimony. I want to relate to the Senate at this time that last year the Authority was given approximately $3,000,000 in connection with the South Holston and Wataguga Dams, and Mr. Clapp, as manager of the TVA, used the money, not on the dams, but for what he called resource development. That is shown by the official record. So the record is clear as to what they want to use the power for.

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to read, if the Senator will permit——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOBEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that there was a disagreement or misunderstanding between the Senate conferees and the House conferees about the expenditure of the $3,000,000, and the TVA did spend that money, as the Senator has said, but in accord with what was the view of the House conferees?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is what happened. Mr. Clapp had some friends in the House who were favorable to it, and he went to them and got an opinion. He then went to the Bureau of the Budget and received an adverse opinion. He never came near the Senate conferees until after they discovered what he was doing, and then they called him in for an examination. That is what Mr. Clapp did. That is the way Mr. Clapp has treated the Senate of the United States.

In this connection I submit an extract from a letter from Mr. F. S. Lawton, Acting Director of the Budget, to Mr. Gordon Clapp, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM LETTER DATED OCTOBER 3, 1947, FROM BUREAU OF THE BUDGET TO MR. GORDON CLAPP

This leaves for consideration the following allocations from the new appropriations:

(a) Investigations, future projects	$299,000
(b) South Holston-Watauga Dams	2,320,000
(c) Chemical plant	3,243,000
(d) Resource development	5,490,000

The budget provided $90,000 for item (a) Investigations. The record indicates that this figure was acceptable to both House and Senate. The allocation of $299,000 to this work, despite a congressional cut of 30 percent in the total new appropriation requested for TVA would, in the absence of extraordinary justification, be at least questionable.

In justifying your budget before the Congress you urged the necessity of $5,254,000 new appropriation as an addition to $12,056,000 of carry-over funds, or a total of $17,310,000 to carry forward the work on the South Holston and Watauga Dams according to schedule in fiscal year 1948. The House, assuming a $12,056,000 carry-over, cut the new appropriation item to $3,254,000. The Senate eliminated provision of new funds for these projects. The conferees restored the $3,254,000. You have allocated $2,320,000.

Your Miss Owen informs us that while the conferees were at work on the bill she, in response to a request for the minimum sum necessary to continue the work on the two dams on schedule, gave the House Clerk serving the conferees a figure of $13,910,000. This with a carry-over allocation of $12,056,000, of which the conferees were doubtless aware, would have required new funds in the amount of $1,854,000. The conferees, nevertheless, provided $3,254,000, and the bill as enacted specifies "not to exceed" this sum for these two projects.

Miss Owen has also informed us that two minority Members of the House conferee group have assured her that it was the intention of the conference committee that, if TVA had any funds not necessary for the dam construction work, such funds could be used for resource development work and other features of the agency program. Accepting all this, the fact remains that the $18,700,000 finally appropriated included "not to exceed $3,254,000" for these projects, and there is nothing in the record to indicate that less than that sum would be necessary. In addition, you had urged, in presenting the budget to both House and Senate, that $5,254,000 would be necessary, plus carry-over, or a total of $17,310,000. Even though this entire sum were available for 1948, additional funds would be necessary for 1949, 1950, and 1951. Obviously the more done in 1948 the less needed in subsequent years.

It is, therefore, most difficult for us to find any basis for advice to anyone that less than the budgeted amount would be necessary in 1948, or for a finding by you that of the $3,254,000 earmarked for these projects in the appropriation act, any amount could be regarded as "left over" or "not necessary for 1948 construction."

The budget as submitted to Congress provided for chemical plant new money in the sum of $8,686,000. The House cut this to $6,686,000. The Senate, aware of the probability that your carry-over would be $15,000,000 instead of $12,056,000, cut this item to $3,000,000. The conferees restored it to $5,000,000 and the bill earmarked "not to exceed" $5,000,000 of the new appropriation. You have allocated $2,216,000 of carry-over plus $3,243,000 of the new appropriation, or a total of $5,459,000 to this project. This allocation is $3,227,000, or 37 percent below the budget, and $1,227,000 below the House-approved figure. Apparently there has been no statement or suggestion by anyone, except as inferred by your allocation, that your budget request of $8,686,000 did not represent the minimum necessary for 1948.

With respect to resource development, the budget provided $6,000,000. The House approved $5,500,000; the Senate, $3,000,000. The conferees' intentions with respect to this item are not entirely clear, but by eliminating the items which are not in dispute between the Houses of Congress, and considering "not to exceed" $3,254,000 earmarked for the South Holston and Watauga Dams and "not to exceed" $5,000,000 for the chemical-plant project, there would remain $3,328,000 for resource development. Your allocation is $5,490,000—within $10,000 of the House figure, $2,490,000 above the Senate figure, $2,162,000 above the conference figure indicated by the record, and only 9-plus percent below the budget figure.

Again, without questioning the statements given us of the intention of the conferees that any of the new funds appropriated found not necessary for dam construction in 1948 might be used for resource development or other features of your program, it is still contrary to all established precedent and practice to assume that the Congress, in specifying "not to exceed" $3,254,000 of the new appropriation for the dams and $5,000,000 for the chemical plant, entertained any feeling that these allowances were materially larger than actually necessary for the purposes stated, or that other than minor amounts would be diverted from these projects.

Quite aside from the legislative history and intent with respect to these matters, your fund allocations as they now stand bring into question the soundness of the executive

budgetary process. This is illustrated by the fact that in applying the congressional cut in new appropriation proposed, the great burden of that cut is placed upon the dams and chemical plant for which additional money must sooner or later be provided, while resource development, and administratively controllable activity, is reduced but slightly, and the allocations for investigations, similarly controllable, is more than triple the amount contemplated by the budget transmitted by the President to Congress.

In view of the President's budget recommendations and the subsequent action by the Congress, it appears that the $3,254,000 maximum specified in the appropriation act for the South Holston and Watauga Dams, and the $5,000,000 similarly earmarked for the chemical plant would be required to meet the minimum needs of these projects either this year or in 1949 and, therefore, should be so applied. If circumstances have arisen which now make it impracticable to proceed with these projects at the rate which these sums make possible, the unusable portions of the funds appropriated for these projects should be placed in budget reserve, at least until your 1949 budget estimates have been reviewed here. It is requested, therefore, that the Form 1 given temporary approval last month be reconsidered by you; that the underlying fund allocations be appropriately adjusted, and that a Form 2 be submitted to modify the existing apportionment and reserve pattern. We should also appreciate your furnishing a revised supplemental statement of your fund allocations.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Acting Director.

HON. GORDON R. CLAPP,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Clapp went to the chairman of the House subcommittee, Representative PLOESER, on this matter, and got the understanding from Representative PLOESER that the money could be expended just as TVA did expend it. There was some misunderstanding, I understand, between the House conferees and the Senate conferees, and Mr. Clapp did go to Representative PLOESER, the chairman of the House conferees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the situation was as it is claimed it was, that it was necessary to get more power to firm up the hydroelectric power, then why did Mr. Clapp get an appropriation of some $3,000,000, and not use it in the construction of dams, from which he could have obtained hydroelectric power, but use it on resource development? They would not need this power until about 1949, 1950, 1951, or 1952. They did not ask for the money last year to start this steam-power plant, because they did not need it. They did not need it, as shown by the fact that they did not use the money on the Holston and the other dams. No; Mr. Clapp wants an empire of his own, and when it comes down to the record, the record speaks volumes as to what Mr. Clapp has been doing.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. In drawing my already overly extended remarks to a close, there are just two things I should like to add. I should like to read briefly from a letter which was written by the Connecticut Development Commission, through its chairman, Mr. Willard B. Rogers, to Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER, chairman of the subcommittee in the House, in charge of the hearing on this appropriation bill. He said:

The Connecticut Development Commission, whose purpose is to encourage the economic development of the State of Connecticut, is greatly concerned over the implications involved through further Federal subsidies to the Tennessee Valley Authority, such as the one now proposed involving construction of a steam-power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

We understand that the present and future shortages in power output are caused by the additional needs of large manufacturers which have been encouraged to locate in that area because of the low power rates made possible through Federal subsidies.

Then he proceeds further to say:

If it now becomes a Federal policy to subsidize steam power plants in direct competition with privately owned utilities and if the resultant lower rates are to be used as an incentive to attract industries away from present industrial regions, such as Connecticut, we feel that this is not only unfair competition to the industries now providing the bulk of the taxes—

And, I may incidentally add, the bulk of employment in our own State—

which make Federal subsidies possible but it is particularly unfair to their employees whose continued employment and wages depend upon their profitable operation.

Mr. President, I ask that this letter from the Connecticut Development Commission be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTFORD, CONN., *April 1, 1948.*

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Corporations,
House Appropriations Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Connecticut Development Commission, whose purpose is to encourage the economic development of the State of Connecticut, is greatly concerned over the implications involved through further Federal subsidies to the Tennessee Valley Authority, such as the one now proposed involving construction of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

We understand that the present and future shortages in power output are caused by the additional needs of large manufacturers which have been encouraged to locate in that area because of the low power rates made possible through Federal subsidy.

It is our further understanding that such use of TVA electric power is definitely at variance with the original concepts of TVA and the act of 1933 which required TVA to give preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations not organized for profit.

If it now becomes the Federal policy to subsidize steam power plants in direct competition with privately owned utilities and if the resultant lower rates are to be used as an incentive to attract industries away from present industrial regions, such as Connecticut, we feel that this is not only unfair competition to the industries now providing the bulk of the taxes which make Federal subsidies possible but it is particularly unfair to their employees whose continued employment and wages depend upon their profitable operation.

If the large industrial users of that region need more power than is currently available through the hydroelectric plants operated by TVA, why is it not in the interests of national economy and fair dealing to insist that such needs be supplied by privately owned and financed enterprises rather than inflict further financial demands on an already overtaxed public?

If in the interests of national defense, as well as in the interests of maintaining a strong economy throughout the country, we feel that private enterprise and the investment of private funds should be encouraged rather than discouraged. It is our further feeling that the competitive effect in other parts of the country should be carefully weighed in each instance.

We can see no essential difference between a federally operated enterprise and a privately operated enterprise where the Government guarantees such a company against loss. Either type of operation is bound to promote inefficiency and can only be justified at a time of national emergency.

CONNECTICUT DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
By WILLARD B. ROGERS, *Chairman.*

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, as a further evidence of how the whole conception of this Tennessee Valley Authority has changed I should like to read a brief excerpt from what is represented to be the testimony given on January 8, 1937, which appears in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals Record, the Sixth District, at the time when the constitutionality of the TVA Act was being challenged. This is the statement:

It is true that by the terms of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act the steam electric generating plant located at Sheffield, Ala., near Wilson Dam, was turned over to the defendant Tennessee Valley Authority. But the defendants allege that the said steam electric generating plant has not been and is not being operated and that there is no plan or intention to operate such plant now or in the future, or to construct or operate any other steam electric generating plants.

There was a representation made in 1937 that there were going to be no steam generating plants in this area to supplement this particular development of a natural resource. Yet as the demand for increased power has come, there has been a demand for steam plants, and as a greater demand for power comes from the cheaper rates, there will be an increased demand for steam plants, until the Federal Treasury will be pouring in literally millions of dollars to supplement by steam generated electricity that was originally intended to be supplemental to a navigation development and reforestation plan.

Mr. President, that is not a policy which we as a government should develop. We should devote Federal funds to the development of those natural resources which can be developed with public funds, and in no other way, for the use of the people in a particular locality, but when the full potential of such a development has been absorbed, and the question comes as to how we are going to increase that potential, then I submit that every part of the country should be on the same basis as to the

manner in which these facilities are provided. If we are to provide power with public money in one part of the country, then let us provide it with public money in all parts of the country, but we will be departing from the course we have hitherto followed with great success.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield a moment?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator referred to some language in connection with a decision in 1937. Is the Senator familiar with the act which Congress passed in 1939 amending the TVA Act?

Mr BALDWIN. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator is not familiar with the act of 1939, I can understand how the Senator may perhaps see this situation as he does. The 1939 act, I will say to the Senator, was the act passed by Congress which authorized the TVA, through mutual arrangement and mutual negotiation, to buy out the private power companies in the TVA area.

By that act Congress authorized and made the TVA the monopoly power generator and distributor in the Tennessee Valley. When we did that, the situation changed entirely in the Tennessee Valley, so far as power was concerned. No longer were there private power companies serving cities, towns, industries, REA's, or anybody else. Then and there, by that act, TVA became the one, sole and only generator and distributor of power in that area. That changed the situation very greatly. The people in that valley today have but one source of power available to them, namely, the TVA.

Congress was wise in doing what it did in establishing the TVA.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to my friend from Alabama that the argument he is now making bears out exactly what I have said, that we started in on the TVA as a reforestation, navigation, and flood control project, and then in 1939 we changed it into something else. How? By legislative enactment. Now it is proposed that more law be enacted to change it, and to pour millions of dollars of Federal funds into the Authority. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will find that in the original act we provided for the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority to be a coordinated and integrated development of all the resources of that valley predicated, of course, on navigation, on reforestation, on flood control, on power, and all those things. But we envisioned the very thing that has transpired, and it finally came to pass when we enacted the law of 1939.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if the Senator from Alabama has an answer to the query that runs in my mind. If the proposed appropriation fails to be approved do we have adequate reason to assume that the Tennessee Valley Authority has authority to go ahead and build the facility anyway? So far as I know the Tennessee Valley Authority is not accountable to Congress for the way in which the Tennessee Valley Authority spends its earnings. The Tennessee Valley Authority reports to the Congress on an annual basis, on the basis of what it has spent, but not on the basis of what it intends to do in the future. So I am wondering to what extent the Tennessee Valley Authority will go ahead and do what conceivably might be denied by the Senate?

Mr. HILL. I would say that no matter how much the TVA feels that it is wise and prudent and necessary to build the plant, it would not attempt to build it if the Congress by its action said it should not do so.

Mr. CAIN. I merely raised the question, and I am very much pleased by the answer of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I intend to take but little of the time of the Senate in a discussion of the matter of the TVA steam plant in the Tennessee Valley. However, it happened to have been my privilege about a year and half ago to go down into the Tennessee Valley area. I went there in somewhat of a skeptical frame of mind because—like many Members of the Senate—I had heard arguments on both sides of the question, and wanted to go down and have a look-see for myself. It has been contended in some areas that the TVA is a vast experiment in State socialism. I want to say that what I saw in the various States and cities that comprise the Tennessee Valley area convinced me that it is no such thing, but rather it is a great encouragement to the American free enterprise system. It is true that by act of the Congress of the United States we have set up a Tennessee Valley Authority and have given it certain powers in the matter of the distribution of electric energy, and certain other powers granted it by the Congress of the United States. But by the use of that power, by the use of the transportation facilities made available to the Authority, by the flood-control projects which we have built there, I think we have made a great investment in the future of America.

Mr. President, I happen to be one of the Members of the Senate who believe that something that is beneficial to one section of our great country is ultimately beneficial to all sections of our country.

During the past few years this Nation has made great investments in other areas of the world, and I think that it was fitting and proper that we should do so, because we have learned that we live in one world, and when there is chaos and war and revolution we cannot be unconcerned thereby.

By the same token, Mr. President, I believe that when we add to the economic advancement of the great Tennessee Valley area we are adding to the wealth of our Nation in every section of our Nation.

I listened very carefully to the arguments which were made today and last night on the subject, and I sat through most of the committee hearings, and have read those hearings when I could not attend some of the sessions. It strikes me that we have, as President Cleveland once said, a condition, and not a theory confronting us.

Some of the arguments which have been made in opposition to the TVA might well have been made perhaps in 1937—at least if one has that point of view—they might even have been made in 1939. But the fact remains, Mr. President, that we have established this Authority. We have said that the Authority has the power facilities down there for the generation and the distribution of electric power. So as a very practical matter, no private power company is going to go into the middle of the Tennessee Valley area and build one steam-generating plant for the firming up of electric power. It just is not going to be done. What does that mean, Mr. President? It means that if we do not advance the Authority the funds—loan it the money, so to speak, to build this steam plant, and the money will be repaid to the Federal Government—the Authority will not have the plant which good business judgment indicates it should have in order to firm up the electric power energy in that vast area of the Tennessee Valley.

Consequently, Mr. President, I say that we have a heavy responsibility upon us on the floor of the United States Senate today, because it is my judgment that if we deny the Authority the right to build this power plant in the Tennessee Valley area, we in effect put that vast area in chains as far as its future development is concerned.

I think the situation there is entirely different than it is in other sections of the Nation, because in no other section of the Nation have we set up a TVA. Men can quite properly question the advisability of having set up that TVA, or of setting up any similar agencies elsewhere in the Nation, and men may honestly differ as to the public policy involved. But in the Tennessee Valley we have already done it. It is an accomplished fact. It is not a theoretical discussion. We have created such an agency there, and now to deny the Authority the right to have the facilities it needs properly to serve that area is, I repeat, to put that area in chains. I do not think the Senate of the United States should do that.

What are the facts of the situation? As of the present time the percentage of steam capacity to total generating capacity of TVA is down, as I remember the figure, to about 16 percent of the total hydroelectric capacity. What would happen in this vast area of the Tennessee if this were a privately owned public utility? Well, we fortunately have some figures in the record which will indicate what would be done. Senators will find on page 47 of the record that as far as the privately owned companies are concerned their "steam plants as approximate percentages of total generating capacity" are as follows: The Alabama Power Co., 43 percent; the Carolina Power & Light Co., 34 percent; the Duke Power Co., 51 percent; the Georgia Power Co., 53 percent; the Niagara-Hudson, in New York State, 48

percent, and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 38 percent.

If we let the TVA build this generating plant which it needs to firm up its power, and we provide the funds, it will only bring that percentage up approximately 20 percent, which will still be far below what any well-operated privately owned public utility would require in the United States.

Mr. President, I think we should carefully consider the situation. I happen to come from an area of the country which has recently suffered a brown-out as far as electric power is concerned. Like the Tennessee Valley, our section of the Nation is growing. Yet with all the power facilities which could be provided by the privately owned utilities and the power facilities which could be provided by the publicly owned utilities, we have been still short of an adequate power supply.

Criticism is made for the directors of TVA that they are coming here and doing some advance planning. I do not believe that they should be criticized for that. I believe that they should be congratulated for doing it. Unfortunately over a period of years private power companies in my area of the country have come before the Congress of the United States and have attempted to block the development of hydroelectric power and transmission lines in the State of California. I regret to say they have had some success. By so doing they contributed to the brown-out we had this year, which adversely affected industry in California, which in turn adversely affected employment, with a resulting adverse effect upon the tax revenues which flowed into the Federal Treasury.

The fact of the matter is that, according to the testimony before the committee, in 1934 the Tennessee Valley region contributed roughly 3.3 percent of the tax revenues. Because of this investment we have made in the Tennessee Valley area, by 1949 that percentage had increased to 6.2 percent. I think that is a fine contribution to the future of our country.

If we were managers of a business concern, if we had the responsibility for this vast power development, and if the facts were as they are here today I am convinced that we would make this steam-plant investment in that vast area of our country. Unless we permit this plant to be built, no one else is going to build it. Our failure to build it may in turn lead to a vast power shortage in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I think the Senator has made a wonderful statement. His argument is a 100-percent high-class contribution to the discussion.

I should like to ask the Senator one or two questions. Did it not appear in the hearings, and is it not a fact as a matter of law anyway, that an amortization plan has been devised by which the Government is being reimbursed for its entire investment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. On a 30- or 40-year basis.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On a 40-year basis, I believe.

Mr. STEWART. Is it not a fact that the earnings of the Tennessee Valley Authority were about $97,000,000 last year? Does the Senator remember the figure?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not recall the figures.

Mr. STEWART. At any rate, it is a going concern. It is making money. It is not in the red. It is not being subsidized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that when we make an investment in an area like that and part of it is chargeable to flood control, part to navigation, and part to power development there will always be arguments, and men will honestly differ as to what percentage should be applied to each. The earnings will vary, depending upon what the percentage is. But so far as being an investment for the good of America is concerned, regardless of what the allocation is, I believe that the return will be one hundredfold, in comparison with the return on a great many investments which we have made elsewhere in the world.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to make one further point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Of course, the question which is being considered here is whether or not this steam plant can be justified chiefly upon the basis of firming up the power which now exists or is latent in the hydro development. I invite the Senator's attention to the statement at the bottom of page 45 of the hearings, at the conclusion of Mr. Clapp's statement:

> The virtue and the necessity for this steam plant, therefore, is to firm up and help us make more useful the water power that we can generate from the river.
>
> Senator KNOWLAND. You are only recommending here what any well-run privately owned public utility would recommend in running a business, and that is that you be able to serve your customers with a firm supply of power regardless of what the weather conditions might be in a year. If you are not able to take that, you are not able to do your job.
>
> Mr. CLAPP. That is correct, sir.

Does not that practically sum up the entire testimony in the hearings?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the question raised by the Senator from Tennessee, let me say that if I had not been convinced at the hearings that this plant was legitimately needed for firming up power, I would not have supported the amendment in the committee. After all, spending an additional $4,000,000, which is merely the first installment on a larger investment, would not be justified, in my opinion, if this were a small and extraneous addition which was not needed, and could be better handled otherwise. I believe that the overwhelming weight of the evidence shows that, based upon good business judgment, if a privately owned utility were in the same position as TVA, it would long ago have started to make plans and to lay the foundations for the steam plant. Obviously a number of years will be required to construct it. A private utility company with a progressive outlook would have begun to plan years ago, rather than run the danger of being caught short, as we have been caught in the State of California. Other sections of the country have been faced with power shortages.

It is planned to have an adequate supply of power when it is needed. I do not need to tell the able Senator from Tennessee that if we had not had this source of power available in the Tennessee Valley the war effort of this country would have been greatly handicapped.

I happen to be a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The great atomic plant at Oak Ridge is there primarily, in my judgment, because this source of power existed. The other great plants, which contributed to the war effort by supplying aluminum needed in the Air Forces, are there because there is an adequate supply of power.

We talk about national defense. Should we ever be challenged again from any section of the world, we shall need an adequate supply of power. In my judgment if war were to come tomorrow, one of the weakest links in our entire industrial situation as related to our national defense would be a shortage of electric energy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there anything in the record to show that any power from the hydro plants in the Tennessee Valley was used at Oak Ridge? Is not the record void of such evidence?

Let me ask a second question. Is there anything in the record to show what Mr. Clapp said was the amount of power which needed to be firmed up?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that a set of charts was exhibited to the committee, indicating that, based upon the present situation, to say nothing of the situation as it will appear in 1952, there will be a shortage of firm power in the TVA area.

Mr. FERGUSON. But today there is no shortage of firm power. It is the anticipated industrial development which will demand more power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not think that is correct, as I read the testimony and the charts.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the Senator made the point a few minutes ago that the ratio of power produced at steam plants to power produced at hydroelectric dams, is larger in the case of private companies throughout the country, than in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Would the Senator say that this disparity is evidence of the fact that there is a lack of balance in TVA today between steam and water power?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think there is no question about it. A properly operated utility company—I do not care whether it is a private company or a public company—cannot operate efficiently if it sells to its customers merely based upon the peak-load capacity, so to speak. That

fluctuates. But when a utility signs a contract, it must be prepared to deliver the power, both during good times of production and hard times of production. If it is not able to do that, obviously it cannot satisfy its customers, whether they be industrial plants or private consumers.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that two additional dams are now under construction, and that their completion will increase the imbalance between steam-generated power and hydroelectric power in the TVA system?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask another question. The Senator stated that, in his opinion, failure to construct this plant will result in a deprivation of power to customers in the Tennessee Valley. The arguments made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and other Senators who oppose the construction of this steam plant, are based almost entirely on the assumption that this plant is being built to supply certain large industrial consumers. Was there testimony at the hearings to the effect that there are many rural electric cooperatives in the Tennessee Valley in Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, and North Carolina?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not recall the exact number.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a very large number.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I know there are a large number of such customers.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are a large number of them.

Mr. COOPER. Is it the Senator's opinion that a failure to build this plant will deprive the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge of needed power in time of emergency?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If anything should cut off the fuel supply to the steam plant there, the availability of a source of adequate power would be of tremendous interest and, I think, would be an absolute necessity to the plant at Oak Ridge.

Mr. COOPER. A few moments ago, I think, the Senator from Michigan said he did not recall any testimony about deliveries of power to Oak Ridge. I should like to call his attention to page 59 of the hearings. Mr. Wessenauer, power manager of the TVA, stated as follows, speaking in regard to certain charts which had been introduced:

> The sales shown on that chart, however, are actually sales to the municipalities and cooperatives. The total shown by the utilities did not include sales to the Government for its own use, the largest use being at the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge.

Further down on that page we see that he said the following:

> Because it may disclose energy deliveries to the Atomic Energy Commission, we cannot put this chart in, but I do have some others which can go in.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then there is no record that any power actually went there.

Mr. COOPER. There was the flat statement that the largest use by the Government was for the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from California will remember, in connection with the statement about nothing being shown in the record about Oak Ridge, that when I appeared before the subcommittee and made a statement, I urged the subcommittee to hold an executive session in order to go into that very question; and I said it was something that ought not be spread on the public record. I also suggested that the subcommittee go into the whole question of the defense requirements down there.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I recall the situation. As I have stated, I did not want to go into a detailed discussion on that point.

I know a chart was presented, and I know a specific request was made that it not be placed in the record.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few moments ago the Senator from Michigan, I believe it was, stated that the additional power to be provided by this proposed steam plant would be used primarily to supply industries which were expected to develop in that area. As a matter of fact, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Michigan and the attention of other Senators to the chart appearing on page 62, in which it is shown that the great increase over the past years and the great increase in the years ahead lies with preference customers; and they are defined—as a matter of fact, they are defined in the act itself, by the wording of Congress—as Government agencies, municipalities, and rural cooperatives.

The chart shows virtually no increase whatsoever to private industries.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say one word, if the Senator will permit me, before I yield the floor. There has been considerable discussion in regard to taxes. It is true, and we might as well face it, of course, that no government agency pays income taxes. But I wish to call attention to the fact that when I went through the Tennessee Valley, I talked with many public officials, and also with many businessmen, some of whom had been very bitterly opposed to the original creation of the TVA, when it was first considered. I believe I can say that almost without exception, regardless of their partisanship or their economic station in life—and I talked to bankers, businessmen, farmers, employees, employers, public officials,—all felt that the TVA was making a great contribution to that area of the country. In every community where I went, if I had a chance to do so I asked whether the TVA and its related organizations were paying local taxes, because I was concerned, as a great many of us are, with that question as it affects the various States where properties will be taken off the tax rolls, with a resultant adverse effect on the local agencies of government. In every case where I made inquiry—I do not say this applies to every part of the Tennessee Valley, but it applies to every place where I was able to make my inquiry—I was told that the TVA was paying, as in lieu of taxes, as much or even more than what had been paid by the privately-owned public utilities in the days before they were taken over. So to that extent, at least, the TVA is making a contribution to the local agencies of government.

Mr. HILL. Mr President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that no private power company or private utility ever amortizes out its capital investment; but it goes on, year after year, without any amortization; whereas, under the law, the TVA is required to amortize out within 40 years the funds the Government puts into the TVA projects?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, I am not in a position to say that no private utility company ever amortizes out; but I understand it is a general practice in many areas of the country for them not to amortize out the capital investment.

Of course in the TVA area, that is being done in a period of 40 years.

Mr. HILL. In that connection it is interesting to note, let me say, if the Senator will yield further, that the TVA has made approximately $92,000,000 in net profits, and of that $92,000,000, $23,000,000 has gone into the Federal Treasury, $11,000,000 went to pay off bonds which had been issued in connection with the purchase of the properties of the private power companies by TVA and $59,000,000 went into capital investments—new projects—which, of course, today are the property of the Government of the United States.

To come back to the point regarding the industries about which we hear so much, does not the record show that, so far as the large industries that we hear so much about are concerned—the Aluminum Co. of America, the Reynolds Metals Co., the Victor Metals Co., and so forth—some five or six of them—this year, in 1949, those big industries will not use more than 10 percent of the firm power capacity available in the Tennessee Valley from the TVA? Is that not true?

Is it not true also that if we were to cut off all those large industries from the TVA power, and if the TVA did not supply a single kilowatt of power to those large industries, there still would not be sufficient power to meet the estimated growth in the demands for power in the next 2 years?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. In regard to the point that perhaps industries move into the valley, does the evidence disclose that this quest for an appropriation is based on the theory that industries will move there?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is not my interpretation of the testimony I read and heard. I think primarily new industries may develop there rather than

that industries will pick up and move there—lock, stock, and barrel—from some some other area of the country.

But I say to the Senator from Illinois that, if such a movement does occur, it will not disturb me because from the point of view of national defense in this atomic age, if we have some diversification of our great industrial centers, I think ultimately we may be adding to the potential national defense of the Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. I wholeheartedly agree with the statement made by the able Senator from California.

Let me ask the Senator one more question with respect to the industries located in the Tennessee Valley producing for instance aluminum and other metal. As I understand, they do not manufacture the finished product, but produce certain products in the raw, which are shipped or transmitted to practically every State in the Union, where the products are finished. So, it seems to me, to those who argue that the Government is subsidizing the Tennessee Valley Authority to the extent that certain people may be receiving a benefit out of it, the reply may properly be made that the whole industry of America that uses the products which go out of the Tennessee Valley and are ultimately finished in the factories in other States of the Union, are equally getting the benefit of the facilities of TVA.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Illinois I think he is exactly correct. Not only are they furnishing raw materials which are put into finished products elsewhere in the Nation, by which process the Tennessee Valley area is making a great contribution to the industries in other sections of the country, but in turn as the standard of living increases due to some development down in the Tennessee Valley area the people, the employees who get better wages have more purchasing power to buy the automobiles that are manufactured in Michigan or the products manufactured in Connecticut or Indiana or these other States of the Union. I might include dried fruit products and other items from the Pacific coast. So I think it has a two-way effect in being beneficial both to the Nation and to the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. To illustrate the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the splendid answer of the Senator from California, on page 64 of the Senate hearings there appears a letter addressed by Mr. R. M. Ferry, manager, Tennessee Operations, of the Aluminum Co. of America, at Alcoa, Tenn., to Mr. G. O. Wessenaeur, manager of power, Tennessee Valley Authority, Chattanooga, Tenn. In that letter Mr. Ferry has this to say:

> The great proportion of the aluminum and basic aluminum products made by Aluminum Co. of America at the Alcoa works—

That is the plant in Tennessee—

> goes outside the State of Tennessee for final manufacture into end products. In the first quarter of 1948, for example, 98.8 percent of the various aluminum products produced at the Alcoa works was shipped to 47 States, other than Tennessee, for further processing, involving great amounts of additional work on the basic or semifinished aluminum materials before they are ready for final use.
>
> Not only are the aluminum products from Alcoa shipped to other States as shown, but also other States than Tennessee provide most of the raw materials for the production of aluminum at Alcoa.

So, of course, the project at Alcoa, Ala., is not a Tennessee project. It is what I may call a very important link in the whole chain of our domestic economy. It is a very important wheel in the whole economy of the 48 States of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Indiana has been on his feet. I had agreed to yield to him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, perhaps I had better get the floor in my own right, because I have a little more than a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well. Then if I could finish with these questions, I shall yield the floor to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to have it appear in the RECORD here what I believe to be a repetition of the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee when we first began the discussion of this bill, which was to the effect that the Senate committee, as I recall the statement, relied in great part upon the record that was made in the House, as there were very extended hearings held on the appropriation bill in the House, to the tune of 1,111 pages as compared to some 517 pages in the Senate. The reports are likewise correspondingly different in the extent to which they go into the matter, and that is why it seems to me, the House having made such a thorough study of the whole project, that the House record is of great importance and should be given considerable weight, because obviously the House committee went much further into it than did the Senate committee. In fact, it was the duty of the House to go thoroughly into the subject, because, under the Constitution, the House is primarily concerned with appropriation bills.

The House report very distinctively says this:

> Testimony of officials of TVA further indicates that the Authority recognizes that although substantial additional power can be generated by installation of new hydro generators, it is approaching the limit of the amount of electricity which can be generated by water power harnessed primarily for purposes of flood control and navigation.
>
> The proposal to construct this steam plant is based upon the recognition of these two factors, and is intended to provide additional generating capacity to meet the currently estimated requirements of the foreseeable future for electric power in the Tennessee Valley area.

I have no quarrel at all with the Federal Congress using Federal funds, to develop a natural resource, and if this undertaking has been, as I think it has been, of tremendous value to the Tennessee Valley, then I am glad of it, and I agree with my friend from California that that benefit is ultimately spread all the way across the country.

My difficulty is this: If the Federal Government used Federal funds to develop a natural resource, and the full potentiality of that natural resource is developed, and if it is put to its full use as the development of a natural resource, then should the Federal Government, because of the cheaper facilities thus provided, add artificial resources, artificial means to expand that natural resource, at the expense of all the taxpayers of the country?

It seems to me there is where we come to a parting of the ways on a question of policy, because once we step in to develop a natural resource to its full potentiality, then it seems to me we ought to use Federal funds in developing some other natural resources, and not pile Pelion on Ossa in an attempt to develop one great area where the development in the first place was mainly concerned with a natural resource, but has finally worked into a federally-subsidized project in competition with all the others in the country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely want to say that I recognize it is an easy selection to pick between black and white. Where one gets into difficulty is when he gets into the gray field, in between. Of course the argument the Senator makes that instead of merely the development of natural resources, when a steam plant is established or constructed, it is getting a little out of that field and I think there is considerable merit and weight to the Senator's argument. But if we take the next step, on transmission lines, we are also getting out of that field, and if that is carried on through to its logical conclusion, it would mean merely the dam being built to hold the water, and perhaps a power house itself being built by the privately owned public utilities, taking the power at the dam rather than at the bus bar as some now advocate, and transmitting it over their lines.

Arguments can be made pro and con over that. My chief point is that depending on the way one looks at it, for either good or evil, that question is a moot question in the TVA area. The Congress has already established a valley authority there. Now, Congress may never again want to establish another valley authority. They may want to, in the future. No one has a crystal bill to enable him to know that.

I certainly think we should proceed with great care before we establish another valley authority as such. But in the Tennessee Valley area we have one. Having taken the responsibility, having made the people dependent for their power supply directly upon TVA, my only point is that when any well-operated privately owned power utilities have an adequate steam stand-by service in order to firm up power, Congress should

not do something which, in my judgment, would ultimately strangle the further development of the great Tennessee Valley area. For my part, I do not want to take the responsibility of withholding from them something which I believe they need in their economic development.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from California still claiming the floor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; to answer some questions.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I think the suggestion made a few moments ago by the Senator, concerning the importance of this measure as part of a possible defense program, is one which merits considerable exploration. I think it was well expressed. I believe the building of the plant is justified on the basis of national need for national defense. I explored the question somewhat during the hearings, by correspondence and conversations with some of the various agencies of the Government. I am advised that there is approximately a 35 percent anticipated shortage of electric power in the next year or two in the entire United States. Since the plant has been requested by TVA, plans have been drawn, the location has been selected in close proximity to an adequate supply of cheap coal, and since an adequate supply of water will be afforded, I think we should proceed with the project. Its location has been chosen at a point at which it can be most economically operated. With the unsettled conditions which exist in the world today, I think we should turn more than ordinary attention to this project as an aid, not only for economic reasons, but for reasons of national defense.

During the recent World War, as the Senator has acknowledged, the Tennessee Valley was a perfect beehive of industry, constantly manufacturing munitions of war. I am told that at one time, when demand was made by the President for the building of 50,000 airplanes, Tennessee Valley electric current was utilized in manufacturing more than 51 percent of the aluminum which went into our fighting planes. The Tennessee Valley made a great contribution, as the Senator has pointed out, to the war effort. If we had not had that great supply of power, there is no telling how much longer the end of the war might have been delayed. I think we should take notice of the unsettled, chaotic conditions in the world. We do not know at what moment we might need to place an order for a large supply of products, such as aluminum, which might be manufactured by the utilization of electric power.

I think that, at least, should help influence the votes of other Members of the Senate who may not feel quite certain with respect to the situation from an economic standpoint.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee had risen. I want to apologize for not having yielded to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The observations which the Senator has made are, so far as I am concerned, conclusive and almost unchallengeable. There is no way to limit the potential amount of power which can be developed in the Tennessee Valley, and consequently the products which may be made by the utilization of the power. Some Members of the Congress, before the Tennessee Valley Authority was ever created, tried to bring about the very result which we are seeking today. Some of the same individuals, when we were confronted by a very serious situation during the war, went before the Appropriations Committees and asked for an additional $50,000,000 for further development of the Tennessee Valley, and many persons who, in the beginning, were fighting the improvement of the valley through the Tennessee Valley Authority, joined in the request.

I, for one, solely on the theory of national defense, would support this project, if for no other reason. As has been pointed out time and again by able Senators who have made a study of the entire proposition, by Senators who live in the valley and know it, by Senators who understand world conditions, we cannot invest $4,500,000 more wisely at this particular time than in the development of steam plants in the Tennessee Valley, because no one knows what will happen tomorrow. What happened during the last war, so far as our needs were concerned, may in the next war be a mere bagatelle.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, as the able Senator from California has so well pointed out, has already been developed and redeveloped. It has the facilities for further development, from the point of view of national defense. Certainly the Congress should not let down at this hour on a small appropriation for the further development of the valley.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for the splendid speech he has made. He heard all the testimony, and it evidently made an impression upon him, as it should have.

I shall talk but a short time this afternoon, Mr. President, but I want to give a little history of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I was unexpectedly elected to the House of Representatives in 1911. That has been a long time ago. I came to Washington on the 4th of December 1911. Fourteen days after that I introduced a good-roads bill. Approximately a month later, in January, I introduced a bill to construct the Muscle Shoals Dam at Muscle Shoals, Ala., on the Tennessee River. Very little progress was made. The House was very much opposed to building a dam at that time. We made very little progress until the First World War occurred in 1917, when the project for producing needed power for war purposes was sponsored by the later Senator Bankhead. I do not mean John H. Bankhead, Jr., but John H. Bankhead, Sr., who was a Senator from Alabama when I entered the House of Representatives.

When the war came on Senator Bankhead and I went to the White House and interviewed President Wilson, and asked him if he would not recommend the building of a dam at Muscle Shoals in order to get the water power from that dam. The President said he would, and I believe he did. A short time later we got an appropriation, and with that appropriation we built the first dam at Muscle Shoals, and no dam was built thereafter until 1933. I had been a Senator for some 15 years before another dam was built. Senator Norris got a bill passed to build another dam on the Tennessee River, but President Hoover vetoed the bill and it did not become a law.

When Mr. Roosevelt became President he was tremendously interested in the building of dams. Senators can see that I have been with this proposition a long time. It has been a long time from 1911 to the present. I introduced the first Muscle Shoals bill in the House of Representatives, as I have said, in 1912. When Mr. Roosevelt became President he was very much interested in the matter of building dams, and he came down in a private car from New York before he was sworn in as President and invited three men to go with him to Muscle Shoals to see the dam which had already been completed under a former administration. Senator Norris, supposedly representing the Missouri River, was one of those who was invited to make the trip in the private car of President-elect Roosevelt. The second gentleman was Senator Clarence C. Dill, of the State of Washington, and Senator Dill went along as a representative of the Columbia River. The President was good enough to invite me as the representative of the Tennessee River, as he said at the time, the Tennessee being a river flowing mostly in my State, beginning in upper east Tennessee and flowing through upper Alabama, and then north into the Ohio through Tennessee and Kentucky.

Senators may see a picture in my office of the Presidential party, with these three gentlemen, and Governor Miller, of Alabama, and his wife, who met us. After spending a most pleasant day seeing that great dam, which had been completed, we returned on the train after dinner, and the President had his secretary bring out some bills for the improvement of the Tennessee Valley. One of the bills is now substantially the law as it was enacted soon after that. After reading the bill aloud, the President took one copy of the bill and handed it to George Norris and told

him that he was going to ask him to introduce it in the Senate. He told his secretary to mail a copy of it to LISTER HILL, who was at that time a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Alabama, and that he would have LISTER HILL introduce the bill in the House. It seemed to me that that was rather unusual, as Senator Norris was supposed to come from the Missouri Valley; but I was very anxious to have the dam built and the project started, and therefore, said nothing about it.

The bill was introduced by Senator Norris, and a copy of the same bill was introduced by Senator HILL, then a Member of the House, as I have said. The bill passed the House, and came to the Senate. In the meantime the Senate had passed the Norris bill, the bills went to conference, and in the conference the Hill bill was accepted, as I recall, and the Norris bill was merely one of those which had been passed, but so far as the outside world was concerned, the newspaper world especially, it was the Norris bill that developed the Tennessee Valley, though it was the Hill bill that was actually passed. I am bringing this matter forward for the purpose of showing the Senate my long history with this project.

Not much progress was made until President Roosevelt became President and the first two dams were built, the dam now known as the Wheeler Dam and that known as the Cove Creek Dam, now called the Norris Dam.

Were those dams built in the ordinary way? Quite the contrary. The House of Representatives would not appropriate the money to finance the building. It takes money to construct dams, and therefore the dams were not built.

I presume all the Members of the Senate remember the PWA legislation, which came in 1933, the first year Mr. Roosevelt was President. It was legislation providing work for people who were out of employment. The same Senator Bankhead to whom I have referred went with me to see Mr. Roosevelt to get him to allot some of the civil-works money, people-out-of-employment money, to bebing the two dams on the Tennessee, one in Alabama and one in Tennessee. We had to do that because the Senate was willing to appropriate the money, but the House had not done so. The House would not appropriate the money. So legislation was enacted authorizing construction of the dams, but no money was available to build them, and we induced President Roosevelt to allot a certain sum out of the money provided for civil works in 1933, the first year he was President. The two dams were then begun.

The next year the WPA legislation was passed. Out of money provided for WPA we secured an allotment to do more work on the two dams.

During the next year, 1934, I was sent to the Philippine Islands. The late Senator McAdoo; the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who now sits near me in the Senate Chamber; the late Senator Gibson, of Vermont, a good Republican and one of the finest men I ever knew; and I were appointed members of the committee to make an investigation of the situation in the Philippine Islands and report to the Senate. We went west via San Francisco, the Hawaiian Islands, Japan, and China. We traveled all over the Philippine Islands and came back by way of the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. Remarkable to state, on the return trip through the Red Sea our ship passed Mount Sinai. It was a very interesting experience to the four of us. The captain of our vessel—it was a Dutch vessel—told us we could see the mountain, and made arrangements so we could have a good view of it. That naturally brought up conversation respecting Jerusalem, and we concluded that when we arrived at Alexandria we would arrange to go to Jerusalem by bus and catch next week's boat for France.

The morning after we had made that agreement I received a radiogram from President Roosevelt. I was at that time a member of the Appropriations Committee, and had been a member of it for many years. Carter Glass was chairman of the committee, and I was next in rank following him. The President in his cablegram said:

> The Senate Committee on Appropriations yesterday, by a tie vote, defeated an appropriation to complete the two dams, one in Alabama and one in Tennessee. Hurry home and break the tie.

The vote was 8 to 8. I thereupon canceled my plan for going to Jerusalem. I told my friends I was obliged to return. I felt it my duty to do so and returned. They also concluded to return home.

On my return I found that Carter Glass was ill. I went to see him. He told me he was one of those who had voted against appropriation of money to build the dams in Tennessee and Alabama. He said he thought he had made a mistake, and would give me his proxy, and I could vote it in favor of the appropriation, and asked me to call a meeting of the committee. I called the committee together, as the record in the committee room downstairs will show. At the meeting I voted Senator Glass as favoring the appropriation. The appropriation was voted favorably by the committee by a vote of 14 to 5. There were two members of the committee absent. The appropriation thereafter was made, and the first dam was built.

I then introduced a bill providing for the building of a second dam, and have since introduced bills providing for all the dams that have been built. The House was not in favor of the project primarily, and it was only as the result of amendments placed on appropriation bills in the Senate that I was able to obtain the money to build all the dams along the Tennessee River and also along the Cumberland River.

That, Mr. President, is a short history of how the dams happened to be built.

At that time the private power companies had control of power in Alabama and Tennessee. They had large investments in those States. They saw the dams being built and felt that the work was inimical to them, and it was not long before they undertook to sell out to the TVA. Many negotiations were conducted, and finally the private power companies sold out to the TVA. They had large investments in all the big cities. The Chattanooga Power Co. alone was sold for $10,800,000. The company operating in Memphis was sold for $17,360,000. Every large city in the State purchased, through the TVA, the private power companies' property virtually at the private power companies' own price. The TVA did not fix the price. The Government did not fix the price. The power companies wanted to get out of Tennessee and did get out of Tennessee.

There is no longer a fight between the private power companies and the TVA. That fight has been ended for 10 or 12 years or more. The TVA has paid the full price, over $150,000,000, for the private power companies as they previously existed. The private power companies have never been dissatisfied with the transaction. I have never heard of any complaint because of the sale of the properties. A great many of the employees of the private companies were kept in employment. No hardship was worked on the power companies.

I want to assure my distinguished and handsome friend, a man I admire very much, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], a former Governor of the great State of Connecticut and now a United States Senator from that State, that the private power companies were not mulcted in that deal. They had the advantage. They received virtually their own price. They sold what they had after the price had been fixed and agreed upon. There has never been a rumor of any trouble at all respecting the sales.

Now, what is the fact since the TVA has taken hold down there? The TVA built many dams. As I recall, thirty-odd dams have been built by the TVA. The Government has furnished the money for the building of the dams. The Government permitted bonds to be issued in some cases, but mostly furnished the money. So the fight is not between the private power companies, as my distinguished friend seemed to think earlier today, and the TVA. It is a fact that has already been established. This thing has already been done.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. One unhappy thing about my position on this question is that I find myself on the opposite side of an important question from my distinguished friend from Tennessee, whom I have come to admire and hold in real affection. I look back upon his record with admiration.

I assure the Senator from Tennessee that my interest in this question is not primarily from the standpoint of the power companies. I think they are well able to take care of themselves, and they have done so. There is certainly no claim that I have ever heard that the power companies did not get a perfectly fair deal. They were paid for their properties what they were worth, and the transaction was satisfactorily closed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. BALDWIN. My difficulty is with the question whether, as a matter of policy, we should use Federal funds to subsidize the implementation of a natural resource the full potentialities of which have already been reached. The natural resource having been developed as it should be—and properly so—by Federal funds for the benefit of the State, and its full potentiality now being in prospect, should the Federal Government now step in with Federal funds and subsidize the expansion of a natural resource by artificial means? Hydroelectric development having reached its ultimate, should the Federal Government now step in and supplement it by subsidizing an artificial plant? That is my difficulty with this question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is mistaken about its having reached its ultimate. It has not. We are building two of the largest dams. They were started about 10 years ago, and they have been developed to a remarkable extent, but we are still making appropriations for them. They are still in the course of construction. They will be completed in the next 2 years.

In addition, we have built a number of dams on the Cumberland River. The new dams will require additional steam power—what is known in power parlance as firming up power for the water power.

There are many other dam sites. There are dam sites along the tributaries of the Tennessee River in Alabama. I am not sure that there are any in Mississippi. I should have to ask the Senator from Mississippi. I do not believe there are any. But in Tennessee and in North Carolina there are tributaries of this river where there are excellent sites. The Cumberland River in Tennessee empties into the Ohio just above the point where the Tennessee empties into the Ohio River. That river has tributaries upon which are other dam sites. The territory has been developed. A wonderful work has been done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure that the able Senator from Connecticut would not consider any hydroelectric development fully developed to its ultimate if it were being operated by a private utility, until and unless the private utility incorporated into the system a sufficient amount of steam power in order to firm it up to its maximum efficiency. They all do it. Then why should he argue that the Federal Government should not do likewise? The practice is efficient, effective, and economical.

Mr. McKELLAR. Knowing the Senator from Connecticut as I do, I believe that if he had been before our committee he would have taken exactly the same position, after hearing the testimony, that the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has taken. The Senator from California is the son of an old-time friend of mine from California who was a Member of the House when I was there, nearly 40 years ago. He is a grand man, just as his father before him, W. P. Knowland, was a grand man when he served in the House.

I recommend to the Senator from Connecticut that he read the Senate committee hearings. I am not as familiar with the House hearings. I did not go through those as closely, perhaps, as I did the testimony of my own witnesses. I brought some of the witnesses here. They are some of the finest men in Tennessee or in the United States. They came here to testify. Among them were Democrats as well as Republicans. It made no difference. I remember Mr. Bruce, one of the most distinguished Republicans in my State. Many others came with him to testify to the facts as they were, and to show what a wonderful thing was being accomplished not only for Tennessee, but for the entire United States through this great development of water power in the Tennessee Basin, and the firming up of power in the proper way with steam power.

The Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. FERGUSON] is a fine man. I am sorry that he has taken the position which he takes. He will remember that the very best men came here to testify to what was being done. The operation has been a success.

I remember when people said that our efforts to develop the Tennessee Valley from an economic standpoint would not be a success. We have been at it for some time. A great deal of money has been invested in power alone—probably between $300,000,000 and $400,000,000. The other moneys which were spent were spent for navigation, and for development of the entire valley.

Let us see whether the United States is losing anything. In 1940 we had not developed the dams to such an extent that we were making much out of the operation. In that year we made only $3,294,000; in 1941, $3,992,000; in 1942, $6,117,000; in 1943, $7,962,000; in 1944, $4,047,000; in 1945, $5,247,000. Remember that the last figure which I have given is a little more than $5,000,000. In 1946 the income from this great development, after paying all expenses, was $18,301,000; for the year 1947 it was $21,950,000. I understand that this year it will be in excess of $25,000,000.

While we have developed a great State, and brought the best kind of government to the people of that State and the surrounding States, have we done so at a loss? Have we thrown our money away, as may possibly be the case with the money which we are sending to Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and various other parts of the world? Senators will notice that I use the word "possibly." So far as the Tennessee Valley is concerned, we are getting a first-class rate of interest on every dollar of money that is invested there.

Mr. President, I turn to my distinguished friend the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], whom I have known ever since he was a boy. I knew his uncle, and I served in the House of Representatives with him. I think one of the first times I ever saw the Senator from Virginia was when he and I were groomsmen for Henry D. Flood, of Virginia. When I think of what we have down in Tennessee, with a little careful management, and when I think how Representative Flood helped with it, how disappointed I am this afternoon when, rather belatedly, I hear from my distinguished friend the Senator from Virginia that he cannot go along with such a wonderful development and such wonderful progress. It is disappointing to hear that statement from him—he who has been so successful in life, and has one of the most beautiful homes the eyes of mortal ever beheld. Senators who have traveled approximately 100 miles to the west of Washington have no doubt seen his beautiful home in Virginia and his wonderful apple orchard, the greatest apple orchard in all the world. Senators who have been there have seen what a wonderful success he has made in something besides politics, for politics is not the only thing he has succeeded at. He has succeeded in everything. If he were a kinsman of mine, I would not have felt more injured than I was in not having him go along with me in endorsing a great project; in fact, in my judgment, the greatest governmental project I was ever connected with. I am proud of it.

I have a statement from my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was one of them; and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], good, splendid CARL HAYDEN, than whom there is not a purer, finer, more gracious man in all the world, was another member of the committee who joined in that statement; CARL HAYDEN is one of those who said that I had gotten from the Congress the money to build all those dams and to buy the plants from the private power companies when it was found that they could not work in harmony in Tennessee with the TVA. They were purchased, and the plan works splendidly.

In January 1912, if I remember correctly—and I know it could not have been later than February 1912—I distressed my brothers who were in the railroad business in Memphis, Tenn., where they were working for the Southern Railway, and they were located in the old offices of the Southern Railway there, when I told them I wanted to improve the Tennessee River and improve the navigation on it and develop hydroelectric power along the bed of that river, beside which they had their railroad—one of the great railroads of the country. When I told them that, my statement certainly created consternation in my family. They thought I was doing something awful to advocate developing that river, when they were running a railroad along its banks. They did not want any opposition. But I finally lived to see the day when they agreed I was correct about it, and it worked out all right so far as my family was concerned.

In the 40 years since that time, I have lived to see practically everyone in Tennessee in favor of it. But some of my friends on the other side of the aisle here in the Senate Chamber say that is because we are getting from the Government something we should not get. Mr. President, do the available figures sup-

port such an argument? The TVA has made money; it is making money all the time, and it will continue to make money, if properly managed. If we take the advice of my young friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]—and certainly he is a disinterested man—and let this bill be enacted as now proposed, that development will be one of the greatest development any State has had. Today other States have such developments and other States will have similar developments. I refer to the States through which the Missouri River, the Colorado River, and the Columbia River flow. Some of those developments already have been made, and of course they should be made.

Now, Mr. President, let me recapitulate.

First. The TVA is the one and only light plant in the State of Tennessee.

Second. There is no question of competing private plants in the State. Whether that is right or wrong that is the situation that exists in the State. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the one and only source of power. There are no private companies unless in the extreme eastern end of the State in or near Bristol.

Third. The Johnsonville power plant is absolutely necessary to firm up the water power so that no city and no town and no farm and no factory in the State or surrounding States that need power and light can be without them.

Fourth. It is absolutely necessary that this be done to give the manufacturers and others a steady and uninterrupted flow of power and light.

Fifth. There has been a tremendous growth of manufacturing and business in our State since we have had the water power and the needs are tremendously increasing in city, town, and county.

Sixth. It is absolutely necessary that we know in advance there will be no shortage of power and light.

Seventh. The plant is absolutely necessary for defense purposes. The Oak Ridge atomic energy plant, the plants of the Aluminum Co. of America, and the plants of the Reynolds Metals Co., which will be called upon to produce aluminum for the 70-group air force Congress has just voted will need this additional steam power. Aluminum production requires enormous quantities of power.

Eighth. The municipalities and cooperatives which distribute TVA power in the Tennessee Valley have experienced a 60-percent increase in demand since the war and expect another 65-percent increase on top of that; and the TVA is not only short but the whole Nation is short of power.

Ninth. The growth and prosperity and development of our State, the capacity of her many plants, and the development of her many farms and especially of the war plants now existing in the State will all be put in jeopardy if we fail to have a proper supply of power and light. Page 2 of the hearing.

WITNESSES

The witnesses who testified for this plant were:

Mr. Frank Ahlgren, the editor of the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn.—pages 3 to 18.

The Honorable Tom Stewart—pages 18 and 19.

Mayor Jim Pleasants, of Memphis, Tenn.—pages 20 to 24.

Senator STENNIS from Mississippi—pages 24 to 25.

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama—pages 26 to 35.

Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the TVA—pages 36 to 58.

Mr. Wessenauer, TVA power engineer—pages 59 to 66.

Mayor Hugh P. Wasson, mayor of Chattanooga—pages 71 to 76.

Mayor Tom Cummings, mayor of Nashville—pages 76 to 89.

Mayor James W. Elmore, Jr., mayor of Knoxville—pages 91 to 104.

Mr. C. Arthur Bruce, of Memphis, Tenn., who has a hardwood-lumber manufacturing business and who has a private plant of his own—pages 105 to 109.

Mr. Thomas H. Allen, president of the Memphis Light, Gas & Water division—pages 109 to 127.

Mayor R. J. Murray, of Huntingdon, Tenn.—pages 127 to 132.

Mr. Ken G. Whitaker, Electric Power Board of Chattanooga, Tenn.—pages 133 to 135.

Mr. James N. Bloodworth, Decatur, Ala.—pages 135 to 138.

Mr. Charles E. Shaver, of Huntsville, Ala.—pages 138 to 140.

Mr. C. H. Jackson, executive secretary, Florence Chamber of Commerce, Florence, Ala.—pages 141 to 142.

Telegrams and letters from mayors, businessmen, and laboring men from all over my State to me—pages 143 to 161.

Statement by Congressman KEFAUVER—pages 161 to 162.

Senator LISTER HILL—pages 162 to 168.

Mr. James L. Mattox, superintendent Municipal Light & Power Department, Columbus, Miss.—pages 168 to 171.

All these witnesses made out a splendid case for the building of this additional dam.

They showed it would be necessary in national defense because of the war plants in east Tennessee.

Because of the great atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Because it is necessary for the manufacturers, the laboring people, and all others in Tennessee and those several nearby States.

They showed that in 1940 the increase was $3,294,255; 1941, $5,992,083; 1942, $6,117,464; 1943, $7,962,533; 1944, $4,047,005; 1945, $5,247,666; 1946, $18,301,494; 1947, $21,950,985—page 511.

Practically everybody in the Tennessee Valley wants to continue it and build it.

They showed beyond a doubt that if properly managed it will pay good interest on the money the Government has got invested in it.

THE PRIVATE COMPANIES

The private companies then put on their proof.

Mr. James H. Greene, executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa. He objected to it largely because the private companies had to pay Federal taxes and the TVA did not have to—pages 171 and 176.

Mr. Elton Kile, president, National Associated Businessmen, Kileville, Ohio. He thought the stand-by plant was unnecessary and thought the steam plant was unauthorized although the TVA has five steam plants already and that they were asking for monopolistic privileges—pages 176 to 179.

Mr. Grey Dresie, secretary, Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, Wichita, Kans. Thought substantially the same thing—pages 179 to 185.

Mr. Frederick A. Kimmich, vice president, Ostendorf-Morris Co., Cleveland, Ohio. He was opposed to the project as "an unnatural and arbitrary rearrangement of the economic forces that apply in the selection of plant location." He thought it was an attempt to "subsidize industry"—pages 185 to 188.

Mr. John H. Bream, lawyer, Harrisburg, Pa. Felt that it was unfair not to have the TVA taxed like other power companies—pages 188 to 189.

Mr. Garner M. Lester, president, National Tax Equality Association, Jackson, Miss.—pages 189 to 193.

Mr. H. A. Stansbury, managing director, Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Charleston, W. Va. He complained of migration of industries although all the testimony showed there has been no migration of industries—pages 194 to 197.

Mr. George T. Holmes, secretary, Kentucky Tax Research Association, Louisville, Ky.—pages 197 to 198.

Mr. Edward J. Bachman, president, Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Minneapolis, Minn. Took the position that this was "subsidized power"—pages 199 to 201.

Mr. N. W. Kelley, president, Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, Roanoke, Va. He complained of movement of industrials to Tennessee. He could not give any names at all—page 202.

Mr. Charles Eaton, executive vice president, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, Newark, N. J. His complaint was unfairness in taxes—pages 203 to 207.

These witnesses did not really know anything about the particular situation or the particular plant and though some of them were researchers I do not believe that anyone would claim their evidence was important one way or the other. All of them were nice gentlemen, I have no doubt.

I next come to the two principal witnesses offered on the other side. They were Mr. P. L. Smith, president of the National Association of Electric Companies, at Washington, D. C., and Mr. Raymond T. Jackson, attorney for this association, living at Cleveland, Ohio. In a way their evidence was along the same lines as the others but in one respect it was important.

Mr. Thomas H. Allen, one of the TVA witnesses, was asked what he received for his services and his answer promptly was $12,500 a year. Mr. Allen was also

asked for whom he appeared and he answered he appeared for the city of Memphis. Now, when Mr. Jackson went on the stand I asked him for whom he appeared and he said he appeared for the National Association of Electric Companies. I tried my best to find out whether he was on a salary or fee but he would not tell me.

Mr. Jackson also further said:

I told you exactly what I am doing, Senator. I don't know anything about power lobbies, and to me they are no different—when anybody comes before the Congress, I don't know whether they are a lobby or not (p. 256).

I then said:

Let me proceed with reading this article: Power companies fight building of TVA stem plant. Pursell L. Smith, head of the National Association of Electric Companies (here there was an interruption) and the head of the private power lobby which is fighting against an appropriation for the TVA Johnsonville steam plant is being paid $65,000 a year as the head of this private power lobby. Some of the arguments of this lobby being advanced in opposition to the proposed construction (pp. 256–257).

I then questioned Mr. Jackson.

Senator McKELLAR. You were employed, were you not, by Mr. Smith?

Mr. JACKSON. No; I just stated that I was not.

Senator McKELLAR. Who did employ you?

Mr. JACKSON. I said I have been employed on special matters by American Gas & Electric Co.

He came with Mr. Smith and Mr. Smith, on pages 208 and 209 suggested that he be examined first and later on Mr. Jackson said he was not employed by Mr. Smith but he was an employee of the American Gas & Electric Co., the Appalachian Electric Power Co., the West Virginia Power Co., the Ohio Power Co., and a number of others.

I then asked:

All private power companies?

Mr. JACKSON. Oh, yes. We have no Government subsidy—they don't. They are not in partnership with the United States Treasury or anything. All they have to do is pay taxes (p. 257).

Later Mr. Smith said:

Inasmuch as Senator McKELLAR has raised the question of my salary, I would like to make an explanation, please.

Senator McKELLAR. It was raised yesterday on Mr. Thomas A. Allen, and that is why.

Mr. SMITH. You quoted from a newspaper there.

Senator McKELLAR. Yes, sir, I did. I would be glad to have you do it.

Mr. SMITH. I just want to say this, so there will be no misunderstanding. I am not paid $65,000 a year by the National Association of Electric Companies for the purpose of opposing the TVA as such. I am employed by the association for many duties in connection with the activities of the association, one of which is the question of the interest of the utility companies in matters involving TVA and many related subjects. We also handle problems with respect to Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Central Valley project in California and many other situations, and I would like to emphasize that because it is so important and comes out here so frequently.

Senator McKELLAR. You live in Cleveland?

Mr. SMITH. I live in Washington, D. C.

Senator McKELLAR. You represent all these companies here?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. In what capacity?

Mr. SMITH. I am president of the association (p. 261).

Then again:

Senator McKELLAR. Was this paper mistaken about the amount of your salary?

Mr. SMITH. My salary is $65,000 a year by contract.

Senator McKELLAR. You represent all these electric companies here at that salary?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct (p. 262).

I suppose Mr. Smith is probably the highest-paid lobbyist in the world. I have never heard of anyone getting quite so much salary. Just $10,000 less than the President of the United States. These private companies are not being injured by the Government if they are able to pay $65,000 a year for lobbying in Washington. I do not believe even as high-paid lobbyist as he is that Mr. Smith made very much of an impression on anyone as a witness, or Mr. Jackson, either, for that matter, as he would not say what fee he was going to charge.

The Chattanooga Power Board paid $10,800,000 for the facilities at Chattanooga.

The TVA and 38 distributors paid the Tennessee Power Co., which was the private power company owning most of the property, $78,500,000.

TVA, $44,949,400; municipalities and corporations, $33,650,000.

The Memphis Power Board and the TVA jointly paid $17,360,000 for the Memphis plant.

The city of Knoxville and the TVA paid jointly $8,274,000. Nashville paid about $8,000,000 for its property.

They paid over $100,000,000 in the State of Tennessee alone.

In Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Georgia, a total in the neighborhood of $125,000,000.

Mr. President, I am a little regretful that a man as able and as handsome as my attractive friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the chairman of this subcommittee which has had charge of this matter, does not go along with this great project. It is a great project for our State; it is a great project for the entire country.

There are several reasons in support of the appropriation that I wish to state, although I shall be brief and shall hurry along as fast as possible. The Senate, and particularly the members of the committee, will recall that the testimony before the committee was of a peculiar nature. Mr. James H. Greene, of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., testified; and thereafter, probably a dozen witnesses who were secretaries of chambers of commerce testified. What did they know about this matter? Were they engineers? Oh, no; they were chamber of commerce men. Of course, chamber of commerce men are good men; I do not mean to criticize them. But I do not believe they have the same sort of knowledge and the same kind of judgment that the businessmen we submitted as witnesses on the other side of the question showed they had.

The testimony on that side was by Mr. Kimmich, from Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. John H. Bream, from Harrisburg, Pa.; Mr. Garner M. Lester, Mr. H. A. Stansbury, Mr. George T. Holmes, Mr. Edward J. Bachman, from Minnesota; in fact, testimony was presented by a Virginian, too, the secretary of a chamber of commerce in Virginia. They were nice men and they made very interesting witnesses; but we cannot depend on testimony of that kind for what we wish to know. This is a practical matter. Proposals of this sort must be based on facts, and so we must obtain the facts. I omitted the two most important witnesses on the other side, Mr. Jackson, a lawyer from Cleveland, Ohio, and Mr. Smith, the greatest representative of the power interests in this country, or in any country, I suppose. They both made very intelligent witnesses. They should have. Mr. Jackson did not tell how much he got from the private power companies for coming down here and making an argument, but Mr. Smith very promptly stated he got $65,000 a year for managing transactions of this kind. We are all familiar with that. He was a nice man. I have no criticism to make of a man who can make that much money. Just think of it. He can represent here in Washington companies that desire favors from the Government and get $65,000, which is but $10,000 less than the salary of the President. He is a pretty good man. I compliment him on his ability as a businessman, on being able to be the leader of his profession in all the world. No other representative around the Government or the Congress, or a part of it, ever was known to get that much money before. I compliment Mr. Smith upon it.

What sort of proof did the people in Tennessee and Alabama produce? I tell Senators in the long service I have had here, now nearly 40 years, I never had as many fine witnesses from my State on any matter of importance, as on this.

I shall ask a Senator on one side of the question and a Senator on the other side to confirm what I am about to say. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee on the one side and the distinguished Senator from California, who took the other view of it, will say that Mr. Allen and Mr. Bruce and the various other gentlemen presented by the people of Alabama and Tennessee and Georgia, and the neighboring States, were men of the highest type and made excellent witnesses. I take it by the silence of Senators, they agree with that statement. I felt sure they would.

Just a few more remarks, and I shall leave the matter with Senators. Mr. President, we are all aware of the great success the TVA has achieved and the fine example it has been to the rest of the country. If there were such an organization in Oregon, California, Washington, Idaho, or Colorado, or on the Missouri River, or on any other river in our country, what a wonderful thing it would be.

I may say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and to the Senator

from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], that TVA has been a wonderful success. Mistakes have been made. Those in charge have not always done just what I should have liked to see them do, but taking it as a whole they have made a success of the proposition and it has paid the Government. All Government projects do not pay off in money, but this one does, some $20,000,000 a year, and yet it has been in real operation only the last 2 or 3 years. It is engaged in some things probably it ought not to be engaged in, such as developing the farm industry. I doubt if TVA ought to be in that. I will join other Senators at any time in restricting that activity, because I do not think it ought to be done. I think this enterprise ought to be conducted as a genuine, honest, straight organization. It has been a great success. It has made money. It has built up our State. The Government will not lose anything at all by it, but will make money on the investment, because the investment is worth exactly what it is represented to be on the books of the Authority today. If mistakes have been made, they should be corrected.

Mr. President, if there is anyone who wants to ask any questions that I can answer, I shall be glad to answer them. Otherwise, I have said all I want to say at this time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. The point is based on rule XVI, section 2, reading as follows:

> The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation.

The amendment under consideration——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair interrupt the Senator to say we have not reached the amendment to which the Senator is addressing his point of order.

Mr. KEM. If the Chair will permit me to say, on examination of the amendment it seems to me the amendment now is the appropriation of some $30,000,000 for certain construction, including one small plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. The Chair, with his ready and quick perception, I think foresees that the particular language to which the Senator from Missouri objects is the "one steam plant, New Johnsonville, Tenn."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was the Chair's understanding.

Mr. KEM. If the Chair will permit me to say, it seems to me the point goes to the amendment now under consideration, because we are considering the amendment proposing the appropriation of some $30,000,000 for certain construction, including one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. If the Chair feels that the discussion of the point I make should be deferred, I shall be glad to defer it under the ruling of the Chair. I should like the Senate to know I have in mind that this is new legislation which should not be introduced into the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wants to be quite sure the Senator from Missouri does not misunderstand the Chair. If the Senator from Missouri desires to address his point of order to the appropriation figure, as well as to the language, it certainly is in order at the moment.

Mr. KEM. I should like to do so, if the Chair will bear with me, in view of the fact that it seems the two are intermingled and connected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

Mr. KEM. As has just been said, we are dealing with an amendment that proposes the appropriation of some $30,000,000 for certain purposes. One of the purposes for which the $30,000,000 is to be devoted is the construction of one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. The point of order, Mr. President, is predicated on the proposition that the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., is entirely new legislation. It has not previously appeared on the statute books. It is improper to introduce such legislation for the first time in an appropriation bill. Of course the question involved is a simple one, namely, whether the TVA Act as amended contains authority or authorization to construct a steam plant. I have examined the act with some care. It seems to me that the purposes of the act are summarized in section 23. Those purposes are enumerated as follows:

> (1) The maximum amount of flood control; (2) the maximum development of said Tennessee River for navigation purposes; (3) the maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation; (4) the proper use of marginal lands; (5) the proper method of reforestation of all lands in said drainage basin suitable for reforestation; and (6) the economic and social well-being of the people living in said river basin.

In carrying out those general powers, steam plants are referred to in various places. The Corporation which is created by the act is authorized in section 7, subsection (a), to purchase certain nitrate plants, including steam plants located, respectively, at Sheffield, Ala., and Muscle Shoals, Ala. Certainly that does not cover a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to the following provision of the act, which will be found on page 3:

> Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, the Corporation—

That means the TVA—

> shall have power to construct dams, reservoirs, powerhouses—

The bill provides for the construction of powerhouses, and it has been complained that they cost too much money.

I read further—

> powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines.

It is also provided that it shall have power to acquire real estate for the construction of dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, powerhouses, and other structures and navigation projects at any point along the Tennessee River, or any of its tributaries.

Fuller authority to construct powerhouses could not be given than this power which Congress has given by the act.

Mr. KEM. I have in mind the language to which the Senator from Tennessee directs attention. It is perfectly apparent from the context that what the Congress had in mind when the act was passed was powerhouses connected with hydroelectric development. It is constantly used in that way in the act. When Congress meant steam plants, as I shall show the Senate in a few minutes, Congress knew perfectly well how to express that idea. There was no confusion in the mind of Congress as to what was meant by a powerhouse and what was meant by a steam plant. When Congress meant a hydroelectric powerhouse, it said hydroelectric powerhouse. When it meant a steam plant, it said steam plant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wanted to ask the able Senator what Congress meant when it referred to power structures?

Mr. KEM. Where does that phrase appear?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In section 4 (j). What did Congress mean when it said:

> in the construction of any future dam, steam plant——

Mr. KEM. If the Senator will ask me the questions one by one, and direct my attention to the section of the act, I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield twice to me, I shall be glad to ask him the questions.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Section 4 (j) of the original act provided, among other powers enumerated, that

> The Corporation—

Meaning the TVA—

> shall have power to construct dams, reservoirs, powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has just picked out a few words from the section. The Senator should read the entire language. The language is perfectly clear——

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will permit me, I will read the entire section.

Mr. KEM. I am capable of reading it myself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator asked me if I would read it.

Mr. KEM. The Senator chose to read a certain part. If the Senator will read the entire section, I shall be glad to have it read.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Different powers are enumerated. One series of powers is enumerated in section 4 (j). Let me read all of section 4 (j). Of course it starts by saying "the Corporations," referring to TVA "Shall have power to construct dams, reservoirs, powerhouses, power structures"——

Mr. KEM. The Senator is not reading the language correctly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, yes, the Senator is reading the language correctly.

Mr. KEM. The Senator omitted the words "such dam."

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is where the Senator from Missouri falls into a fatal argument, because he is reading from the 1935 act, and not the original act.

Mr. KEM. I am reading from the original act, as amended. That is what governs the procedure today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all. If the Senator wants to construe what Congress meant when it passed the act, he must go back to the original act. The original act of 1933 did not contain the language upon which the Senator is depending to make his argument. I have read the entire section as it is given in the original act.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I submit that the statute which governs proceedings today is the TVA Act as amended, and the question as to whether the acquisition or construction of a steam power-plant is authorized under existing law depends not upon what the law was when it was originally passed, but upon the law as it stands amended today.

I believe that the Senator from Alabama had another question, and I shall be glad to answer it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair ask the Senator from Missouri whether it is his position that the amended act repeals the language to which the Senator from Alabama has referred?

Mr. KEM. No. My position is that the amended act reads as follows:

> Shall have power to construct such dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River—

The Senator from Alabama in reading it omitted the word "such"—

> Shall have power to construct such dams, and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as in conjunction with Wilson Dam, and Norris Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, now under construction, will provide a 9-foot channel in the said river and maintain a water supply for the same, from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control destructive flood waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River drainage basins; and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses.

It is perfectly clear that it means powerhouses on these rivers—

> Power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me there?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The last clause the Senator read is the identical language of the original act, and that is the only part that was in the original act. Therefore it could not possibly have depended on the first part of this amended section for its interpretation.

Mr. KEM. I take it that if there is any rule of statutory construction that is well known and universally followed it is the rule that the construction depends upon the four corners of the instrument, the four corners of the statute, and the statute which the President pro tempore is called upon to construe today is the statute as it was amended and stands on the books today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield, of course, in order to ascertain what Congress intended from this whole instrument, one must go back and get the original expression of intent, and the original act merely contained a like provision, which shows clearly that it was not tied to the first part of the provision, as the Senator would have us believe now.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator permit me to say that Congress frequently changes its mind, and that it has changed its mind with reference to the project it meant to authorize in the Tennesee Valley, not once, but several times? The question before the Senate today is, what authority exists as of today for the construction and ownership of works in that area?

I believe the Senator had some other question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I was quoting from section 15. This was in the original act.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And it was in the act as amended in 1935.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It reads:

> In the construction of any future dam—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is page 10.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Section 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It reads, "In the construction of any future dam, steam plant," and so forth. What did Congress mean when it inserted that language?

Mr. KEM. I can tell the Senator in a very few words what it means as of today. I invite the Senator's attention to section 15 (a), which was an amendment inserted in the year 1939, by the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Section 15 as originally passed provided that in the construction of any future steam plant the Corporation, or the Board, was authorized and empowered to issue, on the credit of the United States, certain serial bonds, not exceeding $50,000,000.

In 1939 Congress amended that by inserting section 15 (a), and if the Senator will look at the last line in section 15 (a), he will see the following language:

> The authority of the Corporation to issue bonds hereunder shall expire at the end of 5 years from the date when the section as amended herein becomes law except that such bonds which may be issued—

And so forth. In other words, Mr. President, in 1939 Congress provided that that authority should terminate and be at an end within 5 years from the date of that amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KEM. The authority, therefore, to issue those bonds, to which the Senator from Alabama directs attention, expired in the year 1944.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for a question, not for an argument.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to make a comment on what the Senator has just said.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I well remember the act of 1939. As a matter of fact, I was a joint author of that act, from which the Senator has just quoted.

Mr. KEM. Was the Senator joint author also of the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of the act he has just quoted.

Mr. KEM. Was the Senator author of the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I am telling the Senator that that was an amendment of the TVA Act. I am telling the Senator that.

Mr. KEM. What intrigued me was that the Senator's recollection of the act seemed to be better than his recollection of the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I remember the amendment quite well, and what I am saying refers to the amendment which the Congress adopted in 1939, to which the Senator has just referred. If he will read the last sentence again, the Senator will see that it took away from the TVA the power to pay for steam plants from the issuance of bonds, but it did not say one word about taking away the power to build steam plants.

Mr. KEM. The Senator is trying to lift himself up by his own bootstraps. He calls attention to section 15, which gives the power to issue bonds, then he says that power is taken away, but it remained. Let me ask the Senator, if the power conferred by section 15 was terminated in the year 1944, how can it be said that any vestige of that power remains in the corporation or the board?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to make myself clear. I do not contend that the power to construct steam plants is derived solely from section 15. As a matter of fact, section 15 recognized that the power existed to construct steam plants, and provided a way by which they could be paid for, that is, by the issuance of bonds.

Mr. KEM. Of course, I have already directed the attention of the Senate to certain steam plants which were authorized to be bought, a steam plant at Muscle Shoals, and another in Memphis. There is no question but that certain specific, definite, steam plants were authorized to be purchased. My point is, if the Senator will bear with me, that there is no blanket authority to go out into the Tennessee Valley, anywhere the corporation may elect to go, and purchase or erect a steam plant. In other words, the authority to buy a steam plant

at Muscle Shoals does not carry with it by any implication, the authority to buy or erect a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator in that statement, but let me ask him what this means in section 14, on the same page. It says, "In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained," and so forth.

Mr. KEM. I was just pointing out to the Senator what those steam plants are. They are the steam plants referred to in section 7, the steam plant at Muscle Shoals, and other plants. There is no question but that certain specific steam plants are authorized. At the very outset of my remarks I pointed out the authority to buy a certain steam plant, that is, the steam plant at Muscle Shoals. The act proceeds and makes certain provisions for the handling and the financing of that steam plant. But the Senator misses the point of my argument entirely if he thinks that I am contending for a minute that no steam plants are authorized. My contention is that no steam plant is authorized at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator does not contend that the act has set out in it exactly where every dam is to be built and every steam plant is to be constructed.

Mr. KEM. No. If the Senator will permit me to say it, that is the vice into which the Appropriations Committee has fallen. It has undertaken to authorize the construction of a plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., which is entirely outside and extraneous to the proper office of an appropriation measure.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator cite to me the section of the act or amendment of the act on which he is basing his argument?

Mr. KEM. I am basing my argument on the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, Public No. 17, passed in the Seventy-third Congress, first session; as amended by Public No. 412 in the Seventy-fourth Congress; as further amended by Public No. 224 in the Seventy-sixth Congress; as further amended by Public Resolution No. 88 in the Seventy-sixth Congress; as further amended by Public No. 184 in the Seventy-seventh Congress; and finally as amended by Public No. 306 in the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask the Senator a question? I missed the first part of his argument.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. Is the Senator contending that there is no authority to construct a particular dam or a particular steam plant without the specific naming by Congress of such plant or such dam?

Mr. KEM. Not for a minute. I hope the Senator from Kentucky would not think I would make an argument of that kind.

Mr. COOPER. Is the Senator contending that there is no general authority in the act to construct such steam plants as are necessary for the efficient operation of the Authority?

Mr. KEM. Absolutely, and I challenge the Senator from Kentucky to point out such a general authority.

Mr. COOPER. I find in section 4 of the TVA act, which I understand the Senator does not now deem applicable—an opinion which I think is subject to question—the following provisions:

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, the Corporation—

* * * * *

(f) May purchase or lease and hold such real and personal property as it deems necessary or convenient in the transaction of its business, and may dispose of any such personal property held by it.

(g) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers herein specifically conferred upon the Corporation.

* * * * *

(i) Shall have power to acquire real estate for the construction of dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, power houses, and other structures and navigation projects at any point along the Tennessee River, or any of its tributaries.

* * * * *

(j) Shall have power to * * * acquire or construct power houses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

I call attention to the words "other structures" in subsection (i), also to the fact that it has been held that transmission lines could be constructed, and I would ask the Senator to draw the distinction between the construction of transmission lines needed for efficient disposition of power and the construction of plants needed for the efficient disposition of power.

Mr. KEM. I will be glad to do so, Mr. President. The transmission lines are physically connected with the distribution of power from a hydroelectric dam. Certainly the right to construct and operate those dams could be fairly said to be an incidental power when the authority was given to construct the dam and to market the power from it.

Mr. COOPER. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. KEM. Yes, I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. COOPER. I point out that it was not absolutely necessary for the Tennessee Valley Authority to construct transmission lines to the dams in order to dispose of power. It could possibly be done by private companies. It was necessary to efficiently dispose of the power. It can as reasonably be argued that steam plants can be constructed to efficiently dispose of power developed at the dams.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the courts have held that the construction of the transmission lines from the hydroelectric dam were reasonably connected; were incidental facilities the right to construct which was given in the power to construct the dams. For my part I think there is no reason to quarrel with that decision. I think it was clearly right and correct. But I ask the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Alabama or any other Senator if they know of any decision of any court of record which has held that the right to construct a hydroelectric dam and powerhouse carries with it the incidental right to construct a steam power plant.

Mr. COOPER. I think the Senator from Missouri is the first one who has questioned that power. I do not know that it has been decided by any court. I will say that a few years ago Congress appropriated money to construct a steam plant in the Tennessee Valley at Watts Bar. Congress did not question its power at that time. The Congress appropriated money for the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase private utility companies which included steam plants. At that time the power was not questioned.

Going back to the matter of principle and not just the specific words, it seems reasonable to me that if a court would hold that it was necessary and essential to build transmission lines to make proper disposition of power taking into consideration the well-known fact that steam plants are needed properly to dispose of water power, it would follow that there would be authority to construct sufficient steam plants properly to dispose of power developed at dams.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not desire to wear down the patience of the Chair, but I do want to say that the argument of the Senator from Kentucky and the argument of the Senator from Alabama to an extent would carry us to the point where under this statute the TVA would be authorized to build or buy or operate power plants anywhere in the United States that the corporation thought were reasonably incidental to its efforts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator a moment ago asked if either the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Alabama would point out to him any Supreme Court decision.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know of a Supreme Court decision, but I do have something here which I believe the Senator from Missouri would accept as being pretty close to it. This is taken from a complaint filed in a suit which went to the Supreme Court of the United States testing the TVA authority. The complaint was signed by the Honorable Raymond T. Jackson, an attorney of Cleveland, Ohio, who, by the way, testified befor the committee against the provision in the bill. I refer the Senator to a statement in that complaint signed by Mr. Jackson as counsel for all the power companies which were trying to overthrow the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. I read:

Under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended the number and capacity of steam and hydroelectric plants for the generation of electricity which the defendants—

That is, the Tennessee Valley Authority—

may construct and operate in the Tennessee Basin—

And I agree that it ought to be confined to the Tennessee Basin—

are wholly undefined. Said act as amended purports to vest complete and uncontrolled

discretion in the defendants in relation to such matters.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that is the first time I have ever heard it seriously contended that the statement made by a lawyer in a pleading was an authority. I thought it was pretty generally recognized that we lawyers sometimes say as we are paid, that any qualms of conscience are salved by the tinkling jingle of our clients' gold. The proposition that a statement made in a pleading on behalf of a litigant by his counsel is an authority which the United States Senate should consider, or which the President pro tempore of the Senate should seriously consider in ruling on a point of order, is, indeed, unique.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to make it clear that I was not citing the statement as authority upon which I recommended that anyone rely. However, this distinguished lawyer takes the same position today which the Senator from Missouri takes. But when he was fighting the case in the Supreme Court, this is what he said about it. He is a distinguished lawyer.

Mr. KEM. That is an admission against Mr. Jackson's interest. I take it it is hardly an admission against my interest.

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Alabama hav_ a question?

Mr. HILL. I desire to address the Senate in my own time.

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to advise the Senator from Alabama when I have completed my remarks.

Mr. President, as I was saying, steam plants are referred to in more than one place in this statute. They are referred to in section 15, in which the authority to issue bonds for the purchase of steam plants is expressly given. In a later amendment the authority was expressly terminated, so that it could be exercised only within 5 years.

It seems apparent that in 1939 the Congress looked at this statute and said, "We have given a power to the Tennessee Valley Authority which goes pretty far. It is a power which we do not see now is directly connected with the generation of hydroelectric power and flood protection in the Tennessee Valley. If that power is to be exercised, it must be exercised within 5 years from this date." That time expired in 1944.

Let me get these references in order. In section 7, a steam plant is referred to. It is the plant at Muscle Shoals. I take it that it would be admitted by learned Senators that that does not authorize the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville.

The next section to which I wish to refer is section 15. That is the section in which authority was given to issue bonds. The authority terminated in 1944. In section 15 there is reference again to a steam plant:

> The Board, whenever the President deems it advisable, is hereby empowered and instructed to complete dam No. 2 at Muscle Shoals, Ala., and the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals.

If the Congress intended that the Board should have the authority to construct steam plants anywhere at any time, why did it use printer's ink to give this specific authority to construct, own, and operate the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2 at Muscle Shoals? I think the question carries with it its own answer.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude as I started. I think the authority given to the TVA under the act is summarized as clearly and specifically as it is possible to do in words. That language is contained in section 23 of the act. There are set out six purposes which Congress says are the general purposes of the act. I submit that not one of them is the purpose to construct, maintain, or operate a steam plant.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. KEM. No.

Mr. President, I believe that clearly, through an excusable omission in failing to consult the general act of authority, our committee has inserted in this appropriation bill a piece of general or new legislation, and that the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit that the point of order is not well taken, because I think we must consider not only the whole TVA Act, but the common-sense principles upon which it must rest.

Certainly there is no question of doubt that the spirit of the TVA Act was not only to set up hydroelectric plants and multiple-purpose dams, but also to set up an integrated electric-power system in that area, to such an extent that authority was given for the TVA to take over the existing power system. Inasmuch as that was done, it is not common sense, in the judgment of the junior Senator from California, that they would set up an integrated power system and at the same time would eliminate the possibility of firming up power with a steam plant, when there is not a publicly owned or privately owned utility system in the country which does not have to depend upon steam plants for the firming up of electric power.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me finish this thought, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

During the course of the hearings the junior Senator from California, who presided at a number of them, raised certain questions as to the reason for the location at New Johnsonville. The reason will be found on page 42. A map of that area was submitted, showing that the New Johnsonville location is substantially in the center of the power load. The question occurred to me as to why it should not be located at Memphis or some other place.

Therefore I submit that the language in the bill, "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.," is not in fact new legislation, but rather is merely a limitation in the appropriation act, so that they could not take the money which the committee desired to have appropriated for the purpose of constructing a steam plant and locate it either outside the TVA area—which, of course, they would not do—or in some area where they could not get the full economic use of the plant.

I am sure that the able Senator from Missouri knows the farther electricity must be transmitted—and this is true whether it be a steam plant or a hydroelectric plant—the greater the power losses are in transmission. It seems to me that it is good economics, and is a saving of money to the TVA—which in turn means saving money to the Federal Treasury—to have this plant located where it can receive the greatest economic benefit. Therefore, the language is merely a limitation in an appropriation bill, for which there is ample right and precedent, rather than in any degree being new legislation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator understand the Senator from Missouri to say that he was objecting to the location of the plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., if such plant were to be built?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I did not. I was merely pointing out to the able Senator that to that extent the language was a limitation by the Appropriations Committee so that the plant would be placed where the testimony showed it would render the greatest economic value to the TVA project.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think the Senator is devoting his very respectable powers of argument to the point that New Johnsonville, Tenn., is a proper, fit, and apt location for this plant, which is entirely beside the point. I did not for a minute make the point that New Johnsonville is not a good location for such a plant, if such a plant is to be built, or that New Johnsonville is not a central location. I know nothing about that.

My point is that at no time has the Congress authorized the construction by the TVA of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, or at Knoxville, or at New York, or at Oakland, Calif., or at Kansas City, Mo., or anywhere else. Until such an authorization is made, I say it is improper, and subject to a point of order, for the Appropriations Committee to undertake to put such a law on the statute books.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit to the able Senator from Missouri that it is not at all unusual for the Appropriations Committee, in dealing with an authorized project—and I think there is no question that the TVA is an authorized project—to indicate in an appropriation bill that certain amounts of the funds to be appropriated will be for transmission lines or for power plants or, as in the case of the Central Valley project in my State, will specifically be allo-

cated for the Friant-Kern canal, or the Delta-Mendota canal, or the Shasta Dam, or whatever it may be. It is well within the province of the Appropriations Committee, when recommending the appropriation of money for irrigation purposes, to place certain limitations on the money, so that it will not be misapplied by being used for power projects, or vice versa.

In this limitation we have tried to indicate that of that amount of money, a part of it—as we have set forth in our report and in the bill—shall be for the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., and shall not be used for some other purpose—for instance, let us say, for research work or for something else. I think that is well within the power of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will permit me to say so, I think he is assuming the point at argument, which is that the TVA is authorized to build or construct or own a steam plant. If the Senator from California will be kind enough to point out to us the place in the TVA Act where the ownership and construction of such a steam plant is authorized, then I shall be glad to take into consideration the argument he has made.

However, the point is not the good faith of the Appropriations Committee. Certainly, that has not been challenged. The point is not whether New Johnsonville, Tenn., is a proper or central location for the proposed plant.

The question is whether under the enabling statute the ownership or construction of a steam power plant anywhere has been authorized by the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I submit that when the act says "powerhouses," it is obvious that a powerhouse or power plant can be either a steam plant or a hydroelectric plant, and that the intent of the Congress and the language of the law are sufficient to cover either one, both of which would be necessary in order to carry out this integrated program.

For the Senator from Missouri to take a narrow interpretation of the phrase "power plant" as meaning solely a hydroelectric power plant, I do not think is a realistic approach. I think a power plant can be either a steam power plant or a hydroelectric power plant—or, in fact, it could be an atomic-energy power plant. If, either in this case or in any other case, the law provided for a power plant, and if, 10 or 15 years later, we were to find that we could better generate power by means of atomic energy, I hope the Senator would not take the position that that narrow interpretation should be placed on that term—namely, that we could not make the fullest possible use of the technological developments which we hope to achieve.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, several rather interesting propositions have been advanced in the course of this discussion, but I think the one advanced just now by the Senator from California is perhaps the most interesting of all. That seems to be that if the TVA is authorized to construct a power plant for hydroelectric power, which we admit it is, or if it is authorized to own a steam plant at Muscle Shoals, which we admit it is, then by some hocus-pocus it has acquired the power to keep up with industrial and scientific developments, wherever they may lead.

As I understand the Senator from California, he is advancing the proposition that if the Congress authorizes the TVA to construct and own a steam plant at Muscle Shoals or to construct, own, and operate hydroelectric plants along the Tennessee River, then the TVA may also keep a weather eye on scientific development and may acquire an atomic plant at Kingsport, Tenn.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the language to which I called the Senator's attention did not refer to a hydroelectric plant or to a steam plant. It was "powerhouses," or "power structures." I submit to the able Senator from Missouri that it would be the duty of any well-run firm, whether privately owned or publicly owned—of course, this is purely a hypothetical question, as the Senator must realize, because we do not now have commercial production of atomic power for electric-generating purposes—but if in the course of years it should be established that it was possible more economically and more efficiently to generate power by means of atomic energy than by means of a hydroelectric power plant or a steam plant, I should say that probably every public utility in the country would be interested in that, if they could save money to their rate payers and also to the companies themselves. In that case, I think every privately owned public utility and every publicly owned public utility would be interested, and certainly they should not be foreclosed from participating in that development in the course of the years, if such a development occurs.

Therefore, I merely say that when power plants are mentioned in this connection, I do not think that specifically means hydroelectric power plants and I do not think it specifically means steam power plants, but I think it means power plants using whatever can be used best to do the particular job.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from California is, then, of the serious opinion that under the TVA Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority could engage, today, in the generation of power by atomic energy created from fissionable materials.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I did not say that, because of course that would depend on the Atomic Energy Act itself and on the safeguards which might be set up by the Atomic Energy Commission, and whether in the judgment of that Commission it would be possible, without disclosing anything that might be of a military nature, to license—either to publicly owned or privately owned power companies—whatever type of plant might be necessary for the manufacture of electric power through the use of fissionable materials. I merely mention that as a possibility for the future. No man is wise enough today to know how quickly such a future development might come upon us.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not know that I follow the Senator from California in the various ramifications of his argument. But so far as the Senator from Missouri is concerned, I say that if the TVA wishes to engage in the use of atomic energy, it should come to Congress for specific authority for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether he takes the position that the term "powerhouses" refers exclusively to hydroelectric power?

Mr. KEM. I think it does specifically so refer, in view of the context in which it is used. The President pro tempore has in mind section 4; does he?

As was pointed out in the colloquy with the Senator from Alabama, I think language authorizing the construction of the dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as set out specifically—the Wilson Dam, the Norris Dam, the Wheeler Dam, and the Pickwick Landing Dam—specifically modifies the language of the entire section, and that the authority to construct power structures, as well as transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works on the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various projects by one or more transmission lines, necessarily is so modified and qualified.

I shall tell the Chair why I think that is so. If it were not so, that would have created on the Tennessee River a veritable octopus that could reach out all over the United States and acquire all sorts of power plants. As the Senator from California has said, they could engage in the generation of atomic energy. They could come into my State and say, "We think in our judgment it is wise for us to come into Missouri, because your power plants could compete with ours, and you compete in our market." I think the only reasonable construction of the language is that the power structures referred to are the power structures at the Wilson Dam, Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, and the Pickwick Landing Dam, and incidental dams on the Tennessee River.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to submit another question to some Senator who can answer it. The Chair would like to know whether the subject of justification arose in the committee in the consideration of the amendment. If it did, the Chair assumes the presence of the amendment in the reported bill would indicate the committee had resolved the matter in favor of the validity of the amendment. But the Chair has understood there was some discussion of the matter in the committee and would like to be advised what happened in committee in this connection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I recall no discussion at all as to whether this was legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator will agree with me when I say—and it fits in with his explanation, which I agree

is correct—that no point of order was raised against this amendment as being legislative and therefore inappropriate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It was not mentioned, was it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was not mentioned as to that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I mean.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the power plant at New Johnsonville was mentioned and there was considerable discussion concerning it, but the point of order was not raised.

Mr. FERGUSON. The point of order was not raised.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. We have an understanding of it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, referring to the words "powerhouses and other structures," in paragraph (i) subsection 4, and the words "powerhouses" and "power structures" of subsection (j) of section 4, I strongly contend that the use of those words meant any kind of powerhouse or power structure, whether it was a hydroelectric powerhouse or a steam powerhouse. A steam plant is as much a powerhouse as any other power plant, you get electric power from a steam plant as well as from a hydro plant. But if for the sake of argument there should be any doubt that "powerhouses and power structures and other structures" means steam plants, when we turn to the other sections of the bill, the other sections make it absolutely clear that those words mean a steam plant or steam powerhouse as well as a water powerhouse. I call the Chair's attention to page 22, section 14, of the TVA Act, the language of which has been quoted before. The last sentence in that section says:

In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said Board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained and allocated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator state again where he is reading?

Mr. HILL. I am reading from page 22, section 14 of the TVA Act. Possibly I had better read the whole section. Section 14 reads:

The Board—

That means the TVA Board—

shall make a thorough investigation as to the present value of dam No. 2—

We knew it then as dam No. 2. It is now known as the Wilson Dam. That was the dam under construction during World War I, in 1917–18. The dam was in existence, owned by the Government of the United States, at the time the TVA Act was passed in 1933.

The Board shall make a thorough investigation as to the present value of dam No. 2—

The Wilson Dam, in other words—

and the steam plants at nitrate plant No. 1 and nitrate plant No. 2—

Both those steam plants, the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 1, the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2, were built in 1917–18, during World War I, and were in existence when the TVA Act was enacted. Congress directed that the Board should estimate the value of the dam and of those two steam plants, and then, as to the cost of the Cove Creek Dam, which was a dam then under consideration for construction, now known as the Norris Dam—

for the purpose of ascertaining how much of the value or the cost of said properties shall be allocated and charged up to (1) flood control, (2) navigation, (3) fertilizer, (4) national defense, and (5) the development of power. The findings thus made by the Board, when approved by the President of the United States, shall be final, and such findings shall thereafter be used in all allocation of value for the purpose of keeping the book value of said properties.

Up to that point, Mr. President, section 14 dealt with properties, steam plants, and a dam then owned by the Government of the United States, and which, under the act, were to be turned over to the TVA Board. The act did not stop there. It went further and said what?

In like manner—

That is, in the manner previously provided in section 14—

the cost and the book value of the dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed—

Showing it was the clear intent and purpose of the act that there would be steam plants, in the language of this section, "hereafter constructed."

So there can be no question but what section 14 confirmed the fact that it was the intent and purpose that powerhouses, power structures, and other structures should include steam plants as well as water plants. The statute was doing what? It was providing for the allocation of costs and book value of what? Of this very Johnsonville plant which is before the Congress today, if Congress appropriates the money and the steam plant is constructed.

I turn to section 15. What do we find in that section? Section 15 was a part of the original act, Mr. President. Section 15 says:

In the construction of any future dam, steam plant, or other facility, to be used in whole or in part for the generation or transmission of electric power, the Board is hereby authorized and empowered to issue on the credit of the United States and to sell serial bonds not exceeding $50,000,000 in amount, having a maturity not more than 50 years from the date of issue thereof.

In other words, Congress provided not only for the construction of steam plants, but for the issuance of bonds with which to pay for them, the idea at that time being that it might be that the TVA would be financed not so much from appropriations out of the Treasury as from bonds issued by the TVA, and guaranteed by the Government. So Congress again clearly authorized the construction of steam plants.

As to section 15 (a), Mr. President, that section does not in any way, shape, fashion, or form, take anything away from section 15 or in any way repeal section 15. It simply adds additional power for the purchase of steam plants, dams, and power facilities. Section 15 (c) constitutes the language of the bill which Congress enacted in 1939, authorizing the TVA to purchase properties of private power companies in the Tennessee Valley. The question arose as to whether, under the act, the TVA would have the authority to purchase dams, steam plants, and other power facilities. There was no question raised that TVA would not have the power to construct steam plants, dams, transmission lines, and power facilities, but there was a question as to purchasing properties without some further authorization from the Congress.

That is how section 15 (c) came into the act.

Mr. President, section 15 clearly authorized the construction of steam plants, dams, and so forth, and the issuance of bonds to pay for the same. Then the question came up as to buying the properties of private power companies in the TVA area, and whether or not the TVA had authority to purchase dams and steam plants or transmission lines and other power facilities. In order that there might be no doubt about the authority, section 15 (c) was added to the act through the bill which was passed in 1939, to give to the TVA the additional power of purchasing as well as constructing steam plants, dams, and other power facilities.

In that connection, Mr. President, I should like to call the Chair's attention to the language of the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture made on the bill reported in 1939, the bill which, as I say, embodied section 15 (c). Here is what the Senate committee said:

Under the existing Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended, the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority are empowered to issue bonds and use the proceeds thereof for the construction of dams, steam plants, or other facilities to be used for the generation and transmission of electric power, also for the construction or acquisition of transmission lines, and for making loans to municipalities and cooperative organizations for the purchase of existing transmission lines and distribution properties. The authority under the law to issue bonds for the purchase——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. From what section is the Senator reading?

Mr. HILL. I am reading from a report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which accompanied the bill which was passed in 1939 embodying section 15 (c).

Mr. BALDWIN. I apologize for the interruption.

Mr. HILL. The committee report went on to say:

The authority under the law to issue bonds for the purchase of existing generating facilities is extremely doubtful. It is this defect—

That is, a defect with reference to purchase—

It is this defect in existing law which the proposed amendment is designed to remedy.

That is Senate Report 189, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, pages 1 and 2.

When the bill came up for consideration by the Senate the then majority

leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], had this to say:

This bill proposes to consolidate sections 15 and 15 (a) of the existing Tennessee Valley Authority Act, so as to make it perfectly clear that in addition to the right and authority to construct transmission lines and all other sorts of public utilities, such as those that are contemplated by this purchase—

Remember, Mr. President, that in the purchase were some steam plants owned by private power companies—

the Tennessee Valley Authority may also purchase them. There has been some doubt expressed as to the authority of the TVA under existing law, to purchase these properties.

That is, the properties of private power companies, referring to dams, steam plants, transmission lines, and other power facilities.

The Senator from Kentucky then stated that—

The Tennessee Valley Authority could undoubtedly construct similar properties.

The late Senator Norris spoke on that occasion, and here is what he had to say, Mr. President:

Under existing law the TVA could issue bonds and build the plants—

Namely, the steam plants of private power companies, along with any other installations which the private power companies had—

but there is a question whether it can purchase the plants when they have been built by others. It may be a doubtful question, but in order to be sure about that, this measure has been offered.

Mr. President, I happen to be the author of the bill for the creation of the TVA. It was passed by the House of Representatives, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] said earlier in the afternoon. I sat on the conference committee of the two Houses assisting in ironing out certain differences. There was no question in the minds of the conferees that the act authorized the TVA Board to build dams, steam plants, transmission lines, and any other power facilities which might be necessary for the orderly, economical, and businesslike generation and distribution of power and for the development and operation of an integrated and complete system in the Tennessee Valley.

I submit to the Chair that the language in section 4 certainly, as it is fortified and sustained by the language in sections 14 and 15 of the act, make it definite and clear that there is no question but that the construction of a steam plant is authorized by the Congress.

In that connection, Mr. President, I have before me the language which authorized the construction of the Watts Bar steam plant, a plant constructed by the TVA. I quote the language in the law today (54 Stat. 781):

as an additional amount to carry out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, approved May 18, 1933, as amended by the Acts approved August 31, 1935, and July 26, 1939, including the funds necessary to begin construction of a dam on the Holston River near Jefferson City, Tenn.; to begin installation of two additional electric generating units at Wilson Dam, Alabama, and one additional electric generating unit at Pickwick Landing Dam, Tennessee; and to begin construction of steam electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 120,000 kilowatts in the area served by the Authority.

Mr. President, that is the language of the act passed by Congress in 1940 for the construction, for the building of what is known as the Watts Bar steam plant, a plant built with funds from the Treasury of the United States appropriated by the Congress, built by the TVA for the TVA and now a part of the TVA system.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the clear language of the act, the clear intent of the Congress, there can be no question but that the steam plant is authorized, and that the Appropriations Committee has full authority to bring in this appropriation under this authorization, and the point of order should be overruled.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point, but I should like to say just one further word.

It has always been a rule of construction in the courts, I have understood, that when items are set forth in specific terms, it is a fair assumption that those items which are not included in specific terms are not to be included as being implied. In other words, if a statute mentions one thing specifically and fails to mention another specifically, it is rather indicated that the item which is left out was left out intentionally, and only those things are to be included which were specifically set forth.

Applying that to the section of the bill which gives the power to this corporation, we find that there is no mention whatever of steam plants. The mention is of dams, reservoirs, rivers, tributaries, and the construction of channels to maintain a water level. The language is all in terms dealing with water, in connection with a hydroelectric development.

The clause granting powers to this corporation then proceeds to say:

shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

There is no mention whatever of a steam plant. Therefore the powerhouses and the power structures specifically referred to are to be considered in connection with a hydroelectric development, and not a steam development.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if section 7, section 15, and section 16 do not each show that the draftsman of the act knew exactly how to express the concept of the steam plant when and if he intended to use it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think that is definitely so. I intended to make the further point that since subsequent provisions specifically mention steam plants, it is a fair assumption that they were not included in the earlier sections. Had they been, there would have been no need of making specific reference to them later.

Mr. HILL. Section 15 was in the original act and section 15 (c) was subsequent thereto to authorize the purchase, in addition to the construction of steam plants, dams, and power facilities.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is the very point I am making.

Mr. HILL. They are both parts of the act today—one supplements the other.

Mr. BALDWIN. The very fact that the term "steam plant" is not mentioned in the first section I read, which was the one of general authorization, and that it is mentioned specifically later, but in terms that place a limitation upon it, is significant. For example, section 15 (a) provides, "The authority of the Corporation to issue bonds hereunder shall expire at the end of 5 years," which means bonds in connection with the construction of the steam plant. So that the authority to issue bonds in connection with the construction of the steam plant, I submit, expired at the end of 5 years.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It was not a limitation of 5 years on the subsequent steam plants. Section 15 (a) was inserted in 1939 for the purchase of private power plants. It gave the TVA 5 years in which to buy these properties—to purchase them. It was not a limitation on the power of the TVA to construct plants.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in concluding my remarks, that since the specific steam-plant provision was not included in the original general authorization of authority, although many other specific things were included, it is, under a fair rule of interpretation, to be assumed that steam plants were not intended to be encompassed by the general and specific authority granted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to point out what I believe to be the fallacy in the argument of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and in the argument of my good friend the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

I should like to have the President pro tempore consider exactly what is being proposed. The distinguished Senator from Missouri and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut are saying that because section 4 of the act creating the TVA does not specifically use the words "steam plant," or name the New Johnsonville steam plant, there is no authority contained in the act for the construction of this plant.

The Senator from Connecticut in his last argument, however, did not say that in section 4, subsection (i), after the words "dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, and powerhouses" are used, the general term "other structures" follows. The question which the President pro tempore must resolve is: Do the words "other structures" include steam plants?

As has been so ably argued by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] sections 14 and 15 of the same act indicate clearly that it is contemplated that the words "other structures" shall be interpreted to include steam plants and to authorize their construction. If such general authority is not

contemplated in the words "other structures" found in section 4, then it would be utterly ridiculous to speak in sections 14 and 15 of the construction of steam plants in the future. Section 14 first relates to the allocation of the cost of existing dams. Then it states:

> In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed and turned over to said board for the purpose of control and management shall be ascertained and allocated.

Senators will note the use of the word "dams." Dams are specifically named in section 4 and their construction authorized. In section 14 steam plants are named with dams which implies that the construction of steam plants was authorized by the use of the words "other structures" in section 14.

In section 15 a method of financing the construction of steam plants was provided. Which could only mean that it was contemplated by the use of the words "other structures" in section 4 that steam plants could be constructed. If this is not a correct deduction and if it was never contemplated that steam plants could be built, why was it necessary to provide for their financing?

Argument has been made by the Senator from Missouri that the amendment of the TVA Act in 1938 withdrawing the power to finance steam plants by the issuance of bonds, destroyed any authority to construct steam plants. I say that the amendment simply removed a method of financing—a method of financing steam plants by bonds—but did not deprive the Congress of using other means, such as appropriations, to provide for the payment of steam plants, as is now proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

In support of my position I point out that after section 15 was amended Congress appropriated funds to build a dam at Watts Bar.

So I say that by any reasonable theory of construction I believe there is no doubt that the words "other structures" in section 4 which relates to the general powers and authority of the TVA, certainly mean, when construed with other sections, that there is authority to construct steam plants.

One more point and I shall close. Section 31 of the act provides that the act must be liberally construed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri makes points of order against three committee amendments on page 2; the first amendment which he challenges being the increased appropriation in line 7, the second amendment which he challenges being the increased appropriation in line 11, and the third amendment which he challenges being the language in line 13 "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn."

So far as the points of order against the first two amendments are concerned, the Chair thinks the situation is very clear. Rule XVI prohibits increased appropriations—

> Unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate.

It seems to me quite clear that these increases are moved by a standing committee of the Senate. The points of order are overruled with respect to the first two amendments to which the Senator from Missouri has addressed himself.

This leaves the much more difficult question involved at line 13, and involved in the identification of "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn." The Chair finds himself in great perplexity in this connection, and regrets that the only wisdom he can bring to bear upon the subject is that of an ex-editor instead of a Senator seeking appointment as a judge of the United States Court with the equipment to justify him.

It seems to the Chair that the entire purpose of the legislation which must be construed, and particularly that purpose as described and identified in the committee reports accompanying the original legislation, contemplates an integrated system, and it seems to the Chair that an integrated system includes not only dams and hydroelectric works, but also steam plants, as identified in the specific language in section 14 of the amended act.

It seems to the Chair that the point made by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is thoroughly persuasive, and that the words "other structures" in subsection (i) of section 4 must refer to something other than and in addition to dams, reservoirs, transmission lines, powerhouses, and so forth. It seems to the occupant of the Chair that the phrase "and other structures," in view of the nature of the entire legislation, could well include steam plants, in view of the other factors to which the Chair has referred.

The Chair is very reluctant to overrule the point of order because of the very persuasive argument presented by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and his associates in connection with it. It seems to the Chair that it is a close point. The Chair would like to make it very plain that after he has ruled he will consider that the action is in no sense prejudicial if the able Senator from Missouri wishes to appeal from the decision of the Chair. In fact, the first impulse of the Chair was to leave the decision to the Senate, as would be possible under the rules, but it seemed to the Chair that he first should indicate his own impression on the subject.

Therefore the point of order is overruled, and if the able Senator wishes to appeal from the decision of the Chair, the Chair will be very glad indeed to submit the appeal to the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am content with the ruling of the Chair. The matter, of course, will be finally disposed of by a vote on the proposed amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, certain statements have been made in relation to the available power throughout the United States generally. I want to submit for the RECORD a "key list for summary of power survey" and a "summary of capability, peak load, and margins of reserve in the Federal Power Commission region, 1947 to 1951." There seems to be considerable misinformation respecting the availability of power in America. I present the following figures from the summary of capability, peak load, and margins of reserve.

The United States total for 1947 was as follows: Capability, 45,278. Peak load, 43,225. Margin of reserve, 2,053. Percentage of reserve, 4.7.

The same percentage of reserve, 4.7, exists for 1948.

The figures for 1949 are as follows: capability, 54,482. Peak load, 50,416. Margin of reserve, 4,066. Percentage of reserve, 8.1.

In 1950 the capability will be 59,612. The peak load will be 53,256. The margin of reserve will be 6,356. The percentage of reserve will be 11.9.

In 1951 the capability will be 64,028. The peak load will be 55,798. The margin of reserve will be 8,230. The percentage of reserve will be 14.7.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the key list for summary of power survey, and the summary of capability, peak load, and margins of reserve, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Key list for summary of power survey

Region	Area	Code No.	Company name
I	1		
	2	Pool A	New England pool.
	3	Pool B	Upper New York State.
	4	363	Consolidated Edison Co. of New York.
		354	Central Hudson Gas & Electric Co.
		361	Long Island lighting system.
	5	Pool C	Pennsylvania-New Jersey interconnection.
	6	Pool D	Baltimore-Washington pool.
II	7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19.	Pool E	North Central.
	11	Pool F	Michigan.
III	18	541	Virginia Electric & Power Co.
	19		
	20		
	21	384	Carolina Power & Light Co.
		389	Duke Power Co.
		474	South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.
	22, 23, 24	Pool G	Commonwealth & Southern-Savannah Electric and Power and Florida Companies.
IV	13	Pool H	5 major utilities—eastern Wisconsin.
	14-40	Pool I	Northern Illinois pool.
	14, 17, 29	Pool J	United interconnection (less Iowa companies).
	15	302	Union Electric Co. of Missouri and subsidiaries.
	16	277	Northern States Power Co.
	17	163	Iowa Illinois Gas & Electric Co.
		160c	Iowa Power & Light Co.: Central.
		160 s w	Southwest.
		157	Iowa Electric Co.
		161	Central States Electric Co.
		151	Interstate Power Co.
		156 e	Iowa Public Service (east).
		164-156 w	Sioux City Gas & Electric and Iowa Public Service (west).
		222	Iowa Electric Light & Power Co.
		158	Iowa Southern Utilities.
V	25, 33, 34, 35, 38.	Pool K	Southwest power pool.
	36	347	Southwestern Public Service Co.
	37, 38	Pool L	North Texas interconnected.
		Pool M	South Texas interconnected.
		516	West Texas Utilities Co.
VI			
VII		Pool N	Northwest power pool.
VIII		Pool O	Pacific Southwest pool.

Summary of capability—peak load—margins of reserve—FPC regions, 1947–51

ADVERSE HYDRO CONDITIONS

	1947	1948	Percent	1949	Percent	1950	Percent	1951	Percent
Region I:									
Capability	13,192	14,332		15,388		16,523		17,547	
Peak load	12,456	13,215	6.1	13,748	4.0	14,242	3.6	14,680	3.1
Margin of reserve	736	1,117		1,640		2,281		2,867	
Percent reserve	5.9	8.5		11.9		16.0		19.5	
Region II:									
Capability	10,293	10,916		12,440		13,443		14,198	
Peak load	9,732	10,842	11.4	11,520	6.3	12,161	5.6	12,714	4.5
Margin of reserve	561	74		920		1,282		1,484	
Percent reserve	5.8	0.7		8.0		10.5		11.7	
Region III:									
Capability	4,257	4,715		5,048		5,490		5,942	
Peak load	4,168	4,595	10.2	4,939	7.5	5,232	5.9	5,530	5.7
Margin of reserve	89	120		109		258		412	
Percent reserve	2.1	2.6		2.2		4.9		7.5	
Region IV:									
Capability	5,760	6,225		6,679		7,453		7,945	
Peak load	5,767	6,260	8.5	6,644	6.1	6,897	3.8	7,149	3.7
Margin of reserve	(7)	(35)		35		556		796	
Percent reserve	(0.1)	(0.6)		0.5		8.1		11.1	
Region V:									
Capability	3,127	3,558		4,033		4,684		5,300	
Peak load	3,002	3,474	15.7	3,850	10.8	4,234	10.0	4,490	6.0
Margin of reserve	125	84		183		450		810	
Percent reserve	4.2	2.4		4.8		10.6		18.0	
Region VI:									
Capability									
Peak load	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Margin of reserve									
Percent reserve									
Region VII:									
Capability	3,560	3,820		4,000		4,330		4,370	
Peak load	3,550	3,975	12.0	4,365	9.8	4,740	8.6	5,085	7.3
Margin of reserve	10	(155)		(365)		(410)		(715)	
Percent reserve	0.3	(3.9)		(8.4)		(8.6)		(14.1)	
Region VIII:									
Capability	4,418	5,205		5,773		6,302		7,074	
Peak load	4,550	4,950	8.8	5,350	8.1	5,750	7.5	6,150	7.0
Margin of reserve	(132)	255		423		552		924	
Percent reserve	(2.9)	5.2		7.9		9.6		15.0	
United States total:									
Capability	44,607	48,771		53,361		58,225		62,376	
Peak load	43,225	47,311	9.5	50,416	6.6	53,256	5.6	55,798	4.8
Margin of reserve	1,382	1,460		2,945		4,969		6,578	
Percent reserve	3.2	3.1		5.8		9.3		11.8	

MEDIAN HYDRO CONDITIONS

Region I:									
Capability	13,274	14,416		15,472		16,607		17,631	
Peak load	12,456	13,215	6.1	13,748	4.0	14,242	3.6	14,680	3.1
Margin of reserve	818	1,201		1,724		2,365		2,951	
Percent reserve	6.6	9.1		12.5		16.6		20.1	
Region II:									
Capability	10,328	10,981		12,505		13,508		14,263	
Peak load	9,732	10,842	11.4	11,520	6.3	12,161	5.6	12,714	4.5
Margin of reserve	596	139		985		1,347		1,549	
Percent reserve	6.1	1.3		8.6		11.1		12.2	
Region III:									
Capability	4,357	4,815		5,148		5,590		6,042	
Peak load	4,168	4,595	10.2	4,939	7.5	5,232	5.9	5,530	5.7
Margin of reserve	189	220		209		358		512	
Percent reserve	4.5	4.8		4.2		6.8		9.3	
Region IV:									
Capability	5,846	6,315		6,773		7,553		8,050	
Peak load	5,767	6,260	8.5	6,644	6.1	6,897	3.8	7,149	3.7
Margin of reserve	79	55		129		656		901	
Percent reserve	1.4	.9		1.9		9.5		12.6	
Region V:									
Capability	3,145	3,576		4,051		4,702		5,318	
Peak load	3,002	3,474	15.7	3,850	10.8	4,234	10.0	4,490	6.0
Margin of reserve	143	102		201		468		828	
Percent reserve	4.8	2.9		5.2		11.1		18.4	
Region VI:									
Capability									
Peak load	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Margin of reserve									
Percent reserve									
Region VII:									
Capability	3,560	3,850		4,360		4,950		5,200	
Peak load	3,550	3,975	12.0	4,365	9.8	4,740	8.6	5,085	7.3
Margin of reserve	10	(125)		(5)		210		115	
Percent reserve	0.3	(3.1)		(0.1)		4.4		2.3	
Region VIII:									
Capability	4,768	5,605		6,173		6,702		7,524	
Peak load	4,550	4,950	8.8	5,350	8.1	5,750	7.5	6,150	7.4
Margin of reserve	218	655		823		952		1,374	
Percent reserve	4.8	13.2		15.4		16.6		22.3	
United States total:									
Capability	45,278	49,558		54,482		59,612		64,028	
Peak load	43,225	47,311	9.5	50,416	6.6	53,256	5.6	55,798	4.8
Margin of reserve	2,053	2,247		4,066		6,356		8,230	
Percent reserve	4.7	4.7		8.1		11.9		14.7	

[1] No data.

Mr. FERGUSON. These tables indicate that we do not have the shortage of power which has been stated from time to time in this debate.

I invite the attention of the Senate to some facts which were obtained from the TVA office today, showing peak demands. In 1945, on July 31, there was a peak demand of 1,192,000 kilowatts, of which 311,000 were from steam. On December 20, 1946—and these are the highest peak demands in the year—the figure was 2,304,000 kilowatts, of which 332,000 were from steam. On December 30, 1947, the figure was 2,309,000 kilowatts, of which 383,000 were from steam. The reason I call this to the attention of the Senate is that there was a capacity in the steam

plants of 450,000. Therefore they were not using all of their capacity.

It has been stated a number of times that the purpose of the steam plant is merely to firm up the power and avoid a shortage. In the record of the hearings is to be found language which I shall read into the RECORD. As I stated yesterday, these are my personal views and not the views of the committee. I do not speak for the committee, as I indicated yesterday.

I read from page 268:

Those are the sales to the so-called preference customers, being the sales to municipalities and cooperatives, plus the very minor amount of retail sales. In our view as related to the total sales, the striking feature of that chart is the small proportion of the TVA's energy production which went to these preference customers. Obviously TVA's energy production is far in excess of the requirements of those preference customers.

That would indicate that the preference customers were not going to get the big increase shown by the chart which Mr. Clapp placed in the record.

On page 268 will also be found the following:

This would be particularly true, if from TVA sales to Federal agencies, there were omitted the sales of secondary or "dump" energy made as a matter of money saving to, and not one of necessity on the part of, the Federal agencies.

On the question as to whether Oak Ridge is using any of this power, on page 269 we find the following:

Let us point out, this is new—that the great diffusion plant at Oak Ridge is provided with its own steam power plant of 238,000 kilowatts of capacity. While the details have not been made public, it is the general presumption that this vital enterprise is essentially self-sufficient as to electric power, with the TVA supplying stand-by service and supplying dump—

No amount was given.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to quote from page 8115 of yesterday's RECORD. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made the following statement:

As I understand, the testimony showed that today there is in Memphis, Tenn., a steam plant that is not being operated, but which could be used to firm up any power. They do not need that power at the present time. They anticipate in the future large industrial developments in the Tennessee Valley, and they want to be ready by 1952, with this $54,000,000 plant, to furnish power to those new industries.

In the past few moments I have received a telegram from Mr. Thomas H. Allen, of the Memphis Power & Light Co., which is the light division in Memphis. The telegram is dated today, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 15, 1948.*

Hon. K. D. MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Commercial Appeal reports that Senator FERGUSON states there is a steam plant at Memphis that is not being operated. This plant has been operated continuously at high capacity. Further if money is made available now it would be fast work to complete a large plant by 1952.

THOS. H. ALLEN,
Memphis Power & Light Co.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, does the Senator recall what the testimony was at the hearing? It was to the effect that there was a plant there. It was at the Fisher body plant or one of the other plants. It was not in operation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall the testimony that it was not in operation. It is there.

Mr. FERGUSON. The record will show that.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was bought by the TVA.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the hearing shows not only that the plant to which the Senator from Tennessee is referring is in operation, but that 60 percent of the power goes to the Arkansas Power & Light Co., and 40 percent into the TVA system.

The Senator from Michigan said something about the TVA not using its peak capacity. Of course, no power company can contract for the sale of its peak capacity, because no power company knows what the peak capacity will be from year to year. A great deal depends upon how much rain the good Lord sends us, and how long a period of low water there is. One year the peak capacity may be very high. Another year the peak capacity may be very low. During 1 year conditions may be very tight, and it may be necessary to buy power from some other power company. During some other year, there may be power available above the amount which is contracted for sale. We cannot tell. A power company cannot sell right up to its peak capacity, because it does not know exactly what that peak capacity is going to be, and it must operate with some degree of safety.

In that connection, the Senator from Michigan made a statement with reference to the power available at this time. I have before me a news release by the National Security Resources Board. The Senate will recall that last year when the Congress passed the act for the unification of the armed services we established the National Security Resources Board. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] will recall it, because he played a large part in drafting that legislation.

The idea in establishing the National Security Resources Board was that it might make plans and make some kind of a check on industrial preparedness, and prepare a program so that we could have not only military preparedness, but industrial preparedness, which is just as essential, and in a way is basic to military preparedness.

The National Security Resources Board under the chairmanship of Mr. Arthur M. Hill, named a committee composed of Mr. E. Robert de Luccia, chief, bureau of power, Federal Power Commission; V. M. Marquis, American Gas & Electric Service Corp.; J. E. Moore, Ebasco Services, Inc.; and Barclay J. Sickler, of the Bonneville Power Administration, to make a study of our available power at this time. As a result of the investigation and the study by that committee, and after consultation with some 40 other experts on the question of power and the generation of power, who were brought here from throughout the country, the National Security Resources Board made a release on the twentieth of last May, in which it is stated, among other things:

The electric power situation in the United States was described as tight today by Arthur M. Hill, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, in a statement summarizing the results of a staff study.

Mr. President, I looked in the dictionary to see just what the definition of "tight" was. I had an idea what it was, but I was curious to see what the dictionary would say. One definition is "too close for comfort." So, Mr. President, the situation today is too close for comfort.

The release then says:

The seriousness of the situation, he said, lies in the fact that during 1947, electric power capacity was consumed to within a 5-percent average margin over peak loads, compared with more than a 20-percent margin in 1941.

In other words, in 1941, at the time when we were hurled into World War II, we had a 20-percent margin; but in 1947, the year just passed, we had less than a 5-percent margin.

The release continues as follows:

"The National Security Resources Board," Mr. Hill asserted, "will work actively with the other Government agencies and the industries involved to explore every possibility of expediting and enlarging the power program. We shall also keep in touch with developments so that we can recommend such governmental action as may be required in the light of future contingencies."

In that connection, too, Mr. President, I might add, inasmuch as the Senator from Kentucky seems to have yielded me the floor for the time being—for which I am grateful—that Mr. Arthur Hill, as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, wrote a letter to the President of the United States, with the suggestion that the President might wish to transmit the letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee—which was done under date of May 24. In that letter Mr. Hill stated this:

On May 19, 1948, I submitted to you a report on the national electric power situation. With specific reference to the southeast, it is clear that the margins for reserves are inadequate for the period 1948 through 1951. Accordingly, every effort should be made by the Federal Government to support and expedite the power expansion program designed to relieve this critical power situation. From the standpoint of national security, a larger power cushion should be provided in order to permit prompt handling of future loads that may arise in connection with the rearmament program.

It is our understanding that the Senate Appropriations Committee is now considering the Tennessee Valley Authority's request for an appropriation to start construction of a steam generating plant on Kentucky Lake at New Johnsonville, Tenn. It is the opinion of the National Security Resources Board that the capacity from this proposed new steam plant is needed in the area and will provide, in combination with existing hydroelectric power, a greater margin of safety.

While other steam facilities might be constructed outside of the Tennessee Valley Authority's operating area, the New Johnsonville project would, in our opinion, provide a better solution to the power supply problem from the standpoint of location, fuel supply, coordination with existing hydro and minimum transmission to load centers.

If you agree with our conclusions, which are based entirely on national security considerations, you may wish to transmit this recommendation to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR M. HILL,
Chairman.

Mr. President, I do not desire to take any further time of the Senator from Kentucky, who has been very generous, except I wish to call the attention of Senators to the chart on page 60 of the hearings, which shows how this power is needed, not for large industries, not for new industries, but in large measure for residential consumption and for farmers and farm homes.

Mr. CAIN and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Tennessee, and I now yield to him.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief observation as a matter of interest. I am advised that today the TVA paid into the general fund of the Treasury the sum of $7,536,325. That is out of power proceeds. That makes a total of approximately $10,500,000 paid during this year.

In that connection, as a matter of further interest, I wish to say that if my information is correct, the TVA has earned a net profit, to date, after all depreciation allowances, of approximately $97,000,000. Of that amount, nearly two-thirds has been reinvested in the expansion of the utility system. About $34,000,000 has been paid back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, we were discussing the steam-power plant at Memphis. I should like to refer to the testimony at pages 112 and 113 of the hearings on the Government corporations appropriation bill, where Mr. Allen, who is the manager of the plant in the city of Memphis, was interrogated by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I should like to read a little of the testimony. The Senator from Michigan asked Mr. Allen this question:

Where did you get power prior to that time?

In other words, prior to 1938, I believe, or about that date, when they first purchased TVA power.

Mr. Allen replied:

Prior to that, the city of Memphis was supplied by a plant then owned by the Memphis Power & Light Co.

The testimony continues as follows:

Senator FERGUSON. Who owns that plant now?

Mr. ALLEN. The Memphis Generating Co.

Senator FERGUSON. And who is the Memphis Generating Co.?

Mr. ALLEN. That is all that is left in that area of the old Electric Bond & Share Co. property.

Senator FERGUSON. And what are they doing with that plant?

Mr. ALLEN. It has been operated 60 percent for the Arkansas Power & Light Co. and 40 percent purchased by the TVA; all that power comes into our system.

Then, after discussing that point a little, the following occurred:

Senator FERGUSON. It is still operating at full capacity, is it?

Mr. ALLEN. It has been operating at full capacity.

Senator FERGUSON. What would there be to prevent that plant from being enlarged by private industry?

Mr. ALLEN. That is a very old plant, Senator.

Senator FERGUSON. Is that the only thing that you know that would stop it from being enlarged?

Mr. ALLEN. It is located right in the heart of the city, almost, and enlargement of that plant to any great degree would involve the problem of securing water in large quantities, or to extend its spray pond, which it now uses for cooling the water, in an area where the land is not available for that kind of thing.

Senator FERGUSON. Did that plant, at the time you took this power from it, in 1938, furnish all power to the city of Memphis?

Mr. ALLEN. Not quite; some of it came from across the river, then.

Senator FERGUSON. But would you say practically all of it?

Mr. ALLEN. At that time, in July 1939, the peak of the Memphis Gas and Water Division, just after we took it over, on June 27, was 57,000 kilowatts and that plan would turn out 52,000 kilowatts. The rest of it came in by exchange from Arkansas Power & Light Co.

Senator FERGUSON. As you see this plant today, it would die just a natural death, it is going to pass out of the power picture?

Mr. ALLEN. We have all kept it alive down there because we need the power.

Senator MCKELLAR. When was it built, if you remember?

Mr. ALLEN. I don't know when that plant was built. I remember with the curiosity of a kid of 15 or 16, roaming around in there, and that is a long time ago.

I read that testimony to emphasize that it is an old steam plant, practically incapable of being enlarged, and it is a plant of very small capacity for present needs. I read that testimony also to emphasize the fact that the plant has been operating at full capacity, and there has been no failure to use all the power developed at the plant and no lack of need for the operation of the plant at full capacity.

I think that is all I care to say, except that I want to see the amendment adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was there not another steam plant?

Mr. STEWART. My attention was called only to the one that Mr. Allen testified about.

Mr. FERGUSON. There was another one that was owned by some private company.

Mr. STEWART. If it was owned by some private company, that would be one. The testimony of Mr. Allen is another. That had not been called to my attention. I was not on the committee, and I attended only part of the hearings, but I heard that testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I recall the fact, there were two plants.

Mr. STEWART. The hearings would disclose that. I did not know about it.

That is all I care to say, except I am anxious to see the amendment adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the point at which the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] made certain remarks about the use of a plant at Memphis, Tenn., page 106 and 12 lines of page 107 of the hearings, which explain the matter and show that all the power facilities are not being used.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE INDUSTRIAL PLANTS FURNISHING THEIR OWN POWER

Senator FERGUSON. Mr. Bruce, you do furnish your own power?

Mr. BRUCE. That is right, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you know why some of these larger industries, like the Reynolds Metals, and the other aluminum companies, should not put in plants and furnish their own power?

Mr. BRUCE. I could not answer that. Of course, the reason, Mr. Senator, why we furnish our power, is that we have waste from our manufacture, sawdust and shavings, and we utilize that to make our own power.

Senator FERGUSON. But it is not unusual for manufacturers, when they have a plant, to create their own power?

Mr. BRUCE. In the past, there have been quite a few of them. The Fisher Body Co. at Memphis, had a big power plant before it moved, and recently the paper plant which moved in there still has that operation.

Senator FERGUSON. You do not know whether they even operate that plant now, do you?

Mr. BRUCE. I do not know. The Firestone Rubber Co. in our city is the largest manufacturing plant for tires under one roof, in the world. They have a big plant.

Senator FERGUSON. They have a private power plant?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Senator FERGUSON. And do you know whether that is being operated?

Mr. BRUCE. I do not; no sir.

Senator FERGUSON. So these two plants, the former Fisher Body plant and the Firestone Rubber Co. plant—you do not know whether they operated their own power plants?

Mr. BRUCE. No; I do not.

Senator FERGUSON. Is there anyone here who has that information?

Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. Allen, do you know whether the former Fisher Body plant or the Firestone Rubber Co. plant operate their own power plant?

Mr. THOMAS H. ALLEN (of Memphis, Tenn.). The Firestone Rubber Co. does run its plant to the extent of their capacity, and they use the steam for processing purposes.

Senator FERGUSON. But not for power?

Mr. ALLEN. You see, as they need steam in the handling of their rubber, they take it off the intermediate stages of the turbine, and, therefore, any amount of power they take off the turbines, produced by that amount of steam, they get for nothing. The balance of their power they buy from us. They are a very large user of our power. They just furnish enough of their own for the processing.

Senator FERGUSON. You are talking about the rubber?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. What about the other plant?

Mr. ALLEN. Do you mean the Kimberly-Clark?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. They are under our own power.

Senator FERGUSON. And when did they start operations there?

Mr. ALLEN. They just started that plant. That was the Fisher Body before the war; after the war, Kimberly-Clark bought the plant.

Senator FERGUSON. When was the private power plant in the Fisher plant constructed?

Mr. ALLEN. It has been a good many years ago; I do not remember how long ago.

Senator FERGUSON. About how many years ago?

Mr. ALLEN. I would say 15 or 20 years.

Senator FERGUSON. What we are seeing down in this valley is that the private plants creating power are ceasing to function and the TVA is taking over that business?

Mr. ALLEN. We are taking over a large part of it.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The matter the Senator from Michigan has just had inserted in the RECORD applies to power plants owned by private industry, I believe.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of the committee amendment dealing with construction of the steam plant. I do not do so merely because I live within the Tennessee Valley. Under the same circumstances I would support such an amendment if it were in the Connecticut Valley, the Columbia Valley, or any other valley in the United States.

I suppose our proximity to a given problem has influence upon the degree of our support or opposition to it. I do not believe I am prejudiced in favor of the Tennessee Valley as against any other valley, because I should very much like to see ultimately all the water resources in the United States harnessed for the benefit of the American people. I realize that private enterprise or private capital is not going to do that and cannot do it, any more than it could do it in the Tennessee Valley. So I hope nobody in the Senate or anywhere else will feel that I am prejudiced in behalf of this particular amendment because it is in the Tennessee Valley.

In the first place, I support the amendment because its adoption and the construction of the plant will not necessitate nor probably result in the transfer of any industry from any other part of the United States into the Tennessee Valley. Up until this time I do not believe there has been a single industry or a single plant moved from its original situs into the Tennessee Valley because of the development of that valley. Enterprises and industries have developed in the valley, some of them, as has already been indicated, for the production of raw materials that feed important industrial plants all over the United States. I have in mind now an industry located in the State of Pennsylvania which would like to establish a subsidiary plant in the Tennessee Valley for the production of raw materials to be sent to its factory in Pennsylvania to supply it with the material from which it produces the finished product. That is not a detriment to the industry where it is located. It is a benefit to it, because it supplies a larger quantity of raw material with which to furnish the country the finished product, which it produces, and gives more employment to more people in the community where it is located. So I would, if I could, calm the fears of any Senator who opposes the amendment because of any thought that it may result in the removal from his State or his own section of some vital industry. It has not done so up until now, and I do not believe it will do so, because there is room for the development of industries in the Tennessee Valley as a part of a chain of industries without in any way affecting those that already exist in other parts of the country. So much for that.

It was the original intention of the TVA, with which I have been associated legislatively ever since World War I, in the construction of the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, that whenever the facilities and the resources of the Tennessee Valley should be developed it would invite within that valley the creation of industrial activity that would be continuous. Any plant that wants to establish itself in any community naturally desires continuity of power and of resources.

Attention has already been called to the fact that due to floods and low water and various other things in connection with the power the valley can develop, we have a peak and we have a depression or a valley; we have ups and downs. A plant contemplating its development in a live community will not develop itself, it will not establish itself, unless it has a reasonable prospect of year-round power or resources which will feed it. That is an elemental fact, and it has developed now in the Tennessee Valley so far as industries are concerned that there is a need for this plant and a need for what we might call ancillary power in that community, in order that there may not be any recess or hiatus in any given period of a year during which these plants may operate.

Something has been said with reference to the REA. I know that in the Tennessee Valley, within the radius in which power can be distributed, there has been a vast increase in the installation of rural electrical energy. There has been a vast increase in the availability for farm life of the power generated in the Tennessee Valley, whether hydroelectric energy or energy generated by steam in the operation of steam plants already in existence. It might be said, and no doubt will be by those who are adamant against this appropriation, that no additional power should be created for the benefit of the farmers in that region of the country; that so far as those are concerned who are now receiving electric energy on their farms, all well and good, but that we are under no obligation to establish an additional plant or to create additional power in order that more farmers may partake of the benefits of the TVA.

I do not subscribe to that theory, because private power plants will not be established in the Tennessee Valley to any great extent for the reason that the Tennessee Valley Authority, by authorization of the Congress, bought all the private utilities within the radius of the Tennessee Valley's power to generate or to distribute, and therefore there is no longer any inducement for private enterprise to build plants, whether for REA or for industrial purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In line with what the Senator from Tennessee has said, at the time Congress had before it the bill, which was passed in 1939, to provide for the purchase of private companies in the Tennessee Valley, Mr. Wendell Willkie, who, it will be recalled, was the head of the Commonwealth & Southern Co., which was a holding company of the power companies which the Tennessee Valley Authority bought, appeared before the House Committee on Military Affairs and made a statement. To me, in Mr. Willkie's words, there seems to be the gist of the whole picture presented to the committee. Mr. Willkie said:

> I know not a man that is a man of any thought, whether he believes in the public operation of power or in the private operation of power, but who does not also believe that it should be noncompetitive. Something has been said here about monopolies. Now, I know not the distinction between public and private monopolies, but I do know, as any student of the utility business knows, that it is a natural monopoly and should be such, whether in public or in private hands, and the man who represents the public agency here sits and pleads for it to be a public monopoly, and in that he is right.

The Congress recognized the wisdom and the inevitability, I may say, of what Mr. Willkie had to say, and that is why Congress passed the act of 1939 to buy private power companies. Mr. Willkie said that the supplying of electrical energy should be a monopoly. It owns the source from which residential consumers, farmers, and all users get power.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his observation. That being true, if there is any additional power created in that region, it must be created by TVA. It will not be done by private enterprise. He would be a foolhardy man who would compete against the TVA by establishing a plant for industrial distribution, for the REA, or to supply power for Government agencies which are essential in defense.

Mr. HILL. There was no compulsion on the plants to sell. The Government did not in any way contest their ownership. The sales were made in free and open negotiations between the TVA, representing the Government, on the one hand, and the private companies on the other hand, the private power companies selling of their own accord.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. It came about not through coercion, but through negotiation. The Government was generous. I do not say it was too much so, but it was generous and fair with the Commonwealth & Southern Co., and has been generous and fair with other private utilities which have been taken over. The TVA has been beneficial to private utilities, within the region, because it has furnished power to them which they, in turn, distribute among the people. They benefit by receiving cheaper power than they could otherwise receive, and the people have been benefited by the transmission of that power through the agency at a lower rate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment.

There is no danger to any other community in the United States that industries will be drained away from them and located in the Tennessee Valley. That has not happened up to this time, and it will not happen. It will benefit these very communities by enabling them to produce raw materials which are needed by industries all over the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is interesting to note that for every dollar the people of the Tennessee Valley are today expending for power, they are expending $2 for electrical appliances, which are not manufactured in the Tennessee Valley; they come from Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, New York—from all over the United States, from many of the States of the Union.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. In other words, every time a farmer in that section has electricity brought into his house he has power available to operate a washing machine or a refrigerator, a corn husker or a corn sheller, or other machinery, manufactured outside the Tennessee Valley and shipped there, thereby giving employment and profit to labor and capital in other sections of the country, of which they would be deprived if it were not for the power generated in the valley.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to say that the experience in the Pacific Northwest might be applicable to this subject. The private power people always opposed such projects as Grand Coulee and Bonneville. They are now buying power from those plants at a cheaper rate than they ever before paid. They are using their own distribution lines and making more money than they ever made before. In other words, they are tickled to death that Congress has had the foresight to build these great dams, with steam plants made adjuncts to them. There is a great power pool. That is what it will mean in the Tennessee Valley. It does not hurt them one iota. They are doing better than they have ever done. It means more rural electrification.

It is strange to me, I will say to the distinguished minority leader, that in the Congress of the United States we always have a fight to get appropriations for power projects. Always the argument is, What are we going to do with the power? The country is always short of power; it never has enough. The more we generate, the more the people use. Appropriations for the generation of power are the only ones we make that pay back and, in some cases, make a profit.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

I shall now conclude. I did not want to take much time and I wish to stand by my resolution. In the Tennessee Valley or in any other valley where power is generated we do not want the situation to become static. There may be a point beyond which the use of power cannot be absorbed, but we know that if there is any more power to be generated in the Tennessee Valley it will be done by the TVA. We want a generation of power that will be in operation all the year round, so that persons who invest their money in industry will not be caught in a situation in which they have to wait for months before there is a peak of power which will enable them to resume operations. I think that is a fundamental situation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have not been able to hear all the discussion on the floor. I have read a meager reference to the project in the report, and I find myself with some questions on my mind, one of which the Senator from Kentucky just touched upon. That is the question of the continuity of the power supply under the conditions of a variable water supply.

It is conceivable that one might equalize the supply of power either at a minimum or a maximum. At a minimum one would perhaps install at the dams only the amount of hydroelectric power apparatus as would be appropriate to the minimum summer flow of the river. That, of course, is ridiculous. The maximum provision for maintaining a year-round supply of power would be to install in the dams the amount of hydraulic machinery capable of taking care of the heaviest flood, which would in turn require the provision of a very large amount of stand-by steam plants. Somewhere in between those two extremes is obviously the proper thing to do.

There would be little difficulty for a private power company to decide where it should balance out its power between steam and hydraulic. It would turn over to its engineers the problem of the most profitable point at which the steam and hydraulic power should be balanced. That having been determined, the hydraulic plant would be built of that appropriate size, and a steam plant of appropriate size to balance it would be built.

It is difficult for me to imagine any basis on which a public power operation, particularly this one, which is tied up so tightly with flood control and navigation, would start in making its calculation.

The question I wish to ask, after this preamble, is, Is there any figure set by the TVA in asking for its appropriation as to the size of the steam plant which is proposed? I find no reference to it in the very brief paragraph in the committee's report. In the extreme case, is there anything to prevent their going ahead with indefinite expansion plans for the steam plant? That is the first question.

Mr. BARKLEY. A minimum for that purpose, of course, would be fixed by the appropriations the Congress would make. The present appropriation for this particular plant is $4,500,000, I believe. It is estimated it will cost four million. The Senator from Michigan has said that, including transmission lines and all customary installations, it would cost something like $80,000,000 or $84,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have heard the figure eighty-four or eighty-five million.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is a speculative figure. But it is estimated, I think by the TVA itself, that the construction of the plant will cost approximately $54,000,000. Thereafer, of course, in regard to any other plant—if any other plant should be under contemplation, and I do not know that it is—it will be a matter for Congress to determine whether there should be expansion by the construction of another steam plant. But I do believe this plant is necessary in order to give a guaranty, not this year because it will take 4 or 5 years to construct the plant, but that there might be a guaranty of continuous service to those plants which are developing in the valley, and which may be developed in the valley, because I do not think we should fix such a low ceiling upon it that even a plant which is already there might not enlarge its capacity if it saw fit to do so in order to supply goods to other parts of the country, because obviously more goods turned out there are used in other parts of the country than in the Tennessee Valley itself.

It has been difficult to hear the Senator from Vermont because of the interference on the floor. I should like to hear what the Senator asked me.

Mr. FLANDERS. Just going back to the preamble of my first question—and I have another yet in reserve, if I may be allowed to continue to question the Senator——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. In what I said before asking the question I intended to express my conviction that there is perhaps no definite point which the TVA is setting as the scientific point for balancing out its water power. It may come back for steam-power expansion every year, in which case the system becomes a steam-power system; or it may set the balancing point where it will be primarily a hydroelectric system. Had I been in position to catechise the TVA folk I would have wanted some expression of purpose or calculation on their part as to whether they were definitely moving into the steam-power area of generation, or whether the balancing out was to be done at a lower figure, which kept it primarily as a hydraulic system.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I might respond there, I am not a member of the committee, and I did not have an opportunity to interrogate the TVA authorities, but my knowledge of and familiarity with the TVA convinces me that they are not seeking to develop the steam phases of their power to the point where steam will predominate over hydraulic. They are seeking to strike a general average which will enable them to say to those who are interested in electric power, whether industrial, agricultural, or municipal, that there will be an ample supply during any given year, regardless of the fluctuations of water fall, upon which they may depend. It is necessary that that be so, in order that the hydraulic features of the development shall be successful to the fullest extent.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is absolutely undisputed; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Vermont wanted to ask me another question, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have another question to ask, if the Senator will permit me to continue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have taken the position for many years past in private conversations, and on the occasion of my primary campaign for the nomination for the Senate, that I was not against Federal power as such, but that I was against subsidized power. In giving an example for myself or for anyone who questioned me as to what I meant by that, I would refer to the Hoover Dam as an example of Federal power which was not subsidized power. The Hoover Dam power generation pays for itself, pays the interest on its bonds, and is in the process, if I am correctly informed, of amortizing its cost. So that is a public power and water-supply outfit, a little mixture of both, but is a Federal project involving the generation of an immense amount of power, which I feel is in the public interest, and which I thoroughly approve. Now, it is a little difficult for me—and I say this with regret to the senior Senator from Kentucky—to justify the payments of taxes from the very meager aggregate incomes of my green but still stony State for the support of power generation in as fertile and as lovely and as prosperous a section of the country as is represented by the Tennessee Valley. I should like to know, and I do not know how to find out, whether our small aggregate incomes up in Vermont are helping to pay for this power in Tennessee. I heard no particular discussion on that point. There is no evidence, so far as the report is concerned, that the question was brought up as to whether these power plants would pay for themselves, would carry their load of local taxation, would pay appropriate interest on the bond issues, and would amortize themselves before the equipment wore out or became obsolete. That is one of the things, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, that I should like to know.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity of the question of the Senator from Vermont and his attitude in respect to the project. I do not regard the appropriations which are made out of the Treasury for the TVA as subsidizing the TVA, or industry in the TVA, or the cities or the inhabitants of the TVA region, any more than appropriations for flood control in remote sections of the country are subsidies to those particular sections because the money raised to pay the expenses is raised by general taxation all over the United States.

It would be impossible—and I do not know whether it will ever be consummated—that all our river valleys should be developed for the use of the people. I myself believe in that theory. But if it should be possible, and if all the valleys and all the people in all the valleys wanted their valleys developed for purposes such as are included in the TVA Act, it would be utterly impossible to do that simultaneously, any more than it is possible to erect all flood-control projects that are needed in the United States at the same time. We have to begin somewhere.

Insofar as any particular expenditure is being made in one part of the country and not all over the country so that it is spread out everywhere, it could be said that people in another section are helping to pay for that expense. That is an inevitable result because of the impossibility of covering a vast country such as ours with simultaneous development in all parts of it.

On the subject of amortization I think I should say that the TVA is being amortized by the turning into the Treasury of annual amounts. I think I just heard the Senator from Tennessee a while ago say that at this very time over $7,000,000 is being turned into the Treasury by the TVA, so that it is being amortized.

I do not think it is quite accurate or precise to say that because of this development in the Tennessee Valley, which is a larger development of its type than anywhere else in the country, it is being subsidized at the expense of any other section of the country. When the time comes, if it comes, when the Connecticut Valley or the Merrimack Valley, or the Delaware Valley, or the Missouri Valley, or any other valley shall be developed at public expense, of course people from all other sections of the country will be contributing to such enterprises. Whether that ever takes place is a matter for future speculation. I myself do not know.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator I might say that when certain preliminary negotiations were entered into with the people of my region with regard to a possible Connecticut Valley Authority or Connecticut-Merrimack Valley Authority, the general public sentiment rather put a damper on the enterprise. It looks to me as though the folks of the Connecticut Valley region are going to be perpetually in the condition of subsidizing other projects simply because they think subsidization is wrong or undesirable. That is one of the penalties of having a little conscience on a matter of this sort. You have to pay for your virtue, such as it is.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that, but I will say to the Senator that I recall that 2 years ago, when there was a disastrous flood in the Connecticut River, we voted for some flood protection on that river, not simply as a theoretical proposition, but in order to protect the people who live in that valley—not only their homes, but their industries. When I voted for such assistance I did not think I was subsidizing the people of the Connecticut Valley. The people whom I represent in Kentucky did not think I was voting to subsidize the people of that valley, although it was an expenditure out of the Public Treasury for the benefit of some very great industries in that valley. I have in mind one in particular which was greatly benefited by the expenditure, or the proposal to expend money for its protection.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator whether that expenditure was before or after the Supreme Court decided that the Federal Government controlled the water clear up into the springhouse in the pasture above my house?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator's interpretation of the Supreme Court decision is a little exaggerated, but that expenditure was before the Supreme Court decision in regard to the Tidelands case, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is now nearly 6:20 o'clock. We have only started on the first amendment to the bill. We have not even gotten the first committee amendment adopted or rejected, whichever way the vote on it may go. We have another amendment or two which are very controversial. The bill is quite a long one. I wonder if we cannot facilitate matters. Of course, we do not in any way want to cut off anyone who desires to speak on the first committee amendment. We have not only the pending bill under consideration, but the naval appropriations bill is ready for action, and the bill providing the appropriations for the Economic Cooperation Administration has been reported. I understand there are two veto messages which will have to be acted upon. We certainly would like to get through with those matters and begin consideration of the farm bill quickly. I suggest to Senators that if we have a night session, opportunity will be afforded for full debate, but I beg of Senators to expedite action, and either accept or reject the amendments which are pending as quickly as possible.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to state that we are approaching the time when we can no longer delay action upon the farm program bill if we are to continue a farm program of any kind whatsoever. When that bill passes the Senate it will have to go to conference with the House. So at least 2 days would be required before it could be brought back to the respective Houses by the conferences. It is to me unthinkable that Congress should go home without continuing a farm program. It is true the House has passed a stopgap bill which has a good many deficiencies in it, but there is no opportunity to hold hearings upon that bill, and I believe hearings should be held upon it if it is to be considered. The shortest cut is to take up our own bill, pass it, and go to conference with it. But if we delay much longer we cannot even do that.

So as far as I am concerned, the farm program bill is the pending business. It has been temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the Government corporations appropriation bill. I understand that the naval appropriations bill will probably not take more than a few minutes—considerably less than an hour. If we complete action on the Government corporations appropriation bill within a reasonable time I should be willing to have the naval appropriations bill taken up. I should like to make the initial presentation on the farm bill tonight so

that action on it may be concluded tomorrow. I feel safe in saying that unless action on a farm program bill is concluded tomorrow there will be no continuation of a farm program after January 1, but we shall revert to the old 52 percent support level for a few basic commodities. Therefore I would object to taking up any further legislation after the naval appropriations bill is disposed of.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I address an inquiry to the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope I did not correctly understand the Senator from Vermont to say that unless this bill were enacted we would have no farm legislation at this session. Did the Senator make such a statement?

Mr. AIKEN. I made the statement that it was my belief that there would be no continuation of a farm program, other than reversion to the 1938 level of support. I know that the Senator from Georgia wonders why.

I do not want to criticize the House bill; but we would almost have to have hearings on it, or at least meetings of our committee before we could adopt the proper amendments to that bill. For example, there is no provision in it for continuing support for any commodity of more than 90 percent, regardless of how badly it might be needed. It is written in such a way that it eliminates support for a full year for Maryland tobacco, while it gives support to other types of tobacco. It continues a 90 percent guarantee support price for eggs, which means that we would probably have to spend $100,000,000 to purchase eggs which we do not need next year.

It continues 90 percent parity support for dairy products, which means absolutely nothing whatsoever unless the parity formula is revived.

Furthermore, the Commodity Credit Corporation goes out of existence on July 1. There has been no indication as yet when the House is going to act upon the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. There is every indication that if it does act on the bill which has been reported, it will be almost impossible for the conferees of the House and Senate to get together, because the bills have such drastically varying provisions.

Therefore it seems to me now that the only way we can insure the future existence of the Commodity Credit Corporation, that agency of Government which makes purchases not only for the European recovery program, but for the occupied areas and for the armed services, besides supporting farm prices, is to enact a bill continuing it in existence. It may go out of existence on July 1 unless we can continue it for a year in the farm bill which is now before the Senate.

We have all those things to consider, and have very little time to consider them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I realize that we are greatly pressed for time, but I deplore the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has always been such a stout fighter in this body for farmers. Surely if nothing else could be accomplished, a joint resolution could be enacted continuing any present laws which might be on the books, which would prevent an absolute collapse of the farm program.

I am not familiar with all the details of the House bill. Personally I was disposed to support a proposal which would continue the existing laws for a period of 12 months, to enable us to study more in detail a measure of such tremendous importance as that which the Senator from Vermont has reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I trust that if the worse comes to the worst the Senator will not close the door to a joint resolution continuing any existing laws for a period of 12 or 18 months.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the Senator from Georgia that the Senator from Vermont is not taking a defeatist attitude. I was simply making the statement that we did not intend to take defeat by letting one legislative measure after another come up, setting the farm program aside, so long as the farm bill is the pending business.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection——

Mr. AIKEN. We must continue a good program. As I say, the stopgap legislation passed by the House cannot be accepted as is, under any circumstances, because I have just pointed out some of the things in it which would not work. Therefore I do not believe that we should be too long in considering the long-range farm program. I do not know how many Members wish to speak. I know that there are some amendments to be offered. Some will be quickly accepted by the committee, so that they should not take very long.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. I, too, am tremendously interested, as the Senator well knows, in the continuation of a farm program at this session of Congress. I understand—and this may be incorrect; perhaps the Senator has better information—that the Committee on Agriculture of the House will not take this long-range farm program upon which the Senator from Vermont and other Senators have been working. I am wondering whether or not he has any information in that connection.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no information. We shall not, of course, know how closely we can get together with the House until we get into conference. I do know that while we may not get all we want on the part of the Senate in the form of a bill, there is a good chance of getting a better bill than the one which has already passed the House.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding, upon very reliable authority, that two of the members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House have made the suggestion that, in view of the shortness of time and in view of the importance of this particular farm bill, the committee probably would have no opportunity really to study the bill, if it were passed, and to enable them intelligently to reach a decision between now and Saturday night. I thought perhaps the Senator had heard something in that connection.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that some Members of the House are in favor of a long-range bill at this time. We have worked on this bill for almost 9 months. I realize that, while the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has spent this time on the bill, there are Members of the Senate who have not had the time to spend on it. I do not know whether they would ever have the time they ought to have to spend on it.

I am satisfied that the farm people generally are supporting this long-range farm bill. I know that the Department of Agriculture has withdrawn any objections it may previously have had. I know that last night in Los Angeles President Truman stated, according to the press, that he was fully in accord with it and hoped it might be passed at this session.

In view of all that support, I do not know why we should throw away the money spent in acquiring information and the months spent in preparation of the bill. I do not believe that the Senate will be so minded; and I do not believe that the House will, when it comes to the matter of accepting a good program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. To me this is a question of tremendous importance, in view of what the Senator says, and in view of what I understand to be the attitude of some members of the House Agriculture Committee. If we are to have a farm program at this session, it seems to me that members of the House Agriculture Committee and Members of the Senate will have to get together pretty fast. As the Senator well said a moment ago, there are certainly some objectionable features in the continuation of the present support program for another year, and certain amendments should be added if we are to be compelled to adopt that means. We cannot do that in a moment, either, I will say to the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Georgia. That is something that will have to be worked upon. If there is no possibility of getting through the House the sort of program provided by the Senate bill, something should be done between now and Saturday so that some kind of a program can be provided.

Mr. AIKEN. I think, if we can pass this bill through the Senate tomorrow, a workable program can be arrived at.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to add to and concur in what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said concerning the farm program. I also should like to reply to the question raised by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. The members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry met at various times with Members of the House Committee on Agriculture on the different phases of the farm program—not only on the support price phase but also on other phases. I believe there is a meeting of the minds on many of those questions, insofar as the two Committees on Agriculture are concerned; and I am very hopeful, in fact, quite confident, that we can accomplish and obtain concurrence by the House committee on the farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the first three amendments be considered en bloc, because they are so tied together, it seems to me, that a vote on one of them will determine the vote on all of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the three amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the first three committee amendments, which are being considered and will be voted upon en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays. But first I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Baldwin	Gurney	Moore
Ball	Hatch	Morse
Barkley	Hawkes	Murray
Brewster	Hayden	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Hoey	Pepper
Buck	Holland	Revercomb
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Feazel	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Young
Fulbright	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the first three committee amendments, which, by unanimous consent, are considered and are to be voted on en bloc. On this question the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate for more than a few moments. I do not intend to argue the philosophy of public power versus private power.

In my capacity as ranking minority member of the Committee on Atomic Energy, I have listened to certain testimony which indicated that there was a strong possibility that the facilities at Oak Ridge would find it necessary to ask the Tennessee Valley Authority for more power. Because of that information, on June 7, I addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is a short letter, and I shall read it to the Senate at this time:

DEAR MR. LILIENTHAL: The reactivation of certain facilities at Oak Ridge will, I am informed, necessitate a considerable increase in power requirements. I am further informed that the power now used, and the power to be required, at Oak Ridge is considered to be classified information.

This would seem to be nonsense on two grounds: First, because it wouldn't take much of a detective in the Tennessee Valley to figure out how much electricity is going to Oak Ridge; and, second, even if he did figure it out, what good would it do? If I am right in my conclusion as to the nonsecrecy of this information, will you please advise me how much power you are using now and how much you intend to use. I am planning to write to the Tennessee Valley Authority to ask them if they can supply the necessary power with their present requirements.

Under date of June 10, I received an answer to my inquiry. The answer is signed by Sumner T. Pike, Acting Chairman of the Commission:

JUNE 10, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR MCMAHON: We have your letter of June 7 regarding power requirements for Oak Ridge. While we have not publicized the figures on the quantity of power furnished Oak Ridge by the Tennessee Valley Authority, we agree with you that such information does not involve classified information. The present contract between the commission and TVA establishes an electrical power demand of 225,000 kilowatts. The present power load averages about 211,000 kilowatts. There are, however, certain particulars regarding our power requirements that do involve classified information, because these particulars, together with certain other facts, could possibly provide an index to the rate of production of fissionable materials at Oak Ridge. This information would include figures on the power generated by the Commission itself at Oak Ridge, details on type and quantity of power required by any individual facility within Oak Ridge, and records of total power consumption over an extended period of operation. If you wish, we shall be glad to send a representative of the commission to discuss these matters with you.

At present there is no definite program for reactivating any of the facilities at Oak Ridge which are in standby status. However, there is always the possibility that future developments—

I particularly call the attention of the Senate to this phrase:

or an emergency might necessitate the start-up of these facilities. The minimum additional power required for reactivating such facilities is estimated to be in excess of 50,000 kilowatts and the maximum might be several times this figure. None of this additional power requirement could be met from the commission's own installed power generating capacity at Oak Ridge.

Sincerely yours,

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
SUMNER T. PIKE,
Acting Chairman.

On receipt of that letter informing me of the possible future requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission, I got in touch with the Tennessee Valley Authority. Under date of June 15, they wrote me as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MCMAHON: Your office has advised us that the Atomic Energy Commission has informed you that its future operations may require 50,000 kilowatts of power in addition to the amounts which the TVA has now contracted to supply to the Commission's operations at Oak Ridge. You have asked whether the TVA will be able to meet this requirement from its present authorized system.

This additional amount of power has not been included in any of our estimates for future loads served by the TVA, and TVA would not be able to meet this additional requirement unless we are able to add generating capacity over and above the facilities already authorized and in process of installation on the system.

Mr. President, it is because I have been convinced by the testimony I have heard, and because it is the estimate of the Commission that in the event of an emergency, which we all know might develop tomorrow, next week, next month, or a year from now, it would become necessary to reactivate the now closed-down facilities at Oak Ridge, and additional power might be required in order to meet the requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that I feel there is nothing else for me to do except to vote for the $4,000,000 steam plant. Purely as a matter of defense, without any regard whatever to the basic argument as to whether or not we should further expand TVA for power purposes, it would certainly seem to be self-evident, in view of the situation which I have described, that the defense requirements of the United States demand that we start the construction of this facility. It will be impossible for the Oak Ridge installation to open up certain other facilities that are now being considered for reopening, and to service them, unless we provide for additional power.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Do I correctly understand that this letter does not say that the Tennessee Valley Authority must have the steam plant; it simply says it must have additional facilities?

Mr. McMAHON. The net effect of it. I may say to my colleague, is that there may well be additional requirements, which, I am told are 50,000 kilowatts. The TVA say they cannot furnish that amount of power with their present facilities.

Mr. BALDWIN. But they do not say they need a steam plant in order to fur-

nish that additional amount of power, do they?

Mr. McMAHON. No, they do not.

Mr. BALDWIN. They merely say they need additional facilities. The point I wanted to make was that there were hydroelectric potentials still possible of development there which probably would take care of additional requirements.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I may answer——

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment please. I will yield to the Senator from Michigan in a moment. I want to reply to my colleague. That may well be true. I do not pretend to be a hydroelectric engineer. I have made no study of the water table or the possibilities of further power to be derived from water plants. I am faced with a condition, not a theory. They say they are short of power and they suggest that this is the way the need should be met. I care not whether the power comes from steam or whether it comes from water, or whether they get a jet-propelled engine, but I know the additional power is needed, and this amendment is reported by the committee in order to provide it. I do not see how the Senate could take the responsibility of depriving the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge of 50,000 kilowatts that it may well need within 6 months.

I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely desire to say in reply to what has been said by the junior Senator from Connecticut, that the word received here from the TVA office today indicates there are now under way developments which will produce 700,000 kilowatts of hydro power. So there will be plenty of hydro power to meet requirements. Another thing I should like to call to the attention of the Senator is that the letter is dated the 7th of June. The bill had not then been reported from the committee. It was reported last Saturday. The subcommittee voted on it on June 8. As chairman of the subcommittee I have had no knowledge of this information from the TVA or from anyone else. Now, just at the moment of voting on the proposal, there is produced on the Senate floor this information. It seems queer to the chairman of the subcommittee that the information could not have been furnished either to the subcommittee or the full committee.

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Connecticut has yielded the floor. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I am informed the House Appropriations Committee took testimony in respect to the Oak Ridge requirements. I have not read that testimony myself but I am informed there was testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely want to say, I thank the junior Senator from Michigan for the information he has given us. I know that my distinguished colleague is much concerned about atomic energy and its development and the power requirements for it, as am I. But it would seem to me from what the Senator from Michigan has said that there is in prospect adequate development in the reasonably foreseeable future to take care of additional requirements, which gives me reassurance in the matter.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, as a member of the committee I have not participated in the debate, and I shall not delay consideration of the bill at this time, but I think it is very unfair to attempt to place a national-preparedness or national-defense label on the amendment which is currently before the Senate. Everyone knows that TVA has a procedure involving preference customers. I ask my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] if there would be any justification for denying Oak Ridge increased power for operation for national defense and to give all the power which is currently being subsidized to some of the large industrial users. Every Senator knows that under the operation of the TVA system there are preference customers. TVA could not deny to Oak Ridge, which is engaged in a federally operated defense project, or to any other plant which is essential to the national security, all the power which might be required for their operations.

Mr. President, as I said, I did not intend to participate in this debate, but I deeply deplore any effort made at this hour of the debate to embarrass or seek to embarras any Member of this body who does not find it possible to go along and support this steam-plant project.

I have in my hand a letter, dated Spokane, Wash., May 28, 1948, written by the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane. I should like to read it, because I think it will disprove some of the contentions made here that there is any shortage of power in TVA, or that there is an inadequate supply of power with which to operate any expanded operations of the Oak Ridge plant.

This letter was written to a Member of the House, and I shall read it so that the Senators may have the information. It reads as follows:

Here is a situation that has just developed which I believe you will find of some interest.

During the war the Government built a ferrosilicon plant—four furnaces—at Rock Island on the Columbia River, near Wenatchee, Wash. The War Assets Administration is now advertising that plant for sale, with the privileges of complete removal from this territory.

We are exceedingly anxious to retain that plant in the Northwest because we feel it balances out our economy, and is really an essential plant—not only for peacetime operations, but especially in case of an emergency such as national defense. The plant will require 25,000 kilowatts of power.

As you already know, we in the Northwest are starving for power, in spite of the fact that we have wonderful dams like Grand Coulee and Bonneville, and in spite of the fact that Grand Coulee Dam is now producing in round numbers, 200,000 kilowatts more power than it did at the wartime peak.

The Bonneville Administration maintains that it is unable to allocate any power to the Rock Island plant, and I am willing to accept their statement as a fact in view of our general power shortage.

For example: We need 2,000 kilowatts more for the Pend Oreille Mining & Metals Co., which has leased part of the magnesium plant in Spokane. We need 13,000 kilowatts more for the Chromium Mining & Smelting Co., which has leased the other part of the magnesium plant. We need 35,000 kilowatts additional firm power for our aluminum reduction plant operated by the Kaiser Co. These are all right here in Spokane. The Bonneville Administration is unable to supply any of these.

Consequently, I am willing to accept the Bonneville Power Administration's statement that they will be unable to allocate any power for the Rock Island ferrosilicon plant until 3 or 4 years from now.

However, we are informed by reliable sources that the prospective purchaser of the Rock Island ferrosilicon plant is assured of an immediate allocation of adequate power by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and consequently is considering moving the plant to that area.

Now, I come to the real point of this letter. If the Tennessee Valley Authority has such a surplus of power, and can promise such heavy loads as 25,000 kilowatts for immediate delivery to the Rock Island ferrosilicon plant, then how comes it—that the Tennessee Valley Authority comes to Congress pleading that they are so short of power that they want an appropriation to build a steam plant.

That is the real point I want to make, Congressman JENSEN. It doesn't add up to me, and I am just passing it on to you for whatever value it may have.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. FORD,
Managing Secretary.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I cannot understand how such overtures or promises are being currently made by TVA to any plants in the Northwest or in any other section of the country.

I reiterate at this time that it would be approaching treason for the TVA to deny an adequate supply of power generated in that area to Oak Ridge, if the Oak Ridge operations required such power for the national defense. I think it is entirely improper to interject such an approach or such an argument into this debate. I did not intend to say a word, but I feel it is incumbent upon me, as a member of the subcommittee, to attempt to refute some of the arguments which are being made here, obviously designed to change the minds of members of this body, because every Senator, all other loyal patriotic Americans, will insist that priorities be given to Oak Ridge and to every other national security operation of the Federal Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I happen to be familiar with the situation referred to in the letter which was read by the Senator from Idaho, coming from the Chamber of Commerce at Spokane, Wash. It is not true that the TVA has guaranteed to that concern, or that it had any interest in, purchasing the plant at Rock Island. On the contrary, the TVA has advised them that they cannot furnish power to them from the supply of power which is now available.

I hope the Senator will believe that I am in good faith, because I have been interested, as a Senator, in knowing

whether the very situation to which the Senator has referred, through the letter, has been accurately stated. I find that it is now the plan of the concern, which is a Pittsburgh outfit, by the way, a very large and reputable concern which was interested in the purchase of surplus property in Rock Island, Wash., to abandon that theory entirely, because power cannot be obtained. It has started on a new enterprise, if power becomes available, to build a plant that will supply the Pittsburgh plant with the raw material which it needs.

I do not think the statement of the Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce in Spokane should be accepted as evidence against the known fact that the TVA not only has not guaranteed any such power, but has advised the concern that it cannot furnish it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the three committee amendments en bloc.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is with some hesitation that I rise to reply to the Senator from Idaho. I thought the floor of the Senate was a place in which Senators give their brother Senators information which they believe to be pertinent to the question under discussion. If I were to accept the criterion of conduct suggested by the junior Senator from Idaho I would conceal information vital to the matter under discussion. This, of course, I could not do.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the letter which I received is dated June 15, today. I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I take it that the Senator from Idaho, in considering the appropriation, must have had in mind that the Oak Ridge installation was where it is. I think I might properly ask him why it did not occur to him that he might inquire of the interested authorities as to whether they had any information which bore on the problem in hand.

Mr. President, I resent the statements of the junior Senator from Idaho and his criticism that I have delayed bringing information to the attention of the Senate. I bring it in good faith. I do not even vouch for it personally. I told the Senate who had given it to me. I say, for myself, that it influenced my vote. The Senator from Idaho can vote as he pleases.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, there certainly was no intention on my part of casting any reflections upon the Senator from Connecticut. I simply wanted to stress the point which apparently had been submerged throughout the debate, and that is that under the operation of TVA there are preference customers, public buyers, and REA. I ask my colleagues if the Oak Ridge plant does not qualify as a preference customer. If it does so qualify, it is difficult for me to conceive of any situation wherein the Oak Ridge plant would be denied any power which it currently needs, or any increased amount which might legitimately and justifiably be denied to other users who have been operating defense plants.

Mr. President, that is the point I am making because I am assuming that those in charge of the TVA operation are loyal patriotic Americans and never could there be any question in my mind that the Oak Ridge plant could be denied all the power required for the operation of that plant in the interest of national security.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to speak for just a moment. I would not have taken the floor at all but I should like to express the hope that the judgment and foresight of the junior Senator from Idaho can be better relied upon in this instance than in the past. I have had a Columbia Valley Authority bill kicking around committees of the Senate for some years and nothing has been done about it. If action had been taken on that measure there would be no shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest at this moment. I am forced to agree with the junior Senator from Idaho that there is a serious power shortage there and that we are suffering the loss of plants and potential industrial developments which otherwise would come to our section of the country.

Furthermore, if the Columbia Valley development bill had been acted upon, there would not have been the disastrous floods which have wrought such havoc in our section of the Nation in the past few weeks. Indeed, the loss there has been so great that it would have gone a long way toward paying the initial cost at least of a Columbia Valley Authority project.

Therefore I hope that in opposing the provision for this steam plant to even up the power load in the Tennessee Valley the junior Senator from Idaho will be proven more correct if he votes against it than he has been in his opposition to the Columbia Valley Authority project, which opposition has been largely responsible for the inaction, the terrible loss from flood, and the serious power shortage which now confronts the Northwest.

I should hope, in view of that experience, that he would be for this appropriation, and also that he would join with me in sponsoring the Columbia Valley Authority bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first three committee amendments, which are being considered en bloc.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. A vote in the affirmative will be for the amendments, and a vote in the negative will be against them, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote "yea" is a vote for the committee amendments, and a vote "nay" is a vote against the committee amendments.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. On this vote the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I am advised that if present and voting the senior Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the senior Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent due to being called to the hospital on account of an accident to a member of his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is necessarily absent on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who would vote "nay" if present, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "yea" if present.

If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Hayden	Maybank
Barkley	Hill	Morse
Chavez	Hoey	Murray
Connally	Holland	O'Conor
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Donnell	Knowland	Russell
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Lucas	Stennis
Ellender	McClellan	Stewart
Feazel	McFarland	Taylor
Flanders	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
Green	McMahon	Wherry
Hatch	Magnuson	Young

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Ecton	Moore
Ball	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Bricker	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brooks	Ives	Taft
Buck	Jenner	Thye
Butler	Kem	Umstead
Byrd	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cain	McCarthy	Watkins
Capehart	Malone	Williams
Capper	Martin	
Dworshak	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—14

Bushfield	Reed	Wagner
George	Robertson, Va.	White
Kilgore	Smith	Wiley
McCarran	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Myers	Tobey	

So the first three committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendments were agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that when action shall have been had on the pending bill, it is proposed to take up for consideration the naval appropriation bill. After that a statement will be made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] respecting the farm bill, at the conclusion of which we would like to take up for consideration the bill making appropriations for the European recovery program. If we all cooperate I believe we can tonight complete the program I have just outlined. Thus we will be able to send the appropriation bills to conference quickly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Senate would proceed with the farm bill before acting on the ERP bill?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] desires to make a presentation of the farm bill, so it will be in the RECORD for Senators to read in the morning. I think the Senator from Vermont will be reasonable in respect to the amount of time he will take to make his presentation.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has informed me that he is ready to take up the bill making appropriations for ERP at the conclusion of the presentation by the Senator from Vermont.

It may be necessary to run a little late tonight, but I hope Senators will bear with us and cooperate with us, because it is very necessary that we get the appropriation bills passed and in the hands of the conferees quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Independent agencies and corporations," on page 8, line 13, after the word "That", to strike out "immediately upon the enactment of this act" and insert "prior to July 31, 1948", and in line 17, after the figures "$10,000,000," to insert "if not otherwise required to be turned into the Treasury under the provisions of the proposed Federal charter."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 19, to strike out:

Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Incorporated: Of the funds available to the Corporation, not to exceed $500 shall be available for administrative expenses related to liquidation and dissolution, and not to exceed $500 for the cost of audit, as required by the Government Corporation Control Act of December 6, 1945 (Public Law 248): *Provided*, That all administrative duties and responsibilities shall be assumed by such officers and employees of the Treasury Department as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and who shall receive no additional compensation for such duties: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall take appropriate steps to secure the final dissolution and liquidation of said Corporation at the earliest practicable date: *Provided further*, That the total cost of liquidation and dissolution shall be paid out of funds available to the Corporation without additional appropriations therefor: *Provded further*, That the Board of Directors of the Corporation is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury title to assets (other than real property) of the Corporation upon certification of the president of the Corporation that such transfer is to the interest of the Government of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to dispose of such assets at such times and in such manner as he may determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 14, after the word "with", to strike out "its" and insert "generally recognized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency," on page 15, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,250,000" and insert "$2,500,000"; on page 16, line 21, after the word "cancel", to strike out "the capital stock" and insert "bonds"; in line 22, after the word "in", to strike out "par value" and insert "an"; and in line 24, after the word "transferred", to insert "plus accrued dividends thereon."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $5,000 of the funds of said Corporation shall be available until June 30, 1952, for the payment of such expenses as the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board or his designee or designees may find necessary for winding up the affairs and effecting the dissolution of the United States Housing Corporation and the United States Housing Corporation of Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 8, after the words "to the", to strike out "Secretary of the Treasury for cancellation" and insert "Reconstruction Finance Corporation"; and in line 14, after the word "transferred", to strike out "within 30 days after the date of enactment hereof" and insert "as of June 30, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 2, to insert:

Not to exceed $3,000 of the funds available to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for expenses of travel shall be available, when specifically authorized by the Administrator or head of the constituent agency concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation or authorization is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Agriculture," on page 23, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$373,600" and insert "$223,600."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry of the junior Senator from Michigan as to why the Senate committee could not concur in the sum stipulated in line 6, on page 23. I note that the appropriation was cut by $150,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the committee denied a request to increase the administrative-expense limitation in the budget estimate of $1,755,300, but has decreased the amount which may be paid to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services from $373,600 to $223,600, a reduction of $150,000. The attempt is to have the agencies in the field given a greater proportion of the money. The $150,000 is taken from the organization in Washington. That will reduce the amount of the Washington appropriation, but give more in proportion to the field. I should like to take this question to conference and have it adjusted at that time.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the junior Senator from Michigan that this reduction, so far as it pertains to the home or central office, would have quite a crippling effect upon that office. I beg of the Senator to give due consideration to the question and make a complete study, so as not to cripple the function of the bank.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Minnesota can rest assured that the subject will be given attention in the conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I fear that this cut is too severe. If it goes into effect, it will cripple the work of the Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I stated, it is a question which in my opinion should be taken to conference. We have changed the figure from $373,600 to $223,600, so the difference can be adjusted in conference. I shall certainly keep in mind what the Senator says. I have talked with a number of persons and I hope the difficulty can be adjusted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have had prepared a statement on the subject. To save time, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, so that it will be available for the information of the conferees.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the information.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Page 23, line 6, delete $223,600 and substitute $373,600, the amount approved by the House.

This would make $293,600 available for administrative expenses for supervisory or other services rendered by the Farm Credit Administration both in Washington and the districts, and $80,000 would be available for liquidation of obligations incurred in the fiscal year 1948.

Under the committee print only $143,600 would be available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for supervisory or other services rendered in Washington and in the field. This would not be sufficient to enable the Farm Credit Administration to carry out its responsibilities during the next fiscal year. It is estimated that the examination of the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks in 1949 will cost $48,000 and that the cost to Federal intermediate credit banks of the services of the registrars will be in excess of $85,000. While these two costs are charged to the central office because these services are required to be performed by public officials, they are activities that are carried on in the field. The examination costs average only about $4,000 per Federal intermediate credit bank, and it should be kept in mind that the 12 banks will average lending approximately $100,000,000 each in 1949. The cost of services of the registrars will average slightly in excess of $7,000 per bank, which is a conservative figure in view of the service performed and the responsibilities. The registrars are public officials employed by the Farm Credit Administration of Washington, D. C. They perform a very important and necessary function for the Federal intermediate credit banks. They are custodians for all the collateral which is used in support of the debentures sold to the public. They must at all times have sufficient collateral in their possession to fully secure all outstanding debentures of the Federal intermediate credit banks. It is gratifying to note that in the years of operation of the Federal intermediate credit banks there has been no misappropriation of collateral held by the registrars in any of the districts. The buyers of debentures have bought with the knowledge that proper procedures are being followed to protect the collateral behind these debentures.

Under the committee print, after paying the cost of registrars in the 12 districts and the cost of examination of the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks, which would total in excess of $133,000, there would remain only $10,200 available for payment to the Farm Credit Administration for the remaining supervisory and other services rendered. These supervisory functions and services include an Intermediate Credit Bank Commissioner, a position established by law and his office which it is estimated will cost $46,500 in 1949, include the service performed by the Finance and Accounts Division in connection with the handling of securities, supervision of the registrars, assembling and tabulating reports, development of budgets and certain supervisory accounting work which is necessary in connection with the operations of institutions of this type, also the Federal intermediate credit banks' portion of the cost of the Office of the Governor of Farm Credit Administration, cost of maintaining files and other services performed by the service divisions of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan, in line with the question raised by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Minnesota, that I have received a good many communications from production credit corporations in my State. They are very much disturbed about the budget cuts in the bill affecting their work.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from one of the production credit corporations in my State, setting forth its point of view on the questions which the Senator from Michigan says he is going to take to conference, in the sincere hope that in conference he will be able to meet some of the objections raised in this letter.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that information from the Senator from Oregon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLAMETTE PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
Salem, Oreg., May 24, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have before me a copy of H. R. 6481, a bill making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

I have studied this bill very carefully. Because of my affiliation with and knowledge of the Production Credit System, I cannot help but feel that the House committee under Mr. PLOESER on appropriations has failed to study the situation and has reached conclusions that are not founded on factual information.

As you know, the production credit system, including the central office in Washington and the 12 production credit corporations, have been doing an exceptionally fine job in serving agriculture and operating most economically. The system requested and the Budget Bureau approved a budget for the 12 corporations and the central office amounting to $1,602,600. The subcommittee on appropriations cut this amount to $1,350,000, a total cut of $252,600. Also, the committee recommended that prior to June 30, 1949, the corporations shall return Government capital aggregating not less than $60,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury. The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration was authorized and directed to cancel such stock.

This appears to me a most dangerous piece of legislation especially in view of the fact that all of us are concerned not only about the present inflationary period in which our business is being conducted, but more especially are concerned about what may be in store for us in the future.

For your information, the system originally had $120,000,000 of Government capital. As the production credit associations became established and developed earnings of their own, they started returning capital to the United States Treasury's revolving fund. To date approximately $39,000,000 has been returned.

From the progress of my own association and neighboring associations, together with my knowledge of the system, another large amount will be returned at the end of 1948, perhaps from another $12,000,000 to $15,000,000. After 15 years of operation this would appear that the System is making real progress in retiring the Government capital.

We in Production Credit have always been told that the funds to be retired from the System would be placed into the revolving fund to be used for capital purposes in case of any real emergency which may arise either on a national or district-wide basis. The return of these funds to the revolving fund will not affect our present program of continuing to retire the Government's capital which I can say from many contracts with other production credit association secretaries, all of us are striving to achieve as soon as possible.

As for my own association and other associations in the district, we are all in favor of farmer ownership and are vigorously proceeding in that direction. It seems a shame that the House would pass H. R. 6481 without amendment and without study and debate in view of the record.

I have before me a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I quote from page 5522, May 10, 1948, an excerpt from the statement of Mr. PLOESER:

"The production credit corporations requested $1,602,000; we gave them $1,350,000.

"I could go on at great length on this subject, but I do not care to take that much time of the Committee, but their operation is almost purely paternalistic. The day has arrived when they are not making any extensive investments in production credit associations, but more in the social field than in the actual lending field or the extension of capital.

"We found that they had about $65,000,000 invested in Government bonds in which they were obviously speculating. They were speculating to their heart's content in the Government bond market throughout the year and they were having a good time at it. We see no excuse whatsoever for any agency of the Government using surplus funds just to satisfy their own vanity as investment speculators, and we have written into this bill a provision taking $60,000,000 of their funds and putting it in the Treasury in the fiscal year 1949."

This in itself would indicate that Mr. PLOESER is receiving his advice presumably from the American Bankers Association, our competitors. Certainly he hasn't taken the time to review the record or he would not be careless enough to state that the corporations have been speculating throughout the year. A survey of the activities of the 12 production credit corporations would indicate that the only bond investments made during the year were for production credit associations sending in surplus earnings to be invested in bonds for the purpose of augmenting their capital structure. I can imagine the only other sale was when the system returned approximately $8,000,000 in cash to the revolving fund of the United States Treasury. To return this cash it was necessary to sell bonds. It would be ridiculous for the corporations, the Government, or any other business institution to sell bonds on the open market and not accept the premium that was being paid.

I am not aware of any activities of the corporations in the social field. My guess is that Mr. PLOESER is thinking of the Farmers' Home Administration. My acquaintance and confidence in you prompts me to be helpful in bringing you down to date on these facts so that when the Senate acts on the budget of the production credit corporations, you will have some knowledge of what has transpired and what is needed.

There never has been a time in the history of the system when the supervision rendered to the production credit associations by the production credit corporations has been of such great importance. More and more farmers are turning to production credit as can be seen by the enclosed statistics. With business more than doubling in the past 2 years, it hardly seems provident to curtail the system of checks and balances which has enabled us to build our cooperatives on a sound framework over the past 14 years. We have experienced a recession in the fruit industry—the fur farmers are having a desperate time. The net returned to growers from many of the agricultural commodities that we finance has been narrowed because of rising costs; therefore, we need the wise counsel and judgment of the experienced people in the corporation to assist us in maintaining a proper balance in the extension of credit to farmers in our area. We are adhering to conservative policies. In doing so we are doing our best to contribute our share to heading off further inflation. Also we have the sincere desire to see that the farmers and stockmen using the facilities of our association keep themselves in liquid condition. Great harm could be done to the average farmer through over-extension

of credit. We work with him, counsel with him, and have on our board of directors experienced and qualified farmers who approve the loans and manage the affairs of our organization. The same is true of the five-hundred-odd other associations in the United States.

May I plead with you and urge that you give us your support in maintaining an economical set-up that is not asking Congress for an appropriation but asking Congress for an approved budget?

The production credit corporations receive their earnings from the income on bond investments and dividends paid by production credit associations. All surplus earnings by these corporations belong to the United States Government and are not being wasted. If you care to confer with members of the subcommittee, you may be helpful. The Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government corporations is chaired by Mr. FERGUSON.

Anything you can do in aiding us in the restoration of this drastic cut will be appreciated by the thousands of member stockholders of production credit associations in Oregon.

Please accept my best regards.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP M. BRANDT, Jr.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

P. S.—I understand hearings on this bill are to come up this week. P. M. B.

Willamette Production Credit Association—Comparative statistics, April 30

	1946	1947	1948
Loans outstanding:			
Number	198	315	441
Amount	$538,000	$882,000	$1,199,000
Production credit association stock	$125,000	$115,000	$75,000
A stockholders (nonborrowing):			
Number	186	184	201
Amount	$12,020	$11,885	$11,970
B stockholders (active borrowers):			
Number	464	497	607
Amount	$114,200	$116,145	$134,060
Accumulated reserves	$88,020	$103,640	$116,750
Net earnings, year to date	$1,188	$4,280	$3,296
Average size of loan	$2,717	$2,800	$2,720
Number loans made year to date	133	181	255
Applications approved, Jan. 1 to Apr. 23			243
Applications rejected, Jan. 1 to Apr. 23			112
Applications approved above, repeat and renewal loans			139
Applications approved above, new members			104

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,500,000"; and on page 24, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 24, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$46,800" and insert "$146,800"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,500" and insert "$21,000"; and on page 25, line 11, after the figures "$25,000,000", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That, notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, in addition to the foregoing the Corporation is authorized to utilize, from the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1148a), such sums as may be necessary (a) to make loans, during a period of 5 years, to bona fide fur farmers in accordance with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148), the aggregate principal amount of which loans shall not exceed $4,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and (b) not to exceed $50,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration in connection with such loans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Commerce," on page 26, line 19, after the word "area", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Corporation is authorized to pay not to exceed $3,918.48 for services actually rendered by 18 of its former employees during the fiscal year 1947 and for which there is no present authority to pay.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 27, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

There is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000 to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be made available by him, as a loan, to The Virgin Islands Company, upon request of the President of the Company, for the purpose of enabling the Company to continue its present operation until June 30, 1949. The loan shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan to the Company.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of Justice," on page 28, line 8, after the word "interest", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That funds of the Corporation shall be available, in amounts not to exceed $338,000 during the fiscal year 1948 and $380,000 during the fiscal year 1949, for expenses of vocational training of prisoners as authorized by the act of May 11, 1948 (Public Law 521), such expenses to be computed and determined on the same basis and with the same exclusions (except vocational training expenses) as provided herein with respect to administrative expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General provisions," on page 31, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 305. After the date of enactment hereof the salaries of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall be at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 7, to change the section number from "306" to "305"; in line 16, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; on page 32, line 7, after the word "violence," to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; and in line 18, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 5, to change the section number from "307" to "306."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there are no further committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$4,840,000" and insert "$6,200,000"; and on page 3 it is proposed to strike out the proviso beginning in line 20 and ending in line 1, on page 4, reading as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public-housing agency any contribution occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Public Housing Administration or its predecessor agencies."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I apologize to the Appropriations Committee for my failure to present this amendment directly to the committee. As we all know, Senators are extremely busy, and I have had no opportunity to get the facts and figures together and present them formally before the committee, but I do so now before the Senate.

Let me say to the Senate that this amendment seeks to effect a change which will give a more equitable distribution on the question of payment of taxes by the public-housing authorities over the country. All told, there are 273 of such projects in operation throughout the United States.

This amendment is designed to restore equitable treatment to the municipalities which are now subject to what I contend, under the language of the bill, is a gross discrimination as the result of this proviso. By the way, the proviso was inserted in the bill for the first time last year. Previous to that time there was no such proviso.

The proviso is directed toward the relationship between the Federal Government and the local housing agencies which own and operate low-rent housing projects throughout the United States.

There are now some 273 of these projects in operation throughout the United

States. The issue involved in this proviso is the amount of local taxes which these projects shall pay to the cities and counties in which they are located.

When the projects were first set up, beginning in 1938, it was recognized that the successful operation of low-rent housing projects depended upon the amount of taxes which the project would have to bear. Under the arrangement between the State governments and the Federal Government local housing authorities are exempt by law from the payment of local taxes. The payment which they make to the cities and counties is in a sense a payment of an amount "in lieu of taxes." This is an amount specified in the contract between the housing authority and the local government. The amount to be paid must be approved by the Federal Public Housing Authority.

In the beginning stages of the program no one was sure exactly what amount should be paid in lieu of taxes. As a consequence, the original contracts contained different provisions with respect to taxes.

That is the point I wish to make and bear down on in connection with this amendment.

In Illinois, for example, the local housing authorities' contracts in Granite City, Quincy, Champaign County, Madison County, Rock Island County, and Alexander County call for a payment in lieu of taxes of 2 percent of the amount of shelter rent paid by the tenants; that is to say, 2 percent of the rent minus any payments on account of utility services. In Decatur, Ill., the original contract specified a payment of 2¾ percent. In the city of Rock Island, St. Clair County, and Winnebago County, the original contracts called for a payment of 3 percent of the net shelter rent. In the cities of Chicago and Peoria, the original contracts called for a 5-percent payment. In the city of Danville, the contract called for a flat payment of only $100 a year; and in Henry County, the contract called for a payment of $165 a year.

The variation in the amounts to be paid was brought about because of the uncertainty as to the amount which could be paid. The important point was to keep those low-rent housing projects operating on the least expensive basis, so that the rents could remain low and serve the beneficial purposes of the acts of Congress, which were designed to give the lowest-income groups in the population adequate housing.

As time went on, it became clear that these public-housing authorities were not paying adequately for the services which were being supplied to them by the local government, such as education, fire and police protection, sanitation, and so forth. Although the United States Housing Act of 1937 requires that the local governments must contribute toward the operation of the low-rent projects at least 20 percent of the amount contributed by the Federal Government, it was very clear that in most cases the cost of the services rendered was several times the amount of local contribution. Moreover, the system for payments in lieu of taxes was inequitable as between cities. The cities which had participated first in the program had agreed to accept very small amounts in lieu of taxes, as contrasted with the cities which came in later. As a result of this situation, the Federal Public Housing Authority conducted an extensive study of the whole question of payments in lieu of taxes. Conferences were held with many public bodies, including the National Association of Housing Officials, the Municipal Finance Officers Association, the National Association of Assessing Officers, and the United States Conference of Mayors. As a result of those conferences, it was agreed that the local housing authorities could pay more than the amounts provided for in the original contract. So at this point practically every housing authority is now paying 10 percent of the net shelter rent.

By this move, each city or county in which a local housing authority existed was receiving the same proportion of the rent as a payment in lieu of taxes. The proviso in this bill and in last year's bill requires that no payment in lieu of taxes can be made in excess of the amount specified in the original contract. This pushes everything back to the situation which prevailed at the beginning of the program, and perpetuates the inequities contained in the original contracts under which some cities paid nothing and other cities paid various amounts ranging from 2 percent to 5 percent.

Of the 273 projects now in operation, in the case of 153 of them there is no provision at all in the original contracts for payments in lieu of taxes. Others provide specific dollar-and-cents amounts. Most of them provide for 3 percent.

Thus, in addition to reducing drastically the amounts which the cities and counties are to receive in lieu of taxes, the proviso perpetuates the inequities as between the various cities and counties. The cities have been relying year by year upon the payment of the 10-percent contribution to support the local government. But, Mr. President, under this provision of the bill, which was written in last year, they cannot obtain that 10 percent from the Housing Authority, because the contract is different. Yet that is what the Congress last year said should be done.

Congress has known for 3 years about this arrangement whereby increased amounts were paid to the local governments, and Congress did not see fit to change it until last year. What is proposed now is to continue the provisions of last year's bill.

If the proviso is continued, the amount which will be saved by the Government in making annual contributions is in the neighborhood of $1,300,000. For the sake of saving that amount of money, the Appropriations Committee is apparently prepared to continue the inequitable system of payments among the various local housing authorities and to deprive the local governments of the revenue which they desperately need. It is a matter of common knowledge that almost every city and county in the country is seeking new sources of revenue in order to meet the mounting costs of local government for education, fire and police protection, and so forth. It is another instance of an economy-minded Congress throwing discretion overboard for the sake of saving a pitifully small amount. That is not very much money nowadays, in terms of Federal Government expenditures, but it is a tremendous amount of money for the municipalities that are taxed to the limit at the present time for health and sanitation services and police and fire protection, and the other essential services and utilities that are necessary for the proper running of a city. As everyone knows, practically every city in the United States is bonded up to the limit, and it is difficult for the cities to do the things that should be done. For instance, the city of Chicago alone, because of the tremendous housing projects there, would benefit to the amount of $250,000 under the provisions of this amendment.

These low-rent housing projects constitute one of the worth-while contributions of the Federal Government to the health and welfare of the low-income groups of our people. Their continued operation is essential. We must not make any move in this Congress which would impair their efficient operation. I urge the Senate to strike this proviso from the bill.

In order to provide funds with which to raise the payment to local governments up to the 10-percent rate which prevailed for 3 years prior to last year, the appropriation to the Public Housing Administration is increased by my amendment from $4,840,000 to $6,200,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think this matter can be explained better by reading from the House committee hearings, rather than in any other way, because in those hearings the matter is boiled down and the facts are presented. I read now from page 791 of the House committee hearings:

PROVISIONS OF ORIGINAL CONTRACTS

In determining its policy in respect to local contributions and payments in lieu of taxes, the PHA has taken into consideration not only that local contributions must be received in an amount equal to the required 20 percent, but also that the local contributions together with the Federal contributions must be sufficient to achieve rents within the means of low-income families.

Even in the earliest days of the program, when the first low-rent housing projects were being planned, it was apparent that local contributions larger than the 20-percent minimum would have to be obtained if low rents were to be achieved. It was, therefore, the original policy of the PHA to encourage localities to grant complete tax exemption for their low-rent housing projects. It was only when a locality insisted upon receiving some payments in lieu of taxes that the PHA authorized the making of contracts providing for such payments.

As a result of this original policy of case-by-case negotiations with the localities, the original contracts present a wide diversity of provisions as to payments in lieu of taxes. More than half of the original contracts contain no provision whatsoever for such payments, and only 7 percent of the contracts provided for payments equal to as much as 5 percent of shelter rent. The following table summarizes the provisions of the original contracts for the low-rent projects established under the original act (Public Law 412, 75th Cong.) and for the projects de-

veloped under the defense amendment (Public Law 671, 76th Cong.) after their conversion to low-rent use.

Provisions of original contracts in respect to payments in lieu of taxes on locally owned low-rent projects under the United States Housing Act

	Public Law 412 projects		Public Law 671 projects		Total, all projects	
	No.	*Pct.*	*No.*	*Pct.*	*No.*	*Pct.*
No payments in lieu of taxes	99	60.4	54	49.5	153	56.0
2 to 2¾ percent of shelter rent	8	4.9	12	11.0	20	7.4
3 percent of shelter rent	26	15.9	28	25.7	54	19.7
4¾ percent of shelter rent	3	1.8	1	.9	4	1.5
5 percent of shelter rent	14	8.5	6	5.5	20	7.3
Fixed amount	13	7.9	3	2.8	16	5.9
Other arrangements	1	.6	5	4.6	6	2.2
Total	164	100.0	109	100.0	273	100.0

FIRST UNIFORM POLICY

The various localities throughout the country speedily came to feel that there had been unfair discrimination between them; those cities which had insisted upon payments in lieu of taxes had received them, whereas those which had not insisted had received none. In order to bring about a uniformity of administration and to treat all localities on the same basis, the PHA in 1942 promulgated a uniform policy in regard to payments in lieu of taxes. Local authorities were authorized to make payments in lieu of taxes which, together with the amounts stipulated in the original contracts, would amount to 5 percent of the shelter rents charged in the project for the year. This authorization was, of course, subject to the statutory condition that local contributions were to be not less than 20 percent of Federal contribution.

Mr. President, here is what happened. The cities were very anxious to get the low-rent housing. They were perfectly willing not to have any payment in lieu of taxes, because they wanted to make a contribution to low-rent housing. The PHA was perfectly willing to do that. It was out to get public housing in every city in the United States. In order to get it, the PHA came to Congress and indicated to Congress, "We can build these houses; the local communities will contribute the amount of taxes."

Then the PHA found some cities that would not do that. For instance, there was a town in Texas that said, "We want, as taxes, the amount we are now collecting on this vacant land." Such a provision was put in their contract.

Then, after the Congress provided those houses, the PHA broke faith with the Congress, without giving any notice and without doing anything other than making special deals with each one of the cities, raising to 10 percent of the shelter rate the amount to be paid in lieu of taxes.

So, Mr. President, if we do not include this provision, the result will be to cost the Federal Government a subsidy of $1,360,000.

My city of Detroit has sent representatives here to Washington to see me. They want this 10-percent payment in lieu of taxes. But I have said to them, as I say to the representatives of all the other cities, that so far as I am concerned, they made their contract; they wanted the housing; they agreed that they would put up the amount in lieu of taxes, as their share; so now they should not get a further subsidy, but they should stand by their contract, the same as all the other cities do.

I think the time has come when the cities of the country as well as the Federal Government must help furnish the poor people of the Nation with housing. That is the only way we are going to have careful operation of the housing projects, because the people will realize they are sharing the burden. This is a burden upon all the people, not only of the cities, but of the United States, and not only of the United States but of the respective cities.

I hope the measure will be left just as it is. As I recall, there was in the committee no discussion about this phase of it, I know the committee was unanimous on it. The cities agreed to this, and they should now carry out the agreement, after they have the housing projects, without changing it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Bricker	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Cordon	Langer	Stennis
Donnell	Lodge	Stewart
Dworshak	Lucas	Taft
Eastland	McClellan	Taylor
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McKellar	Thye
Feazel	McMahon	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Umstead
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Maybank	Watkins
Green	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hawkes	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LODGE. Let the amendment be stated for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the figures "$4,840,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,200,000"; and on page 3, to strike the proviso beginning on line 20 and ending on line 1, page 4, which reads as follows: *"Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public housing agency any contribution occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Public Housing Administration or its predecessor agencies."

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Holland	Maybank
Baldwin	Ives	Morse
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Cooper	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Knowland	Pepper
Donnell	Langer	Saltonstall
Eastland	Lodge	Smith
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Feazel	McClellan	Stennis
Flanders	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McKellar	Taylor
Hayden	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Magnuson	Tobey

NAYS—33

Ball	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Russell
Butler	Hoey	Taft
Byrd	Jenner	Thye
Cain	Kem	Umstead
Capper	Martin	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Millikin	Watkins
Ecton	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Reed	Williams
Fulbright	Revercomb	Young

NOT VOTING—21

Bridges	George	O'Daniel
Buck	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	McCarran	Tydings
Capehart	McCarthy	Wagner
Chavez	McGrath	White
Connally	Malone	Wiley
Downey	Myers	Wilson

So Mr. LUCAS' amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the amendment I have submitted would provide for $1,000,000 additional capital-stock subscription to the Inland Waterways Corporation, which operates the Federal Barge Lines and the Warrior River Terminal Company. This appropriation of $1,000,000 would complete the capital subscription of this Corporation under the existing authorization.

The Federal Barge Lines was organized in its present form in 1924 and since that time has hauled an average of 2,000,000 tons of freight per year. At the time of its organization there were no other common carriers of freight on the Mississippi River proper, and, largely because of the pioneering work which it did, there were, by 1944, over a hundred common, contract, and private carriers operating on the Mississippi River system. In addition to the pioneer work which the lines did, I am of the opinion that the service offered to a large number of small shippers was a basis of considerable support for the improvement of our streams and rivers, thus making profitable private barge-line operations possible.

Perhaps the best example of the need for a service such as is offered by Federal Barge Lines can be found in the Tennessee River, where millions of dollars have been spent in developing a 9-foot channel to Knoxville, a distance of more than 600 miles from the mouth of the river. Although large tonnage is being carried on the Tennessee today, there is not a single ton carried in less than barge-load lots, which means that the small shipper or the shipper who has need of common-carrier service is receiving no benefit whatsoever from that improvement. For instance, a small lot of sugar destined from New Orleans to Knoxville cannot be shipped by water, since there is no common-carrier service beyond Cairo, Ill. As a consequence, the wholesale grocer in Knoxville is not receiving the benefits from the Tennessee River that otherwise should accrue to him.

Quite obviously the reason for this situation is that the operation of package freight service by barge lines is comparatively unprofitable. A bargeload of sugar, for instance, being hauled from New Orleans to St. Louis, can be hauled much cheaper than the hauling of odd lots to numerous points along the river between New Orleans and St. Louis, where stops must be made to unload and distribute. Despite this lack of profit in such form of transportation, the Federal Barge Lines, during most of its existence, has operated at a profit, and, in the 24 years since its formation, the Federal Government has put only $12,000,000 into the enterprise. This amount, I may say, was utilized to buy the equipment which is now being used in order to carry freight on the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

The Federal Barge Lines is now burdened with obsolete and dilapidated equipment, which has made its operation unprofitable in recent years. Until it is rehabilitated, its operation will, no doubt, continue to be at a loss. Under the very capable management of Capt. A. C. Ingersoll, the present president of the Corporation, the Lines is engaged in developing new equipment designed materially to decrease the line-haul cost. Within the last few weeks an integrated towboat has been launched, which is designed to reduce operating cost approximately 50 percent. For instance, using the new unit, a tow consisting of one boat and nine barges, hauling 12,000 tons, or, roughly, two and one-half trainloads, would be able to proceed upstream at a rate of 7 miles per hour, compared with the present speed of 3 to 3½ miles per hour. Captain Ingersoll is confident that outfitting the Lines with several of these units would wipe out present operating deficits, in addition to attracting more business because of the better service which could be offered because of the new equipment.

The Budget requested $3,000,000 in this appropriation for fiscal year 1949, which would be used to construct a second integrated towboat and 29,300 tons of integrated barge capacity and also allow for improving and increasing the capacity of the East St. Louis Terminal. The towboat would cost an estimated $600,000; the barge capacity, an estimated $2,197,500; and the terminal work, approximately $200,000.

If we are to obtain full dividends from the appropriations we have been making for river and harbor development, then we must see to it that the Federal Barge Lines not only continues in existence but is placed in a position of rendering service. Development of the Missouri River, the Arkansas River, the Red River, and numerous other streams, for transportation purposes, will not be fully effective if there is no agency existent to pioneer the transportation service on them. In the beginning of such service, operations are necessarily unprofitable. No private carrier is willing to lose the money over a period perhaps of several years which extension of common carrier service entails. On the other hand, an established line like the Federal Barge Lines, because it is able to balance the loss on shipments of less than bargeload lots against profits on bulk shipments in bargeload lots, is able, when properly equipped, to do this business at little or no loss.

I wish to point out to my colleagues throughout the Mississippi Valley that their entire freight rate structure, rail, barge, and truck, is based upon the rates offered by the Federal Barge Lines. Grain, regardless of its mode of transportation, is shipped cheaper from Omaha to New Orleans, because of the existence of the Federal Barge Lines. Industrial products from Pittsburgh and Chicago likewise carry a cheap rate because of the work which this Government corporation is doing. Minneapolis-St. Paul has developed into a principal river port largely because of the pioneering work of the Federal Barge Lines on the Mississippi River after its canalization. This is a service from which the small-business man and the farmer all reap a reward. It is a small amount which this amendment provides, but it is a vital amount to thousands of shippers throughout the great midcontinent area.

Let me repeat that the amount provided by my amendment is to be used solely to purchase new barges and a new towboat. As I indicated a moment ago, the entire amount which has been so far spent by the Federal Government for this service has been expended to purchase towboats and barges. Most of this equipment is more than 20 years old, and the money proposed to be added will be more or less an investment on the part of the Federal Government to continue this service for the people of the valley.

I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter under date of May 25, 1948, addressed to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], by Lewis I. Bourgeois be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE
PORT OF NEW ORLEANS,
New Orleans, La., May 25, 1948.

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am advised that on Thursday of this week, the Subcommittee on Government Corporations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will hold a hearing relative to the Federal Barge Lines, with particular reference to appropriating $3,000,000 to make up the deficiency in its original capital stock. These lines are operated by the Inland Waterways Corporation, which was incorporated at $15,000,000, but only received $12,000,000.

A house bill recently introduced sought to make up the deficiency of $3,000,000, but we learn this was cut to $2,000,000, which was most unfortunate.

We in New Orleans urge most earnestly your committee to authorize the full $3,000,000.

Just last week the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans, a civic organization of business and professional men, a membership of 3,500, took cognizance of various bills now before the Congress, some aimed to sell the Federal Barge Lines to private ownership, and one particularly, in the Senate, which aimed to continue the lines and rehabilitate them. I am now the chairman of this club's committee, and am authorized to submit to you our views.

We are all gravely apprehensive that, pending final decision on any legislation, the Federal Barge Lines will find themselves with insufficient funds to operate properly, to furnish regular service, to maintain its equipment, and at the same time do some urgent rehabilitating, with the final result that the lines will disintegrate for lack of funds. We are fearful that the lines will find their equipment in such shape that they may be forced to curtail acceptance of all kinds of freight from all types of shippers, small and large. If this takes place, business interests of the midcontinent and of this port will suffer, as many businesses and industries did locate in that area because of the

assured existence of the lines' services, schedules, rates, and rate territory.

It is well to point out that when the corporation was authorized by the Congress, there were guarantees written in the act. The people of the midcontinent area have every right to ask for their fulfillment. The act provides for certain plans for sale to private ownership, and they embody these guarantees. Therefore the people, when establishing or expanding industry in the midcontinent, could expect either continued Government or private ownership, since in either case the act, if followed, gives assurance of continuation of service.

The executive of the Federal Barge Lines, and his staff, have devised a new type of towboat which should revolutionize inland waterway barge operation. This towboat was demonstrated to the public at New Orleans this week, and its performance won public acclaim. The press carried most encouraging news stories of the demonstration. Its use will be attractive to the shipping public because it will cut down the long transit time now in effect by river barge lines, between river ports. It will enable the small shipper who, heretofore, could not afford to anticipate his needs for merchandise and thus was deprived of the opportunity to save money on transportation costs to use the lines. Faster deliveries will help him. But this one tow certainly will not be sufficient. The other equipment, almost worn out during the war, need a lot of repair. These lines therefore must have sufficient funds to carry on; and certainly to carry on until the Congress decides as to continuing Government operation, or sell to private interests. We fear it may take the Congress too long to decide.

We respectfully urge your committee, if it is to pass only upon the $3,000,000 appropriation to vote this total amount favorably. This is most important so that the lines can maintain proper service to the midcontinent area, and certainly this service should be continued without interruption.

It will be our committee's purpose to submit our views to every Member of the Senate and the House relative to the disposition of the Federal Barge Lines, but we will do this in separate communications.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS I. BOURGEOIS,
Chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, when this question came before the subcommittee and the committee the amount was placed at $2,000,000 instead of $3,000,000. The House allowed $2,000,000, and Mr. Ingersoll when he testified before the Senate committee, stated that he thought the House committee went on the assumption that their revenues would be as estimated in their budget. In other words, they came before the budget and stated that they were able to get a certain amount of revenues, and when they came before the committees they indicated that they could not obtain those revenues.

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would add $1,000,000 to the amount of the bill. The amendment would be used for the erection of a barge. They have already built a barge, and they want to build another just like it before they even experiment with the one they have. This is what the House says about the matter:

After a few months of experimental operation with this equipment to ascertain its practicability for river transportation, the management hopes to add additional barge equipment to its facilities and procure additional "integrated tow" boats. If such equipment proves successful, it is possible that the feasibility of providing common-carrier barge service on inland waterways can be demonstrated in such manner that private capital can be attracted to this operation, thus enabling the Government to get out of the barge business.

In other words, it is the intention of the Government to liquidate this business. They have built one barge. The Government corporation wants to build another barge for $1,000,000 before it has even experimented with the one which has been built.

I read further from the House report:

In view of the fact that legislation to authorize the sale of the barge line is pending, the committee is reluctant to recommend appropriation of the entire request in the budget of $3,000,000. The amount of $2,000,000 is recommended for 1949. This sum should enable the Corporation to obtain enough new capital equipment to demonstrate efficient operation and to attract private capital to this enterprise, and also to provide working capital adequate under careful management to maintain the Corporation as a going concern.

Mr. President, in a few words that is the substance of what the amendment would do. It would take another $1,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to build an experimental tug or towboat for the river; and they have not demonstrated that they have one now which will work. I hope the Senate will sustain the action of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think that concludes the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to strike out "to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury" and insert "the revolving fund authorized in title 12, United States Code, section 1311."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, first I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. In House bill 6481, on my desk, page 24, line 3, I find the figure "$60,000,000." Has the figure been reduced to $20,000,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been reduced from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President the pending measure provides in the section "Production credit corporations"—

That prior to June 30, 1949, the corporations—

Speaking of production credit corporations—

shall return Government capital aggregating not less than $20,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury, and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration is authorized and directed to cancel the capital stock of the corporations in par value amount equal thereto.

My amendment does not involve any increased appropriation of money. It simply provides that the $20,000,000 which is to be paid by the production credit corporation and credit associations shall go to the revolving fund which is their reservoir of capital for loans rather than back to the Treasury of the United States. I shall briefly state my reasons for offering the amendment.

As Senators know, there has been created in the past a revolving fund of approximately $120,000,000, from which funds could be made available to local production credit associations for loans to farmers for purposes for which loans were not usually available from banks at that time—for seed loans, machinery loans, fertilizer and similar loans. My amendment would keep intact the revolving fund of $120,000,000 so that if great need arises in the future, funds will be available for the purpose. The Production Credit Corporation has made a fine record in my State, Kentucky, and in the Nation. The need for its services is still present, and I do not see any reason for reducing the revolving fund, which makes this type of credit available. This may lead to the eventual destruction of the fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize that we have been a long time on this particular bill, but I urge the Senate not to adopt this amendment for this reason: This Corporation was financed by the Treasury, or the money of the taxpayers of the United States. It has now accumulated in the Corporation treasury a surplus of $60,000,000. The Government wants that money repaid to its Treasury through the cancellation of stock. The stockholders of the Corporation are the farmers. I agree that it has been a good thing for the farmers. But they have this fund accumulated. They are not paying 1 cent of interest to the United States Government. Now they do not want to return the $20,000,000. The House said $60,000,000, but the Senate committee said $20,000,000. They do not want to pay it back into the Treasury because they feel that if they keep it in the revolving fund, if they need it in the future they can go and get it. They have now a $60,000,000 surplus. There is no reason why the taxpayers should not have this money paid back into the Treasury, so that they will not have to pay interest on it. This Corporation is paying no interest at the present time.

I therefore hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand that no objection is made by the Production Credit Corporation, or by their local agencies, to paying this money into the revolving fund. The committee provision is that it shall be paid back into the Treasury, which could mean that the revolving fund, established for the benefit of the farmers and for this type of loan, would be eventually destroyed. My amendment will assure the maintenance of the revolving fund, and its continued availability for the use of farmers in the future.

I am not in any way in controversy with the Senator from Michigan upon the point that the money should be paid back. I am in controversy, however, upon the point that it should be paid back into the Treasury rather than to the

revolving fund. I believe that the farmers of the Nation desire that the revolving fund should be kept intact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Corporation now has a surplus of $60,000,000. According to the terms of the bill, we allow it to retain $40,000,000. All we are asking it to do is to pay back $20,000,000, so that the Federal Government will not be compelled to pay interest on it. This Corporation pays no interest; and if we adopt this amendment it means that nothing will come back to the United States Treasury or the United States Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. COOPER. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$19,000,000" and insert "$20,650,000."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the amount of money provided for the Federal Housing Administration for administrative expenses. When the $19,000,000 figure was fixed it was anticipated that the program would be only under title II. We know that title VI of the National Housing Act was scheduled to go out of effect on March 31 of this year. So when the budget was sent up, only $19,000,000 was asked for, in order to handle the title II loans.

But following that time, Congress extended the life of the operations under title VI, and authorized $750,000,000 of additional loans to be insured. Later, Congress extended it again, and authorized an additional $400,000,000. That makes a total of $1,150,000,000 which the Congress authorized the FHA to handle, without giving it any increase whatsoever in the funds available for paying the expenses of handling those loans.

This amendment would increase the amount by $1,650,000. As a matter of fact, it will not be money the Treasury will pay out, because every loan that is made pays a fee to pay the expenses of closing the loan. If we go along with the $19,000,000, that simply will mean one of two things: Either it will slow up the work of clearing the title VI loans, which we authorized, and for which commitments are already made, or we shall get shoddy inspections, and thereby will get loans that will be poor risks, and eventually a loss will fall upon the Treasury.

As I stated a moment ago, all the money is paid in by the borrowers, so in the long run this amendment will not cost the Government anything. By giving the agency this $1,650,000 additional, we can have efficient operation and can have reasonably prompt closure of loans and can have good inspections which will result in giving us better risks.

I think it will be a good investment, and I hope the Congress will authorize the use of the additional amount of money by the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, title VI has not been passed as yet. The reason for the difference between the $19,000,000 figure and the $20,650,000 figure is that the authorization for title VI of the housing bill had not been passed, and the Senate committee believed it should accept the judgment of the House, because the work has not been authorized.

As the House committee said in its report:

> The budget estimate of $19,000,000 relates primarily to work under title II. The amount has been approved, and the expenses relating to title VI of the program will be considered after enactment of a new title VI authorization.

So, Mr. President, when title VI is passed, it will carry an authorization, and then in the Appropriations Committee a deficiency appropriation can be handled.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, is it not a fact, and was it not brought out before the Senator's committee, that there are now outstanding commitments, under title VI, in the amount of approximately $1,000,000,000? I am sure the Senator remembers that back in December, we authorized $750,000,000 in loans, and that authority was to run until March 31. I am sure the Senator also remembers that in March we again extended title VI, and authorized $400,000,000 additional. The greater amount of those two authorizations is still outstanding. The commitments have been made, but those projects are simply held up, waiting until inspections can be made.

As the Senator has said, this $19,000,000 goes primarily to title II loans. The result is that there is nothing upon which to operate for title VI loans; and as a result we have $1,000,000,000 of outstanding commitments, but no opportunity to make the proper inspections.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, just one sentence before the vote on this amendment: The $400,000,000 which was provided for was on a 30-day extension of the title on April 30, under the appropriation for 1948; but the appropriation we are talking about now would be from June 30, so there is nothing really to provide for at the present time, until further legislation is enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, on page 17, in line 13.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, it is proposed to strike out all beginning with the word "That", in line 11, through the words *"Provided further"*, in line 6.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the language I am trying to strike out by this amendment is a limitation on the number of officers and employees in the classification grade 11 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, and of class 4 of the professional service, used in the Public Housing Administration. It provides that not more than 20 percent of the total number of that class of officers can be in those grades.

I shall take only a minute to explain this amendment. The Public Housing Administration, as it stands today, really is the custodian of a large number of various housing programs which were developed and put into effect during the war. They were developed by other agencies, but they have been turned over to the Public Housing Administration for it to administer. A great many of them are in process of liquidation and are being closed out.

Practically all the work of this particular division is of a supervisory nature. It is not a case in which the usual run-of-the-mine employees are used—employees such as stenographers, clerks, typists, and others who are in the lower grades; but the work is largely supervisory, and naturally it calls for a high percentage of supervisory personnel. So this limitation, as it is written into the bill, is an undue restriction upon that agency, if we are to have proper administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, just a few words on this amendment. Last year the Congress of the United States undertook to say that this agency had too many high-paid employees in its services; and therefore the Congress provided that not to exceed 20 percent of the total number of officers and employees of the agency of that class were to be in the higher-salaried group which have just been referred to, and whose salaries would be paid from such funds. The agency got along all right with that arrangement last year. There is no reason why Congress should not say at this time that the agency has had too many high-paid officers, and there is no reason why the Congress should not stipulate here that that agency cannot have as many high-paid employees as it desires. That is all there is to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama on page 19, in lines 1 to 6.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REED, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status; and

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6411. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in furtherance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6247. An act to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ACCEPTANCE OF CONSTITUTION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION INSTRUMENT OF AMENDMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution from the Senate (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, which was, on page 2, to strike out all after line 7, down to and including line 2 on page 4, and insert:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

(a) such sums, not to exceed $550,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, as apportioned by the International Labour Conference in accordance with article 13 (c) of the constitution of the Organization: *Provided, however,* That the annual United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the Organization shall not be greater in proportion than the United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the United Nations; and

(b) Such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

SEC. 3. No person shall serve as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and no citizen of or resident in the United States shall participate in any session, conference, or meeting, or other work of the International Labor Organization or of any subordinate committee or organization thereof without the consent of the Secretary of State.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. CONNALLY conferees on the part of the Senate.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF OCEAN STATIONS BY COAST GUARD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2122, to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Coast Guard is authorized to operate and maintain floating ocean stations for the purpose of providing search and rescue, communication, and air-navigation facilities, and meteorological services in such ocean areas as are regularly traversed by aircraft of the United States.

"SEC. 2. The Coast Guard is authorized, subject to approval by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to operate, on floating ocean stations authorized by section 1 hereof, such air navigation facilities as the Administrator may find necessary or desirable for the safe and efficient protection and control of air traffic. The Coast Guard, in establishing, maintaining, or operating any air navigation facilities herein provided, shall request the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage."

And the House agree to the same.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION BY COAST GUARD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 1853, to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That in order to aid navigation

and to prevent disasters, collisions, and wrecks of vessels and aircraft, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate—

"(a) aids to maritime navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States;

"(b) aids to air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States as requested by the Secretary of the appropriate Department within the National Military Establishment; and

"(c) Loran stations (1) required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States; or (2) required to serve the needs of the maritime commerce of the United States; or (3) required to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States as determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

"SEC. 2. The Coast Guard in establishing, maintaining, or operating any aids to air navigation herein provided shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage. Before locating and operating any such aid on military or naval bases or regions, the consent of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, shall first be obtained. No such aid shall be located within the territorial jurisdiction of any foreign country without the consent of the government thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to limit the authority granted by the provisions of section 77 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 621), or by section 5 (f) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (49 U. S. C. 175), or by title III of Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451 and the following).

"SEC. 3. Such aids to navigation other than Loran stations shall be established and operated only within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established on the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agree to.

PROGRAM IN FIELD OF LIGHTER-THAN-AIR AERONAUTICS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6628, to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized and directed to study, and plan for, experimental lighter-than-air rigid airship construction and operation. The Commission shall report to the Congress as soon as practicable in the first regular session of the Eighty-first Congress the results of its study with such recommendations for further legislation as it may consider desirable and feasible for the development and operation of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The United States Maritime Commission shall receive the assistance and cooperation of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, and may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in conducting the study provided for in this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 5416, to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That those provisions of the order of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 6, 1948, which are based on certain recommendations contained in the Report on Conditions Found to Exist on the Fort Hall Irrigation Project and the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, dated February 26, 1941, and which are described in the said order as made pursuant to the authority contained in the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), are hereby approved pursuant to the provisions of such Act.

"SEC. 2. During such periods as water for the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project may be available in excess of the present duty of three acre-feet per acre per annum, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the delivery of such excess water equally to the project lands in an amount not to exceed five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum, in addition to the present duty of three acre-feet per acre per annum: *Provided, however,* That any surplus water temporarily available in addition to the three and five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum may be furnished for use on project lands on terms, conditions, and rates to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. The Little Indian Unit containing one thousand one hundred eighty-six and thirty-three one-hundredths acres of irrigable land in townships 2 and 3 south, ranges 36 and 37 east, Boise meridian, within the boundaries of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, is hereby made a part of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and the lands therein shall have the benefit of, and be subject to, all existing legislation applicable to said project to the same extent as other lands of like ownership and character within the project. The Indian-owned irrigable land in the unit shall be charged with its proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act. The non-Indian-owned irrigable land of the unit shall be entitled to receive only natural-flow water until a full project water right is acquired for said land through the execution by the owner of a contract, or contracts, providing for the repayment to the United States of like per-acre costs as are charged against the Indian-owned land in the unit. Said charges, as to Indian and non-Indian lands, shall be a first lien against the lands, under the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210).

"SEC. 4. The net irrigable area of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is hereby established as forty-seven thousand and forty-four and sixty-three one-hundredths acres of land, more or less. This area includes the forty-six thousand eight hundred and three and seventy-two one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, shown as the irrigable area of the project by the maps and plats in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, and the two hundred and forty and ninety-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, included in eight additional tracts of land described as follows: (a) An irregular shaped area in the northeast corner of the east half southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 36, township 5 south, range 33 east, Boise meridian, containing one and seventy one-hundredths acres; (b) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the west half of section 35, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty-eight and seventeen one-hundredths acres; (c) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the south half of section 14, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing forty acres; (d) a portion of the northwest

quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing thirty-three and forty-two one-hundredths acres; (e) Fairview Park in the east half southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter and west half southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres; (f) the east half northeast quarter northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian containing twenty acres; (g) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Pocatello lateral in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ninety-seven sixty-two one-hundredths acres; and (h) the southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres. The above-described tracts of land, together with such lands in the portion of the village of Alameda lying between the Pocatello lateral and the Oregon Short Line Railroad right-of-way in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, as (notwithstanding their inclusion in the irrigable acreage shown by the maps and plats hereinabove mentioned) have no water right at present, shall be entitled to receive, or to continue to receive, water through pumping operations or by gravity flow, provided the respective owners thereof, within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, enter into contracts whereby they agree (1) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project construction costs of $18.12 per acre, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, for such of their lands as do not now have a project water right, (2) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, for such of their lands as are not now covered by contracts for the repayment of such costs, and (3) to install, maintain, and operate, at their own expense, pumping machinery to lift the water from the project canals or laterals for the irrigation of such of their lands as cannot be supplied by gravity flow. The noninclusion of the Fort Hall town site within the net irrigable area of the project as hereby established shall not prevent the obtaining of water rights therefor in accordance with the Act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1025).

"SEC. 5. There is excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by the designation of the project area in section 4 of this Act the nine thousand six hundred and seventy acres of tribal, allotted, and non-Indian-owned lands located between Fort Hall and Gibson, Idaho, heretofore authorized to be included in the project by the Act of March 3, 1927 (Ch. 371, 44 Stat. 1398). The construction costs apportioned to the tribal lands so excluded are hereby canceled and the water rights are made available for project use. The water rights for the lands of the several allottees and non-Indian owners within the area so excluded shall not be impaired or affected by reason of such exclusion, but water shall be delivered only at the head of the laterals serving these lands. The respective owners of such lands may make their water rights available for project use, whereupon the construction costs assessed or assessable against their lands with respect to the water rights thus made available shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior. Allottees of lands within the excluded area, or their heirs or devisees, may donate or sell their lands to the tribe or may exchange their lands for assignments of tribal lands within the project area. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, $8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior, in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, of one hundred and eighty acres of non-Indian-owned land, with water rights and improvements appurtenant thereto, described as the north half southeast quarter southwest quarter section 13, township 4 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, and south half northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter section 7, township 4 south, range 35 east, Boise meridian, located within the area excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by section 4 of this Act.

"SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,995 to compensate the following-named landowners, or their heirs, for work accomplished or for future work necessary in filling, leveling, and otherwise preparing for irrigation the abandoned portion of the old Fort Hall Main Canal within their holdings, in not to exceed the following amounts: Frank E. DeKay, $401; Henry Jensen, $633; Theodore H. Gathe, $654; A. E. Albert, $106; Ezra D. Wilson, $127; J. M. Bistline, $378 Ambrose H. McGuire, $424; Ellen Griffith, $412; C. M. Allen, $116; Olive A. Granden, $184; William Webster, $28; Hiram Faulkner, $114; Williamette Blakeslee, $298; Frank Parker, $99; and Henrietta C. Blakeslee, $21.

"SEC. 7. Pending the construction of a siphon to provide gravity flow water to ninety-six and six-tenths acres of irrigable lands in the southwest quarter section 27, and east half section 28, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, which lands have been irrigated by pumping operations over a period of years, the Secretary of the Interior may accept the conveyance by the landowners of the pumping equipment for use of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and may operate such equipment as a part of said project in order to provide water for the irrigation of such lands; the acceptance of such conveyance being subject to the owners of the lands executing releases to the United States of any and all claims whatsoever due to the pumping operations carried on by such landowners.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to revise and reform, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in all the circumstances affecting the interests of the United States and the contractors, existing contracts between the United States and the Idaho Irrigation District, the Progressive Irrigation District, and the Snake River Valley Irrigation District in Idaho, which contracts provide for certain payments by the districts to the United States for the benefit of works of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project.

"SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for refunds to Indians, or their heirs, the sum of $1,419.55, representing irrigation assessments of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project erroneously made and collected, as follows: Andrew F. Cutler, $153.80; Alice Sorrell Johns, $168.95; Nettie Stinson LaVatta, $146.62; Earl Edmund Cutler, $159.20; Charles Faulkner, $145.25; Josephine LaVatta Rumas, $155.20; May Phyllis LaVatta Brower, $29.90; Leonard I. Cutler, $135.85; Effie Diggie Houtz, $122.75; Lucy Yandell Spencer, $25; Charles Gerard Cutler, $121.53; and Hattie Sorrell Siler Tillotson, $55.50.

"SEC. 10. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the relocating, rehabilitating, cleaning, and extending of irrigation systems serving the lands irrigated from Ross Fork, Bannock, and Lincoln Creeks, which lands are outside of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, including the construction of a storage reservoir on Bannock Creek. The costs of any work benefiting Indian lands performed pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned on a per acre basis and collected under laws applicable to Indian irrigable lands on the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project. Operation and maintenance charges against such lands shall likewise be subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations as apply to Indian lands on the Fort Hall project. Any unpaid charges against such lands shall be subject to a first lien as provided in the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210). No expenditure shall be made under this authorization which will benefit lands in non-Indian ownership unless the owners thereof execute contracts providing for the repayment of their proportionate per acre share of the costs of the work assessable against their lands.

"SEC. 11. In order to prevent the accumulation of delinquent project assessments or other charges against the non-Indian-owned lands of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause liquidation of all delinquent assessments or charges by taking such action as may be necessary, including the foreclosure of the Government's lien covering any such delinquent charges or by initiating such other procedure as may be legally available, which action may be taken by him at any time when in his judgment the best interests of the project would be served thereby.

"SEC. 12. All Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN SANBORN,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

WATER-POLLUTION-CONTROL ACTIVITIES IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the abatement of stream pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research to devise and perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes which are not susceptible to known effective methods of treatment, and to provide Federal technical services to State and interstate agencies and to industries, and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities, in the formulation and execution of their stream-pollution-abatement programs. To this end, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator) and the Federal Works Administrator shall have the

responsibilities and authority relating to water-pollution control vested in them respectively by this act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water-pollution agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or adopt comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance and improving the sanitary condition of such interstate waters and tributaries thereof. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. For the purpose of this subsection the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may deleteriously affect such waters.

(b) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and abatement of water pollution; encourage the enactment of uniform State laws relating to water pollution; encourage compacts between States for the prevention and abatement of water pollusion; collect and disseminate information relating to water pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof; support and aid technical research to devise and perfect methods of treatment of industrial wastes which are not susceptible to known effective methods of treatment; make available to State and interstate agencies, municipalities, industries, and individuals the results of surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments relating to water pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof conducted by the Surgeon General and by authorized cooperating agencies; and furnish such assistance to State agencies as may be authorized by law.

(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and abatement of water pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by the Congress.

(d) (1) The pollution of interstate waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, is hereby declared to be a public nuisance and subject to abatement as herein provided.

(2) Whenever the Surgeon General, on the basis of reports, surveys, and studies, finds that any pollution declared to be a public nuisance by paragraph (1) of this subsection is occurring, he shall give formal notification thereof to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution and shall advise the water-pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate of such notification. This notification may outline recommended remedial measures which are reasonable and equitable in that case and shall specify a reasonable time to secure abatement of the pollution. If action calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified is not commenced, this failure shall again be brought to the attention of the person or persons discharging the matter and of the water-pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate. The notification to such agency may be accompanied by a recommendation that it initiate a suit to abate the pollution in a court of proper jurisdiction.

(3) If, within a reasonable time after the second notification by the Surgeon General, the person or persons discharging the matter fail to initiate action to abate the pollution or the State water pollution agency or interstate agency fails to initiate a suit to secure abatement, the Federal Security Administrator is authorized to call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate, before a board of five or more persons appointed by the Administrator, who may be officers or employees of the Federal Security Agency or of the water pollution agency or interstate agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate (except that at least one of the members of the board shall be a representative of the water pollution agency of the State or States where such discharge or discharges originate and at least one shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Federal Security Agency). On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing the board shall make its recommendations to the Federal Security Administrator concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

(4) After affording the person or persons discharging the matter causing or contributing to the pollution reasonable opportunity to comply with the recommendations of the board, the Federal Security Administrator may, with the consent of the water pollution agency (or of any officer or agency authorized to give such consent) of the State or States in which the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged, request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

(5) Before or after any suit authorized by paragraph (4) is commenced, any person who is alleged to be discharging matter contributing to the pollution, abatement of which is sought, may, with the consent of the water pollution agency (or of any officer or agency authorized to give such consent) of the State in which such matter is discharged, be joined as a defendant. The court shall have power to enforce its judgment against any such defendant.

(6) In any suit brought pursuant to paragraph (4) in which two or more persons in different judicial districts are originally joined as defendants, the suit may be commenced in the judicial district in which any discharge caused by any of the defendants occurs.

(7) The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the board and a copy of the board's recommendation; and may receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require. The jurisdiction of the Surgeon General, or any other agency which has jurisdiction pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall not extend to any region or areas nor shall it affect the rights or jurisdiction of any public body where there are in effect provisions for sewage disposal pursuant to agreement between the United States of America and any such public body by stipulation entered in the Supreme Court of the United States. While any such stipulation or modification thereof is in force and effect, no proceedings of any kind may be maintained by virtue of this act against such public body or any public agency, corporation, or individual within its jurisdiction. Neither this provision nor any provision of this act shall be construed to give to the Surgeon General or any other person or agency the right to intervene in the said proceedings wherein such stipulation was entered.

(8) As used in this subsection the term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, a State, municipality, and a political subdivision of a State.

SEC. 3. The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State water-pollution agency or interstate agency, conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of water pollution confronting any State, interstate agency, community, municipality, or industrial plant, with a view to recommending a solution of such problem.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General shall prepare and publish, from time to time, reports of such surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments made under the authority of this act as he may consider desirable, together with appropriate recommendations with regard to the control of water pollution.

SEC. 5. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized, subject to the provisions of section 9 (c), to make loans to any State, municipality, or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into interstate waters or into a tributary of such waters, and for the preparation (either by its engineering staff or by practicing engineers employed for that purpose) of engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. Such loans shall be subject, however, to the following limitations: (a) No loan shall be made for any project unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General, and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this act; (b) no loan shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator, or in an amount exceeding $200,000, whichever amount is the smaller; (c) every such loan shall bear interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum, payable semiannually; and (d) the bonds or other obligations evidencing any such loan (1) must be duly authorized and issued pursuant to State and local law, and (2) may, as to the security thereof and the payment of principal thereof and interest thereon, be subordinated (to the extent deemed feasible and desirable by the Federal Works Administrator for facilitating the financing of such projects) to other bonds or obligations of the obligor issued to finance such project or that may then be outstanding.

SEC. 6. (a) The Surgeon General and the Federal Works Administrator, in carrying out their respective functions under this act, shall provide for the review of all reports of examinations, research, investigations, plans, studies, and surveys, made pursuant

to the provisions of this act and all applications for loans under section 5. In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving loans in connection therewith, consideration shall be given to the public benefits to be derived by the construction thereof, the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for the loan for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the works after completion of the construction thereof.

(b) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board to be composed as follows: The Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be Chairman of the Board, a representative of the Department of the Army, a representative of the Department of the Interior, a representative of the Federal Works Agency, and a representative of the Department of Agriculture, designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Federal Works Administrator, and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively; and six persons (not officers or employees of the Federal Government) to be appointed annually by the President. One of the persons appointed by the President shall be an engineer who is expert in sewage and industrial-waste disposal, one shall be a person who shall have shown an active interest in the field of wildlife conservation, and, except as the President may determine that the purposes of this act will be better furthered by different representation, one shall be a person representative of municipal government, one shall be a person representative of State government, and one shall be a person representative of affected industry. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States shall be entitled to receive compensation at a per diem rate to be fixed by the Federal Security Administrator, together with an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while engaged on the business of the Board. It shall be the duty of the Board to review the policies and program of the Public Health Service as undertaken under authority of this act and to make recommendations thereon in reports to the Surgeon General. Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed the sum of $20,000,000 for the purpose of making loans under section 5 of this act. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, the sum of $1,000,000, to be allotted equitably and paid to the States for expenditure by or under the direction of their respective State water pollution agencies, and to interstate agencies for expenditure by them, for the conduct of investigations, research, surveys, and studies related to the prevention and control of water pollution caused by industrial wastes. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended, shall be allotted by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Federal Security Administrator, and shall be paid prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed $800,000 to enable the Federal Works Administrator to erect facilities at Cincinnati, Ohio, as may be necessary for the use of the Public Health Service in connection with the research and study of pollution of interstate waters and the training of personnel in work related to the control of pollution of interstate waters. The amount authorized for this purpose shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, supervision of construction and other administrative expenses incident to the work: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Agency shall prepare the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts and supervise construction. Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, a sum not to exceed the sum of $1,000,000 to enable the Federal Works Administrator to make grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of engineering, architectural, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of projects approved by the appropriate State water pollution agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General. Grants made under this subsection with respect to any project shall not exceed whichever of the following amounts is the smaller: (1) $20,000, or (2) 33⅓ percent of the estimated reasonable cost (as determined by the Federal Works Administrator) of the action preliminary to the construction of such project. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, such sum (not to exceed the sum of $2,000,000) as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, such sum (not to exceed the sum of $500,000) as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this act.

SEC. 9. (a) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, the appointment of engineer and scientist officers may be made under the provisions of section 208 (b) (1) of the Public Health Service Act, in addition to the appointments authorized by such section 208 (b) (1); but not more than five such additional officers shall hold office at the same time.

(b) The Federal Security Administrator, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the Federal Government, may utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(c) (1) Upon written request of the Federal Works Administrator, from time to time submitted to the Federal Security Administrator, specifying (a) particular projects approved by the Surgeon General, (b) the total estimated costs of such projects, and (c) the total sum requested for loan which the Federal Works Administrator proposes to make for such projects, the Federal Security Administrator shall transfer such total sum (within the amount appropriated therefor) to the Federal Works Administrator for the making of loans for such projects pursuant to section 5 hereof. In making such loans, the Federal Works Administrator shall adhere to the order or sequence of priority for projects established by the Surgeon General and shall take such measures as, in his judgment, will assure that the engineering plans and specifications, the details of construction, and the completed treatment works conform to the project as approved by the Surgeon General; and the Federal Works Administrator shall furnish written reports to the Federal Security Administrator on the progress of the work.

(2) The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized (a) to hold, administer, exchange, refund, or sell at public or private sale any bonds or other obligations evidencing loans made under this act; and (b) to collect, or provide for the collection of, interest on and principal of such bonds or other obligations. All moneys received as proceeds from such sales, and all moneys so collected, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) The Surgeon General and the Federal Works Administrator are each authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out their respective functions under this act.

SEC. 10. When used in this act—

(a) The term "State water pollution agency" means the State health authority, except that, in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency, other than the State health authority, charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of water pollution, it means such other State agency;

(b) The term "interstate agency" means an agency of two or more States having powers or duties pertaining to the abatement of pollution of waters;

(c) The term "treatment works" means the various devices used in the treatment of sewage or industrial waste of a liquid nature, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances, and includes any extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions, and alternations thereof;

(d) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands;

(e) The term "interstate waters" means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, State boundaries; and

(f) The term "municipality" means a city, town, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage, industrial wastes, or other wastes.

SEC. 11. This act shall not be construed as (1) superseding or limiting the functions, under any other law, of the Surgeon General or of the Public Health Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to water pollution, or (2) affecting or impairing the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, or sections 13 through 17 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899, as amended, or (3) affecting or impairing the provisions of any treaty of the United States.

SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Water Pollution Control Act."

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the

two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 2691. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; without amendment (Rept. No. 1684).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2740. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1685);

H. R. 6293. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1687); and

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1686).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Richart T. Charett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1688);

S. 2049. A bill for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1689);

H. R. 851. A bill for the relief of Adney W. Gray; without amendment (Rept. No. 1690);

H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III; without amendment (Rept. No. 1691);

H. R. 1779. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1692);

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1693);

H. R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Constable; without amendment (Rept. No. 1694);

H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1695);

H. R. 2552. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1696);

H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1697);

H. R. 3427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1698);

H. R. 4644. A bill for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1699); and

S. Res. 256. Resolution to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2834) for the relief of Elizabeth R. Pendleton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1700).

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1701);

S. 2795. A bill to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments; with amendments (Rept. No. 1702);

S. 2861. A bill to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1703); and

H. R. 4816. A bill to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals; with amendments (Rept. No. 1704).

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original bill, continuing the authority for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State for 1 year, and I submit a report (No. 1683) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and printed, and the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

The bill (S. 2869) continuing the authority for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State for 1 year, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 2867. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2868. A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to Trenton Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original bill (S. 2869) continuing the authority for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State for 1 year, which was ordered to be placed on the Calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2870. A bill for the relief of Roman Szymanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MAGNUSON) introduced Senate bill 2871, to aid in the production of permanent housing in the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

AID IN PRODUCTION OF PERMANENT HOUSING IN PORTLAND-VANPORT AREA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill dealing with aid in the production of permanent housing in the Portland-Vanport area. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that a one-page brief statement in explanation of the bill may also be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2871) to aid in the production of permanent housing in the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. MAGNUSON), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to assist in providing housing accommodations for families in the Portland-Vancouver area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster, the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is hereby authorized to purchase at a price equal to the unpaid balance plus accrued interest, any first mortgage made after the effective date of this act, and within 2 years of the date of the purchase, for the purpose of financing the building of a new residential structure or structures located in the metropolitan area of Portland, Oreg., or Vancouver, Wash., with respect to which the financial institution from which such mortgage is purchased has insurance under section 2 of the National Housing Act, as amended: *Provided*, That not more than $10,000,000 of the funds available to the Federal National Mortgage Association shall, in the aggregate, be used for the purchase of such mortgages.

SEC. 2. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act is amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,510,000,000."

The statement presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT ON BILL TO AID PRODUCTION OF PERMANENT HOUSING IN THE PORTLAND, OREG.-VANCOUVER, WASH., AREA

This bill would encourage the extension of necessary credit to assist in providing low cost housing urgently needed in the Portland-Vancouver area as a result of recent floods. The bill would authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association (a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) to purchase first mortgages made, after the enactment of this bill, for the purpose of financing the construction of new residential structures in that area, if the financial institutions from which the mortgages are purchased have insurance under section 2 of the National Housing Act with respect to such mortgages. Any such purchase would have to be made within 2 years from the date of the mortgage at a price equal to the unpaid balance plus accrued interest.

Under this section 2 of the National Housing Act, financial institutions may be insured against losses, up to 10 percent, on the total amount of their loans made for the purpose of financing alterations, repairs, and improvements of existing structures or financing the building of new structures. Any such loan for building a new structure (referred to as title I, class 3 loans) may not presently exceed $3,000. Legislation (S. 866) is pending which would increase this amount to $4,500.

The total amount of funds the bill would make available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for this purpose would be

$10,000,000, which would be provided by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The total amount of authorized investments, loans, purchases, and commitments of the Corporation would be increased accordingly. The bill would not require any appropriation of funds by the Congress.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted three amendments, Mr. RUSSELL submitted several amendments, and Mr. AIKEN submitted several amendments, intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2318, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on June 12 I entered a motion to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Codes, which had passed both Houses. I desire to withdraw the motion at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion referred to by the Senator from Colorado is withdrawn.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business, Calendar No. 1346, Senate bill 2318 to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6772, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes. The original and supplemental estimates amounted to $3,927,738,700. The House reduced that in the amount of $241,005,450. Of these amounts, the Senate restored $116,437,000.

In addition to that, Mr. President, and following the submission of the original bill, the President requested $9,000,000 for exploration in the Elk Hills oil reservation in California. This came in after the House had considered the bill. Both the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services approved the request. We therefore inserted it in the bill. With that insertion, the total restoration by the Senate amounts to $125,437,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point my remarks the first 7½ pages of the report on the bill.

There being no objection, the portion of the report (No. 1621) specified was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate, with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

SENATE ACTION

General information

[In millions of dollars]

	Appropriation	Senate action (+ or −)
Budget request	[1] 3,937	−125
House action	3,687	+125
Restoration request	[1] 3,878	−66
Senate action	[1] 3,812	

[1] Includes $9,000,000 submitted as supplemental in S. Doc. No. 164.

SCOPE OF THE BILL

The bill calling for a total appropriation of $3,812,170,250 embraces all regular naval appropriations for the Department of the Navy; the headquarters, United States Marine Corps; the entire operating forces of the United States Navy, including naval aviation, and of the United States Marine Corps, including the Reserve components of such forces; all field activities, headquarters, forces, bases, installations, activities, and functions under the control or supervision of the Department of the Navy. Attention should be called to the fact that in the Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948, $315,000,000 in appropriations was provided for aircraft procurement of which $150,000,000 is earmarked to liquidate previous contract authority. In addition, $588,000,000 in new contract authority was included. These amounts normally would have been carried in this bill but were approved and passed by the Congress as a 1948 measure in order to accelerate procurement of needed aircraft for adequate national defense.

On June 3 the President submitted a request for an appropriation of $50,000,000 and contract authorization of $66,500,000 for public works for the National Military Establishment, Department of the Navy. These amounts are not included in this bill since they will be reviewed as a part of the requests submitted in the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1948.

COST OF THE NAVY

The committee last year pointed out that actual cash expenditures for the Department of the Navy were running about $525,000,000 ahead of actual cash appropriations. During the fiscal year 1949, cash expenditures will exceed appropriations by approximately $700,000,000. The committee wishes to point out that in addition to this outlay of cash a very sizable amount of wartime inventory is being consumed. In the fiscal year 1949, inventory to be consumed is estimated at $1,028,000,000. This figure represents original cost to the Navy. Its replacement with modern equipment at current prices is estimated at $1,750,000,000 by the Department of the Navy.

In addition, as will be shown in more detail under "Aviation and construction of ships," various sizable additional sums besides those now being spent will be required in the immediate years to come. The following table shows budget comparisons including consumption of inventory.

Comparison, Department of Navy budget by appropriations, expenditures, and actual costs, fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949

[In millions of dollars]

	1947	1948	Estimate, 1949
Budget:			
Cash appropriations	4,663	3,757	3,812
Less cash to liquidate prior contract authority	250	150	56
Net appropriation	4,413	3,607	3,756
New contract authority	----------	[1] 1,101	[2] 280
Total new program	4,413	[1] 4,708	[2] 4,036
Actual costs:			
Expenditures	5,159	4,134	4,505
Inventory consumed	1,055	680	1,028
Cash collections	375	125	25
Total actual costs	6,589	4,939	5,558

[1] Includes 1949 aircraft procurement program.
[2] Shipbuilding only. Does not include 1949 aircraft procurement program, included in Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948.

This tabulation reveals several important facts:

1. The actual cost of the Navy (nearly $5,000,000,000 in the 1948 fiscal year; $5,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1949) is substantially more than the $3,800,000,000 being appropriated. This is due primarily to two factors—(a) the carry-over of money from prior years' appropriations to be expended as equipment and materials are completed and delivered, and (b) the use of surplus inventory.

2. A substantial part (probably as much as 1¾ billion dollars) of the Navy's current program is being met by utilization of inventory—war reserves and current working-stock items such as aircraft from storage and material from the appropriation-purchase account, ship-material account, medical-stores account, and marine stores—in excess of purchases. This use of inventory is important because if the Navy is thus meeting current needs for war reserves and normal working stocks that is reaching the point of exhaustion, the inevitable result (all other factors being equal) will be a forcing of substantially increased appropriations in the future to support the present size and scope of naval operations.

Obviously it is difficult at this time to forecast future needs. However, in their testimony before the Senate subcommittee, Navy representatives did indicate that a future level of appropriation requirements during the 1950 and 1951 fiscal years might reach $6,500,000,000. This estimate was predicated upon assumptions that we maintain in those years the same naval strength as now planned, plus appropriations to continue the shipbuilding and conversion program at approximately a $300,000,000 annual rate; the public works program on an annual basis of about $200,000,000 and full implementation of the aircraft procurement program in accordance with recommendations of the Congressional Air Policy Committee.

The committee concurs with the report of the House of Representatives which stated:

"This is a matter of grave concern which the Congress should be prepared to consider in the near future. We must have in mind the question of whether we are going to continue even larger appropriations to maintain the same size Navy, or whether we can safely maintain our place in the world with a smaller one. It is to be hoped that the world situation will soon stabilize so that we will have a better idea as to the exact future requirements."

FLEET

This bill will permit the Department of the Navy to allocate to the active fleet: 277 naval combatant ships, 486 auxiliary combatant ships, 763 total active. To the reserve fleet: 664 major combatant ships, 1,215 other vessels, 1,879 total reserve.

This calls for the maintenance and preservation in a state of readiness of virtually the same size fleet as provided by the 1948 fiscal year appropriations. Representing, as it does, the world's most formidable Navy, it is a real national asset and merits the continued confidence and support of this Congress and the Nation.

NAVAL RESERVE

While the committee continues its active and sympathetic interest in the Reserve components, it believes the exact sums necessary for their support can be better determined when the effects of a selective service law are better known.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

While the committee expects the Navy to restrict its civilian personnel to minimum requirements, it desires to point out that wise administration of the huge amounts appropriated require adequate and properly trained personnel. In restoring amounts for salaries for this purpose, it believes that $1 added may well save five or more.

INCREASED COSTS

In considering its recommendations, the committee has been mindful of the unanimous testimony of the material bureau heads that costs are up about 18 percent over 1 year ago.

PROJECT ORDERS

The committee last year in its report stated:

"The committee as a result of its detailed study of appropriations obligated by the Navy Department noted the extensive use of project orders. While the committee recognizes the necessity of their use under many circumstances, yet it strongly recommends the prompt formulation of a basic policy designed to control, within limits, the employment of this method of obligating funds."

As a result of the committee's recommendation, the Department of the Navy has made commendable progress in tightening up the controls relating to project orders more nearly to conform with the basic law and the original concept of their use. However, the committee feels that additional progress can and should be made in view of the unusual condition found surrounding the use of project orders in 1947. For example, in a study of the 1947 project orders, it was found that an unduly high percentage was placed in the last 60 days of the fiscal year, in many cases in the last 30 days. In one bureau 93 percent of the total project orders was placed in the last 60 days and 84 percent in the last 30 days. In another, 71 percent and 42 percent were placed in similar fashion. While these are the extreme examples, a detailed study carefully shows that this practice is more common than uncommon. It further appears that in some instances an apparent effort is made at the last moment to obligate funds rather than permit money to revert to the Treasury. Other investigations reveal that some bureaus of the Department of the Navy have obligated funds by the project order device for work of a recurring and general operating nature, which by no means could be construed to be either permanent or unusual in accordance with the original concept of the project order device.

The Department of the Navy is able to support its contention that more judicious use of project orders has been made during 1948. However, the committee recommends that the Department of the Navy continue to study this question to the end that it consistently improved its fiscal control at all levels so that project orders will be used only as originally intended by law and subsequent regulations. It also recommends that the staff of the Appropriations Committee continue to study this question in cooperation with the Department of the Navy.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

Since this bill appropriates funds for ship construction and conversions begun before the fiscal year 1949, but does not specify the amount of contract authorization for additional conversions or shipbuilding and ordnance, the committee invites attention to the legal authority which permits the Department of the Navy to start construction of ships. This procedure works as follows:

There is presently available to the Navy as a composite result of the following laws, 1,161,718 tons of combatant vessels. The authorization laws are:

Act of March 27, 1934, Public Law 135 of Seventy-third Congress.

Act of May 17, 1938, Public Law 528 of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Act of June 14, 1940, Public Law 629 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Act of July 19, 1940, Public Law 757 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Act of December 23, 1941, Public Law 369 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Act of July 9, 1942, Public Law 666 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

The total standard displacement of six new ships contemplated in the 1949 program is estimated at about 75,000 tons. The balance of tons is available to the Navy until used. Furthermore, certain parts of existing tonnage authorizations are self-perpetuating since new tonnage authorization becomes available as existing ships are lost or otherwise disposed of or become over-age.

Seventeen conversions in the present program are authorized by Public Law 319 of the Eightieth Congress. There is no limitation as to the number of ships which can be converted under this authority.

In the case of either new construction or conversion, the appropriation which is made has two features.

1. By the wording of the act it authorizes the Navy to proceed with whatever program the President has approved within existing authorizations. This program is not set forth in the law but is presented to the Appropriations Committee at the time of the hearings. This language, in effect, constitutes contract authority during the fiscal year of the appropriation for the entire cost of the approved program, in the 1949 case, $280,000,000.

2. An appropriation of cash is made annually equivalent to the estimated expenditures for all construction under way.

During the 1949 fiscal year, conversions of existing ships, new construction, including armament, and payment of previous obligations incurred for shipbuilding, will call for a total expenditure of $312,080,000. This amount is provided by funds in two appropriation titles, namely,

(a) The "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" (IRNV) program, under which no new construction has been authorized since 1948 but which provides current funds for the liquidation of the vast war-construction program, and

(b) A new appropriation program, begun in 1948, called "Construction of Ships, Navy," and "Ordnance for new construction, Navy," which finances the construction costs of new vessels, largely prototypes in the 1948 and 1949 budgets.

1. Increase and replacement of naval vessels: The IRNV program, including armament costs, calls for expenditures of $224,000,000 during 1949. Funds appropriated during the war period remain available in sufficient amounts to cover these estimated 1949 expenditures so that no "new" money is requested of Congress for this fund in this bill.

2. "Construction of ships, Navy," and "Ordnance for new construction, Navy": The total amount expected to be spent during 1949 in this fund to meet obligations incurred for new ship construction and conversions previously authorized, as indicated above, will amount to $88,080,000, of which $82,270,000 is appropriated in this bill.

The above details only the costs of these programs in the form of cash outlay during the fiscal year 1949. The actual total cost of these programs initialed in 1948 and 1949 is substantially more; and, while the committee believes it entirely proper and necessary for the national defense to construct prototype ships in order to incorporate and test out the more modern devices and also to modernize present ships, it believes the Congress and the Nation should know the future cost. Latest estimates indicate that to complete the old program (IRNV) expenditures after 1949 will total approximately $442,000,000. The same future cost to complete the new program will amount to about $463,000,000, or a total of $905,000,000 for both. This will be spread over a period of approximately 4 years.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT

Although the naval aircraft procurement programs submitted at this session has already been approved, the committee desires to make a few observations. In order to maintain the authorized level of 14,500 available aircraft, it will be necessary to procure approximately 3,300 each fiscal year. At present costs it is estimated that expenditures for the purpose will reach a peak in 1952 of approximately $1,800,000,000 annually as contrasted with an estimated expenditure of $430,000,000 during 1949. Obviously, expenditures during the next fiscal year represent only the beginning increments of a much heavier level of expenditure needs to maintain our established goal of adequate naval aircraft.

RATION ALLOWANCES

The committee is in accord with a proposal from the Secretary of the Navy to increase the commuted ration allowances for enlisted naval personnel from the present standards of approximately 90 cents per diem to $1.05 per diem effective July 1, 1948, particularly since it understands that this would bring Navy practices in line with similar commuted leave rations as established by the Army earlier this calendar year.

REVISION OF THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION ACT

In 1947 the naval appropriations were submitted in alternate form—the one form as used in this bill, with minor modifications, and the other a so-called functional budget which would organize appropriations in terms of primary Navy functions. The alternate proposal would appear to have provided parallel fiscal control with management responsibility, greater clarity in budget presentation, and a more definite determination of costs for each of the several naval activities. The committee endorsed these objectives last year and wishes again to draw attention to this alternate budget proposal. It recommends that both the staff of the Appropriations Committee and the fiscal and budget personnel of the Department of the Navy cooperatively consider at an early date the complete ramifications of such a budgeting procedure for the Department of the Navy so that, if its merits are as great as they now appear to be, the presentations and structure of the 1950 naval budget appropriations may

be in accordance with the form of the alternate budget requests of 1947.

Amount of bill as passed the House	$3,686,733,250
Amount of increase by Senate (net)	125,437,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	3,812,170,250
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates, 1949	3,936,738,700
Amount of appropriations, 1948	3,181,723,100
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the estimates for 1949	124,568,450
Exceeds the appropriations for 1948	630,447,150

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD some figures which give the status of the Navy bill in different calculations. I trust the figures may be informative.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of Navy bill

HOUSE ACTION

Original and supplemental estimates	$3,927,738,700
House action	3,686,733,250
House reduction	241,005,450

NAVY RESTORATION REQUEST

Of the House reduction of $241,005,450:	
The Navy requested restoration of	182,900,600
Plus President's late request for oil reserves	9,000,000
Or a total restoration of	191,900,600

SENATE ACTION

The Senate restored	116,437,000
Plus oil reserves of	9,000,000
Making total restoration of	125,437,000

SENATE SUMMARY

Thus, from total budget requests of	$3,936,738,700
The Senate's recommendation of	3,812,170,250
Represents a net reduction of	[1] 124,568,450

[1] From original and supplemental budget requests.

Military personnel

	End of fiscal 1948	Average fiscal 1949
Navy:		
Officers	42,623	45,700
Enlisted	361,079	386,061
Nurses	2,600	2,914
Total	406,302	434,675
Difference	28,373	
Marine Corps:		
Officers	7,001	7,363
Enlisted	79,164	81,862
Total	86,165	89,225
Difference	3,060	
Grand total	492,467	[1] 523,900
Difference	31,433	

[1] End strength, 552,000.

Operating planes

	End, fiscal 1948	Average, fiscal 1949
Fleet combatant	2,506	3,154
Combat support	936	1,158
Aircraft supporting fleet	2,351	2,592
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	2,051	2,362
Total operating	7,844	9,266
Logistic support (now operating)	3,078	3,433
Grand total	10,922	12,699

Ships

	Active fleet	Reserve fleet
Major combatant	277	664
Auxiliary	486	1,215
Total	763	1,879

NOTE.—Same numbers, 1948 and 1949.

Major shore stations

Jan. 1, 1948	176
June 30, 1948	166
June 30, 1949	170

Material bureaus

	1948	1949[1]
Ordnance	$184,000,000	$248,000,000
Bureau Ships	370,000,000	370,000,000
Bureau Supplies and Accounts	200,000,000	218,000,000
Aviation, Navy	411,000,000	605,000,000
Bureau Yards and Docks	132,450,000	150,375,000

[1] Costs up about 18 percent over 1948.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I now ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous expenses", on page 2, line 19, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$7,500,000"; and in the same line, after the words "of which", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research, Navy," on page 3, line 13, after the word "Research", to strike out "$45,000,000" and insert "$42,255,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves," on page 3, line 23, after the word "reserves", to strike out "$245,500" and insert "$9,245,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Observatory," on page 5, line 7, after the word "Observatory", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$465,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Hydrographic Office," on page 5, line 14, after the word "publications", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$3,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Naval Personnel—Training and education, Navy," on page 6, line 3, after the word "for", to strike out "$13,000,000" and insert "$13,741,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses, Bureau of Naval Personnel," on page 7, line 2, after the word "medals", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$1,570,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Reserve," on page 7, line 14, after the word "Activities", to strike out "$125,000,000" and insert "$125,436,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ships—Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," on page 10, line 15, after the word "expeditions", to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert $370,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ordnance—Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Navy," on page 11, line 5, after "(Public Law 604)," to strike out "$210,000,000" and insert "$248,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—Pay and subsistence of naval personnel," on page 12, line 13, after the word "duty", to insert "and those performing service in the quarters of female officers and enlisted women, and except those performing service in the residences or quarters of naval attachés as authorized by the Secretary of the Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 15, line 14, after "(Public Law 248)", to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert $218,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 17, line 9, after the word "housing", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$4,875,000"; in line 10, after the words "in all", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$150,375,000"; and in line 18, after the word "located", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for any expenses incident to transferring offices of the Navy Department between buildings at the seat of government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Aeronautics—Aviation, Navy," on page 18, line 10, after "(Public Law 604)", to strike out "$440,000,000" and insert "$470,000,000"; and in line 12, after the words "in all", to strike out "$575,000,000" and insert "$605,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marine Corps—Pay, Marine Corps," on page 19, line 13, after the word "conditions", to strike out "$144,862,000" and insert "$145,744,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 16, after the word "law", to strike out "$14,400,000" and insert "$15,313,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 20, after the words "In all", to strike out "$199,492,000" and insert "$201,287,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses, Marine Corps," on page 22, line 13, after the word "Reserve", to strike out "$130,000,000" and insert "$134,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Shipbuilding—Increase and replacement of naval vessels," on page 24, line 2, after the word "vessels", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That of the balances remaining of appropriations under this head, there shall be available during the fiscal year 1949 such sums as the Secretary may from time to time determine to be necessary for the employment of personnel in the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with the construction of vessels which have been heretofore authorized under this head.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department, salaries," on page 24, line 15, after the word "services", to strike out "$3,641,000" and insert "$4,289,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 17, after the word "Research", to strike out "$1,152,000" and insert "$1,262,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 18, after the word "Library", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$78,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 19, after the word "General", to strike out "$294,300" and insert "$316,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 20, after the word "Operations", to strike out "$1,125,000" and insert "$1,325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 22, after the word "Survey", to strike out "$36,000" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 25, after the word "Personnel", to strike out "$3,870,000" and insert "$5,194,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 1, after the word "Ships", to strike out "$5,715,000" and insert "$6,702,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 2, after the word "Ordnance", to strike out "$2,757,600" and insert "$3,267,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 3, after the word "Accounts", to strike out "$3,960,000" and insert "$4,810,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 5, after the word "Surgery", to strike out "$970,200" and insert "$1,122,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 6, after the word "Docks", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 8, after the word "Department", to strike out "$30,111,100" and insert "$35,111,110."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses", on page 25, line 17, after the word "offices", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions—Department of the Navy," on page 28, line 17, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947"; and on page 29, line 5, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 22, to insert:

SEC. 112. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute an amendment to the committee amendment, printed as section 112.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the amendment of the committee beginning on page 32, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee; no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that this is a committee amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is not a committee amendment. It is an amendment which has been in Navy appropriation bills since approximately 1915. It is a prohibition against the stop-watch time studies as practiced in the Navy industrial establishments. It was inserted by the Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations this year and eliminated by a tie vote in the full committee. The amendment simply reinserts the provision in the bill. It has been in all Navy appropriation bills since the late Senator Borah started it in 1912, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator says that the provision has been in the Navy bills since 1912. That is 36 years too long, in my estimation. The Navy, in these words, has been prevented from following accepted and acceptable practices which are followed in practically every other industry in the Nation. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that naval workers are not allowed to strike, as other workers are, and this provision has worked well through two wars. In my opinion, this is a wrong time for the practice to be changed, when we are trying to stimulate work in naval establishments.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. This amendment is a substitute for the entire section 112, is it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It substitutes the first four lines. The balance of the section is as printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a query comes to my mind, very naturally, as I have heard the amendments stated. There are probably 40 as to which there is a hundred percent record, that is, the appropriations have been increased over the amounts carried by the House bill. The query is, Why does it happen that way? What would happen if, when a bill came before the Senate, we found that in a few instances the amounts had been reduced? How does the Senator account for that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully reply to the Senator that he is not 100 percent correct.

Mr. TOBEY. How much am I off the beam?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are probably three instances in which the amounts have been reduced.

Mr. TOBEY. In 3 out of 40 cases?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the short experience I have had as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would say that the responsibility of the Senate is to see whether the reductions made by the House should be maintained, or whether in the interest of good service in the Navy, Army, or any other branch of the Government, they should be in part restored. Let me call to the Senator's attention the fact that in this instance the Navy requested the restoration of $191,000,000 out of a reduction of $250,000,000. The bill, as reported to the Senate, restores $125,000,000, or approximately half of what the Navy authorities requested. I would say that the fact that we have restored approximately half is coincidental. The amount turned out to be approximately half.

Mr. TOBEY. Did it ever occur to the Senator from Massachusetts that possibly there is a potential that the parties interested in the legislation let the House put what it will into the bills, knowing that the Senate will increase the amounts? Is there less resistance in the House or in the Senate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from New Hampshire had been present in the meetings of the committee he would agree with me that all the details were worked out. In fact, all day Sunday we considered the requests and made the figures as fair as possible.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Massachusetts knows that there is no personal criticism of my friend. I simply failed to find any reductions. I sometimes wonder if in the life of the Senate of the United States, we shall have an appropriation bill in which the predominant changes are reductions rather than increases.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope that will be the case, provided it does not ruin the Government service. I will say to the Senator that over the past 2 years, since I have been following Navy appropriations, certain methods of bookkeeping and accounting have been greatly improved. On the other hand, I warn the Senator that because of the increase in the Air Force requirements, on account of increased ship requirements, and on account, particularly, of the reduction in the "fat" left over from the war, the Navy budget, unless there is a material reduction in Navy service, will be larger next year and in the next 4 years than it is this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma conferees on the part of the Senate.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators have inquired about how long the Senate will remain in session tonight. It is the present intention to take up the Economic Cooperation Administration bill at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was just wondering at what hour the Senator from Nebraska thought we would take up the Economic Cooperation Administration appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Vermont has told he me would speak about 35 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Ordinarily it would take me about 35 minutes to present the preliminary statement on Senate bill 2318. I would not refuse to answer questions, but I should prefer to have them postponed until tomorrow, if my colleagues will agree.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wished to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont a question or two at the completion of his address this evening. I understood him to say the farm bill would not be taken up until tomorrow. Am I correct?

Mr. WHERRY. It is the unfinished business. I think it would be fair to comply with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator, as his bill has been displaced three or four times, and he has very kindly deferred his explanation and presentation of the bill, and his address will be made tonight. After the Senator from Vermont concludes his remarks, it will be the intention to ask that the long-range agricultural bill be temporarily laid aside and that the ECA bill be taken up.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope no one will misunderstand my motive. I am in thorough agreement with the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I merely asked whether after his speech had been concluded the Senate would take up the ECA bill, and postpone further consideration of the farm bill until tomorrow. Am I correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator from Vermont, and I appreciate the difficulty he has had. I am in thorough accord with him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I understand correctly the Senator to say that he desired not to be interrupted tonight?

Mr. AIKEN. I should prefer not to have questions asked tonight. I should rather have them put off until tomorrow, so that at the conclusion of the analysis of the bill the Senate may take up the ECA appropriation bill and dispose of that, and then tomorrow morning start in with the long-range farm bill and keep at it until it is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to postpone my questions.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no intention of being discourteous. If any Senator were urged too greatly to ask a question, I should probably not refuse to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a good many questions in mind about the bill, but I shall endeavor to suppress the questions until tomorrow. At that time, however, I shall propound a number of inquiries with regard to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont hopes that when the Senator from Georgia asks his questions tomorrow, he may receive satisfactory answers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I trust I may.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last July the Senate made an appropriation of $15,000 to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to enable it to make a study of the trends and needs of agriculture in the United States, and to make recommendations to meet the situation as they found it.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed consisting of seven members, and beginning October 1 we started holding hearings in different parts of the country, as well as in Washington. We heard the

representatives of all the major farm organizations, we listened to the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the State departments of agriculture, we heard about 325 to 350 farmers from all parts of the United States—from Denver east and south. As a result, we made a report of our findings about February 1, which has been placed in the hands of the Members of the Senate, and then as rapidly as possible we formulated Senate bill 2319 to implement the report. We felt that it was useless to say what we found as to the conditions in agriculture in the United States if we did nothing about it.

I wish to say, as I have said before, that all during the work of the subcommittee and the full committee we acted as a unit. No partisanship entered into our deliberations. At no time did we have to have a formal vote or division of opinion in the committee in order to determine what was to go into the report or into the bill. We discussed every problem informally, and agreed without the necessity of having a formal vote.

Senate bill 2318 is the bill of this body itself. It is a bill which was prepared in accordance with the instructions given the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last July. It was reported out of the committee unanimously, and, as I have said, we have acted unanimously all the way through, from the very beginning, almost 9 months ago.

I shall now undertake a section by section analysis of the bill. I know that many questions will arise in the minds of Senators, and tomorrow I shall be very glad to try to answer all the questions, and I think there will be an answer to most of them at least.

Mr. President, sections 1 and 2 provide for a short title and declaration of policy.

TITLE I—REORGANIZATION

Title I deals with reorganization and reassignment of functions performed by the United States Department of Agriculture—hereinafter called the Department. Soil conservation and other functions requiring direct dealing with farmers are decentralized so as to bring their exercise closer to farmers, provide for greater farmer participation, and to coordinate services at the local level.

ADMINISTRATION OF CONSERVATION AND OTHER PROGRAMS REQUIRING FARMER PARTICIPATION

Section 101 creates a new agency, the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement, and centralizes in it, at the departmental level, administration of:

First, functions now administered by the Soil Conservation Service;

Second, functions now administered by the Agricultural Conservation Programs Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration;

Third, other functions related to soil conservation; and

Fourth, other functions requiring direct dealings with farmers.

This is in accordance with the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture before a joint committee of Congress on a long-range agricultural program.

At State, county, and local levels, the major educational, informational, and demonstrational features of these functions will be exercised by the State extension services, and research will be performed by the State experiment stations, which is a reaffirmation of present practice provided for in several legislative acts. Other features will be performed by the State agricultural councils, the county and community agricultural program committees and the county agricultural program executive committees, hereinafter discussed. However, the furnishing of technical assistance and machinery and equipment to soil conservation districts will be performed by the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement.

It is not the committee's intention that the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement should carry out educational, informational, or demonstrational programs of its own, except insofar as such activities are incidental to the carrying out of its expressly assigned programs. Likewise it is not the intention that the Extension Service will carry out soil and agricultural action programs except insofar as such activities are an integral part of educational, informational, and demonstrational activities.

Regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service are to be abolished, unless the State agricultural councils elect to retain them or establish similar offices between two or more States.

Sections 102 and 104 provide additional (unmatched) funds for the State extension services and experiment stations to carry out any additional functions given them by section 101.

Section 103 sets up an establishment within the Office of Experiment Stations to cooperate with the State experiment stations in carrying out the functions assigned to them by section 101.

At present most of the Soil Conservation Service research work is carried on cooperatively with the State agricultural experiment stations.

COMMUNITY AND COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM COMMITTEES, COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES, AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COUNCILS

At present, pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U. S. C. A. 590h (b)), the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) utilizes local, county, and State committees chosen as provided in that section in administering the agricultural conservation payment programs. Pursuant to section 388 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. A. 1388) these same committees are utilized in administering the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. These committees are chosen as follows: First, the farmers in local areas (designated by the Secretary) elect (A) "local committees" and (B) delegates to a county convention; second, the county convention elects a "county committee"; and third, the Secretary appoints a "State committee." Under S. 2318 these committees would be replaced by new organizations to be known as "community agricultural program committees", "county agricultural program committees", "county agricultural program executive committees", and "State agricultural councils."

I may say that this organizational procedure has the approval of the Department of Agriculture, and for the most part simply writes into law many of the practices which they are already employing.

Under the provisions of section 105 of S. 2318, the local committee would become a "community agricultural program committee."

I want to say here something about the definition of "farm operators." In this section 105 the committee used the term "farm operators" in a broad sense to include sharecroppers and tenants. The term "farm operators" has a narrow connotation in some areas, but the committee had no intention to exclude anyone in the use of this term who receives a substantial part of his income from the land. I am making that explanation now so that if the question of the definition of a farm operator should come up later, it will be plain.

Section 106 provides for a county agricultural program committee consisting of the members of the community agricultural program committees in the county, the agricultural extension agent, and representatives of such soil-conservation districts or other agencies as the State agricultural council may specify. Since S. 2318 was reported your committee has prepared an amendment to this section providing that the county agent shall be ex officio and shall have no vote.

Under the provisions of section 107, each county agricultural program committee elects from among its members a county agricultural program executive committee of not less than three nor more than five members.

Section 108 provides for a State agricultural council, consisting of at least six elected members and three ex officio members, in lieu of the present State committee appointed by the Secretary. Provision is made for election of additional members in the larger States.

I want to say here that since the bill was reported out, the committee has decided on an amendment which will be printed and will be available tomorrow, which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture will appoint the members of the State council who are to be nominated by the farmers of the State through their county chairmen. There will have to be three persons nominated for each position to be filled by the Secretary. We felt that by using this method we would retain that continuity of the program from the Secretary right straight down through to the farmer, but at the same time, while the Secretary appoints a State council, every member whom he appoints has to be approved and nominated by the farmers of the State before he can be appointed.

The committees and council provided for in sections 105, 106, 107, and 108 assist the Secretary in the administration of soil conservation and other programs requiring direct dealings with farmers.

Section 109 makes provision for administrative expenses of the various committees and the State agricultural council and prescribes limitations upon expenditures.

Section 110 limits any one person to membership in one council or executive committee.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

STATE PLANS

Section 201 provides that no State soil-conservation plan submitted under section 7 (c) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U. S. C. A. 590g (c)) shall be approved by the Secretary except "after consultation with" the appropriate State agricultural council, and unless it contains certain provisions for participation and cooperation by the State agricultural council and the community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees.

The committee has decided upon another amendment at this point, and the Department of Agriculture has suggested that instead of requiring the Secretary to approve the State program after consultation with the State council, that we require him to approve the program upon the recommendation of the State council, which, in our opinion, concentrates a little more authority with the State, although as the bill is written it would be almost impossible for the State, the local, and the national levels to work any way except in full cooperation with one another.

EXTENSION OF CONSERVATION-PAYMENT PROGRAMS

Section 202 extends to December 31, 1950, the period within which conservation payments or grants may be made directly by the Secretary instead of through grants-in-aid to States.

As the bill was set up originally in 1938, it was contemplated that it would operate as a grant-in-aid program. However, only 23 States so far have shown interest enough in having it operate as a grant-in-aid program to enact the necessary legislation. Therefore, we are extending for 2 years more the time in which they can put themselves in shape to operate on a grant-in-aid basis if they see fit. If they do not see fit in 1950, after having 12 years in which to decide, I think we might conclude that they prefer to have it operate as a national program and not bother with the grant-in-aid proposition any longer. However, we did feel that we should give them 2 years more to see if they wanted to operate on that basis.

UTILIZATION OF COMMUNITY AND COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM COMMITTEES AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COUNCILS

Section 203 amends existing law to provide for utilization in agricultural conservation-payment programs of community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees and State agricultural councils, in lieu of the committees now utilized.

The committees utilized now are set up in accordance with plans promulgated by the Secretary, and for the most part it will be seen that we are simply writing the present method into law. That is the effect anyway, except for the State council, which is now appointed as he sees fit by the Secretary, but which in the future will be appointed by members designated or nominated by the farmers of each State.

LIMITATIONS ON CONSERVATION PAYMENTS AND GRANTS

Section 204 provides that payments or grants of aid for soil building or conserving practices, whether made under a State plan or by the Secretary, may be made only for practices, first, approved by the Secretary after consultation with the appropriate State agricultural council; and that would be changed to be approved by the Secretary on recommendation of the appropriate State agricultural council; and second, having (except in the case of demonstration or experimental farms) long-term value. Such payments would be divided among landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers on the basis or the relative value of their contributions to such practices. This section also provides for a limitation of $1,000 upon the total payments which may be made in any year to any person (except with respect to demonstration or experimental farms); but payment for practices having long-term effect may be distributed over a period of 5 years.

In other words, while the payments are limited to $1,000 in 1 year, yet the farmer might do a $5,000 soil-conservation job and be paid at the rate of $1,000 a year for 5 years. This amount of $1,000 is a controversial figure. Last year the Appropriations Committee restricted the amount which could be paid to any one farmer to $500. This year it is $750. The recommendation of the Department of Agriculture was that it be made $2,500 for any 1 year.

There are good arguments to be made for all these figures. There are some truck farms in the East, large ranches in the West, and large cotton farms in the delta district of Arkansas and Mississippi where the acreage is so large that the payments would amount to several thousand dollars each year, either for the application of lime or for ditching, terracing, or for whatever sort of program the State council authorized payments. I think only 1 percent of the farms of the United States, however, would draw more than $750 a year under the present law. We are not changing the basic soil-conservation law at all in this bill, and we are not changing the basic phases of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Section 205 amends section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to substitute references to the community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees, and State agricultural councils for references to the present local, county, and State committees.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

This is the title dealing with price supports. It differs materially from either the 1938 Agricultural Act or the Steagall amendment in that this plan bases price supports on the supply as well as upon market prices, thus giving flexible price supports.

Section 301 amends section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 in the following respects:

First. The method of computing parity prices would be changed to the extent necessary to give appropriate recognition to changes in relationships between the agricultural commodities themselves occurring since the base period, 1910–14, such as those resulting from the discovery of new uses or new methods of production.

As an example of change in use, during the period from 1910 to 1914 practically no soy beans were produced. Now it is a major crop, involving in excess of 12,000,000 acres. As an example of shift in method of production, or mechanization in production of crops, the best example is probably wheat.

While it is essential that the proper balance be maintained between farm and nonfarm prices, in view of changes in uses and methods of production, any parity price formula will necessarily become an unworkable standard in the course of time, if it does not permit adjustment in the prices of the agricultural commodities as among themselves. In fact, this has already occurred to such an extent that the 1910–14 base-price of the commodity is used in computing the parity prices of only 47 of the 157 items for which parity or comparable prices are now calculated. S. 2318 would provide a formula which, while preserving the 1910–14 relationship between farm and nonfarm prices, will reflect the developments of recent years. Thus, while parity prices on the average would be based on the differences between the 1910–14 and the present prices of things that farmers buy, the new parity price formula in S. 2318 accepts the prices of individual farm commodities for the 10 immediately preceding years as reflecting the current relative supply of and demand for different farm products better than the price relationships between different farm commodities in 1910–14. However, the period 1910–14 is retained as the base period in showing the over-all relationship between the prices of things farmers buy and the prices of farm products. The period of 1910–14 has advantages as a base period for farm products as a group because no large segment of our economy was badly out of adjustment with other segments of our economy at that time due to the absence of war, depression, or seriously disturbed international trade conditions. On the other hand, changes in population, consumption of products, trade, total production, and other factors have had a marked effect in changing the relative demand for different farm products now as compared to the period 1910–14.

PARITY PRICES OF BASIC COMMODITIES

Corn (per bushel): New, $0.953 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.567 times $2.50 equals $1.42; old, $0.642 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $1.60.

Wheat (per bushel): New, $1.22 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.726 times $2.50 equals $1.82; old, $0.884 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $2.21.

Cotton (per pound): New, $0.1808 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.1076 times $2.50 equals $0.2659; old, $0.124 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $0.3100.

Peanuts (per pound): New, $0.062 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.37 times $2.50 equals $0.091; old, $0.043 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $0.120.

Rice (per bushel): New, $1.44 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $0.857 times $2.50 equals $2.12; old, $0.813 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $2.03.

Tobacco (per pound): Flue-cured, new, $0.336 (10-year average price)[1] divided by $1.68 equals $0.200 times $2.50 equals $0.500; old, $0.229 (present base price)[2] times $2.12[3] equals $0.485; Burley, new $0.340 (10-year average price)[1] divided by $1.68 equals $0.202 times $2.50 equals $0.505; old, $0.222 (present price)[2] times $2.12[3] equals $0.471.

PARITY PRICES OF SELECTED NONBASIC COMMODITIES

Cottonseed (per ton): New, $44.60 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $26.50 times $2.50 equals $66.20; old, $22.28 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $56.40.

Hogs (per hundredweight): New, $12.50 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $7.44 times $2.50 equals $18.60; old, $7.28 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $18.20.

Beef cattle (per hundredweight): New, $10.90 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $6.49 times $2.50 equals $16.20; old, $5.41 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $13.60.

Milk (per hundredweight): New, $2.81 (10-year average price) divided by $1.68 equals $1.67 times $2.50 equals $4.18[4]; old, $1.60 (present base price) times $2.50 equals $4.00.[4]

In making these calculations, the following data were used to tie the new parity formula to the 1910–14 base period: The 10-year average of prices received by farmers for their products—1938–47—was 168 percent of the 1910–14 base period, and the May 15, 1948, index of prices farmers paid for products purchased, including interest and taxes, was 250 percent of the 1910–14 base period. The new parity price calculation uses the preceding 10-year average price—1938–47—of the individual commodity to determine the current relationship of the commodity to all farm products sold. The old parity price calculation uses the 1910–14 individual commodity price—unless some other base period has been accepted, as in the case of tobacco—to show the price relationships between farm products.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES

Using corn as an example, the calculation of parity under the new parity formula is as follows: The 10-year average price of corn—1938–47—was $0.953. Average prices of all farm products during the last 10 years is 168 percent of the average prices of all farm products during the 1910–14 base period. Thus, $0.953 is divided by 1.68 to show the parity price of corn in 1910–14, which would amount to $0.567. Since the prices of things farmers buy are now 250 percent, or 2.50 times as high as in 1910–14, the current parity price of corn would be 2.50 times $0.567, or $1.42.

In calculating the parity price for corn under the old formula, the actual price of corn from 1910–14 is used, which was $0.642. Since the prices of things the farmer buys are 2.50 times as high as in 1910–14, the 1910–14 price of corn, $0.642, is multiplied by 2.50, which gives $1.60 as the old parity price of corn, as figured under the present method. It would be $1.42 under the new method, 18 cents a bushel less than under the old method. I shall explain why that is not a disadvantage as I go on.

It should be noted that while the parity prices of some products are higher and others lower under the new formula, the average parity price of all commodities will be the same under the old and new formulas. In the change from the old to the new parity formula the parity price of livestock, livestock products, and oil seeds are higher, while parity prices for grain crops are lower. It is because the relationships between prices of individual farm commodities have changed materially since 1910–14 that there is need of revising the parity formula to use current price relationships between individual farm commodities.

A provision in Senate bill 2318, however, provides that where there is a difference between the two parity prices for a product exceeding 5 percent of the old parity price, the adjustment to the new parity will not take place at the rate of more than 5 percent in 1 year. The main reason for that it so there can be no abrupt drop in the parity price of any commodity. The main reason for the lower parity prices for the basic commodities under the new parity formula, except for rice and tobacco, for which the parity prices will be higher, is the low prices for the other products in the years 1938, 1939 and 1940. For instance, cotton had three 9-cent years—in 1938, 1939 and 1940—as compared to a probable average of 30 cents a pound during the last 3 years. Insofar as the prices in 1948, 1949 and 1950 may be higher than in 1938, 1939 and 1940 for these products, their parity prices under the two formulas will come closer together in the next 3 years, and the new parity for a product may exceed the old if the 10-year average price of the product becomes relatively higher than those of other commodities. The formula provides for the annual adjustment of dropping the first and adding a new year's price to the 10-year average price of farm products.

It is desirable that the new parity prices for livestock and oil seeds be somewhat higher relative to grain prices because 85 percent of the corn crop and a large part of other grains are normally fed to livestock. This change in the relationship of parity prices for livestock and grains will encourage the feeding of grain which is the most desirable means of utilizing grain when supplies become burdensome.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Can it be said that the formula which takes a 10-year period as the criterion might permit or require, as the decade moves up toward a higher 10-year period of prices, that farm prices start upward at a time when the prices of the things the farmers buy would be tending downward, so that one would be moving in the opposite direction from the other, whereas generally they would be expected to move in the same direction?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his question, please?

Mr. PEPPER. If the 10-year bracket is the period that influences the parity figure, as you move from a lower-price structure, let us say, up into a decade all of which has high-price structures, you would tend to raise the parity price, under the formula, would you not? The parity price would tend to rise. I was wondering whether there could be a case in which there would be a tendency for farm prices to rise at the time when the prices of the things the farmers buy would have tendency to be falling.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think so. I think there would tend to be a relationship between the prices of the things farmers buy and the prices they receive for the things they sell, that is that the purpose of parity is to give the same or constant purchasing power to a given amount of farm products.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont has an estimate as to the difference in cost of the new program, as now proposed, as compared with the cost of the old program, annually.

Mr. AIKEN. I think there probably could be no accurate estimate of the cost; but it is my belief that the cost of the new program will be lower because it lowers the incentive price of the commodities of which we have too large a supply. We provide here for a lower price-support level for potatoes and eggs and some of the other commodities on which we have been spending a good many millions of dollars. On the whole, I believe it will be a fairly inexpensive program to administer.

Of course, no one can tell for sure. We have had the best agricultural economists in the country, not only in the Department of Agriculture, but those of the farm organizations, and other economists, such as Dr. Black, of Harvard, working with us; and the bill is a result of their combined knowledge, although I must state that they did not always agree, any more than economists in any other line always agree.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The implication of the Senator's answer, then, is that although this program has been modernized and, to use his explanation, has been improved in the light of experience, nevtherless, barring unforeseen happenings, the program will not cost as much to ad-

[1] Ten marketing years beginning during calendar years 1938–47.

[2] Based on marketing seasons 1934–38.

[3] May 15 index of prices paid August 1934–July 1939 equals 100.

[4] Not adjusted for seasonal trends.

minister as the program as we have had has cost. Is that correct, or, rather, is that the Senator's belief?

Mr. AIKEN. Personally, I am satisfied as to that, for the simple reason that we encourage the production of the items we are short of, and discourage the overproduction of the commodities of which we already have too large a supply.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Vermont said he would yield for questions tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will follow that arrangement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator is to yield, I have a number of questions to ask, which would lengthen this discussion considerably. I had understood that it would go over until tomorrow. I know that other Senators also have questions.

Mr. AIKEN. I should prefer to have it go over until tomorrow, if that is agreeable to the Senator. I shall take about 10 or 12 minutes more to make my general presentation and analysis of the bill.

Mr. President, I continue with the analysis:

Second. "Parity" as applied to income is redefined for the purpose of establishing a more useful and accurate standard. This change has no substantive effect.

Third. The term "carry-over" as applied to corn, rice, peanuts, and cotton is redefined to include imports. This term was not previously applied to peanuts.

Fourth. The term "normal supply" as applied to corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts is redefined to represent current requirements more accurately than has heretofore been the case. In defining "normal supply," the estimated exports for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined and estimated domestic consumption for the preceding marketing year would be used. The allowance for carry-over provided for in the existing definition of "normal supply" remains the same as in the present law, except in the case of cotton, which would be 23 percent in the bill as reported, in lieu of 40 percent in existing law. Since the bill was reported, however, your committee has prepared an amendment which would make this allowance 30 percent, instead of 23 percent. The definition in existing law of "normal supply" is not applicable to peanuts, but the new definition would be made so under the bill. The allowance for carry-over in the case of peanuts would be 15 percent. Provision is made in the bill for necessary adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions. The term "normal supply" as applied to tobacco would not be changed.

Fifth. The term "total supply" has been redefined to cover peanuts; and in the case of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts, to include imports. The term as applied to tobacco has not been changed.

PRICE SUPPORT

Section 302 contains the price-support provisions of the bill.

Price supports have proven to be an effective and sound device for improving farm prices, influencing production, and, in the case of storable commodities, accumulating reserve stores which have been of great value in times of war and crop disasters. They are an essential part of any well-rounded farm program. The committee devoted a great deal of time and study to this question, in the light of past experience, and arrived at several general principles which we believe should characterize future price-support programs.

First. Price supports should take into account both market prices and the supply of farm products.

Second. Mandatory price-support operations should be limited or conditioned to the storability of the products.

Third. The minimum price-support level (in periods of heavy supply) should be below the desirable long-time price level, in order to encourage producers to shift part of their productive resources to those products in short supply or greatest demand.

Fourth. There is need of giving considerable discretionary power in adjusting the price-support plan to meet changing or unforeseen conditions.

However, there should be discretionary power to establish support levels on any commodity above the mandatory level in order, in time of emergency, to encourage or maintain needed production. An example of that this year is the case of flax, where the Department of Agriculture is supporting the price at 150 percent of parity, because of the acute shortage and the national need.

With these principles in mind, section 302 of S. 2318 would amend section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938—which contains the principal permanent price-support provisions—to provide as follows:

First. Price support of any agricultural commodity through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations would be authorized. This authorization provides the necessary flexibility in the choice of methods to be used in supporting prices. Thus it authorizes not only loans and purchases but also direct payments to farmers. The use of indirect methods such as the development of improved merchandising methods is encouraged. In determining the methods to be used, as well as the other terms and conditions of price-support operations, the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation are required to give consideration to, first, the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor; second, the price levels at which other commodities are being supported; third, the availability of funds; fourth, the perishability of the commodity; fifth, its importance to agriculture and national economy; sixth, the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation; and, seventh, the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand. Compliance with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices may be required as a condition of price support on either basic or nonbasic commodities.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I may inquire, does the Senator desire to yield before completing his speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has said he would like to finish his speech without interruption.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to finish. I am nearly through. I shall be glad tomorrow to try to answer all the questions that I may be asked pertaining to the bill.

In the case of the basic commodities, cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, the authority to impose marketing practice requirements as a condition of eligibility for price support would not authorize the imposition of marketing quotas if they have been voted down by farmers, and the acreage allotments used for purposes of eligibility would be the same as those determined pursuant to the marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Before deciding upon the farm-support schedule, the committee examined the farm price and production data over the past 25 years and found that even with an 85-percent price-support program, let alone a 90-percent support as under the Steagall amendment, that some of our major farm products would have had Federal support about three-fourths of the time over the 25-year period. That is a heavy burden to place on the Treasury and it encourages farmers to produce the things that they are accustomed to producing without considering what the Nation needs. Probably there is no better guide to production needs than a flexible price system that reflects supply and demand conditions, just so price does not fluctuate so widely or so quickly as to bring economic ruin to producers.

A flexible price support schedule varying inversely to supply in like manner will encourage farmers to adjust production to demand.

High support prices—near the normal market price—also have the tendency to freeze production or acreages in undesirable patterns rather than to encourage adjustment in production to meet demands.

In the case of the basic commodities price support at from 60 to 90 percent of parity, the minimum level depending upon the relationship of the total supply of each commodity to its normal supply—would be required to be made available to cooperators (those who do not exceed farm acreage allotments); except that if marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers the level of price support would be reduced to 50 percent of parity. Your committee felt that this minimum price support of 50 percent should be given even though marketing quotas should be disapproved since the complete lack of price support for a basic agricultural commodity would so seriously lower the income of a particular producer group as to impair the general welfare. If, however, marketing quotas are approved by producers, the level of price support which would otherwise be given to the commodity would be increased under the bill as reported by a minimum of 10 percent of parity, but not beyond 90 percent of parity.

Since reporting the bill the committee has recommended that instead of a premium of 10 percent of parity plus an additional percent to be given by the Secretary if he felt it desirable, the premium for quotas be 20 percent of the support price computed without regard to the premium. It would be 20 percent of the support price but not exceeding 90 percent of parity. Under the bill price support is not required to be made available to noncooperators, but at the Secretary's discretion such support may be provided at levels not in excess of those provided for cooperators.

Third. Price support for nonbasic commodities is discretionary with the Secretary up to a maximum level of 90 percent of parity. It is difficult to provide any procedure for controlling the marketing of certain products in order to make price support effective. Potatoes constitute one of the most difficult problems although the Secretary may prescribe conditions pertaining to compliance and a large percentage of the producers follow the plan, difficulty arises with the noncooperator who proceeds to dump all of his production on the market. The problem is further complicated because the early, medium, and late potato markets overlap. Even though the cooperators follow prescribed conditions and may hold their cull potatoes off of the market and receive a minimum price for them, noncooperators may benefit from marketing their entire production. This will tend to help break the market for the cooperators. This difficulty arises because potatoes, unlike tobacco, do not pass through central markets where controls can be exercised. One of the most promising approaches to this problem is that of potato-marketing agreements. Last year such an agreement was developed for Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota for the marketing of late potatoes. One is being considered by the Maine potato growers for the current year. Also Virginia and North Carolina have developed a potato-marketing agreement for the current year. Potato-marketing agreements entered into by the growers promises to be an effective way of holding low-grade potatoes off of the market. The growers who enter into such an agreement will help to make it effective in their localities. If a price-support program for potatoes is developed, the language of the bill would make it possible for the Secretary to give preference to the producers who are operating under marketing agreements.

The price of wool, however, is required to be supported at such level between 60 and 90 percent of parity as the Secretary considers necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds. The present production of wool is approximately 300,000,000 pounds, which is not considered adequate and which places this country in too great a state of dependence upon foreign countries for wool. There has been a consistently decreasing number of stock sheep and lambs on farms and ranges in this country until now we have only thirty and a half million—the lowest since 1867.

Fourth. In case the national interest requires, price-support operations at levels in excess of 90 percent of parity are permitted with respect to either basic or nonbasic commodities.

I have already mentioned flax as this year's example of that.

Fifth. The Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from using its funds to carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost, but this prohibition does not prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from using its funds to support the price of such perishable commodities by operations with respect to storable commodities processed therefrom. For example the Commodity Credit Corporation could support the price of milk through the purchase of powdered dry milk, or the price of citrus fruit through the purchase of canned concentrated juice. The bill expressly permits direct price support for perishable nonbasic commodities through other means available to the Secretary. Thus section 32 funds would be available for such price support. Since the bill was reported, the committee has recommended an amendment which would make it clear that the Commodity Credit Corporation's facilities could be utilized in carrying out section 32 and school lunch programs, involving the procurement of perishable commodities. The cost of such programs would, of course, be defrayed from section 32 or school-lunch program funds. The basis for differentiating between storable and nonstorable commodities is that on storable commodities the Corporation has a reasonable prospect of avoiding losses by disposing of its inventories during times of shortages or increased demand. The price support operations of Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to the basic commodities have in the aggregate been carried out without loss to the Corporation. Perishable commodities must be disposed of promptly and the losses involved are often great. Moreover, the yields of the more perishable commodities are so variable and so subject to the control of the producer, as by the application of fertilizer, insecticide, and water in the case of irrigated crops, that the acreage planted may have little relationship to production. Section 32 is the recognized medium for the disposal of surpluses of perishable commodities and provides for such disposal largely through donation to charitable institutions and through the school lunch program. It should also be noted that in the case of all the basic commodities, there is in effect a statutory system for adjusting production to demand through the establishment of marketing quotas and penalties.

Sixth. Limitations are imposed upon the price at which Commodity Credit Corporation can sell farm commodities subject to a number of exceptions. These limitations and exceptions are generally comparable to those now in effect and are intended to prevent sales of farm commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation in a manner which would impair price-support operations with respect to such commodities.

MARKETING QUOTAS

Sections 303, 304, 305, and 306 change the conditions which must be determined by the Secretary to exist before marketing quotas can be imposed upon corn, wheat, cotton, and rice. As reported, the sections would provide that whenever the Secretary determines—

First, that the total supply of the commodity for the marketing year beginning in the then current calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 15 percent, or

Second, that the total supply of the commodity for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending and that the average price for the commodity for three successive months does not exceed 70 percent of parity, the Secretary shall proclaim marketing quotas for the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year.

Since reporting the bill, your committee has reported out amendments to each of these sections which would increase the amount by which total supply must exceed normal supply from 15 percent to 20 percent, and would decrease the requirement with respect to the average farm price from 70 percent of parity to 66 percent of parity, except that in the case of cotton the amount by which the total supply is required to exceed the normal supply would be reduced to 8 percent.

A careful study of available data indicates that the amendments set up comparable conditions of supply and prices as a guide in voting quotas for the different basic commodities.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—IMPORTS

Section 307 requires the Secretary to take imports into consideration in determining acreage allotments for corn, wheat, and rice for the purposes of marketing quotas.

UTILIZATION OF COUNTY AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COUNCILS UNDER AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Section 308 provides for the utilization of the community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees and State agricultural councils in carrying out the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SECTION 32 FUNDS

Section 401 provides for accumulation, up to $300,000,000, of section 32 funds not currently required for program purposes. Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), appropriates for each fiscal year an amount equal to 30 percent of the customs duties for the preceding calendar year, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage exportation and to increase (by means of diversion programs) domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products and to reestablish farmers' purchasing power. To the extent that funds annually appropriated by section 32 are not fully utilized during any fiscal year, this provision would permit the

balance of the funds not utilized to be carried over to subsequent fiscal years and used for the purpose for which such funds were appropriated. This provision would make it possible to formulate long-range surplus-disposal programs.

PARITY—OTHER STATUTES

Section 403 conforms the definitions of parity contained in other statutes to the definition of parity contained in section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by S. 2318.

SECTION 22

Section 402 would amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. The bill is designed to strengthen price-support programs for American agricultural commodities and to prevent their disruption through excessive imports of foreign commodities.

The revision of section 22 would carry out recommendations heretofore made by the President to the Congress and more recently requested of this Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In requesting revision of section 22, the Secretary of Agriculture stated:

> The field within which the authority granted by section 22 may be exercised is so limited that the authority cannot be of much aid to the Department of Agriculture in discharging its price-support obligations in this period of adjustment. If a program of the Department is not undertaken pursuant to one of the three statutes referred to in section 22, the authority conferred by that section may not be utilized to control the importation of an article the importation of which is materially interfering with the successful operation of the program by the Department.

The principal changes contemplated by this section of the bill are:

First. To extend the authority of section 22 so as to cover not only agricultural commodities, but also the products thereof;

Second. To extend such authority so as to cover articles the import of which affects any loan, purchase, or other programs or operations undertaken by the Department of Agriculture (including price support and stabilization operations) with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof;

Third. To make the provisions with respect to quantitative limitation restrictions applicable to the total quantity of an article imported during a representative period as determined by the President, rather than to each country's average annual quantity of the article imported during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, as now provided;

Fourth. To authorize the President, by a specific grant of authority, to describe designated articles by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such bases as he determines;

Fifth. To clarify the definition with respect to the fees authorized, which are considered duties for some purposes, as now provided, so that they shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States, as, for example, our duty preference arrangements with Cuba; and

Sixth. To prohibit enforcement of a proclamation under section 22 that would be in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is a party.

I understand that this proposed amendment to section 22 has been cleared with the State Department, and we are assured there will be no veto of it this time.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 404 provides that the act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that section 402 would take effect upon enactment. Present price support provisions under which the basic commodities are supported at 90 percent of parity—92½ percent in the case of cotton—expire with the crops of such commodities harvested prior to January 1, 1949. The Steagall amendment, under which the so-called Steagall commodities are required to be supported at not less than 90 percent of parity, expires on December 31, 1948.

AMENDMENTS

Since reporting out the bill, your committee has reported out a number of additional amendments, some of which have been discussed in the foregoing analysis. All of the remaining amendments are technical and perfecting in nature with one exception, as follows:

A new section 309 would be inserted. The section would amend section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to require the Secretary, first, to proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding marketing year, and, second, to proclaim a national marketing quota for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for each marketing year for which a quota is proclaimed for fire-cured tobacco. This would mean that, once the Secretary proclaims a marketing quota for any kind of tobacco, he is required to proclaim a marketing quota for that kind of tobacco for each succeeding year without regard to the supply conditions presently required by the statute, unless growers vote to discard the quota system. Since marketing quotas have been proclaimed for the marketing years beginning in 1948 for flue-cured, burley, and fire-cured tobaccos, this section would require marketing quotas to be proclaimed each year hereafter for these three kinds of tobacco, and also for Virginia sun-cured tobacco.

Because of the long period for which tobacco is held to properly age, tobacco presents problems of market supply not found in other commodities.

I shall be glad to discuss that further tomorrow if it has not been made clear.

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of my colleagues in bearing with me and giving me an opportunity to present this preliminary analysis of the bill tonight.

I have some amendments, practically all of them technical in nature, we might say, relating to crossing "t's" and dotting "i's," which I shall submit so that they may be printed and be available tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. So long as the Senate does not get out of patience.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall not take any time. I merely wish to send to the desk sundry amendments to the bill which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield the floor?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. On behalf of the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment to be offered to the bill, to be printed and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont technically still has the floor. He did not yield the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as I understand this long-range agricultural bill, insofar as cotton is concerned and so far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned, it makes a reduction in cotton parity from 90 percent to 75 percent, with an additional 4-cent reduction and an additional variation in regard to other commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. It would mean 75 percent for normal supply. Beginning last year the supply was just a trifle over normal. It would probably be normal next year.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Vermont will admit that the Commodity Credit Corporation made over $100,000,000 on cotton last year, as stated by C. C. Smith, the chairman of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In other words, the parity on cotton is going to be reduced from 90 percent to 75 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. No, not in 1 year. We provide that parity cannot be reduced over 5 percent in any 1 year. In the meantime, the bad years of cotton, when it brought only 9 cents, 1938, 1939, and 1940, will be dropped from the 10-year period, and the 30-cent years will be added, so that the parity price of cotton is very likely to come up, and possibly in 3 years might exceed what the parity would be under the old method of computing it. I have no figures with me tonight, but I shall be glad to produce them tomorrow.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator will remember the late John Bankhead, of Alabama, who took such an interest in the cotton growers, and Representative

Steagall, who was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives. The Senator from Vermont well knows that cotton was not at parity in 1939 and 1940, but also was not during the war years, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and am I now to be told, coming from a cotton State, that the plan is further to reduce the parity on cotton, after the cotton farmer has been robbed of millions of dollars, so that the Government can ship it to Japan to run MacArthur's business, and to make a record for the Army and to run the Government of Japan? The farmer seems to be forgotten. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that I think it is an outrage and a disgrace that cotton should be reduced and the loan should be reduced from 90 to 75 percent in the face of what has happened to cotton.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further, but I do hope the Senator from South Carolina will not forget the efforts I have put in to help the cotton growers when they needed it most, and I say to him tonight that this new parity formula I know will increase the price of cottonseed 20 percent, and will, I believe, more than offset the slight reduction in cotton. But I refuse to yield further.

Mr. MAYBANK. If I may make a remark as one coming from a cotton State, the cottonseed is only used to pay the expense of ginning and baling the cotton and the picking of cotton. That has nothing to do with the price of raw cotton.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily set aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6801, the so-called Economic Cooperation Administration appropriations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at this time I wish to present from the Senate Committee on Appropriations the recommendations for foreign aid appropriations for the coming year. It is my belief that the Senate will not consider during this year a bill of greater import to our economy or of more lasting significance to the security of this Nation and the world.

In its simplest terms, the appropriation which the committee recommends calls for the expenditure of American dollars to aid the recovery of Europe and to extend help into many war-ravaged areas of the world. In its broader aspects, however, this bill provides for the shipment of American production and wealth at a cost of personal sacrifice of every citizen of the Republic. The appropriation is a venture in faith on the part of this Nation. It expresses the belief that the freedom-loving people of the world, by sharing their resources and their strength, can withstand the tyrannous forces of a philosophy and government that holds in slavery the peoples of more than half of Europe. The appropriation is recommended because there is in America a widespread conviction that the free people of the world must stand or fall together and that a portion of the resources of this Nation should be put temporarily at the disposal of other free peoples until the non-Communist governments can recover their mutual strength.

The great bulk of the money will be distributed in western Germany and the 16 nations of Europe who were signatories at the Paris Conference. Members of the Senate Appropriations Committee traveled during the past year through these various countries. We have seen at first hand the conditions which we seek to correct through this appropriation. We have seen the shattered cities and towns that were destroyed by a war which has disrupted also the normal patterns of industry and trade. We have seen people in Europe who have turned to the false promises and early disillusionment of communism because the difficulties of ordinary living have made them lose confidence in the institutions of free government. Members of the committee believe, as most Americans believe, that free governments can be maintained in Europe if two conditions are fulfilled. The first condition is that the European nations must make a total effort to help themselves. The second condition is that some limited outside assistance be given them to start again the flow of raw materials, the movement of goods in trade and the stabilization of inflated currencies.

Obviously the resources of the United States are not adequate to meet the full needs of the world. Such aid as we can extend to nations on whose strength we can count in future years must be extended wisely and with great caution. Those of us who have seen Europe since the war have seen also vast stores of American equipment dumped in foreign fields. We have seen the production and wealth of American workers spent to no good purpose whatsoever. I can conceive of no more tragic a conclusion than that this appropriation should follow the pattern of past appropriations made by this Government in some instances for foreign aid. If such should be the case, then we should be guilty of having exploited human hope to waste the substance of this Nation.

With adequate precautions on the part of Congress and with responsible administration by those to whom these funds will be entrusted, no such consequences need occur. In the hope that such consequences will not occur the committee presents its program.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Appropriations recommends that the sum of $6,125,710,228 be provided for assistance to the people of foreign countries during the coming year. This amount is $408,000,000 below the budget estimates for the program. It is $245,000,000 above the amounts allowed by the House action on the foreign-aid bill.

To present a proper perspective of the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in relation to that of the House, however, it will be necessary to state in greater detail the differences between the bill as it passed the House and the bill that is recommended to the Senate. Actually, the committee recommendation, if adopted, would increase expenditure under this program by an indefinite amount, in excess of $1,100,000,000. The effect of the possible Senate action upon the expenditures for foreign aid can be stated in terms of the amounts recommended for the European recovery program and for China.

FOR THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The budget estimate requested $5,300,000,000 for 17 countries for 12 months.

The House allowed $5,055,000,000 for 21 countries for 15 months.

The committee recommends the sum of $5,055,000,000 for 18 countries for 12 months.

FOR THE CHINA PROGRAM

The authorization provided for $463,000,000 for 12 months, of which $125,000,000 was for grants sought by the Chinese Government.

The House allowed $400,000,000 for 15 months to be expended in accordance with the provisions for Greek-Turkey aid.

The Senate Appropriations Committee recommends that $460,000,000 be provided for 12 months, of which $125,000,000 shall be given in grants for military and other requirements of the Chinese Government.

The committee recommends that other programs which are provided for in this bill be furnished the following amounts:

Government and relief in occupied areas should have $1,325,000,000, of which $125,000,000 is earmarked for recovery in the Japanese area, and the remainder is designated for the prevention of disease and unrest in Germany, Austria, and the Japanese area.

The sum of $250,000,000 should be applied to the Greek-Turkey program, which is an increase of $50,000,000 over the House amount and a decrease of $25,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The full budget estimate of $70,710,228 is recommended for the use of the International Refugee Organization of $20,000,000 is allowed for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, which is $40,000,000 below the amount allowed by the House.

Although this bill is reported in the rush of the closing days of this session, and is presented to the Senate within a week of the vote in the House, the bill has had careful study by the Senate Appropriations Committee. We began our hearings more than a month ago without any bill before us and with no knowledge of what action the House would take. Such a procedure is highly unusual and to my knowledge has only the precedent that the Appropriations Committee made when we proceeded in advance, without waiting for House action, to study the interim aid bill.

In the committee hearings testimony was offered by many witnesses of the Government, by the individuals who will administer the funds appropriated, and by private citizens who the committee

felt had pertinent experience and knowledge.

There was evidenced strong support for the aims and purposes of the foreign-aid programs, and particularly for the European recovery program, but in all the great detail of testimony submitted to the committee there was little information on which the committee could base a firm, precise, stable, and undisputed appropriation figure.

Let me discuss with the Senate very briefly the type of evidence on which we have had to recommend this appropriation.

We were given detailed analyses of the type of goods which might move from the Western Hemisphere to the participating countries of western Europe. It was on this trade movement that the estimates for the program were computed by the executive branch of the Government, yet the committee was told, also, that ECA purchases will not be limited to the Western Hemisphere and that the dollars we appropriate in this bill may be spent anywhere on earth.

The committee was given an estimate that $22,000,000 will be required out of ECA funds to meet shipping costs and other dollar deficits during the next 12 months. The figure was derived by deducting miscellaneous dollar income from the total dollar payments for shipping of the participating nations. It was testified that, without reservation, the $22,000,000 figure is utterly unrealistic as a statement of the payments which the Administrator of the program must make to move the goods furnished.

The justifications by which the committee had to determine the amount of the appropriation were extremely general. We were not asked to provide money to purchase any particular goods or to meet any specified needs. In effect, we were told that we were buying recovery and the price tag was established by a deficit in the balance of payment arising out of projected trade patterns. The proponents of the program did not justify the expenditure of $5,300,000,000 on a reasonable basis. Instead, the committee has been challenged to justify a cut in a program that has shifted its figures constantly as the Congress has questioned the propriety of the various component parts.

From the testimony which the committee heard on the European recovery program, the members of the committee felt that for many reasons the executive branch of the Government had set some of its estimates too high.

In the list of 50 items studied there were many instances where it appeared that shipments for the coming year, in view of past European imports, were unrealistically large. Such commodities as tobacco; petroleum, agricultural machinery, fertilizer, fats and oils, and cotton were listed to move from the Western Hemisphere in relatively large quantities.

There was a fundamental doubt in the minds of many members that $4,000,000,000 can be expended wisely in the short space of a year, and there is a remaining fear that expenditures may be forced, and will result in a repetition of UNRRA tactics with wholesale dumping of American wealth in foreign lands. In this respect the committee presents the four-billion-dollar figure with hopes that the Watchdog committee, so-called, established in the authorization act can be successful as a deterrent to unwise expenditure.

Over the months in which the justifications for the foreign-aid program have been before this Congress the executive branch has shifted its studies constantly, obtaining ever-new subtotals out of the same set of facts, yet remaining always within the same $5,300,000,000 grand total of the program. Despite the vast improvement in crop prospects in Europe, imports of food and tobacco were estimated to total $308,000,000 more in March than they were estimated in December. The proposed imports of seven nations were reduced by $800,000,000 in late revisions of the estimates, and the estimated needs of the remaining nations were increased by the same amount.

It is the earnest hope of the Senate Appropriations Committee that more realistic justifications will be presented for any appropriation to be made after next January for further expenditure in 1949 and in 1950. There is no reason why this appropriation cannot be sought in terms of expenditures that somebody actually proposes to make. The Congress should be asked to provide fixed sums for relief, for development of power, for shipping costs, for inland transportation, for administration, and for various recovery items. There is no reason why this Congress should be asked to appropriate money freely for worldwide expenditure for any commodity under the sun on the basis of studies of possible trade movement between the Western Hemisphere and western Europe.

The funds the committee recommends at this time are extremely generous. It is the largest recommendation for an appropriation ever made in peacetime for foreign aid in the history of our country. If the money is expended wisely, it may result in savings in our national military budget. If the recovery program is successful to any appreciable degree, it will open certainly whole new areas of trade and enterprise to American commerce.

With faith that a better world can be built out of the hopes of mankind; with hope for the promise of restored stability of European government and trade; with hope for a strong United States in a prosperous and peaceful family of democratic nations, the Senate Committee on Appropriations presents this bill to the Senate for action and asks for its passage.

Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "for", to strike out "the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949" and insert "such periods as are specified herein ending not later than June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title I—Economic Cooperation", on page 2, line 1, after the word "until", to strike out "June 30" and insert "April 2."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is the key amendment in the bill, and I shall ask for the yeas and nays, because I think it is highly important that the position of the Senate should be unmistakably plain.

I wish to say in a sentence to the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee that I am personally profoundly grateful to him and his committee for the good faith and good spirit in which they have approached this entire problem. It has never occurred to me that the figures which came down in the estimates were untouchable. As the Senator may recall, in my own plea to the committee I was chiefly urging against the general horizontal cut of more than $1,000,000,000 involved in the pending amendment, rather than challenging any of the specific figures.

I would not undertake to say that I was in accord with the committee in respect to all the various amendments which it made; but, speaking generally and over all, I think the report is a highly acceptable one under all the circumstances, and I feel that the committee has proceeded in full accord with the tremendous undertaking which we are underwriting in the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. On behalf of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 1.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Moore
Baldwin	Hawkes	Morse
Ball	Hayden	Murray
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Revercomb
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McClellan	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Umstead
Feazel	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at the top of page 2, striking out "June 30" and inserting "April 2."

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Cain	Ives	Smith
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Stennis
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Murray	

NAYS—15

Brooks	Hawkes	Malone
Butler	Jenner	Moore
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	O'Daniel
Capehart	Kem	Revercomb
Dworshak	McClellan	Taylor

NOT VOTING—17

Brewster	McCarran	Tobey
Buck	McGrath	Wagner
Bushfield	Myers	White
Downey	Reed	Williams
George	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Langer	Thomas, Utah	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$100,000"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "purchases of typewriters and similar machines where same cannot be procured under the provisions of the Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1949:"; in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "forty" and insert "sixty"; in line 9, after the word "vehicles", to insert "purchase (not to exceed two), maintenance, and operation of aircraft:"; in line 12, after "(28 U. S. C. 921)", to insert "deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d)"; and in line 25, after the word "certified", to insert a semicolon and "and of which such amount as may be necessary but not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be available for assistance to the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones under the provisions of Public Law 389, Eightieth Congress, first session, until the Free Territory of Trieste or either of its zones becomes eligible for assistance under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which amount shall be charged with any advances made heretofore by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 103 (b) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and the Administrator is hereby authorized to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for advances pursuant to section 103 (b) from the sum available for assistance to Trieste or either of its zones under this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 13, after the amendment last above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated not less than $65,000,000 shall be utilized for acquiring in the United States nonfat dry milk solids:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 16, after the amendment last stated, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $68,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses including not to exceed $10,000,000 for direct administration and not to exceed $10,000,000 for guaranties of investment in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, after the amendment last stated, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not less than 10 percent of each special local currency account established pursuant to section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for strategic materials or other local currency requirements of the United States of America:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 3, after the amendment last stated, to strike out the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That allocations of funds provided pursuant to provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for Austria and any country under occupation by forces of the United States shall be made to the United States Military Government of such countries for administrative and other expenses:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 9, after the amendment last stated, to strike out the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 13, after the amendment last stated, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That where the Economic Cooperation Administrator requests the United States military authorities to perform certain functions under the act, the Economic Cooperation Administrator shall reimburse the military authorities for administrative expenses incurred in the performance of such functions: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $63,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 20, after the amendment last stated, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That pursuant to section 117 (c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 1, after the amendment last stated, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall not exceed $10,000,000 in the first year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 6, after the amendment last stated, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That there shall be included within the local currency administrative expenditures of the United States such sums as may be necessary to meet expenditures of members and staff of the

Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation in the course of performance of committee functions within respecting participating countries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "International Children's Emergency Fund," on page 5, line 17, after the numerals "1948", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

Mr. MORSE. I would like to have an explanation by the distinguished chairman of the committee in regard to that reduction, and I perhaps can save time by asking him whether I am correctly advised that one reason for the reduction from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000 for the International Children's Emergency Fund was the belief or finding of the committee that a certain portion of the fund was to be used behind the iron curtain.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. More than 60 percent of it last year went to countries behind the iron curtain. The committee found no evidence that there was any guaranty that the money going behind the iron curtain went to children of parents who were free with respect to their own political affiliations. In other words, the assistance, according to many of the reports which the committee received, went to children who were affiliated in some way with families who were Communist or were in favor with the governments, not to the children of parents who favored the democracies or who had no Communist feelings. This in no way shuts off all the funds. It allows a fund to go forward, but it does not provide them with as much money as they would like to have; and I have stated one of the major reasons for that.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask a second question of the Senator in regard to this particular item, referring to the information which I am sure many Senators have been receiving concerning the need for an increase in the funds for use among children in countries which are not behind the iron curtain. I inquire as to whether or not the committee is satisfied that $20,000,000 will meet the needs of children in the countries which are not behind the iron curtain?

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the answer to the question is yes. The fund already has a substantial carry-over. For instance, of the amount we appropriated last year there is a balance of something over $12,000,000, and certain other amounts are going into the fund from UNRRA. All in all, in cash and in matching funds, there is available at this time around $57,000,000. So there are adequate funds to work with, so the next objective should be to avoid indiscriminate feeding of those behind the iron curtain who are pro-Communist.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to take any more time at this late hour, other than to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee to my hope that when this matter goes to conference—and it is bound to be the subject of discussions in conference—that the Senate conferees will keep in mind, as I am sure they will, that there could hardly be a better expenditure of American dollars under the economic recovery program than the expenditure of American money for the benefit of the thousands upon thousands of homeless and orphan children in the devastated areas of Europe, the solution to whose problems after all will determine in large measure I think on the way Europe will go in the future. I certainly hope—and I shall take the Senator's word for it—that in conference the committee will make absolutely certain that all the money actually needed—and I think if we err at all on this item, we should err in the direction of over-generosity rather than of parsimony—for the help of those thousands of children will be made available. I would rather save elsewhere in the bill than save on giving aid to children, who, after all, are going to become the adults of Europe in a very few years, and will determine in large measure future American-European relations.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that there are $5,300,000,000 earmarked for children and adults of the participating countries. Much of that, of course, will find its way to the children of the free countries as well. This fund goes to the United Nations, and through United Nations participation must go to the countries all over Europe, including those behind the iron curtain. Reports of dozens and dozens of cases have come to us that this money is being used to foster Communists in countries behind the iron curtain, while others who believe in freedom and who are tinged with anticommunism in those countries are prevented from sharing in those funds, due to Government controls. There are certain steps taken by the Administrator to prevent abuses, insofar as possible, and they are making progress in that direction, but nevertheless that situation continues on a large scale.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire knows the junior Senator from Oregon does not want any of our money used to aid communism. On the other hand, if we can work out the checks within the United Nations that would make it possible even for us to help children behind the iron curtain itself, I would be willing to see some American dollars used for that purpose, if we could have at least some reasonable assurances that it would have an influence in leading the child away from communism, rather than have to implant in him more deeply doctrines of communism.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reference to page 3 of the committee report shows that the budget estimate for the Economic Cooperation Administration is $5,300,000,000 for 17 countries for 12 months. By the House action the amount is $5,055,000,000 for 21 countries for 15 months. The committee recommendation is $5,055,000,000 for 18 countries for 12 months.

In other words, Mr. President, the Senate committee has increased by a considerable amount the amount of the appropriation for the Economic Cooperation Administration, and yet the item now under consideration shows that the committee reduced by $40,000,000 the appropriation for the International Children's Emergency Fund.

Mr. President, I shall not ask for a vote, and I shall not offer any amendment, because I am hopeful that the matter can be worked out in conference, but I wish to say that it is a sad commentary upon this bill that we increase by millions the amounts available for the 18 countries of western Europe, and diminish by one-third the amount of the appropriation for the 20,000,000 hungry children of the world. What will be the comment by those who look at the action of the Senate, when they see that we have increased one fund and have diminished another that actually goes to the survival of 20,000,000 children of the world?

I mentioned in the debate on the ERP bill that the International Children's Emergency Fund needed $250,000,000; not $60,000,000, but $250,000,000. That is needed in order to give one meal a day, with matching by the countries affected, to the 20,000,000 hungry children of the world. What is to be the answer to those children, Mr. President—that we have not enough money to help them to get one meal a day?

In instance after instance we claim we are supporting the United Nations, that every individual unilateral action we take is in support of the United Nations, and yet when we look at the facts we find that when we cooperate at all with the United Nations we do it only to a very limited degree. It is an international agency functioning under the United Nations organization, yet we have given them only a pittance. Mr. President, it will not make any difference at this time, but some day someone reading the report will pass judgment upon what we do.

I simply want to register a protest against a policy which allows almost unlimited and uncounted millions for certain purposes, and nothing but penury, poverty, continued hunger, and continuing lack of cooperation with the United Nations to furnish one meal a day to the 20,000,000 hungry children of the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Florida, who speaks of hundreds of millions of dollars going to the participating countries, that a substantial part of the amount will go to the orphans and other children. A very large part of the appropriation will find its way into a program to strengthen the children of Europe. Sixty percent of the fund last year went to countries behind the iron curtain. On the day when anyone can stand on the floor of the Senate, or come before the Appropriations Committee, and say that a child born to non-Communist parents, in one of those countries behind the iron curtain, will receive an even break with children of Communist parents, I shall be willing to support appropriations. But it makes me sick and tired to appropriate money that helps to promote communism

in those countries, and at the same time, have it denied to the only friends we have in those particular countries. How must it seem to a father or mother who desires an element of freedom and does not want to bow down to Soviet domination, to find that their children are denied food from the United States, while food supplied through the International Children's Fund goes to children of Communists in slave states?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell me what children are not included?

Mr. BRIDGES. In the International Children's Fund?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. What children are not included?

Mr. BRIDGES. Those participating in the fund last year were children in Albania, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Rumania, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Uraguay, and Yugoslavia.

Mr. LANGER. I take it that the children in Germany are not included?

Mr. BRIDGES. The children in Germany are not included in this appropriation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator whether, under this amendment, all children in Communist countries will be excluded from the relief?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. All we did was to reduce the amount. We did not offer any amendment to exclude them.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the amount was cut from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000, and the same countries which have been given relief heretofore will continue to receive it?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. Because we have no control over that. It is a United Nations program. We put the money into an International Fund which is administered by the United Nations. We have no control over where the money goes.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not quite see under what theory we should make a contribution to children in outright Communist countries.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not, either; but, as a matter of fact, the only way we can prevent that is to make no contribution, because we are only one of the United Nations, and, although we supply most of the money, we cannot exercise a veto over the Fund. Therefore we must either withdraw from it, or continue our participation.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me that $60,000,000 for the relief of children is a small sum, to begin with, if it is properly distributed. If we cannot have it distributed to those to whom it should go, to people who are friendly to our cause, it strikes me that we should establish an organization of our own to the end that we make a contribution of $60,000,000 or more to children in the nations which are in sympathy with our ideals.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I am very willing to appropriate $60,000,000 and more than that in $5,300,000,000 to go to children in countries which are participating in the European recovery program, but I am unwilling to throw the money to countries behind the iron curtain, unless I have assurance that the children of parents who love and want freedom will receive an even break with the other children.

Mr. LUCAS. I have great respect and compassion for every child, wherever he might be, but I definitely know that the child that is tutored under the Communist regime will grow up to be a Communist. That is a certainty. However, I would not hesitate to give to children in countries controlled by the Communists who resist communism if I knew they were getting the relief—that I seriously question?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wish to suggest that probably the United Nations itself, in the distribution of this fund, is not free to discriminate against any of the members of the United Nations, and a number of the nations to which reference has been made here are members of the United Nations, and therefore theoretically are on the same basis with other nations. I doubt whether the United Nations itself would feel authorized to discriminate against the children of these particular countries because they happen to be behind the iron curtain, but are still members of the United Nations, and must be dealt with as such. Therefore the only way by which we could control that probably would be in the reduction of the amount.

I deeply appreciate the inadequacy of the sum of $20,000,000, even for the nations which are sympathetic with us and on our side in the controversy. Yet the $60,000,000 probably would have to be distributed under the United Nations in approximately the same proportion as it has been heretofore, because the countries are members of the United Nations, and they would not feel justified in discriminating.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator has the figures at hand, will he tell us what the total amount appropriated for the International Children's Fund has been for the present fiscal year, during the time of the existence of the organization?

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean by the United States?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; by the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. A hundred million dollars was authorized, and $40,000,000 has already been appropriated by the United States. There are still $60,000,000 authorized, but we are recommending an appropriation of $20,000,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Here is the figure I wish to call the Senate's attention. On page 12 of the committee report the following appears:

> This year the Children's Fund had an appropriation under Public Law 84 of $40,000,000 to be matched with funds of other nations in the feeding of children. Under its original matching formulas the fund was able to distribute only $15,000,000 of the amount awarded by the United States.

That means that only $15,000,000 was actually employed, because the other countries could match only $15,000,000. So we put up only $15,000,000.

I continue to read from the report:

> A revision of the matching formula in the passage of the ECA authorization bill enabled the fund to distribute in the past few months an additional $12,652,364.

That makes a total of not quite $28,000,000 we have actually disbursed. I read further:

> However, an unobligated balance of $12,347,636 remained in the fund as of May 1, 1948. In addition to funds directly appropriated by the Congress, the Children's Fund has been the recipient of several million dollars arising out of the liquidation of UNRRA. Money from this source continues to be received even at this late date.

What I wanted to suggest was, would the Senator say I was correct if I supposed that, let us say, $75,000,000 would be the outside limit of all the United States has thus far contributed to this International Children's Emergency Fund? Would I be in error if I should say $75,000,000 was the outside limit?

Mr. BRIDGES. We have not given that. We gave $40,000,000 in an appropriation last year, of which there still remains in the fund $12,652,364.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the point I wanted to make. Now we are cutting it down to $20,000,000, in addition to what has been appropriated in the past. Yet I do not think anyone would question the fact that this international organization said there were from twenty to thirty million needy children in the world, that the funds should be made available on a matching basis. I heard on the floor of the Senate that the leader of the International Children's Emergency Fund said the children were having good meals, that the Organization was getting good cooperation from all these countries, and was gradually expanding the program. Yet the record convicts us—of course not with any evil design—on the facts and the figures, even with this appropriation, of not having made $100,000,000 available to feed the twenty to thirty million hungry children in the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out to the Senator that this is just one fund. The United States has been donating billions and billions and billions of dollars over the world, some $23,000,000,000, since the war ended; and I might say to the Senator that a very large part of that has gone to feed the people of the world, a large percentage of whom have been children. So children all over the world have been among the prime beneficiaries of this very generous aid by the United States. This is just one particular project.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President, but if the Senator will allow me, I think it

is substantially accurate at least to say that that was the UNRRA program, under which that kind of relief was distributed. The children's emergency fund came along as the successor to the UNRRA program.

I am not talking about the children in only one part of the world. I am talking about a child, whether it is black, or yellow, or brown, or red, or white, wherever it is under God's shining stars.

Mr. President, the able Senator has referred to the fact that some of these children are behind the iron curtain. I wonder if it is not a fact that in the memory of Senators on this floor there was nothing that so embittered the German population, probably nothing that gave Hitler more fuel for his evil designs, than for him to be able to point to the fact that the Allies kept a blockade around Germany's coast after the end of World War I and starved the German children. I wonder whether this odious communism, which we hope will at some time, like a pest, pass from the earth, will be more aided and expedited in its passage and dissolution by making friends out of children wherever they are.

I do not question the motives of the committee, of course, but I do question the policy of showing the world that we have $5,000,000,000 to spend upon the economic recovery of 18 western European countries, but could not even match the House appropriation to meet the hunger of the world's children.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from New Hampshire and the Committee on Appropriations on what they have done with this appropriation. I think they have performed an exceptional service, and I thank the chairman and all the members of the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am grateful to the Senator for his comment.

Mr. HATCH. But I am wondering if the committee has not made a mistake in this particular item. It occurs to me a grave and serious mistake may be made right here. In the first place, we are going to herald throughout the world that the chief reduction made is in the children's fund.

Everything that has been said here tonight about hungry children is, of course, appealing to all of us, but I wish to suggest to the Senator and to the Senate that merely because a country is behind the iron curtain is no sign at all that the people of that country are Communists, or that any considerable number of them are. Take, for instance, the country of Poland, a country behind the iron curtain, or take Czechoslovakia, which is now behind the iron curtain. We can take nearly every one of the countries behind the so-called iron curtain and find that from 85 to 90 percent of the people are opposed to communism. It is only the very small minority, which has obtained control of the government by police methods, and by forcing their will upon the great mass of the population, that belongs to the Communist class. The children of those people who are not Communists are discriminated against because they happen to be behind the iron curtain.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit, they are the very ones who do not get the food when it is sent into those countries.

Mr. HATCH. We cannot send food into Poland.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly not.

Mr. HATCH. But the great majority of the children of Poland are from among those who are opposed to communism.

Mr. WHERRY. And they are the very ones who do not get the food when it is sent in there. I was over there and saw the conditions.

Mr. HATCH. If I knew that they would not receive the food, I would agree with the position taken by the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator brought UNRRA into the discussion. UNRRA was mentioned.

Mr. HATCH. I did not bring it up.

Mr. WHERRY. It was brought up in the discussion. I wish to say that I should like to support the children's fund. I certainly would on the basis of the humanitarian plea which is made to us. But the argument the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is making is the very argument by reason of which the committee did not increase the fund, but reduced it. The reason why the reduction was made was because those to whom the Senator would like to give the food over there, those who are holding out against communism, will not receive the food. We cannot reach them. I was in Russian-occupied territory. I went to the city of Wiener Neustadt, 50 miles inside the Russian-occupied territory, and I saw the conditions which prevailed there. I tell the Senate that in the distribution by UNRRA those who opposed communism were being discriminated against in the matter of food that was being distributed. I saw the discrimination with my own eyes.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I supported the committee in its action. I have a great deal of sympathy for the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who in his heart wants to help the children. So do I. I also wish to endorse what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said. With all the power at my command, I endorse the statement made by the chairman of the committee, who said that if we can be assured that the people we desire to help will receive the food, we would provide it. If I were certain of it, I would vote for any appropriation the Senate might want to make.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had not intended to yield. I wanted to get through with what I had to say as quickly as possible. The hour is late. I merely wanted to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a grave and serious mistake may be made right here and now. I will say when the word penetrates into Poland, into Czechoslovakia, and the other countries behind the iron curtain that these funds have been cut off, it may result in the making of Communists out of 85 to 90 percent of those who are this day fighting against communism as best they can, and who in the future hold the hope to overthrow the communistic governments under which they live.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico, whom I know is very sincere in what he says, that a great deal of the information which came to us formed the basis upon which we took action. The information which came to us from Czechoslovakia, from Poland, from Yugoslavia, and from other nations was that the children of those who are not in the Communist clique running the government right down to a village level, although hungry and in squalor and in desperate circumstances, did not receive the food that was sent to nourish them, while the little children of the Communists and their followers received it. That was one of the reasons why we took the action we did. I do not now know how we can help relieve that situation. The Senator was fair when he said we might or might not be making a mistake by the action we now propose to take.

Mr. HATCH. I know the Senator from New Hampshire does not want to make a mistake, and certainly if the money is going to the Communist children, whereas the children of non-Communists would be discriminated against, none of us would want to do anything that would result in such discrimination. But I am not at all sure that that is what is happening. I am not a member of the committee. I have not had the advantage of the information the committee has had. But with what little knowledge I possess of the conditions I feel that a grave mistake is being made. While there will be no yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, I personally now register my protest and disapproval of the Senate amendment, and express the hope that the House figure will remain in the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Did the Senator from New Hampshire receive any evidence on the situation in Finland? I am very much concerned with Finland, because the information I have received is that the Finnish children need this help desperately. The people of Finland have been 100 percent loyal to the things we believe in. I want to be very careful that we do not overlook some of the people who are trying to make this fight, by cutting this aid too fast and too low. I have not received the latest information on the subject, but I want to raise the question with the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to Finland, so that when the conferees meet they will look into that question, so that we may not make the mistake which the Senator from New Mexico has spoken of, and which he fears might be made.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that even with the cut which the committee made, assuming it will stand, that with the money the fund is carrying over the organization will have more money to spend next year than it spent this year.

Mr. SMITH. I was told recently by a representative of the fund that they have just $4,000,000 now in the bank; that that is all they have to use.

Mr. BRIDGES. If that is what the Senator has been told, it is different from

what the committee has been told. If the information to you is true, then testimony presented to us was false.

Mr. SMITH. I have attempted to get the accurate figures, but I have not been able to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. If they falsified the records to us, then, so far as I am concerned, they will never get another cent until such time as we learn the true situation. They seem to have said to the Senator, on the one hand, that they have but $4,000,000 left, but they certified to us they have over $12,000,000. If there is such a discrepancy, then someone is committing a very grave breach of truth. I believe in dealing with people who tell the truth. If they cannot tell the truth to us, of course, we cannot have any faith in them.

Mr. President, let us clearly understand the issue. We have dished out $23,000,000,000 for foreign aid since the war ended. We have shown ourselves to be the most generous Nation on the face of the globe. We have given aid to people all over the world. We have helped hundreds of millions of people, and tens of millions of children have been fed by reason of the appropriations we have made to aid people in foreign countries. We did not cut out the children's fund altogether. We are willing to continue it. But we cannot control the United Nations. If the committee could be sure that the children of those who have freedom in their hearts, children who are hungry and cold and who live in poverty and squalor were not going to be denied, but would receive the same aid that is given to the children of Communist parents, then we would have taken a different attitude. But as it was we left the children's fund sufficient money so that next year they will have more money to spend than they did this year.

(Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All in favor will say "Aye."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has been very helpful to me in presenting facts on this matter of which I was not aware when the debate started, and I think I have two more questions to which I am going to seek to obtain an answer from the Senator and I know he will cooperate with me in giving the answers. Am I correct in my understanding that this is the only part of the bill that involves the appropriation to any United Nations organization?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; more than $70,000,000 is provided for the International Refugee Organization, which we left as budgeted, which was the exact amount requested.

Mr. MORSE. There are two appropriations then in the bill to divisions of the United Nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. And this one affecting the children involves a cut from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000. Now I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if it is not true that when we appropriate the $20,000,000 and assume that the $20,000,000 stands in conference the same proportion of the $20,000,000 will go supposedly to children behind the iron curtain that would go to them if we appropriate the $60,000,000. We are in no way changing the fact that we are aiding children behind the iron curtain who may be of Communist heritage except we are not giving so much money of the total program?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. I might say that the moral effect might be that the United Nations group administering the fund might tighten their regulations so that they can have stricter control and see that the true objective is reached.

Mr. MORSE. I think I have made clear to the Senator from New Hampshire that I share his views that I am not in favor of building up communism in the world, but does the Senator think that there is any danger that the proposed action on this particular item may result in the reaction throughout the world that when it comes to giving support to the United Nations this is another evidence of our retreating from cooperating with the United Nations rather than giving this particular division of the United Nations support?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator that this last year we gave so much that they could not match it. It looks as though they may not be able to match the appropriation this year.

Mr. MORSE. I am greatly impressed by the fact that apparently they are going to have more money under this appropriation this year than they had last year.

Mr. BRIDGES. Slightly more.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much concerned about the propaganda abroad in the world that we talk about supporting the United Nations only when it is favorable to us to support the United Nations, but that when we are called upon to give aid which may be of special benefit to some other nation, and not necessarily to us, then we find a spirit of noncooperation with the United Nations creeping into American policy. I am inclined to share at least a part of the view of the Senator from New Mexico, that this cut might result in further propaganda. I admit that we are going to be faced with Russian propaganda anyway, but the result may be further Russian propaganda that this is another evidence that we are not giving actual support, but only lip service to the United Nations.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand, the reduction will apply just the same among the free nations as it does among the nations behind the iron curtain, so all the children will be affected. Is this sum sufficient to carry out the matching program, or are we reducing aid to all the nations, whether they are behind the iron curtain or not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from New Mexico overlooks one fact——

Mr. HATCH. I am merely trying to get the facts. I am not familiar with them.

Mr. BRIDGES. In this appropriation we are giving more than $5,000,000,000 for economic relief.

Mr. HATCH. Let me interrupt to say that I realize full well that that relief is of decided advantage and benefit so far as helping children is concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. The people of the free countries who receive direct relief will probably——

Mr. HATCH. They will probably not need so much.

Mr. BRIDGES. They will be taken care of to a large degree, so the cuts will come in the countries behind the iron curtain, because we are supplementing our aid in such a generous way in other countries.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it was a reasonable attitude for us to take.

Mr. HATCH. I am still concerned that a mistake is being made, but I want to be very straightforward and say that I certainly understand that the committee intends no mistake. However, in connection with these complicated matters it is very easy to make a mistake. If we are to make a mistake, I would rather make it anywhere else than in connection with aid to children.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In fairness, and so that the RECORD may contain the statement which the committee had before it, Mr. Maurice Pate, Executive Director of the International Children's Organization, on page 144 of the hearings, in response to an inquiry by the chairman, testified as follows:

> Mr. PATE. In each country we have set up a small mission of international staff, that is, of citizens of countries other than the country in which they operate, and these missions run anywhere from one in the case of a very small country like Albania to half a dozen in a larger country like Poland.
>
> The mission is in constant contact with the government or with local agencies handling the distribution of food. In each country the staff moves about observing the distribution, seeing that the general policies of the fund are carried out.

I thank the chairman of the committee for allowing me to place that statement in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Florida that I was one member of the committee who had some misgivings, along with others, about cutting the funds. On the other hand, I wish to say to the able chairman of the committee that I sat through the hearings and listened to Mr. Pate. The testimony before us showed that a number of heads of missions in countries behind the iron curtain were citizens of other countries behind the iron curtain. During the hearings I raised the point as to why, for example, a Swiss citizen rather than a citizen of Yugoslavia was not used as head of a mission.

Rather than Yugoslavia using a Pole as the head of a mission, I raised the question as to why they did not use Swiss, Swedes, or someone else, so that we could feel sure that there was not the type of discrimination to which reference has been made. I believe that if the United Nations itself will try to solve that problem, it will find the Congress in a more generous mood.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I rise to pay tribute to the American people and the American taxpayers for their generosity and their charity, and for the help which they have given to the peoples of the world since the war ended, and before. We have been the most generous people in the history of the world. I am sure that the Congress of the United States, and particularly Members of the Senate, will join me in paying great tribute to the American taxpayers for their generosity and their charity, because they have been generous and they have been charitable. They have paid the bills which the Congress has incurred through appropriations since the war ended, and during the war, and they have accepted the burden with a smile. I, for one, want to pay great tribute to the taxpayers of America. I pay tribute to their generosity and their charity. I know of no equal in the history of the world. No other peoples have been so generous. It would be appropriate for the Senate of the United States to stand for at least half a minute in silent tribute to the generosity of the American people.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I made it known earlier in the evening that I wanted to speak on the bill. I would have preferred to speak before the vote was taken on the second amendment, shortening the time; but it was said that it was desired to get the vote over so that some of the older Members could go home, because they were tired. Therefore I take it that all Senators left in the Chamber are young, hale, and hearty. However, I do not intend to abuse the privilege of the floor. I had estimated, and so stated, that I might speak for half an hour; but I shall cut that time in two, and hope to get through sooner than that.

Mr. President, I voted against the so-called Marshall plan when it was before the Senate, because I felt that it bypassed the United Nations. If I had it to do over again—and I do have in another form tonight—I would still vote against it. I intend to vote against the bill. I am opposed to the plan. I think it is becoming apparent—to me, at any rate—that this is the most colossal hoax ever perpetrated upon any people, including the American taxpayers.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] just paid tribute to the generosity of the American people. I think they are being sadly imposed upon in this so-called European Economic Cooperation Administration scheme.

Recently I purchased a copy of the New York Times. I bought it in North Carolina, so it was an early edition. I saw an article in it which astounded me. When I returned to my office I told my staff about it and they could not believe that what I told them was true. I said, "Get the New York Times and read it for yourselves." We get a copy in the office. They got the New York Times for that particular day, and looked all through it; and they said, "There is nothing like you say in the New York Times."

So I looked at it and, lo and behold, the article was not there.

So I went home and got my copy of the New York Times, and brought it down to the office and spread that page of my copy down beside the corresponding page of the office copy of the New York Times. I found that the two pages were identical, with the exception of the one article which I had quoted. That article had been left out of the other edition of the Times, and another one had been substituted.

Since then I have come to have a better understanding of why such a thing could happen, since I have learned that $10,000,000 of the money to be appropriated here is to go to the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and to the magazines Time, Life, News Week, and Reader's Digest, I believe, as their part of a reward for helping sell the Europeans, presumably, on the Marshall plan. But of course it is hard to separate the funds. When those publications get the money, they are anxious to sell the plan to anyone.

Of course, Mr. President, the American people, including the Members of the Senate, were told that the European Recovery Program was necessary because people were starving, or that it was necessary because people in Europe were in imminent danger of starving. I read an interesting item in the Wall Street publication Financial Aid. I do not know whether they were boasting about how clever the advocates of the Marshall plan were, or what their object was in printing this statement: but the article said that the State Department sent out two different groups of speakers—with many teams to each group, of course; but one group of speakers went to women's clubs and church organizations, and told them, "The Marshall plan is to feed hungry people, especially starving babies; and you good religious people, you women, certainly will support the Marshall plan, won't you?"

And of course those people said, "Yes."

Another group of speakers was sent out by the State Department to businessmen's organizations, such as chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, and what not. They told those businessmen, "Don't let anybody kid you at all. This Marshall plan is going to get business for American business and American products." They were that cynical in selling the Marshall plan.

Anyway, I heard those arguments.

I should have liked to vote for the Marshall plan in the first instance, if it had been channeled through the United Nations, because I want to see the United Nations work; I believe it should be strengthened; I think it is our one best hope. I was elected on the basis of supporting the United Nations, and I intend to keep that pledge.

Now I shall read the headline of an article which appeared in the New York Times; it will be sufficient to read the headline, and then I shall describe "on the cuff" the material following the headline:

Europe feels pang—

Mr. President, a pang is a pain; it is bad; it is not good—

Europe feels pang of—

Mr. President, what do you imagine the pang is that Europe feels? After all the sad tales we have been told about the necessity of the Marshall plan, surely the pang Europe feels must be a pang of hunger or of starvation, or perhaps it is pestilence as a result of starvation.

No; it is none of those things. The headline says:

Europe feels pang of overproducing.

Is not that a terrible pang for our friends in Europe to suffer? We must hurry up with the Marshall plan, so as to alleviate that situation and ease that pain, that pang that is afflicting our brethren across the ocean.

The article following the headline states that in Holland food is being destroyed; that in many parts of Europe production is being curtailed because in many lines they have produced more than they can sell.

To substantiate that, I shall quote from the United States News and World Report for May 14. This is a publication aimed at businessmen. In speaking about Europe, it says:

Surpluses are beginning to show here and there.

Mr. President, the reference is to Europe, of course.

Surpluses are beginning to show here and there. Dutch vegetables, Italian fruits, German textiles, are examples. These things are spoiling or sitting in warehouses. It is not that they are not needed by neighboring countries. At the bottom, it is money trouble that is blocking trade.

Imagine, Mr. President! Food spoiling in warehouses in Holland; Italian fruit spoiling—fruit that is needed by everyone to maintain health, and that is needed especially by children. Of course, I imagine that in Italy they raise a good many oranges. But that fruit is spoiling because people do not have little pieces of paper with certain figures and pictures on it, possibly. Italy, with the lowest standard of living in Europe, is destroying food; and even in Germany, textiles are piling up in the warehouses, unused.

Mr. President, in view of this information, I can come to no other conclusion than that the Marshall plan is a hoax. I can see reasons for it, other than feeding hungry people. It is evident that is not the reason. If all the people of Europe lack is money with which to buy their own products, it strikes me as rather foolish that we should have to send them money with which to buy their own products. The New York Times and the United States News and World Report say their products are spoiling.

Here is something that may give us a clue as to what the Marshall plan is really for. I read from the New York Times of May 14:

Pressure is urged on Latin-America. Banker wants ECA—

That is the Economic Cooperation Administration—

buy plan used to end Argentine trade bars and spur Brazil payments.

In other words, you bribe them with Marshall plan funds to lower their trade bars so our monopolists can grow richer; and in Brazil they have already bought stuff they cannot pay for, so we give them some Marshall plan money to pay our monopolists for stuff they have sold on credit and cannot collect for.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in the case of Marshall-plan funds, so far as I can find out, the object is to enable our cartelists and our monopolists to gain control of the economic life of foreign nations with these bribes to corrupt politicians, enabling our businessmen to infiltrate and get control of foreign business.

Of course, we are sending billions of dollars' worth of our products abroad. It may be only a coincidence that makes things here at home scarce and keeps prices high in this country. That may be only a coincidence, although the Marshall plan was conceived and perpetrated on the American people, it happens, at a time when we were just about to get over the hump of production, here at home, and be able to buy an automobile or a Frigidaire, or whatever we might happen to want, at a respectable price. But along came the Marshall plan and a big armament program to keep things scarce again.

So we have the Marshall plan going through the Senate at a very late hour at night, when one is hesitant to discuss it at any length. There are a great many things I should like to say about it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my good friend from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the Senator saw the article in the Times-Herald a few days ago, saying that the New York Times was getting nearly a million dollars out of the amendment on page 5, line 2.

Mr. TAYLOR. I read that article, not in the Herald Tribune. I read it some place, though, about the bonus being paid to the newspapers and magazines.

Mr. LANGER. The Times-Herald was getting $850,000, according to that article; is not that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Times-Herald in Washington?

Mr. LANGER. No. I mean the Herald Tribune of New York.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes, yes.

Mr. LANGER. And Fortune magazine, and Life?

Mr. TAYLOR. Time.

Mr. LANGER. And Time?

Mr. TAYLOR. And the New York Times.

Mr. LANGER. I mean Time magazine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; Time magazine and the newspaper, the New York Times.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator remember whether in that list any single newspaper opposed to the Marshall plan received one single dollar?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. no; no newspaper opposed to the Marshall plan got anything. In fact, the Chicago Tribune, which was opposed to the Marshall plan, was very much upset over the whole thing.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not a fact also that the various magazines I have mentioned time and time again have carried beautiful photographs of some of the leading Members of this distinguished body?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, anybody who has been for the Marshall plan could get plenty of space in those publications.

Mr. LANGER. I understand some of that money is going to the movie magnates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I guess they need the movies to help them sell the plan. They need every means of propaganda to sell a scheme like this. There is no doubt about it at all.

Mr. LANGER. Under the amendment they have reduced it from $15,000,000 to $10,000,000, I understand.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is to make the people feel good and think how much they have saved.

Mr. LANGER. I take it that is covered by line 2 of the amendment on page 5, which says, "That guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall not exceed $10,000,000 in the first year."

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a very clever technique. First, they are to be given $15,000,000; then, when it is cut down to $10,000,000, the people are duly grateful and very happy that it only costs them $10,000,000 to learn all about the Marshall plan. Of course, Mr. President, it is difficult for the people to find out about these things because of this subsidy to the press, which has pulled the wool over the eyes of the American people. So we have the sorry prospect of using the taxpayers' money also to guarantee the profits of American industry.

Here is another little item from the United States News and World Report, "How to Earn Dollars Abroad," is the title of it. It says, "Guarantees of payment in U. S. currency." This is from the United States News and World Report of May 14 again. The heading on the article says, "Money invested in Europe by private investors is to get some Government protection. Profits, if any, will be paid in dollars."

There is the answer to the Marshall plan. Our businessmen are muscling in on the folks over in Europe, taking over; but they cannot get their profits out. Marks, lire, and francs are no good to them, so they figure out a Marshall plan, and now the taxpayers are going to be taxed to guarantee the profits in dollars to our businessmen over there in those countries. The article goes on to say, "The idea is to lessen the risk of doing business abroad and encourage new enterprises." Listen to this next line: "European recovery, too, will be helped." That is the whole thing they worry about—"European recovery, too, will be helped." That is wonderful. Hallelujah?

Mr. President, I could go on and talk all night about this thing and never say the same thing twice.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand the bill, then, we are appropriating $20,000,000 to feed all the hungry children in this world; then we are appropriating half as much for the New York Times, the New York Herald, Fortune magazine, Newsweek, and Time magazine.

Mr. TAYLOR. Time and Life.

Mr. LANGER. And Life, and a few movie institutions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Is that right?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, of course, they got The Iron Curtain out of that money given to the movies, and they will get more. I do not believe the people who are foisting these measures on the American people are generally worried about the Communist threat; they are just stirring it up all the time so they can get away with these great appropriations for armament profits, for the Marshall plan to guarantee their profits abroad, and to pay the newspapers and magazines for selling the people on the idea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, line 17.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are asked for.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator insist upon a quorum call?

Mr. LANGER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Baldwin	Hatch	Moore
Ball	Hawkes	Morse
Barkley	Hayden	Murray
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Holland	Pepper
Butler	Ives	Revercomb
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McClellan	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Umstead
Feazel	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, line 17. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Assistance to Greece and Turkey," on page 5, line 24, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$250,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Assistance to China," on page 6, line 21, after the word "until", to strike out "June 30, 1949" and insert "April 2, 1949"; in line 25, after the word "aircraft", to insert "deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321 (d));"; on page 7, line 7, after the word "exchange", to strike out "$400,000,000, of which not to exceed $1,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses" and insert "$460,000,000, of which $125,000,000 shall be available exclusively as provided in subsection 404 (b) of said act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 11, after the word "Act", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That expenditures hereunder shall be made and administered in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives and the limitations provided in the Act for Assistance to Greece and Turkey (Public Law 75, 80th Cong.), as amended and supplemented by the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Military Establishment—Department of the Army—Civil Functions—Government and Relief in Occupied Areas," on page 8, line 21, after the word "Army", to strike out "such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; $1,250,000,000" and insert "such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $1,325,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 21, after the word "Congress", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 1, after the numerals "1948", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided,* That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 18, after the word "purposes", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That such agreement shall, where applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 23, after the word "Congress", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including Territorial ports, to ports in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such countries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 7, after the word "countries", to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the Secretary of the Army shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan, Korea, or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 14, after the word "transportation", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That service during the fiscal year 1949 of an individual rendered to the Department of the Army under this appropriation as an expert, consultant, or technician shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—International activities," on page 12, line 19, after the word "contribution", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for contribution to the International Regugee Organization until such time as there are effected agreements providing for a caloric diet for the occupants of refugee camps that is no higher than that prevailing in the country in which such camps are located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—General provisions," on page 13, line 10, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947," and in line 24, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 202. No funds made available under the authority of this act shall be used for the purchase of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended), at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase: *Provided,* That no funds available under this act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 202. None of the funds available under this act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 6, to strike out section 203, as follows:

SEC. 203. Not more than $50,000,000 of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the purchase of farm machinery, including farm tractors.

And in lieu thereof to insert a new section 203, as follows:

SEC. 203. No part of of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to purchase farm machinery in the United States in an amount which will bring the total purchases of such machinery during fiscal year 1949, in the United States, by or for the benefit of the countries participating in the European recovery program, to more than $75,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 15, to strike out section 204, as follows:

SEC. 204. Whenever an export license for a commodity, the production or shipment of which to a nonparticipating country was contracted for in good faith prior to March

1, 1948, is denied and cannot be obtained under section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, the Administrator shall provide for the procurement of such commodity to transfer to a participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, at not less than the contract price of such commodity to the producer or exporter, as the case may be, including any cost incurred in converting the commodity to meet the requirements of the participating country.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 2, to strike out section 205, as follows:

SEC. 205. Not less than 50 percent of all nitrates or nitrogenous fertilizer material, including anhydrous ammonia, obtained for participating countries by the Economic Cooperation Administration under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 with funds provided herein shall come from production of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Army is hereby authorized to produce and sell such nitrogenous fertilizer materials, including anhydrous ammonia, to fill such 50 percent of such export requirements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 204. Not less than 50 percent of the United States export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) for nonoccupied areas shall come from production of plants operated by or for the Department of the Army. The Department of the Army is hereby authorized to produce and sell, in addition to its production for occupied areas, such nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including andydrous ammonia) required for United States exports to nonoccupied areas and to credit the proceeds of such export sales to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 24, to change the section number from "206" to "205."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is an article in yesterday morning's newspaper which expresses very well the thought which I have before expressed, particularly regarding the authorization of this legislation. I want to read one paragraph of the article in the nature of a summary of what I think is the truth about the program. This is an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann. I read:

The failure of the European governments and of the State Department to promote the political unity of Europe and to uphold the authority of the United Nations has sapped the only foundation on which sustained American support of the recovery program could rest. No doubt it required high statesmanship to put the program on a constructive foundation. It was much easier to put it across as a measure of the cold war, to depend on the fear of communism rather than on faith in a new democratic order.

I realize that it is rather late in the discussion of this question again to refer to the subject, but I merely want to reiterate my belief that this program has been and is continuing to be restricted too closely to the economic aspect, and that the political aspect, particularly the political unity of Europe, has been neglected. I doubt very seriously, unless something is done along that line, that it will be successful.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire article in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN EXPECTATIONS

(By Walter Lippmann)

"Until then I beg of you," said Senator VANDENBERG, "that you give ECA a fair chance." Until when? Until "next January when we shall know whereof we speak. When the second annual appropriation impends, we shall know what kind of job Administrator Hoffman and his staff are doing. We shall know to what extent self-help and mutual cooperation are meeting our expectations."

Though these words were part of Senator VANDENBERG's appeal to Congress to honor a solemn commitment, they carry with them an urgent warning to the leading governments of Europe and also to the President and the Department of State. It is a warning that the continuation of ECA is not assured by the original authorization, nor will it be if the Martin-Taber raid is repulsed. It is notice that "a general overhaul," as Mr. VANDENBERG put it—that is to say a general reconsideration of the basic policy—will be undertaken by the next Administration and the next Congress. It will be undertaken not merely by the enemies of ECA but by its strongest supporters,—who will then "know to what extent self-help and mutual cooperation are meeting our expectations."

No doubt 6 months—for that is what it comes to—will seem like an exceedingly short time in which to prove that ECA should be continued. But if the European governments, and particularly the British and French, make a serious effort to understand the real attitude of this country, they will know what kind of action on their part will in fact meet American "expectation."

They will find, I believe, that the key to the mystery is that while the European recovery program has been "justified" by a torrent of statistics, in fact this extraordinary enterprise, unique in the history of the world, will have to be justified by intangible, uneconomic, political and moral results. The American people hope, of course, that production will rise, that trade will increase, that inflation will be mastered, and that the balance of payments will be righted. But what they are really looking for are signs which they can take seriously that a new Europe is in the making.

It is because signs of that kind are lacking that even the first appropriation for ECA is in danger. For the Martin-Taber attack reflected not so much the strength of the opposition to the recovery program as it did the lack of strong conviction on the part of its supporters. They were absent from the House in large numbers, and those who were present did not fight very effectively. Why? Because, so it seems to me, the governments in Europe and the State Department here have deflated the hopes of the people. In the past few months they have seen "western union" degenerate into little more than an impotent military alliance. They have seen the United Nations maltreated. They have seen the Labor government cold shoulder the movement for European union. They have seen their own government invite the Russians to talk, and then unable to think of anything to say.

As a result, if they have not become isolationists, they are certainly disillusioned at the prospect of huge subsidies, huge armaments, and the draft, all at the expense of housing, health, education, and internal development, with no progress toward a new and better international order.

The failure of the European governments and of the State Department to promote the political unity of Europe and to uphold the authority of the United Nations has sapped the only foundation on which sustained American support of the recovery program could rest. No doubt it required high statesmanship to put the program on a constructive foundation. It was much easier to put it across as a measure of the cold war, to depend on the fear of communism rather than on faith in a new democratic order.

But fear will not sustain a continuing effect. It will work for a few emergencies but not for 4 years. It is good for a sprint but not for a long run. The Russians, once they are bright enough to realize that we are depending on their provocations to generate the steam to carry on, have only to stop being quite so irritating in order to reduce the pressure. Then, no longer frightened but without a sustaining faith in place of their fears, the people's interest languishes. It is languishing now. That is where MARTIN and TABER saw their opportunity.

These are the imponderables, I think, which men like Attlee, Cripps, and Bevin, Schumann, Rene Mayer, and Bidault will do well to take very seriously if—6 months hence when the ECA must undergo a more crucial test than the MARTIN-TABER affair—they intend to meet what Senator VANDENBERG called American "expectations" about the extent of self-help and mutual cooperation in Europe.

It will not be good enough for them to complain about the uncertainty of American public opinion. If they are fair about it, and also wise, they will recognize that what the American public is being asked to do is something which no people has ever before been asked to do, and that, therefore, this altogether unprecedented enterprise can be sustained only if they contribute to it not merely sweat and austerity but also audacity and faith.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, have all the amendments been acted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All but one. The clerk will state the last amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 3, to change the section number from "207" to "206."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now open to further amendment.

The Chair agreed to recognize the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I had intended to discuss this bill at considerable length. For rather obvious reasons I shall not do so. I do want to say, however, that I believe this scheme to effectuate European recovery by the appropriation of this very large sum of money may undermine the American economy and may well make our Nation as vulnerable to communism as are those we are seeking to aid.

Such a plan entails the risk of an unparalleled price debacle at home. Already the American housewife is beginning to feel the inflationary effects of the artificial foreign demand created by our gifts of dollars. Only a few days ago we read headlines telling of record high meat prices. A Missourian recently sent me a telegram complaining of the rising cotton prices, particularly as they affected the cost of his cotton shirts. I went to the Department of Agriculture and was informed there that the upsurge in the cotton market is due in no small part to the placing of orders by foreign purchasing agents to be filled when the

$511,000,000 in the Marshall plan funds for the purchase of cotton is forthcoming for the use of their respective foreign governments.

Every ton of steel and every barrel of oil we send abroad without the benefit that comes from ordinary foreign trade weakens by that much our own national economy. The United States simply does not have an inexhaustible supply of resources. Although this vast dumping operation may serve to prolong the Truman artificial prosperity, anyone who supports this plan upon that theory, or for such a reason is living in a fool's paradise.

In my judgment, the plan we are about to implement by this gigantic appropriation poses a grave threat to our traditional capitalist economy. Heavy tax rates necessitated in no small part by heavy spending abroad, combined with the rise in consumer price levels, have drastically reduced the savings of our middle-income group available for capital accumulation. There is real danger that there will not be sufficient accumulated savings and invested capital to supply the needs for machinery and tools in our industry of the future.

Mr. President, I stated before my belief that the welfare of the people of the United States, and not the people in foreign lands across the seas, should be the first concern of the American Congress.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Am I correct in understanding the Senator's trend of thinking in this matter to be that if these large appropriations are used for the purchase of goods in this country, the effect is further inflation?

Mr. KEM. I do not see how it could be otherwise. We are already seeing the effects, and the process has just begun, in my humble opinion.

Mr. MALONE. Am I to understand further, then, that the making of these huge loans and the consequent siphoning off of incomes and the increases in the wages of workers, which was done first, according to Mr. Roosevelt and others of the administration for the past 10 years, with the announced purpose of preventing inflation, prevents, in the Senator's opinion, the proper accumulation of venture capital for investment?

Mr. KEM. Precisely so. I think evidence of that is already available.

Mr. President, I should like to correct the Senator from Nevada in one respect. I prefer to refer to these remittances to foreign countries, not as loans, but as gifts or grants. I do not see how anyone who reviews our experience of the past 20 years in distributing our wealth around the world can regard these remittances otherwise than outright gifts and grants. I think we are living in a fool's paradise if we call them anything else.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know how much of the money is going for tobacco?

Mr. KEM. I shall get to that in a very few minutes. It is a very surprisingly large amount.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. Why does the Senator think that there is not an inexhaustible supply of funds in the United States so that we can continue this course forever?

Mr. KEM. I think the figures we have indicate the answer, and I believe there is already evidence of the supply of funds and goods being drained away.

Mr. HAWKES. Does not the Senator think we are acting in everything we are doing in connection with those great gifts, as though there were no bottom to the barrel?

Mr. KEM. Exactly so.

Mr. HAWKES. And does not the Senator realize that in every bit of this money we are giving, in excess of that which is necessary to keep people from starving, we are taking a chance of about 10 to 1 of making a contribution to communism, because when the barrel bottom is reached, so that we can no longer buy friendship, I say that if communism is going to spread in Europe, it will spread then, and the Communists will take over all the contributions we have made and all the gifts we have given.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator. I think that was very aptly said.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Can the Senator tell me whether he knows when the European recovery program got the "new look?" It is now the "European Cooperation Administration."

Mr. KEM. I think it was originally known as the Truman plan. Then it became the Marshall plan. Then it became the European recovery plan, and I think it now has the "new look," to which the Senator from Indiana has referred, and I believe it is called the "Economic cooperation plan".

Mr. JENNER. Is it the Senator's understanding that Europe has already made sufficient recovery so that the program does not need to be called a recovery program?

Mr. KEM. I cannot advise the Senator why the frequent change in name.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator was here the other day when we passed the displaced persons bill, was he not?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. JENNER. When we passed the European recovery program, as I understood the proposal—and I believe the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made the address outlining it—he explained to me and the other Members of the Senate that the main purpose of the European recovery program was to help the European people get up off their knees so that we would not have to go on taking care of them forever. Is not that correct?

Mr. KEM. I believe it was something along that line.

Mr. JENNER. It was said that what they needed most was production, but under the displaced persons program, as I understand it, 200,000 are to be permitted to come into the United States, and of the 200,000, 50 percent are to be agricultural workers, and the remaining 50 percent are to be skilled mechanics and skilled technicians. So, following the theory that the idea was to have Europe get on its feet so that it could help itself, what business have we today permitting 200,000 of their skilled workmen to come to America? Why should we send them our money and our material wealth, and then bring over 200,000 skilled workmen from Europe, when they are needed there? Can the Senator explain that to me?

Mr. KEM. Perhaps some other Senator can explain it. I cannot.

Mr. JENNER. Can anyone explain it to me? In the absence of response, I will sit down. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I appreciate the very pertinent suggestion the Senator from Indiana has made, and I thank him for it.

I pointed out on a previous occasion my belief that emotional interest exhibited in some quarters today in favor of distributing around the world the accumulated wealth of the people of this country, accumulated by many generations of thrifty and frugal-minded people, appears to be one of those strange emotional epidemics or moral manias which have excited the minds of men from time to time at many stages in the world's history. For example, there were the children's crusade of the Middle Ages, the South Sea bubble, the tulip craze, the witchcraft persecutions in Europe and America.

Mr. President, I shall be as brief as I can, and merely sketch the points I have in mind.

I wish to say that tonight we are confronted with the question of providing billions of dollars called for by a seemingly endless series of foreign adventures. Tonight we are confronted face to face with a proposition that 2 and 2 make 4 and always have.

Those who oppose the authorization of these plans are, of course, faced with a difficult decision. We can either vote to provide the funds asked for by the Administration and allow these experiments to run their course, a course which some of us believe to be perilous to the welfare and happiness of our people, or we can make an effort to salvage as much of the taxpayers' money as possible by cutting down as much as we can the pouring out of money of American taxpayers in these foreign schemes.

I must admit, Mr. President, that I gave serious consideration to offering no objection, either by word or vote, to allowing Mr. Truman and Mr. Marshall to carry out what may perhaps prove to be a last futile fling at global spending. However, I could not bring myself to evade the responsibility I feel to the people of my State, just as I could not bring myself to fail to raise my voice tonight. I cannot help but remember the solemn pledge I made to the people of my State in the last election to make every effort to reduce governmental expenditures wherever possible. Furthermore, I cannot shirk my duty to the American people to take every step I can, as futile as it

may be, to protect and preserve our American institutions, which have given us the highest standard of living the world has ever seen.

Now we are told, Mr. President, there is nothing to justify a reduction in appropriations for foreign aid in 1948. Economic Cooperative Administrator Hoffman stated, according to the press, in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee that less money means less recovery. The Secretary of State characterized the action of the House in reducing these funds as changing the picture from a calculated risk of success to a calculated risk of failure.

I should say that there not only can but should be a sharp reduction for 1948, and here are some of the reasons. In the first place, Mr. President, the House of Representatives was guilty of no hasty and ill-considered action. In the second place, the House of Representatives is the traditional source of decision on matters of appropriations. I shall not, as I intended to do, sketch the history of that situation, but I should like to quote the word of a man whom I hope is still honored in America. A grand committee of the constitutional convention recommended that "all bills for raising or appropriating money shall originate in the first branch of the Legislature, and shall not be altered or amended by the second branch."

A member of that committee was Dr. Benjamin Franklin. He was asked what purpose was intended to be served by the restrictions on the second branch. He remarked that it was always of importance that the people should know who had disposed of their money and how it has been disposed of. "It was a maxim," said he, "that those who feel, can best judge."

So it would seem to me to be wise to give very careful consideration and attention to the recommendations of the branch of Congress which must answer to the people this year for what is being done in connection with this appropriation. Certainly it was the intention of the founding fathers that we should do so.

In the second place, foreign aid is no substitute for national defense. During the hearings held before the Foreign Relations Committee Secretary of the Army Royall said:

> Without such effort—

That is, the passage of the pending bill—

> the Army budget and the Army itself should be increased.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has asked me something about tobacco. I should like to review very briefly, so the people may know just what is being done in that connection in the appropriation bill. According to the latest estimates available $138,000,000 of the Marshall plan funds would be utilized for the purchase of tobacco during the first 15 months of the program. I suppose under the Senate amendments that amount will apply to the first 12 months of the program. Is that correct, I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LANGER. Let me say, Mr. President, I understand it is $299,000,000. In other words, we give $20,000,000 to feed all the children in the world, and 10 times as much for tobacco.

Mr. KEM. The figure I have received is $138,000,000. My authority is the United States News.

Mr. LANGER. I have the figures; $299,000,000——

Mr. KEM. For tobacco alone?

Mr. LANGER. That is the total for tobacco alone, of which we supply $110,200,000.

Mr. KEM. I am frank to say, Mr. President, the situation is much worse than I had understood. In other words, I understand that this enormous sum of money, more than $200,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money, will be used to send gifts of tobacco abroad to countries whose people are said to be starving, and whose economic recovery is at stake. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if that is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is about correct respecting the amount of tobacco that is being sent abroad.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if $35,000,000 is the amount provided for coffee to be distributed free of charge among the participating nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. One hundred and eighteen million three hundred thousand dollars worth of coffee will move from the Western Hemisphere, of which amount we will pay $26,100,000.

Mr. KEM. Our portion of the gift is $26,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, plus.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who pays for the difference between $118,000,000 and $26,000,000?

Mr. BRIDGES. Forty-four million eight hundred thousand dollars will be paid out of their own dollar earnings or from some other source. Sixteen million two hundred thousand dollars is paid out of loans and credits which they receive from some other sources. Twenty-six million one hundred thousand dollars is what we pay for.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, we loan them other moneys, but in reality do not we pay for it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot tell the Senator where it comes from. It is listed in the justification as loans and credits from other sources.

Mr. KEM. When this plan was first suggested, representatives of the tobacco industry came to my office and suggested that they had a plan to send a large amount of tobacco abroad, and they suggested that, Missouri being a tobacco-producing State, I should be interested in the project. I inquired who was to pay for the tobacco. I was told that under the plan it would be paid for by the United States Government. I asked what was to be done with the tobacco, and was told it was to be given to the starving peoples of the world.

Mr. President, it seemed to me when that proposition was presented by the representatives of the tobacco interests that it was too preposterous even to be considered seriously by the Congress of the United States. Yet, Mr. President, that is exactly what is now about to be done.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know how much Coca-Cola we are going to send abroad?

Mr. KEM. I do not have the figures on that. Perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire could give them.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will answer that question. We export about $398,000 of sweetened sirups to participating countries, but it is not my understanding that that comes directly out of these funds. It is out of some other exchange or dollar credits.

Mr. KEM. But the American Treasury pays for it in the end, does it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. They have other dollar earnings which are used for that particular purpose.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if there is not this difference between tobacco and coffee: When tobacco is given away, something comes back to the American producer; when coffee is given away, the proceeds go to South America, Java, or some other place in the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEM. So it is a total loss to the American economy.

As I understand, the only reply which has come from the Administration with respect to these items is this: They say simply that the programs have been scaled down to rock bottom, and that we must not appropriate a penny less.

Mr. President, there is another reason, it seems to me, why we should pause and consider what we are doing, and that is that a large part of the funds we are about to grant will be granted to participating countries—that is, the 16 countries of western Europe—to meet obligations to the United States. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder, in his testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on May 25, stated:

> In arriving at the estimates of aid requirements the National Advisory Council assumed that the countries participating would be required to use their present and future exchange income to meet their existing financial obligations falling due to the United States and third countries, including both obligations to governments and to private citizens.

What this means, as I understand, is that in the last analysis the American taxpayer is being asked to give money to France, Britain, and other participating countries in order that those countries may continue to pay interest to us, or perhaps installments on debts. In other words, we are making gifts of money to our debtor nations in order that they may pay us what they owe us. What I should like to ask is this: How in the name of common sense, if we start that kind of business, are we ever going to collect any debt anywhere in all the world?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. What reason has the Senator for thinking that they are going to pay us anything—interest on our debts or anything else? I had not heard that they were going to do that.

Mr. KEM. I do not think they are. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that the reason why I am so particularly concerned about this situation is that in my judgment we are creating a precedent that will make it impossible for our children and our children's children to carry on foreign trade with other nations of the world, because those nations will have acquired the idea that they do not have to pay America, that America will give them the money to settle the debt.

Mr. HAWKES. I am thoroughly in agreement with the Senator. I should like to remark that I have never in my life seen anyone who was able to buy a friend and keep that friend after his funds were exhausted so that he could not continue buying the friend. I wish I could throw this off as lightly as do some other Senators. I do not believe that we can get out of this thing when we want to do so. When we start a program such as this, it is like taking on one's back a poor relative who is perfectly able to do things for himself ultimately, but who will not do them because he has found an easy place. The greatest contribution any man can make in Christianity is to teach people to take care of themselves, to endure hardships, and solve their own problems. So long as they find that we will solve their problems for them we shall be destroying the initiative which is the only hope for the redemption of the world.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator. As the Senator knows, one reason why I am so concerned about this situation is that it puts the Senate in the position of showing a disregard for the realistic approach undertaken by our brethren at the other end of the Capitol. Let me read a short excerpt from the House committee report on this appropriation bill. I ask my colleagues if this language does not indicate an effort to approach the matter in an intelligent, common-sense American way.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I have tried very hard to find out whether the American people—the ordinary man and woman—understand in the slightest degree that we now have on our backs a national debt of $253,000,000,000, and whether they comprehend what that means. I find that there is a total disregard of it on the part of the American people. If I am wrong I should like to have some Senator correct me, but in my judgment there is a failure on the part of the American people to recognize the fact that the national debt is a mortgage on every industry, every business, every piece of property which every citizen of the United States owns, because of the right to tax and the power of taxation. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. KEM. I agree absolutely. I was very much impressed by the statement in the address of the Senator from New Jersey in which he pointed out that the debt of the American people today is greater than the combined debt of all the nations to which we are giving away our property and our sustenance.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. This is the language of the House committee:

> It would seem that the administration is not only disregarding the basic principles of sound business practices, but also is in a sense undermining the character of international agreements. Anyone with the slightest experience in business realizes that when one owes a debt and is not able to pay it, the way to maintain his morale is to extend the time for the payment of his debt, rather than directly or indirectly to pay the debt for him. If you give him the funds with which to pay the debt, he will expect the same treatment every time he owes any money, and nothing but complete demoralization may result.

Mr. President, I think we ought to stop and consider whether we are undermining the whole basis of international trade throughout the world for generations to come, in what we are doing in a few hours tonight.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes that God has been pretty kind to the American people throughout the entire tragedy of the past few years.

Mr. KEM. God has been kind, and we are now in a period of inflation.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes that God has given us crops year after year. He has given us the material with which we have done these charitable things in feeding the world—with which I am in perfect harmony. I am in perfect agreement that we should have done the things we did to prevent starvation. But the Senator must realize that in time the American people will wake up and find out what this debt means, and what their situation is. They will realize that they will be accused of bad faith at the time when they find themselves unable to proceed further along the path on which we have started. That is the time when we are going to wake up.

Mr. KEM. When the Senator and I were young fellows we used to call it "the cool, gray dawn of the morning after."

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes that this is not a pleasant thing which he and I as Senators are doing. It would be much more pleasant to say, "Come on in, boys, the water is fine"—and go on with this great program, rather than to think of the American people, and, I say to the Senator from Missouri, think of the people of the world, because we have to reestablish their faith in themselves and their initiative if we expect them to get on their feet again and stay on their feet.

Mr. KEM. Not only the people alive in the world today, but generations yet unborn. Does the Senator from New Jersey agree with me that what we are about to do may affect our children and our children's children?

Mr. HAWKES. I could not agree with the Senator more.

I find that those who stop, look, and listen, and look down the pathway of cause and effect, often are not understood.

Benjamin Franklin said a very wonderful thing in 1772:

> Often those who serve in public office are misunderstood, and what they are doing is not appreciated. But that should not keep them from persevering in trying to do the right thing for the people, in the hope that some day the people will understand that their minds were right and their hearts were right, and will understand what they were trying to do.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have been talking about giving the British, the French, and the other nations of the world money with which to pay their debts to us. But there is another consideration, and that is that we are giving the British money with which to pay the Argentine and the people of other creditor nations throughout the world. If there is any reason in the world why we should put the British in funds so that they can pay their debts to the bankers and entrepreneurs of the Argentine, so far as I know it has not yet been suggested in this discussion. Yet, reason or no reason, that is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. President, I had intended to speak at considerable length; but I shall bring to a close what I have to say.

I have set forth a few reasons why in my judgment the appropriations for this program should be cut, or the reductions should be held to coincide with the recommendations of the House of Representatives, or perhaps cut to an even greater extent. It is imperative that at this time the Congress take every possible step to safeguard our remaining national resources and preserve our domestic economy.

If we are to remain one of the last democratic strongholds in all the world, we must eliminate the grapeshot scattering of American commodities around the world, with no return.

Tom Paine once spoke of three classes of men. Of the third class, he said:

> A certain set of moderate men who think better of the European world than it deserves, and this last class by an ill-judged deliberation will be the cause of more calamities to this continent than all the other three.

Mr. President, applying that language to the situation today, I wish to say that I hope Tom Paine was not a prophet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have discussed with the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] an amendment to be added in line 23 on page 16; and the Senator from New Hampshire is going to accept the amendment. He desires to have the record show a sentence or two of intent, because the purpose of this amendment is to make certain at long last that we are going to take care of our domestic needs for anhydrous ammonia necessary to keep certain fertilizer plants in this country in operation, in order to supply American farmers with the fertilizer they need.

Therefore, I offer the amendment, with the understanding that the language can be perfected in conference, in order to carry out the intent I have enunciated, which is to see to it that the Army must take out from foreign allotments a small quantity of anhydrous ammonia—in the neighborhood of from 3 percent to 5 percent—that is to say keep for domestic use from 3 percent to 5 percent of the amount now being exported—or, in other words, whatever is needed to keep these plants in operation.

So on page 16, line 23, after the word "Treasury", I offer this amendment:

Provided, That the Administrator and the Secretary of the Army shall adjust the export allotments of fertilizer materials and compounds herein provided, including anhydrous ammonia, by taking into account domestic needs of anyhdrous ammonia for the manufacture of fertilizer, to the end of supplying domestic fertilizer plants with that quantity of anhydrous ammonia necessary to meet domestic fertilizer needs.

Mr. BRIDGES. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the call of the roll,

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the calling of the yeas and nays had begun, and the Senator from Vermont had voted, when his name was called, before the suggestion of the absence of a quorum was made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina was on his feet and was addressing the Chair before the Senator from Vermont had answered to his name. The Chair apologizes to the Senator from South Carolina and to the Senator from Vermont.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Millikin
Baldwin	Hayden	Morse
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Murray
Brewster	Hoey	O'Conor
Bricker	Holland	O'Daniel
Bridges	Ives	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Jenner	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kem	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kilgore	Smith
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lodge	Stewart
Ecton	Lucas	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Taylor
Feazel	McClellan	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tydings
Flanders	McMahon	Umstead
Fulbright	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hatch	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Navada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—60

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Smith
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Lucas	Stewart
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taft
Ecton	McClellan	Thye
Ellender	McFarland	Tydings
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Young

NAYS—9

Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Malone
Hawkes	Kem	O'Daniel
Jenner	Langer	Taylor

NOT VOTING—27

Ball	George	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McGrath	Tobey
Byrd	McKellar	Wagner
Capper	Moore	Watkins
Chavez	Myers	White
Downey	Reed	Williams
Eastland	Revercomb	Wilson

So the bill (H. R. 6801) was passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 3566, to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 5 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the below quoted language appearing in lines 9 to 20:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than 90 days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress passes a resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than 90 days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress does not pass such a resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And insert in lieu thereof the below quoted language:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress does not pass such a concurrent resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Claude G. Bowers, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States in the Economic Commission for Latin America established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations February 25, 1948;

J. Klahr Huddle, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Burma, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States on the Kashmir Commission of the Security Council of the United Nations;

William E. DeCourcy, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti;

Harold H. Tittmann, Jr., of Missouri, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Peru;

William C. Burdett, Jr., of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul;

Charles E. Bohlen, of Massachusetts, and sundry other persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States;

John P. Gardiner, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

Leo J. Callanan, of Massachusetts, and several persons for appointment in the Foreign Service;

Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, and sundry other persons for appointment in the diplomatic service; and

Richard M. Connell, of Missouri, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1948;

Henry W. Hemple, and sundry other officers to be captains, commanders, lieutenant commanders, and lieutenants in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

Arthur E. Mueller and sundry other officers for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Henry W. Kassel, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Lee C. Watkins, and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry J. Tasca to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude P. Stephens to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph J. Hancock, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard C. Gilmer, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until today at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m., Wednesday, June 16, 1948) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock noon the same day.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1948:

UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Henry J. Tasca, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

William Ford
Lorin E. Kerr
Henry I. Kohn
Reuben F. Reider

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Charles G. Dobrovolny
Willard T. Haskins

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joseph J. Hancock to be United States district judge of the Canal Zone.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Claude P. Stephens to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

Howard C. Gilmer, Jr., to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Paul Jackson Anderson, Anniston.
Joe N. White, Beaverton.
Robert L. Roberts, Boylston.
James Ernest Lambert, Darlington.
Joseph T. Evans, Elkmont.
Virlie M. Sawyer, Frisco City.
William E. Smith, Glen Allen.
John J. Howell, Gordo.
Joseph N. Cooper, Grand Bay.
Leland M. Cox, Mentone.
Marion Earl Sims, Moundville.

Benjamin F. Screws, Shorter.
Charles B. Brock, Steele.
Larry Robinson, Tuskegee Institute.

ARIZONA

Edward S. Brewer, Cactus.
Emma D. Guillet, Chinle.
H. Fay Hall, Chloride.
Ollie A. Caldwell, Gila Bend.
Lillie M. McEntire, Higley.
Nellie C. Sawyer, Inspiration.

ARKANSAS

Woodrow M. Freeze, Jr., Cash.
Willard C. Wall, Coal Hill.
James Vernon Huntley, Judsonia.
Ernest J. Stroub, Lavaca.
Iva S. Matlock, Leola.
Horace M. Grogan, Mabelvale.
Jennie C. McDonald, Marvell.
Otis W. Neely, North Little Rock.
Dallas Johnson, Pollard.
Robert D. O'Keefe, Rosston.
Albert A. Hill, Scranton.
E. Clay Bumpers, Wabash.
Paul Stonesifer, Winslow.

CONNECTICUT

Thomas F. Honan, Gaylordsville.
Newman C. Clark, Old Lyme.
Herman F. LeDoyt, South Coventry.
Charles C. Logan, West Cheshire.

COLORADO

Harold Iacovetto, Artesia.
Phillip W. Hanning, Jr., Boulder.
Richard Ernest Lemesany, Calhan.
Elma N. Adams, Colbran.
Donald W. Kelly, Lafayette.
Netta M. Finch, Springfield.

FLORIDA

Chandos W. McMullen, Bay Pines.
Donald E. McDermott, Boca Raton.
James L. Mayton, Carrabelle.
Ray M. Coburn, Eagle Lake.
Ruth F. Muir, Everglades.
George P. Adams, Greenacres City.
Willie H. Andreasen, Greenwood.
Lois A. Brown, Immokalee.
Evangeline W. Shuler, Indian River City.
Loice J. Jones, Killarney.
Bernice M. Stefurak, Rockledge.
John O. Rogers, Sebastian.
Daniel Floyd Fager, Shalimar.
Edith Z. Petrey, Valparaiso.
Merle P. Blanchard, Waverly.
Stanton M. Gideons, Webster.
Elmer F. Mosley, Wellborn.

GEORGIA

Dwain S. Brock, Baldwin.
Henry C. Geer, Bogart.
John D. Watts, Brinson.
Thomas R. Davenport, Buchanan.
Eleanor K. Pitts, Chattahoochee.
Frederick L. Dekle, Clyo.
Joseph R. Johnson, Coleman.
Bernarr B. Adams, Dewyrose.
Victor H. Tomlinson, Fort Valley.
James H. Sellers, Jr., Graham.
Maurice F. Smith, Hapeville.
Walter E. Ard, Iron City.
Robert C. Harris, Leesburg.
Kermit Q. Ward, Molena.
Daniel L. Murphy, Sr., Moreland.
Tommie Louise Pressey, Rocky Ford.
Julius M. Engram, Scottdale.
John T. Stubbs, Jr., Summerville.
Horace C. Kelly, Jr., Toomsboro.

HAWAII

Robert K. Matsueda, Kalhului.
Mildred O. Kuwana, Pahoa.

KANSAS

Victor A. Zeckser, Alma.
Reginald E. Snapp, Belleville.
Lee R. Highland, Brewster.
Alice I. Van Sickle, Cedar Point.
George Floyd Hart, Copeland.
Arnold C. Kettler, Deerfield.
Ellen McEnulty, Denton.
Ethel S. Watson, Elsmore.
Allen M. Hunter, Garden City.
Harlan C. Atkinson, Goodland.
Warren W. Nye, Harper.
Wayne M. Stoffer, Haven.
Howard L. Hanson, Hepler.
James F. Lambert, Inman.
Allyan H. Beers, Jennings.
Buford L. Emmele, Kiowa.
Abe W. Fox, Larned.
William P. Helwig, Jr., Macksville.
Ralph M. Plotner, McCracken.
Cleal M. Harrison, Oakley.
Wayne L. Green, Osborne.
Harold E. Hinnen, Potwin.
Roy B. Volz, Powhattan.
Gail L. Hohman, Randolph.
Wayne B. Blackburn, Rozel.
Raymond J. Laudick, Spearville.
Wayne W. Muller, Sylvan Grove.
Eugene H. Riggle, Thayer.
David Mallory Howell, Winfield.

KENTUCKY

James Paul Dodson, Scottsville.

LOUISIANA

Clarence P. Simmons, Georgetown.
Allen J. Lorio, Hahnville.
Alton I. Carter, Jonesville.
Vardaman J. Maples, Mount Hermon.
Marion T. Files, Oak Ridge.
John F. George, Oil City.
Jean H. Clark, Rosedale.
Harvey J. Rabalais, Simmesport.
Charles D. Block, Slidell.
Virginia C. Kent, Tangipahoa.
Erna P. Watts, Walker.
Oliver W. Boyd, Jr., West Monroe.

MAINE

Frederick A. Hobbs II, Alfred.
Donald F. Lord, Belgrade Lakes.
Arnold L. Staples, Brooklin.
Corice B. Feindel, Denmark.
Samuel H. Ring, Lovell.
Hurschel A. Ryerson, North Bridgton.
Ella Mae Quimby, Oquossoc.
Cyril Paul Pelletier, St. Francis.
Frank C. Creteau, Sanford.
Vera M. McDonald, Sherman Station.
Robert M. Heggeman, Standish.

MASSACHUSETTS

Elizabeth R. Colby, Byfield.
Elizabeth S. Russell, Carlisle.
Leo G. Tetreault, Colrain.
William J. Powers, Leicester.
Georgia R. Harvey, Lynnfield.
William P. Stone, Jr., Monson.
George M. Olin, Seekonk.
John Franklin Morton, South Duxbury.
Richard S. Patterson, South Egremont.
Edward G. Caron, South Swansea.
Lorraine W. Russell, Sturbridge.
Eleanor P. Hatton, Woronoco.

MINNESOTA

Ellert M. Erickson, Brooten.
Knute W. Ringstad, Lengby.
Edward S. Thomas, Nashwauk.
Elias B. Scofield, Newport.

MISSOURI

Henry H. Womack, Catron.
Leo G. Kidd, Eureka.
Henry E. Bowers, Langdon.
Florence E. Godman, Miami.
Archie Norman Cooper, Rushville.
Jefferson D. Marsh, Steelville.

MONTANA

Donald R. Lamoreux, Corvallis.
Edwin Russell Bennett, Superior.

NEBRASKA

Bernard E. Hess, Henry.

NEW JERSEY

William A. Allen, Allenwood.
Edward N. Hoffman, Birmingham.
Catherine Gleason, Cresskill.
Edwin L. Glesner, Naughright.
Henry O. Kopp, Riverdale.
George Majoros, Jr., Roebling.

NORTH DAKOTA

Lloyd P. Aanrud, Balfour.
Vernon H. Lane, Carson.
Virginia P. Allen, Coleharbor.
Esther A. Dahlen, Edmore.
James A. Kreitinger, Golva.
Carl V. Larson, Gwinner.
Merwin G. McGregor, Litchville.
Edward N. Swanson, McHenry.
Norman N. Berg, McVille.
Nelmer L. Talmo, Portal.
Lewis E. Peterson, Wimbledon.
Herbert William Whalen, York.

OKLAHOMA

Cecil D. Gray, Canton.
James W. Chalfant, Cheyenne.
Clarence H. Chambers, Chickasha.
Waldine E. Knodel, Cyril.
Joel F. Halliday, Eldorado.
Wily S. Bird, Fort Cobb.
Joseph C. R. Boyd, Granite.
George T. Wilkinson, Hitchcock.
William E. Powers, McCurtain.
Gertrude E. Locke, Panama.
Ina L. Snyder, Piedmont.
Lowell V. Doke, Pocasset.
Edward P. Souligny, Ponca City.
Orville E. Marlatt, Ringwood.
Thelma L. McKnight, Shamrock.
Hughell F. Legg, Spencer.
John R. Redwine, Jr., Spiro.
Treal A. McPherson, Thackerville.
Lewis E. Weeden, Washington.
Rex L. Wall, Willow.

OREGON

Agnes M. Hashberger, Colton.
Kenneth P. McCollum, Elkton.
Myra M. Brinker, Freewater.
Ivan A. Blagg, Grass Valley.
Quincy E. Smith, Idanha.
George T. Benson, John Day.
Dorothy L. Halverson, Lacomb.
Opal F. Maphet, Murphy.
Chester O. Stallard, Nelscott.
Merle R. Brown, Philomath.
Celia W. Smith, Wauna.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pearl E. Chappell, Barnesville.
Ruth Findley Stem, Buckingham.
Gladys M. Parry, Elrama.
Edna I. Keefer, Grantham.
Erma K. Hay, Jennerstown.
Walter A. Hilsbos, Jr., Oakford.
William G. McCurdy, Pitcairn.
Jane M. Martin, St. Thomas.
Abram Miller Kurtz, Scotland.
Renald R. Vogelsong, South Enola.
Howard A. Rathburn, Sugargrove.
Charles A. Brader, Tannersville.
Albert Howe, Vanport.
Marian H. Van Wyk, Whitford.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Harry G. Cushman, Conway.
David M. Peden, Gray Court.
William S. Simpson, Jr., Iva.
Rennie W. Baird, Lake City.
Pearsall LeRoy Rogers, Mullins.
Emily K. Bishop, Port Royal.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leo V. Marek, Avon.
Nettie A. Boatman, Columbia.
Franklin deHaal, Corsica.
Mildred M. Abernathy, Gannvalley.
Ralph G. Garvey, Gayville.
Rubin A. Madsen, Lake Preston.
Vernon Morgan, Pine Ridge.
Milton B. Tracy, Pollock.
Ruby Frederick, Rosebud.
John C. Miller, Volga.
Leroy Patrick Clare, Wakonda.

TENNESSEE

Mae P. Jackson, Bethel.
John B. Overstreet, Celina.
Eugene William Beckman, Loretto.
Richard L. Adkins, Munford.
Stella E. Murphy, Rockford.

VERMONT

Kenneth W. Brady, Bakersfield.
Katherine L. Moore, Cavendish.
Marguerite D. Wolcott, Orwell.
Ora John Slade, South Londonderry.
Kathleen H. Shove, South Woodstock.

VIRGINIA

Nellie S. Wilkinson, Bon Air.
Carl L. Wingate, Crockett.
Willie W. Paulette, Drakes Branch.
Wright H. Dawson, Esmont.
Archie W. Arthur, Evington.
John P. Arehart, Fairfield.
David W. Paulette, Farmville.
Louis H. Suddith, Jr., Highland Springs.
Gordon B. Cartwright, King George.
Harry W. Easterly, Lebanon.
James A. O'Neil, Lorton.
David J. Lee, Middleburg.
George H. Sonafrank, Nokesville.
Minna D. Deane, Nottoway.
William H. Grubb, Jr., Purcellville.
Samuel Francis Atwill, Jr., Reedville.
Boyd Boggess, Richlands.
Olive G. Kidd, Roseland.
Virginia M. Dent, Stafford.

WEST VIRGINIA

L. Stanley Gibson, Widen.

WISCONSIN

William George McCoy, Brookfield.
Laura E. Maxfield, Browntown.
Herbert H. Hilgendorf, Burnett.
William J. Peterman, Cecil.
Gertrude C. Stanton, Clyman.
Norman M. DeMuth, Darlington.
Sheldon E. Cantlon, Ettrick.
Norbert I. Lehmann, Hustisford.
Robert C. Biddick, Livingston.
Ernest H. Thorpe, Mattoon.
Albert G. Willgrubs, Norwalk.
Ralph J. Lemke, Omro.
Jay P. Phillips, Palmyra.
Harry M. Harms, Platteville.
Joseph Homel, Pulaski.
Casimer C. Ruthe, Somers.
Florence E. Dexter, Trevor.
Robert A. King, Wautoma.
Richard R. Williams, Wild Rose.
Eugene E. Farrow, Winnebago.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, by whose power we live and by whose mercy we are spared, we thank Thee for the endless renewing of our daily blessings. Keep us this day without sin and free from the bondage of fear.

Bless richly our Speaker and all Members; grant that they may so serve that they may be models of rectitude, with every root of bitterness cast out and the good of all the goal of each. Help us to believe the best we know and the best our hearts have hoped for; hence we shall be delivered from haste and dismay. Keep us constant in our labors, just in our decisions, relating our vocations to the Divine One who taught as never man taught. O fill us with Thy spirit that we may be armed and guided in the path of the perfect day. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution accepting the invitation to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association in Bermuda; and

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate, having proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) entitled "Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage," returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives, on reconsideration of the same, it was—

Resolved, That the said joint resolution pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WHERRY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. O'MAHONEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3735) entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6419) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. HOLLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5883) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to the above-entitled bill; that the Senate further insists upon its amendment numbered 1 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5524) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 34 and 39 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2237) entitled "An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive requests for extension of remarks but not for 1-minute speeches, owing to

the fact that there is unfinished business which will be taken up immediately.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to call the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him on yesterday at Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on the subject of Presidential veto of the Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bibliography of certain publications on the Panama Canal.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD to follow the remarks by Mr. GRANT of Indiana.

Mr. GROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article sent in by a mother, entitled "A Mother Speaks."

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include extraneous material in two instances.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials and an article.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HART asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item and an editorial.

WE MUST HAVE A STOCK PILE OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the Russell bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise in support of the Russell bill which provides for incentive payments for exploration and development of our domestic production of strategic materials.

First, I wish to discuss the legislation from the standpoint of national defense. In 1939 Congress passed a Stock Pile Act with the intent of building up a supply of strategic materials. When we were attacked by Japan at Pearl Harbor in 1941, we found that there was no stock pile because of the failure of the administration of the act to carry out the intent of Congress.

Our failure to have such a stock pile of strategic materials placed us in a precarious position and unquestionably resulted in extending the length of the war and the loss of more lives than would have been the case if these strategic materials had been ready for use.

We are facing a similar situation today. In 1946 Congress passed another Stock Pile Act known as Public Law 520. Two years later in 1948 we find that there is no stock pile and if war were to break out tomorrow, we would be in dire need of such materials. Administrative policies have permitted many mines to close and it would take months to reopen these mines for production.

During this session of Congress we have appropriated billions of dollars for European aid. We have appropriated billions of dollars for military purposes. We are again about to draft our young men for military service to protect the Nation in case of war.

All of these billions will be of no avail unless we in some way or other provide the metals which are provided for in this bill. We cannot produce steel without manganese. We cannot produce the necessary types of steel alloys without many of the metals listed in this legislation. We need them all in either peace or war.

In case of war the only safe source of supply is mines within the United States. Submarines can block imports. Revolutions in other nations, strikes and embargoes can shut off supplies from other nations. We cannot risk the welfare of the United States in depending upon ores from nations that lie across thousands of miles of sea lanes.

I maintain that if we can spend $20,000,000,000 for European aid and military purposes that it would be the height of folly to neglect the very production of the materials which are required. I realize full well that the policies of this administration have been geared to obtaining these materials through trade and that many of our large mining companies are contemplating foreign investments to produce these minerals which I maintain should be produced in the United States because of the safety which lies in a source of supply that cannot be disrupted or shut off.

Second, I wish to discuss this legislation from an economic standpoint. Regardless of economic theories, new wealth still finds its source in the soil. The income of the United States depends directly upon the production, processing, and distribution of this new wealth in the form of finished goods. Our supply of new wealth determines our standard of living and times price determines the income which will determine whether we have prosperity and national solvency.

We are still a young Nation and in the case of mineral resources we have merely scratched the surface of our landed area. Who knows how much we have in the way of strategic materials? Who knows the tonnage of ore that may be uncovered by the development of an outcropping of ore? No one, and it is only by exploration and development that this can be determined. For the Congress of the United States to provide legislation which will make possible such development should be considered as an investment in the future of the United States. Failure to pass this legislation will bring upon us the indictment of future generations that the Congress of the United States did not have the vision to legislate for the future welfare of the United States.

In my opinion we are in the same position that Congress found itself in the year 1852. At that time Congress was considering the building of railroads to open up the western part of the United States. At that time Daniel Webster, then a United States Senator, spoke as follows during the debate:

> What do we want with this vast, worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it?
>
> Mr. President, I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean one inch nearer to Boston than it is.

That, Mr. Speaker, was less than 100 years ago and today the State of California ranks third in population. Yet if that Congress had followed the advice of Daniel Webster, we would still be a Nation of oxcarts and wagons. The building of the railroads and the development of the Middle West and the Western States brought forth the new wealth that built our present system.

There are those today who like Webster, say that the West has little ores and that we must go to other nations. There are those who are against the investment of these funds to develop the future resources which the generations to come will need. I hope that this Congress will have more vision than Daniel Webster and pass legislation before we adjourn which will make it possible to develop and tap new sources of wealth

which abound in these western mountain ranges as well as in other sections of our Nation, our Territories included, especially Alaska.

Finally I wish to point out that these incentive payments are an investment and should not be classed as subsidies. A careful examination of our economy will reveal that for the past 25 years each $1 of new wealth produced in the United States from the farms, mines, and sea combined has translated into $5 of national income, regardless of depression or prosperity. We have had depressions, only because of our failure to properly price our production of new wealth.

Applying this turn of raw material income let us assume that by the payment of $100,000,000 a year in incentive payments, we can bring into production an additional $1,000,000,000 of new wealth. In the normal process of production and use it will provide the foundation for $5,000,000,000 of national income and with the present rate of tax levy for Federal revenue of 20 cents on the dollar, the increased income will provide the revenue to pay the bill. In addition it will give us the permanent supply of materials for either peace or war.

As you all know we have approximately $260,000,000,000 of national debt. If that debt is ever to be paid it must be paid from the production of new wealth from the soil of the United States. It will never be repaid by imports or production of these strategic materials in other nations.

A FRIEND OF MINE IS DEAD, FOR ISRAEL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a copy of a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I lost a friend, my country lost a truly great man, and the Jewish community of the world lost a hero who now belongs to history, when "Mickey" Marcus died in the hills of Palestine.

Truly it may be said, he died that men might live.

I knew Col. David Marcus well, and long.

Physically, he was no giant; but in his heart he had the courage and the vision of King David.

By temperament and environment he was a civilian citizen of America who served his country well; but by his West Point training and the compulsion of compassion he was a soldier who served the world and died for democracy.

Whatever "Mickey" Marcus did, he did well. He was a capable assistant United States attorney; he was an outstanding commissioner of corrections for the city of New York; he was an American soldier who proved his patriotism at risk of his life.

He was a Jew who gladly and voluntarily left all that men hold dear to help create the new state of Israel, and I know that if he had one moment in which to reflect before his soul fled, he died without regret, because he died for an ideal of a happier human society which was bigger than he was.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can say here which can add to the stature of a brave man. His life is a shining monument to Colonel Marcus which no fleeting words can improve.

But that the record of the life and death of a good man may be written where all may read, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert as part of my remarks the touching requiem written by Loy Warwick and printed in the June 13 issue of the New York Post.

DACHAU MADE DAVID MARCUS, UNITED STATES HERO, A ZION MARTYR

(By Loy Warwick)

David Marcus died at his post in the hills of Jerusalem. And now Palestine seemed so much closer to home.

To many an American, to countless New Yorkers, that "Mickey" Marcus had given his life that others might live in freedom, there was something intensely personal.

The question came naturally: Why?

Why had this American, a West Pointer, a hero of World War II, a successful, respected citizen and public servant—why had he chosen again to forsake the safety and security of home to die in battle on the seemingly remote battlefield of Jerusalem?

The answer was not altogether lost.

Gideon Ruffer, of the Israeli delegation at the United Nations, had at least a part of it:

Marcus had been at the head of an American tank column that liberated the Dachau concentration camp.

"He was one of the first Americans to enter Dachau, and see the terrible things the Nazis had done," Ruffer said. "He remembered the tragedy and horror and the piles of Jewish bodies.

"This he never forgot. He told us:

"'It made me fiercely interested in a Jewish state, a state where the Jews would not be a minority at the mercy of the majority's whims.'"

It was when Ruffer was studying at the Jewish Agency Public-College in Jerusalem that he met Marcus.

"He stayed with us at the school, instead of going to a hotel," Ruffer recalled. "He was very friendly, very popular. He danced with us and told us stories—stories of how he had become a Zionist.

"Mickey Marcus was deeply impressed by the spirit of Jewish youth. He believed that the spirit of the Jewish people is more valuable as a military factor than the numerical superiority of the Arabs.

"For this reason, he was convinced the Jews would win the war. He never lost his faith in final victory."

Marcus' presence in beleagured Palestine had been a closely guarded secret. As he went about the grim, vital task of creating—almost singlehanded—the Army of Israel, there were not many who knew the real identity of this likeable, purposeful man of 47.

Few knew, for example, that this man who had responded so unselfishly to the urgent appeal from the Jewish agency, had once served New York City as commissioner of correction. Only a handful were aware that he was a former United States Army colonel, twice decorated by the United States during World War II.

Marcus held the Distinguished Service Cross for his part in the surrender of Italy and Germany and the Bronze Star Medal for gallantry in action. He saw service in nearly every theater of operations, helped draft the surrender terms for Italy and Germany, and the legal aide to the United States delegation at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

With all his fine legal talent and value as a planner and a strategist, Colonel Marcus was no swivel-chair soldier. He didn't enter Normandy in a command car—he came down in a parachute. And, when the Americans swept into Dachau in 1945, Colonel Marcus rode at the head of a rumbling tank column.

The death of Marcus in the Jerusalem hills was the first officially recorded by the Israeli Government of a former high-ranking United States Army officer, although several former American soldiers have died in Palestine while serving with Israeli forces.

Marcus had been appointed supreme commander of the forces of Jerusalem only a short while before he fell Thursday night on the field of battle.

"Please inform Mrs. David Marcus that her husband fell last night at his post in the hills of Jerusalem," said cablegram from Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion to his widow, Mrs. Emma Marcus, of 485 Westminster Road, Brooklyn.

Mrs. Marcus was prostrated by the tragic news.

PLAN TRIBUTE

There will be a tribute to his memory from his friends and legal associates in Kings County Court, just before the session opens at 10 a. m. Monday.

Many joined Ben-Gurion Saturday in paying tribute to Marcus. In performing the sad duty of disclosing Marcus death, Ben-Gurion had said: "His name will live forever in the annals of the Jewish people and we feel confident American Jewry will be proud of its great and gallant son who has given his life for the liberation of Israel."

Said Dr. Emanuel Neumann, president of the Zionist Organization of America:

"The memory of the late Col. David Marcus will be enshrined in the hearts of all Americans along with the names of Lafayette and Kosciusko, who fought for the rights of human dignity and freedom. As Americans we are proud of his contributions and sorrowful at the passing of a great spirit."

Said Mayor O'Dwyer: "I knew him well enough to know that, if he had to die, that was the way he would have preferred to go—fighting for freedom."

BROOKLYN NATIVE

David Marcus was born February 22, 1901, in Brooklyn, where he was graduated from Boys High School. He attended West Point and was commissioned in the infantry in 1924. Two years later he resigned and went into law—receiving a degree from Brooklyn Law School, at that time part of St. Lawrence University.

He became an assistant United States attorney in 1929, and in 1933 was appointed by Mayor LaGuardia first deputy commissioner of correction. He was made full commissioner in 1940, rejoining the Army that same year.

After the war he served on the German occupation staff of General Clay. In 1946 he was decorated by the British Government, "in recognition of the distinguished service performed in cooperation with the British armed forces during the war."

ANSWERED PLEA OF ZION

Marcus remained in the service until January 1947, and had just resumed his law practice here—at 545 Fifth Avenue—when he answered the plea of the Jewish Agency and went to Palestine, there to accomplish in 6 months what had seemed an insurmountable task.

He was smuggled into the Holy Land shortly after Christmas and immediately began transforming the Haganah into a modern fighting army. He worked day and night.

He wrote military manuals, established officers' training schools, organized a general staff and supervised field and school training.

Marcus fell at Jerusalem and a spokesman of the Israeli Government said:

"He died trying to open the road to get food through to the people of Jerusalem. This was not the responsibility of the Jewish government. It was a world responsibility."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6556, an act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That this act may be cited as the 'Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948.'

"SEC. 2. The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1351), is hereby extended from June 12, 1948, until the close of June 30, 1949.

"SEC. 3. (a) Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the 'Commission') with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment. Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producng like or similar articles the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission. No such foreign trade agreement shall be entered into until the Commission has made its report to the President or until the expiration of the 120-day period.

"(b) In the course of any investigation pursuant to this section the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"(c) Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1354), is hereby amended by striking out the matter following the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and before concluding such agreement the President shall request the Tariff Commission to make the investigation and report provided for by section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, and shall seek information and advice with respect to such agreement from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, from the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.'

"SEC. 4. The Commission shall furnish facts, statistics, and other information at its command to officers and employees of the United States preparing for or participating in the negotiation of any foreign trade agreement; but neither the Commission nor any member, officer, or employee of the Commission shall participate in any manner (except to report findings, as provided in section 3 of this act and to furnish facts, statistics, and other information as required by this section) in the making of decisions with respect to the proposed terms of any foreign trade agreement or in the negotiation of any such agreement.

"SEC. 5. (a) Within 30 days after any trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, has been entered into which, when effective, will (1) require or make appropriate any modification of duties or other import restrictions, the imposition of additional import restrictions, or the countinuance of existing customs or excise treatment, which modification, imposition, or continuance will exceed the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles as found and reported by the Tariff Commission under section 3, or (2) fail to require or make appropriate the minimum increase in duty or additional import restrictions required to avoid such injury, the President shall transmit to Congress a copy of such agreement, together with a message accurately identifying the article with respect to which such limits or minimum requirements are not complied with, and stating his reasons for the acton taken with respect to such article. If either the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, are not in session at the time of such transmission, such agreement and message shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House or Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

"(b) Promptly after the President has transmitted such foreign trade agreement to Congress the Commission shall deposit with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a copy of its report to the President with respect to such agreement."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. RAYBURN. What is the request?

The SPEAKER. That the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. Nobody has spoken to me about it. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] was here a moment ago and he did not know what was going to be done. Of course, I am going to object for the present because we do not know what the amendment is.

Mr. KNUTSON. What is to be gained by holding it up?

Mr. RAYBURN. I object because the gentleman has not said anything to me or to any Member on the minority side that he was going to submit this request. That is a very good reason.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Minnesota withdraw his request.

The Chair wishes to state at this time that many matters will be disposed of by unanimous consent this week. To facilitate the dispatch of that business it is advisable, in fact, it is imperative, that Members submitting such requests first confer with both majority and minority leaders.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the fact that it was necessary to consult anyone with regard to taking a matter off the Speaker's table, and if I have offended in the matter, I apologize.

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary, of course, but it will help expedite matters if that course is followed.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is rather necessary.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an advertisement of the postal and Federal employees which appeared in all the newspapers of the country entitled "The Laborer Is Worthy of His Hire."

Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Will not the gentleman withhold it until after the pending business is disposed of to pass the bill we had under consideration last night?

Mr. RANKIN. I think if we are going to wreck the Republic the Members ought to be here to participate, and I shall insist. We may not want to pass it. I am going to insist.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, the unfinished business before the House is the vote on the bill which was under consideration as we adjourned last night.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. May the gentleman from Mississippi insist upon his point of no quorum, then?

The SPEAKER. He may if he wishes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold my point of order until that vote is taken, if it will be worth anything.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL AGENCIES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the vote on the

bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national defense-incurred enrollments.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that two-thirds had voted in favor thereof.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCK. Last night when the vote was taken I objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and then the House adjourned. I understood that unanimous consent was given that the roll call would be taken as the first order of business this morning.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent was given that the vote be taken again. The gentleman still has the right to object to the vote.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 325, nays 48, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—325

Abbitt	Clason	Gavin
Abernethy	Clevenger	Gearhart
Albert	Clippinger	Gillette
Allen, Calif.	Cole, Kans.	Gillie
Allen, Ill.	Cole, Mo.	Goff
Allen, La.	Colmer	Goodwin
Anderson, Calif.	Combs	Gordon
Andrews, Ala.	Cooley	Gore
Angell	Cooper	Gorski
Arends	Corbett	Gossett
Arnold	Cox	Graham
Bakewell	Craven	Granger
Banta	Crosser	Grant, Ala.
Barden	Crow	Grant, Ind.
Barrett	Curtis	Gregory
Bates, Ky.	Dague	Hagen
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Ga.	Halleck
Battle	Deane	Hardy
Beall	Delaney	Harless, Ariz.
Beckworth	Devitt	Harness, Ind.
Bender	D'Ewart	Harris
Bennett, Mich.	Dirksen	Harrison
Bennett, Mo.	Dolliver	Hart
Bishop	Domengeaux	Harvey
Blackney	Dondero	Havenner
Bland	Donohue	Hays
Bloom	Doughton	Hedrick
Boggs, La.	Douglas	Heffernan
Bolton	Durham	Hess
Bonner	Eberharter	Hill
Boykin	Elliott	Hobbs
Bradley	Ellis	Hoeven
Bramblett	Ellsworth	Hoffman
Brehm	Elsaesser	Holifield
Brophy	Elston	Holmes
Brown, Ga.	Engel, Mich.	Hope
Bryson	Engle, Calif.	Horan
Buchanan	Evins	Huber
Bulwinkle	Fallon	Hull
Burke	Feighan	Isacson
Burleson	Fellows	Jackson, Calif.
Busbey	Fenton	Jackson, Wash.
Butler	Fernandez	Jarman
Byrne, N. Y.	Fisher	Javits
Camp	Flannagan	Jenison
Canfield	Fletcher	Jenkins, Ohio
Cannon	Fogarty	Jenkins, Pa.
Carson	Folger	Johnson, Calif.
Case, S. Dak.	Foote	Johnson, Ill.
Celler	Forand	Jones, Ala.
Chadwick	Fuller	Jones, N. C.
Chelf	Fulton	Jones, Wash.
Chenoweth	Garmatz	Jonkman
Chiperfield	Gary	Judd
Church	Gathings	Karsten, Mo.
Kearney	Morgan	Sabath
Kee	Morris	Sadlak
Keefe	Morrison	St. George
Kelley	Morton	Sanborn
Kerr	Muhlenberg	Sasscer
Kersten, Wis.	Multer	Schwabe, Mo.
Kilburn	Mundt	Schwabe, Okla.
Kilday	Murdock	Scoblick
Kirwan	Murray, Tenn.	Sheppard
Klein	Murray, Wis.	Short
Knutson	Nodar	Sikes
Kunkel	Norblad	Simpson, Ill.
Landis	Norrell	Smathers
Lanham	Norton	Smith, Kans.
Larcade	O'Brien	Smith, Va.
Latham	O'Hara	Smith, Wis.
Lea	O'Konski	Snyder
LeCompte	O'Toole	Somers
Lemke	Pace	Spence
Lesinski	Passman	Stanley
Lewis, Ky.	Patman	Stefan
Lewis, Ohio	Patterson	Stevenson
Lichtenwalter	Peterson	Stratton
Love	Philbin	Talle
Lucas	Phillips, Tenn.	Taylor
Lusk	Pickett	Teague
Lyle	Ploeser	Thomas, Tex.
Lynch	Poage	Thompson
McConnell	Potter	Tibbott
McCormack	Poulson	Tollefson
McCowen	Powell	Trimble
McCulloch	Preston	Twyman
McDonough	Price, Fla.	Vail
McDowell	Price, Ill.	Van Zandt
McGregor	Priest	Vinson
McMahon	Rains	Vorys
McMillan, S. C.	Ramey	Walter
McMillen, Ill.	Rankin	Weichel
Mack	Rayburn	Welch
Macy	Redden	Wheeler
Mahon	Reed, Ill.	Whitaker
Manasco	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Mansfield	Rees	Whittington
Marcantonio	Reeves	Williams
Martin, Iowa	Richards	Wilson, Tex.
Mathews	Riehlman	Winstead
Merrow	Riley	Wolcott
Meyer	Rivers	Wolverton
Michener	Risley	Wood
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.	Woodruff
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Mass.	Worley
Mills	Rohrbough	Youngblood
Mitchell	Rooney	
Monroney	Russell	

NAYS—48

Andersen, H. Carl	Gross	Plumley
Andrews, N. Y.	Hale	Potts
Boggs, Del.	Hall, Leonard W.	Rich
Buck	Hand	Rockwell
Buffett	Heselton	Ross
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Scott, Hardie
Case, N. J.	Kean	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Scrivner
Cotton	LeFevre	Seely-Brown
Coudert	Lodge	Shafer
Crawford	MacKinnon	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Wis.	Maloney	Sundstrom
Dawson, Utah	Mason	Taber
Eaton	Miller, Conn.	Vursell
Gamble	Miller, Md.	Wadsworth
Griffiths	Nicholson	Wigglesworth

NOT VOTING—57

Andresen, August H.	Gwynne, Iowa	Madden
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meade, Ky.
Bell	Hartley	Meade, Md.
Blatnik	Hébert	Nixon
Brooks	Hendricks	Peden
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Pfeifer
Buckley	Hinshaw	Phillips, Calif.
Carroll	Jennings	Regan
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Robertson
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Sadowski
Coffin	Johnson, Tex.	Sarbacher
Courtney	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Stigler
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	Stockman
Dingell	King	Thomas, N. J.
Dorn	Lane	Towe
Gallagher	Ludlow	West
Gwinn, N. Y.	McGarvey	Wilson, Ind.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Madden.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Arthur Edwin Hall with Mr. Carroll.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Cunningham, with Mr. Sadowski.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. King.
Mr. Towe with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Rooney.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Scrivner with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Phillips of California with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Meade of Maryland.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Nixon with Mr. Bell of Missouri.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Courtney.

Mr. HOFFMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GROSS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, with reference to this bill, H. R. 6527, extending the period for providing assistance to certain school agencies still overburdened with war-incurred school enrollments, I discussed the situation in my district with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], who reported this bill from the Committee on Education and Labor and also other members of the committee, which I wish to be included in this debate for clarification.

As there were only 40 minutes debate because the bill is being considered under suspension of rules, I did not feel that I should endeavor to inject the discussion of some particular project. The bill is too important to jeopardize by trying to adjust each particular situation that might apply to some one project.

I have supported this program from its inception. I believe it is only fair and just that the Government bear the necessary expenditures imposed on school districts by the great influx of students in war areas necessary to our national defense. If the school districts are willing to burden themselves by taking care of these children and helping to educate them even though it became necessary for the Government to bring them there in the interest of the war and our national defense, the Government should in my opinion take care of the added expense.

Many of these areas become highly congested. It is impossible for the school districts to take care of the sudden increased attendance. In our own State we are heavily taxed for school purposes. Our school districts and State education program are providing far above the national average in percentage of tax

money for school purposes. Many of these war projects are being continued causing the continuous burden on the school districts and therefore, this legislation is highly desirable and thoroughly justified.

But the situation I have in mind in my district, Mr. Speaker, is one that I wish to call to your attention. As you know, I represent the Seventh District of Arkansas in the southern part of our State. During the war the Navy Department established Schumaker Naval Ammunition Depot near Camden, Ark. It is not only in my district but the home of Senator MCCLELLAN.

This project requires thousands of people in its construction and operation. It is a highly important project in the operation of the Navy and the Navy still carries it as one of its necessary operations.

This project is in Harmony Grove school district, which is a fairly large consolidated school. The school is several miles from the project and to get to the school by bus it is necessary to go through the Camden district.

As it is much more convenient and facilities are more readily available, the Camden school district receives and takes care of these students, several hundred of them.

Under the provisions of the Lanham Act, which this bill would extend, it is provided that Federal assistance is continued to those schools that previously received Federal contribution. Under this bill, it is provided that contributions for operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance will be made to those that are still overburdened with school enrollment caused by war activities and the transition from war to peacetime conditions and who have received during this fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, Federal contributions administered by the Federal Works Agency for such operation and maintenance.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Harmony Grove School District under the act would be the one to receive the funds because the application originally was made by that school district to take care of these school children. Harmony Grove School District has in return transferred the funds to the Camden School District. The Camden School District has been providing for and taking care of these students.

Therefore, this bill extends to those districts, and logically so, that heretofore have received contributions. This means that Camden actually is entitled to continue receiving contributions for taking care of these schools, but because of the situation, the Harmony Grove District must make the application and transmit the funds to the Camden District. The Federal Works Agency has recognized this practical situation before and I have talked with them about this extension, and they recognize the problem now. It is generally understood that this relief can be obtained under such agreement and administration of the funds as we have experienced in the past.

I feel sure there will not be too much trouble in working it out as has been indicated by the provisions of this legislation and with those I have discussed it with in the Federal Works Agency. I recognize the Harmony Grove District would like to keep this money for their own operation and would be glad to take care of these schools to the best of their ability if it were convenient for them to go there. Nevertheless, the money is being provided to take care of the schools which are providing for the children, and I want this statement in the interest of these children who must receive their educational training to be made in order that it might help not only to clarify but explain the history of the legislation insofar as it affects this project.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from Robert P. Cort, of Greenwich, Conn.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted, the Florida delegation may have 30 minutes for the purpose of paying tribute to two of our Members who are retiring, Messrs. PRICE and HENDRICKS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Flag Day address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. RUSSELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three newspaper articles.

H. R. 6923 AND H. R. 6924

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today H. R. 6923 which is for the purpose of providing permanent housing for the flood victims in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their houses as a result of the disaster, most of whom were occupying federally owned housing which has been destroyed, and unless relief is granted they will be without habitations. This bill provides as follows:

H. R. 6923

The attached bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster, briefly provides:

(1) A $30,000,000 Vancouver-Portland area flood-disaster fund to be made available to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator through the issuance and sale of notes to the Secretary of the Treasury;

(2) Authorizes the Administrator to make loans to public and private agencies to enable them to construct and sell or rent dwelling accommodations for families deprived of their homes by the disaster with a first preference to families who had been tenants in the Vanport housing project. One hundred percent loans based on necessary current cost would be available for both sales and rental housing, at a 4-percent interest rate in the case of private corporations or persons and a 3-percent rate in the case of loans to public bodies;

(3) Loans to public agencies cannot be made without the prior approval of the local governing body. To enable such housing to be made available to low-income families deprived of their homes by the flood disaster, the Administrator may agree to waive principal and interest payments during the first 5 years of occupancy to the extent necessary to permit adjustment of rentals, provided that the State, municipality, or other local public body or agency shall similarly agree to make a contribution to the project for such low-rent purposes in the form of cash, land, community services or facilities for which a charge is usually made, or tax remissions or tax exemptions in an amount not less than 20 percent of the amount of the principal and interest payments waived by the Administrator;

(4) Loans for housing built for sale may not exceed 25 years, and the aggregate amount of the loan and any other obligation shall not exceed: (A) $7,500 if such dwelling is designed for a single-family residence, or (B) $12,500 if such dwelling is designed for a two-family residence, or (C) $16,000 if such dwelling is designed for a three-family residence, or (D) $18,500 if such dwelling is designed for a four-family residence;

(5) Loans for rental housing shall have maturities satisfactory to the Administrator and shall not exceed $7,500 per family unit for such part of the property or project attributable to dwelling use;

(6) In addition to the usual administrative provisions and authority to issue and sell notes to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator is authorized to make necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act, and he shall maintain a separate set of accounts for this program

and report to the Congress annually on the program authorized by the act;

(7) No loan shall be made under the act after March 31, 1949, except pursuant to a commitment to make a loan issued before March 31, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, I have also introduced today H. R. 6924 which authorizes an additional $10,000,000 to the Federal National Mortgage Association for loans under section 2 of the National Housing Act. The bill provides as follows:

H. R. 6924

STATEMENT ON BILL TO AID PRODUCTION OF PERMANENT HOUSING IN THE PORTLAND, OREG.-VANCOUVER, WASH., AREA

This bill would encourage the extension of necessary credit to assist in providing low-cost housing urgently needed in the Portland-Vancouver area as a result of recent floods. The bill would authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association (a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) to purchase first mortgages made, after the enactment of this bill, for the purpose of financing the construction of new residential structures in that area, if the financial institutions from which the mortgages are purchased have insurance under section 2 of the National Housing Act with respect to such mortgages. Any such purchase would have to be made within 2 years from the date of the mortgage at a price equal to the unpaid balance plus accrued interest.

Under this section 2 of the National Housing Act, financial institutions may be insured against losses, up to 10 percent, on the total amount of their loans made for the purpose of financing alterations, repairs, and improvements of existing structures or financing the building of new structures. Any such loan for building a new structure (referred to as title I, class 3 loans) may not presently exceed $3,000. Legislation (S. 866) is pending which would increase this amount to $4,500.

The total amount of funds the bill would make available to the Federal National Mortgage Association for this purpose would be $10,000,000, which would be provided by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The total amount of authorized investments, loans, purchases, and commitments of the Corporation would be increased accordingly. The bill would not require any appropriation of funds by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the emergency in the Columbia River area due to the disastrous flood is growing worse from day to day. The river is still at top flood level and many thousands of acres of farm land, suburban, city, and village areas are completely flooded out and more than 50,000 people have been deprived of their homes, and the damage will run far in excess of $100,000,000. I am sure that the people of this area are grateful to the Congress for the enactment of legislation last week, Senate Joint Resolution 231—my companion bill, House Joint Resolution 423—which provided some temporary stopgap housing. But permanent housing relief is necessary as well as funds for reconstruction of public facilities, both Federal and local, in order to protect the lives and welfare of this vast area 120 miles in length up and down the fertile Columbia River Valley.

Owing to the imminent adjournment of the Congress it is essential that extraordinary steps be taken to secure the necessary legislation and appropriations to meet this great emergency which has overtaken our own people. We have been very generous with our aid to many distressed peoples around the world. We now have an opportunity to give some of our largess to some of our own people. I hope the Congress will pass H. R. 6923 and H. R. 6924, and other bills pending to provide housing, emergency aid, and the repair, restoration, or replacement of dikes, highways, and facilities of the Federal Government, and any needed aid to local communities.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was objection.

INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association will hold its sixth conference at Detroit, Mich., during the month of May 1949; and

Whereas this is the first time that the Inter-American Bar Association has planned a conference in the United States; and

Whereas the purposes of the association, as stated in its constitution, are to establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchange of views, and to encourage cordial relations among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the high character of this international association, its deliberations, and its members can do much to encourage cordial relations among the countries of the Western Hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States welcomes the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States, and wishes the association unparalleled success in its sixth conference; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary General of the Inter-American Bar Association.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution passed the Senate yesterday. It was before the full committee on the Judiciary of the House this morning, and as chairman I was unanimously directed to make this request. I have cleared through the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, and there is no objection. This resolution will not become a law: it is merely an expression of good will and welcome. It will cost no money. I cannot imagine any objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman what we can do here about this. They sent that over here, as I understand, unanimously. Now, we have a conference report, and the House conferees all signed it. Two of the Members of the other body have signed it, but the other one is carrying it around in his pocket. Now, my question is, How do we get that one out?

Mr. MICHENER. That is a parliamentary question that should be directed to the Speaker. I would be usurping the prerogatives of the Speaker if I attempted to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could the gentleman answer it in the lobby afterward?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That will be satisfactory. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

LT. GEN. LESLIE RICHARD GROVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5596) to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas the development of an atomic bomb by the Manhattan engineer district, United States Army, during World War II represents not only the greatest achievement in weapon production but also one of the greatest achievements in the coordination of science, industry, and management in world history and was also a major factor in bringing that war to an earlier victorious close resulting in the saving of thousands of lives and great stores of resources; and

Whereas this accomplishment has also opened unlimited possibilities for peacetime and humanitarian application and expansion of atomic science for future use for the benefit of mankind; and

Whereas this initial achievement was successfully concluded under the leadership, supervision, and direction of Leslie Richard Groves, as Director of the Manhattan engineer district, with superior judgment and courage and in accordance with the highest traditions of the United States Army; and

Whereas the said Leslie Richard Groves has requested that he be retired from service as an officer of the United States Army and such retirement has been authorized; and

Whereas the American people and the Congress of the United States deeply appreciate the outstanding and unique service to the Nation and to humanity thus rendered by the said Leslie Richard Groves and desire to express this appreciation by means of official recognition thereof: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint, without confirmation by the Senate, Leslie Richard Groves, Army serial No. O12043, lieutenant general, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Army, such appointment to be effective as of the day prior to the effective date of his retirement from the active list of the Regular Army and such appointment shall entitle him to receive the retired pay of major general of the Regular Army.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized and requested, without confirmation by the Senate, to place the said Leslie Richard Groves on the retired list with the rank and grade of lieutenant general with honorary date of rank thereof as of July 16, 1945, which date commemorates the first explosion by man of an atomic bomb, at the Trinity site, Alamogordo, N. Mex. Such advancement in

grade and rank on the retired list, however, shall not result in any increase in retired pay.

SEC. 3. This act shall result in no permanent increase in the authorized number of major generals on the active list of the Regular Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEIRS, ASSIGNS, AND SUCCESSORS IN TITLE OF MOSES EVANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1275) conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the southwest quarter of section 6, township 14 north, range 4 east, Washington meridian, Warren County, Miss., consisting of apprcximately one hundred and sixty-three and forty-five one hundredths acres, is hereby granted, released, relinquished, and conveyed by the United States to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans upon payment by them into the Treasury of the United States the sum of $245.18; such land being the same land which was conveyed under the credit system laws (credit prior receipt numbered 9309) on September 15, 1818, to Moses Evans who, agreeing to pay to the United States the sum of $2 per acre for same, paid only the sum of $81.72 on entry leaving a balance due thereon of $245.18, now to be paid by the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of the said Moses Evans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM COLLINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1274) conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all right title, and interest of the United States in and to fractional section 4, township 1 north, range 5 west, Washington meridian, Wilkinson County, Miss., consisting of approximately four hundred and ninety acres, is hereby granted, released, relinquished, and conveyed by the United States to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins upon payment by them into the Treasury of the United States the sum of $735; such land being the same land which was conveyed under the credit system laws (credit prior receipts No. 11656, and 11753, dated July 21, 1819, and August 30, 1819, respectively) to William Collins who, agreeing to pay to the United States the sum of $2 per acre for same, paid only the sum of $245 on entry leaving a balance due thereon of $735, now to be paid by the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of the said William Collins.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH PICKERING WINN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 83) authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 158) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of Gaspar Ybarzabal, Pedro Ybarzabal, and Antonio Monasterio, all of Ontario, Oreg., legally admitted as seamen but who have remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that these aliens shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of their actual entry on the payment of the visa fees of $10 and head taxes of $8 per person.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit Gaspar Ybarzabal, Pedro Ybarzabal, and Antonio Monasterio to reside in the United States as temporary visitors for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, provided they remain employed in the sheep industry. If any of the above-named aliens fails to maintain his occupation in the sheep industry at any time within 5 years after the date of enactment hereof, he shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended.

"If, at the expiration of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, the Attorney General shall, after due investigation, find that any of the above-named aliens has maintained an employment in the sheep industry during the entire 5-year period, he is hereby authorized and directed to record such alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States if he is otherwise found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. The Attorney General shall communicate his findings to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien so lawfully admitted for permanent residence from the quota of Spain for the first year that said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTIAGO SOLABARRIETA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 765) for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Santiago Solabarrieta, of Parma, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to permit Santiago Solabarrieta, of Parma, Idaho, to reside in the United States as a temporary visitor for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, provided he remains employed in the sheep industry. In the event that the said Santiago Solabarrieta fails to maintain his occupation in the sheep industry at any time within 5 years after the date of enactment hereof, he shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

"If, at the expiration of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof the Attorney General shall, after due investigation, find that the said Santiago Solabarrieta has maintained an employment in the sheep industry during the entire 5-year period, he is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Santiago Solabarrieta as of December 1, 1924, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and head tax of $8, if he is otherwise found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. The Attorney General shall communicate his finding to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOU CHUNG CHAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1337) for the relief of Hou Chung Chay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Hou Chung Chay, of New York, N. Y., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted on June 5, 1942, to the United States for permanent resident, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this Act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year in which such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKOTO IWAMATSU, ATSUSHI JUN IWAMATSU, AND TOMOE IWAMATSU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1409) for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703, 57 Stat. 600), Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, who rendered outstanding services to the United States Government during the war with Japan, and his wife, Tomoe Iwamatsu, both of whom entered the United States temporarily as visitors in 1939, may be permitted to remain permanently in the United States if they are found to be admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to persons of races ineligible to naturalization.

SEC. 2. That their 12-year-old son, Markoto Iwamatsu, now presently residing in Japan, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he can qualify for admission under all of the immigration laws other than those relating to persons of races ineligible to citizenship and those laws requiring an immigration visa.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WLADYSLAV PLYWACKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1606) for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Wladyslav Plywacki, who served with the United States Army in Europe following his liberation from a German prison camp, and who entered the United States illegally in June 1947, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Poland.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, if any, issued in the case of Wladyslav Plywacki. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Wladyslav Plywacki shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA V. REYER AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1730) for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEON MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5336) for the relief of Leon Moore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General shall not consider as applicable to Leon Moore (a) the provisions of (1) the act relating to certain excludable classes of aliens approved October 16, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 137), and (2) sections 3 and 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, secs. 136 and 155 (a); Supp. V, title 8, sec. 155); and (b) the provisions of section 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 705).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LYDIA A. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1303) for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirements of sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in the case of the late William M. Thompson, formerly employed by the War Department as a construction manager at Nitro, W. Va., who died on May 10, 1918, as a result of typhoid fever contracted by him while an employee in such capacity, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim which may be filed with the Commission by Lydia A. Thompson, widow of said William M. Thompson, within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act, for compensation under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, for the death of said William M. Thompson; but compensation, if any, shall commence from and after the date of the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O'CONNELL & SWEENEY, INC.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 644) for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5974) entitled "A bill for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc.," now pending in the House of Representatives, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and the said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said section and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of facts and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDA WAHLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1643) for the relief of Freda Wahler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the civil-service retirement and disability fund, to Freda Wahler, of Freeport, Ill., the widow of William F. Wahler, formerly a railway-mail clerk, an annuity equal in amount to the annuity which she would have been entitled to receive had William F. Wahler been promptly and properly advised by the Civil Service Commission of his rights as to retirement and had he upon receipt of the proper information elected in writing to receive a reduced annuity equal to such reduced annuity payable after his death to the said Freda Wahler as surviving beneficiary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE G. McCARTHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3066) for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, the alien Lawrence G. McCarthy, Toronto, Dominion of Canada, who is the husband of Mrs. Ruth Gardner McCarthy, a citizen and resident of the United States, shall not be subject (a) to the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 136), insofar as such provisions may be applicable to his conviction in his youth in Toronto, on November 5, 1936, of the theft of personal property valued at less than $25; or (b) to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 4 of the act of March 4, 1929, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, secs. 180a, 180b, 180c), or of any other law prescribing a penalty for illegal entries by aliens into the United States, insofar as such provisions may be applicable to any entry by the said Lawrence G. McCarthy into the United States for a temporary stay. The Secretary of State, through the proper consular officer, is authorized and directed to issue to the said Lawrence G. McCarthy an immigration visa entitling him to immediate admission to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)) Lawrence G. McCarthy, a native and citizen of Toronto, Canada, whose wife is a citizen and resident of the United States, may be admitted for permanent residence under the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, if he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES M. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4103) for the relief of Charles M. Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles M. Davis, Frannie, Wyo., the sum of $25,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Charles M. Davis against the United States for personal injuries, which have resulted in permanent disability, sustained by him on June 21, 1939, near Deaver, Wyo., when he was pinned against his automobile by a Bureau of Reclamation tractor operated by an enrollee in the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLTON C. GRANT AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4128) for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carlton C. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $1,312.50; to Clarence W. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $4,272.50; to Gordon W. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $1,500; to Margaret S. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $193.75; to W. P. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $3,500; to J. Perry Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $9,375; to A. A. Everett, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $737.50; to E. J. Lewis, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $7,500; to E. J. Lewis, Jr., of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $5,000; to Mrs. E. J. Lewis, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $2,500; to J. Stacy Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $593.75; to H. L. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $1,031.25; to J. Rufus Yopp, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $100; to Liston T. Yopp, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $37.50; to Lonnie Everett, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $1,057.50; to the estate of James B. Grant, of Sneads Ferry, N. C., the sum of $625; to D. T. Millis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $500; to A. T. Horne, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $200; to R. E. Sanders, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $441; to L. D. Hobbs, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $830; to Major Davis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $825; to M. Donald Davis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $896; to D. D. Justice, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $800; to the estate of Wade J. Everett, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $400; to L. E. Coleburn, of Morehead City, N. C., the sum of $2,500; to D. V. Justice, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $400; to T. R. Murphy, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $2,021; to Vance Howard, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $567; to Kater Howard, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $1,193; to Harry Moore, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $1,071; to G. C. Hansley, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $882; to Strickland Hobbs, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $440; to Corbett Hansley, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $690; to C. R. Bush, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $420; to R. D. Everett, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $560; to Austin Hobbs, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $750; to J. W. Everett, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $600; to L. M. Davis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $300; to J. R. Hobbs, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $675; to Sherman R. Edens, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $900; to O. S. Edens, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $600; and to L. M. Davis, of Holly Ridge, N. C., the sum of $6,747, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for property damage to their cultivated oyster beds sustained by them as a result of the dumping of sewage and laundry waste from Camp Davis, N. C., which caused the pollution of the waters in which their cultivated oyster beds had been established and resulted in the loss of their cultivated oysters: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out the remainder of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, all claims of Carlton C. Grant, Rudolph Hobbs, Clarence W. Grant, Gordon W. Grant, Margaret S. Grant, W. P. Grant, J. Perry Grant, A. A. Everett, E. J. Lewis, E. J. Lewis, Jr., Mrs. E. J. Lewis, J. Stacy Grant, H. L. Grant, J. Rufus Yopp, Murray Guthrie, Liston T. Yopp, Lonnie T. Everett, the estate of James B. Grant, I. S. Thompson, all of Sneads Ferry, N. C.; D. T. Millis, A. T. Horne, R. E. Sanders, I. D. Hobbs, Major Davis, M. Donald Davis, D. D. Justice, Wade J. Everett, Millie C. Everett, D. V. Justice, T. R. Murphy, Vance Howard, Kater Howard, Harry Moore, G. C. Hansley, Strickland Hobbs, Corbett Hansley, C. R. Bush, R. D. Everett, Austin Hobbs, J. W. Everett, C. S. Everett, J. R. Hobbs, Sherman R. Edens, O. S. Edens, L. M. Davis, Guy L. Everett, C. C. Hines, L. W. Bishop, of Holly Ridge, N. C.; L. E. Coleburn, of Morehead City, N. C.; Mary Shepard, of route No. 1, Jacksonville, N. C.; E. B. Smith, of Jacksonville, N. C.; or the heirs, administrators, or executors of either or any of said persons who may now be dead, or hereafter die, against the United States for damages for injury to property resulting, at any time on or after May 1, 1941, from dumping of sewage and laundry waste from Camp Davis, N. C., into Goose Creek, Barlow Creek, and Kings Creek.

"SEC. 2. Proceedings for the determination of such claims shall be had in the same manner as in cases of which said court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended: *Provided*, That suits hereunder shall be instituted within 4 months after the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this act shall be construed only to waive the immunity from suit of the Government of the United States and to confer jurisdiction upon said court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the persons named in section 1 hereof, and not otherwise to affect any substantive rights of the parties."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. LEROY HANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4456) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann the aggregate sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injury, the hospital and medical expenses, pain and suffering, loss of earnings, and property damage incurred by reason of the injuries and the property damage sustained by them as a result of being struck by an Army vehicle operated by Army personnel on Route 40, one-half mile north of Pennsville, N. J., on March 4, 1943, and said injuries and damage having been caused by the negligent operation of said Army vehicle so as to cause it to turn into the vehicle in which said Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann were riding: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$2,500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "injury, the hospital and medical expenses, pain and suffering, loss of earnings, and property damage" and insert "injuries."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the date "4" and insert "3."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT A. ATLAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4601) for the relief of Robert A. Atlas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert A. Atlas, of Minneapolis, Minn., the sum of $615. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert A. Atlas against the United States for services rendered to the War Department during February and March 1946, when he served as civilian optometrist at Fort Snelling, Minn: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIMITRI PETROU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4881) for the relief of Dimitri Petrou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the alien Dimitri Petrou, of New York, N. Y., as of the 18th of July 1945, the date on which he entered the United States temporarily as a visitor, if he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of Greece for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 8 after the word "visitor", strike out the balance of line 8 and all of line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW FERDINAND DEWITT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5145) for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Anderw Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., of route 21, Alexandria, La., a minor, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of his father, Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Sr., in an accident caused by a United States Army vehicle, near the city of Alexandria, La., in the parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana, on March 15, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the name "DeWitt", strike out "Junior" and insert "III."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Senior" and insert "Junior."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN KEITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5339) for the relief of John Keith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Keith, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $9,000. Such sum represents the loss sustained by Mr. Keith with respect to a contract entered into with the Federal Works Agency in 1944 for the construction of the Frontier Elementary School in San Diego, Calif. An error in transposing estimate figures to determine bid resulted in contracts drawn up for a sum lower than had been intended by the contractor. However, the correct sum of the bid was much lower than that submitted by any other contractor on this project.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. NEILL RAYMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5423) for the relief of E. Neill Raymond.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to E. Neill Raymond, examiner, Farmers Home Administration, Denver, Colo., the sum of $130.78, which represents the cost of transporting his immediate family from Washington, District of Columbia, to Denver, Colo., on August 21, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "pay", insert "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING TITLE TO MINERAL RIGHTS IN LAND IN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5201) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DORIS E. SNYDER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Doris E. Snyder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, Calendar No. 664, and Calendar No. 665, and Calendar No. 666 be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6556), an act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Senate amendment has already been read, I ask unanimous consent that it be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6556 and agree to the Senate amendment?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H. R. 6556, the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. When the bill was considered in the House, I made two principal objections:

First, that the requirement that the President obtain a report from the Tariff Commission as to the maximum permissible reduction to avoid injury to a

domestic producer would involve such interminable delay as to make negotiation of any new trade agreements almost impossible with the limited 1-year extension. The Senate amendments have substantially answered my criticism of the House bill in this respect. A time limitation of 4 months is placed upon the preparation of a report by the Tariff Commission. If the Tariff Commission does not file its report on the articles proposed for negotiation in a trade agreement to the President within such 4 months' period, then the President is authorized to proceed to negotiate, just as under existing law, without regard for the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Moreover, the Tariff Commission, in conducting its hearings and investigation, would not be limited to consideration of the effect of proposed changes in tariff rates upon the welfare of individual domestic producers, but rather of the effect upon an entire domestic industry. Not only is this sound policy, but it would also expedite the work of the Tariff Commission in making its findings and report to the President.

My second objection to the House bill was the requirement that the President submit to Congress for review and possible disapproval any trade agreement which would modify any duty or other import restriction to an extent greater than that recommended to him by the Tariff Commission. I argued that this proposal would constitute a return to the old Republican logrolling tariff policy embodied in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. The deletion by the Senate of this requirement is, in my opinion, an important recognition by the other body, in which I wholeheartedly concur, that the Congress is in no position to scientifically fix specific tariff rates upon the thousands of diverse articles coming into this country.

Under the Senate amendments the President would be required, within 30 days after a trade agreement exceeding the recommendations of the Tariff Commission has been entered into, to send to the Congress a copy of the agreement together with a message accurately identifying the articles with respect to which such recommendations are not complied with and stating his reasons for the action taken with respect to such article. In my opinion, this requirement is not unduly restrictive upon the President, and in fact may be a constructive contribution to the reciprocal trade agreements procedure.

Mr. Speaker, while I should have preferred a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act, both because it would have permitted better planning by the President for negotiating additional trade agreements and would have provided additional assurance to foreign countries that the Hull reciprocal trade policy will not be abandoned, I am convinced that H. R. 6556, as amended by the Senate, is infinitely preferable to allowing the present act to expire.

It is for these reasons, therefore, that I am supporting the Senate amendments.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a commencement address delivered at the University of Notre Dame by Mr. Paul G. Hoffman.

FOREIGN TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say regarding the unanimous request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] with regard to his request to concur in the Senate amendments to the extension of the Foreign Trade Agreements Act, having had an opportunity to consider the matter, we, the minority, have no objection to the gentleman's request that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The bill as amended by the Senate is less objectionable to the minority Members than the House bill, and with the restrictions and limitations with which the conferees would have to contend in their deliberations we see no reason for the delay which would be necessitated by sending the bill to conference. We have no objection to his request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain editorials.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial published in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

FLOATING OCEAN STATIONS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report of the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Coast Guard is authorized to operate and maintain floating ocean stations for the purpose of providing search and rescue, communication, and air-navigation facilities, and meteorological services in such ocean areas as are regularly traversed by aircraft of the United States.

"SEC. 2. The Coast Guard is authorized, subject to approval by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to operate, on floating ocean stations authorized by section 1 hereof, such air-navigation facilities as the Administrator may find necessary or desirable for the safe and efficient protection and control of air traffic. The Coast Guard, in establishing, maintaining, or operating any air-navigation facilities herein provided, shall request the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage."

And the House agree to the same.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1 of the Senate bill authorized the Coast Guard to operate and maintain such floating ocean stations as may be necessary or desirable to serve the needs of the armed forces and commerce of the United States and to fulfill the international obligations of the United States. Such stations were to be established to provide adequate meteorological, communication, search and rescue facilities for the safe, regular, and economic operation of air services over regions regularly traversed by commercial or military aircraft of the United States. The House amendment accomplished substantially the same objectives in different language, but (a) omitted reference to the establishment of such stations for the purpose of fulfilling the international obligations of the United States, and (b) added a proviso requiring the certificate of the Secretary of Defense as a condition precedent to the establishment of any such station. The conferees agreed to the adoption of the language employed by the House amendment, after eliminating the requirement that the Secretary of Defense certify the need for such stations.

Section 2 of the Senate bill (a) provided that the Coast Guard should obtain the approval of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for the operation, on such floating stations, of such air navigation facilities as the Administrator might find necessary or desirable to protect and control air traffic, and

(b) directed the Coast Guard to solicit the cooperation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to insure the utilization of personnel and facilities of the Administration to the fullest possible advantage. The House amendment omitted this section. The conferees agreed to the restoration of such section with one minor change in phrasing.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF AIDS TO NAVIGATION BY COAST GUARD

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That in order to aid navigation and to prevent disasters, collisions, and wrecks of vessels and aircraft, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate—

"(a) aids to maritime navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States;

"(b) aids to air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed force of the United States as requested by the Secretary of the appropriate Department within the National Military Establishment; and

"(c) Loran stations (1) required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States; or (2) required to serve the needs of the maritime commerce of the United States; or (3) required to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States as determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

"SEC. 2. The Coast Guard in establishing, maintaining, or operating any aids to air navigation herein provided shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage. Before locating and operating any such aid on military or naval bases or regions, the consent of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, shall first be obtained. No such aid shall be located within the territorial jurisdiction of any foreign country without the consent of the government thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to limit the authority granted by the provisions of section 77 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 621), or by section 5 (f) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (49 U. S. C. 175), or by title III of Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451 and the following).

"SEC. 3. Such aids to navigation other that loran stations shall be established and operated only within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established on the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (H. R. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill—

(1) Authorized the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to maritime navigation and air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces, and also loran stations required to serve the needs of such forces, the maritime commerce of the United States, and the air commerce of the United States;

(2) Specified that such aids might be established within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and at other places, including military or naval bases, beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States;

(3) Prescribed that loran stations so established to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States be such as may be determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to be required;

(4) Specifically required the Coast Guard to solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in obtaining the fullest utilization of the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

(5) Specifically required the Coast Guard to obtain the consent of the Secretary of the armed service concerned before establishing any such aids on military or naval bases or regions;

(6) Specifically required the procurement of the consent of any foreign country before establishing any such aid therein; and

(7) Provided expressly that nothing in the bill should limit the authority granted by certain cited statutes.

Section 1 of the House amendment contained in substance the provisions of the Senate bill referred to in paragraph (1) above, but omitted the remaining elements of the Senate bill. Section 2 of the House amendment contains in substance the provisions of element (2) of the Senate bill, and in addition provides authority for the establishment and operation of such aids other than the loran stations "at other places where such aids to navigation have been established on the date of the enactment of this Act."

The conferees agreed to a bill which, in three sections, contains all elements of the Senate bill and the House amendment thereto. Section 1 includes elements (1) and (3) of the Senate bill. Section 2 contains all other elements of the Senate bill. Section 3 contains the text of section 2 of the House amendment.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM IN THE FIELD OF LIGHTER-THAN-AIR AERONAUTICS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized and directed to study, and plan for, experimental lighter-than-air rigid airship construction and operation. The Commission shall report to the Congress as soon as practicable in the first regular session of the Eighty-first Congress the results of its study with such recommendations for further legislation as it may consider desirable and feasible for the development and operation of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted

by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The United States Maritime Commission shall receive the assistance and cooperation of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, and may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in conducting the study provided for in this act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OWEN BREWSTER,
A. W. HAWKES,
HOMER CAPEHART,
ED C. JOHNSON,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 1 of the House bill authorized and directed the United States Maritime Commission to formulate and carry into effect a program for the development, experimentation, procurement, and operation of lighter-than-air aircraft, and provided authority for the making of purchases and the execution of contracts necessarily incident thereto. The Senate amendment merely authorized the Commission to prepare a study and plan for experimental lighter-than-air rigid airship construction and operation, and required a report to be made to the Congress as soon as practicable during the first regular session of the Eighty-first Congress. The House recedes, with an amendment which directs the preparation of such study and plan, and the submission of such report to the Congress.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill authorized the Commission to (a) confer with and (b) utilize the personnel and facilities of other Government agencies in carrying out the provisions of the bill. The Senate amendment omitted element (a), but included element (b) in revised language. The House recedes, with an amendment making mandatory the rendition of assistance by other Government agencies to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the bill.

Amendment No. 3: Section 3 of the House bill authorized the appropriation of such sums as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill. The Senate amendment thereto accomplished substantially the same objective, but in revised language. The House recedes.

S. O. BLAND,
EDW. J. HART,
T. MILLET HAND,
HENRY J. LATHAM,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVERSION, MERGER, OR CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL BANKS INTO STATE BANKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6570) to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, feeling as I do about the potential effect and the implication involved in this bill, I was compelled to say when the matter was considered in the committee that I could not go along with the enactment of this legislation. As you may have observed, it is a bill to change the long-standing policy and law of the Nation with respect to the conversion, merger, or consolidation of national banks and State banks.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is the most dangerous time and period in our economy when this action could be taken. When I came to the Committee on Banking and Currency I spent about 3 months studying the law with respect to the Treasury Department, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve System, the latter, of course, being relatively a newer set-up in our economy and financial structure. The result of that study did not yield me enough knowledge to assume or presume to write a book on it, but I was satisfied that as we have the situation now as the result of these several establishments and monetary developments that it ought not to be disturbed, and that we have a very excellent method of banking in this country, each one necessary, and the law pertaining to them very jealously guarded, or should be. The proposal in this bill is to change the manner of the conversion of national banks into State banks. We have about 14,000 banks in the United States. Nine thousand of this number, or substantially that, are State banks; about 5,005 are national banks. The Federal Reserve System is dependent upon the national banks for its existence. Under the law it is required that national banks shall be members of the Federal Reserve System; as to the State banks, it is optional with them. Some of them come in and some do not. There is some, I think, slight ground for saving a little charge for banks desiring to withhold their membership or to withdraw their membership from the Reserve System, but this is not to be compared with the value of the system that we have and which obtains in the United States today.

Substantially, our financial structure has been orderly and preserved by the Treasury, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Banking System, since it was adopted some 30 years ago, or maybe not so long. There would be, to speak frankly about it, too much of a monetary temptation on the part of some national banks to withdraw from the Federal Reserve System, which they could only do by converting themselves into State banks. Then it would be optional with them as to whether they were members of the Federal Reserve System. I can see the possibility and maybe the probability that to make it easy, as this bill does, for national banks to convert into State banks, would be a temptation to them to do this, and there is potentially more than a possibility that enough of these banks would convert into State banks for the simple objective of avoiding the monetary requirement for the support of the Federal Reserve System. And, we could have at a time when this Nation owes—nobody can state the exact amount, but somewhere between $250,000,000,000 and $260,000,000,000, there would be difficulty in financing that and the ability to guarantee against disaster in these matters is so much fixed in the Federal Reserve System that we ought not to do anything that would lend itself to crippling our Federal Reserve System in the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying. I just wonder, if there is a real danger, why the Federal Reserve Board did not express opposition to the bill.

Mr. FOLGER. I did not intend to bring that up, Mr. Speaker, but you know that at this time we have as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board a very fine gentleman, whom I have met, and whom I regard most highly, upon whom we are likely to thrust without sufficient consideration this legislation that might result in the destruction of the Federal Reserve System. Frankly, I should like to have furnished to Mr. McCabe sufficient time for him to acquaint himself with the potentialities of such legislation. I do not mean to say this, but I doubt seriously whether Mr. McCabe has had an opportunity to give what he himself would determine to be a sufficient consideration to the implications involved in this legislation. I am persuaded from the little acquaintanceship I have had with him that if he had the time he would not allow somebody to come down from the Federal Reserve System and say, "We have no objection to this legislation." We are endangering his position as a relatively new Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board in insisting upon this legislation now.

I think, as a matter of fact, such legislation ought to be postponed, and ought to have been postponed until a later date. The two banking systems, the State banking system and the national banks, have run right along together in that proportion. The 9,000 State banks have remained at about that figure in number and the 5,000 national banks have remained at about that figure in number. I think there are 5,011 now.

I believe we are projecting a dangerous proposal in making it easier for banks to escape the amount of money they must keep with the Federal Reserve System to sustain it by voluntary withdrawal when they come to the State banks, and crippling the whole financial system of the United States, and I suggest that it is highly dangerous.

I am opposed to this bill, as I consider it very dangerous legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. (a) As used in this act the term "State bank" means any bank, banking association, trust company, savings bank (other than a mutual savings bank), or other banking institution which is engaged in the business of receiving deposits and which is incorporated under the laws of any State, any Territory of the United States, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, or which is operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia (except a national banking association).

(b) For purposes of merger or consolidation under the act the term "national banking association" means one or more national banking associations, and the term "State bank" means one or more State banks.

CONVERSION OF NATIONAL BANK INTO AND MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION WITH STATE BANK; PROCEDURE

SEC. 2. A national banking association may, by vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of each class of its capital stock, convert into, or merge or consolidate with, a State bank in the same State in which the national bank is located, under a State charter, in the following manner:

(a) The plan of conversion, merger, or consolidation must be approved by a majority of the entire board of directors of the national banking association. The bank shall publish notice of the time, place, and object of the shareholders' meeting to act upon the plan, in some newspaper with general circulation in the place where the principal office of the national bank is located, at least once a week for four consecutive weeks: *Provided*, That newspaper publication may be dispensed with entirely if waived by all the shareholders and in the case of a merger or consolidation one publication at least 10 days before the meeting shall be sufficient if publication for 4 weeks is waived by holders of at least two-thirds of each class of capital stock and prior written consent of the Comptroller of the Currency is obtained. The national banking association shall send such notice to each shareholder of record by registered mail at least 10 days prior to the meeting, which notice may be waived specifically by any shareholder.

(b) A shareholder of a national banking association who votes against the conversion, merger, or consolidation, or who has given notice in writing to the bank at or prior to such meeting that he dissents from the plan, shall be entitled to receive in cash the value of the shares held by him, if and when the conversion, merger, or consolidation is consummated, upon written request made to the resulting State bank at any time before 30 days after the date of consummation of such conversion, merger, or consolidation, accompanied by the surrender of his stock certificates. The value of such shares shall be determined as of the date on which the shareholders' meeting was held authorizing the conversion, merger, or consolidation, by a committee of three persons, one to be selected by unanimous vote of the dissenting shareholders entitled to receive the value of their shares, one by the directors of the resulting State bank, and the third by the two so chosen. The valuation agreed upon by any two of three appraisers thus chosen shall govern; but, if the value so fixed shall not be satisfactory to any dissenting shareholder who has requested payment as provided herein, such shareholder may within 5 days after being notified of the appraised value of his shares appeal to the Comptroller of the Currency, who shall cause a reappraisal to be made, which shall be final and binding as to the value of the shares of the appellant. If, within 90 days from the date of consummation of the conversion, merger, or consolidation, for any reason one or more of the appraisers is not selected as herein provided, or the appraisers fail to determine the value of such shares, the Comptroller shall upon written request of any interested party, cause an appraisal to be made, which shall be final and binding on all parties. The expenses of the Comptroller in making the reappraisal, or the appraisal as the case may be, shall be paid by the resulting State bank. The plan of conversion, merger, or consolidation shall provide the manner of disposing of the shares of the resulting State bank not taken by the dissenting shareholders of the national banking association.

SAME ENTITY

SEC. 3. The franchise of a national banking association as a national banking association shall automatically terminate when its conversion into or its merger or consolidation with a State bank under a State charter is consummated and the resulting State bank shall be considered the same business and corporate entity as the national banking association, although as to rights, powers, and duties the resulting bank is a State bank. Any reference to such national banking association in any contract, will, or document shall be considered a reference to the State bank if not inconsistent with the provisions of the contract, will, or document or applicable law.

FEDERAL TAXATION

SEC. 4. Without limiting the application of section 3, a State or national banking association resulting from a conversion, merger, or consolidation shall for purposes of Federal taxation be considered the same taxpayer as the bank from which it has converted or a bank which has merged or consolidated with it.

CONTRAVENTION WITH STATE LAW

SEC. 5. No conversion of a national banking association into a State bank or its merger or consolidation with a State bank shall take place under this act in contravention of the law of the State in which the national banking association is located; and no such conversion, merger, or consolidation shall take place under this act unless under the law of the State in which such national banking association is located State banks may without approval by any State authority convert into and merge or consolidate with national banking associations as provided by Federal law.

CONSENT OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 6. Section 12B (v) (4) of the Federal Reserve Act (title 12, U. S. C., sec. 264 (v) (4)), is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Without prior written consent by the Corporation, no insured bank shall (a) merge or consolidate with any nominsured bank or institution or convert into a noninsured bank or institution or (b) assume liability to pay any deposits made in, or similar liabilities of, any noninsured bank or institution or (c) transfer assets to any noninsured bank or institution in consideration of the assumption of liabilities for any portion of the deposits made in such insured bank. No insured bank shall convert into an insured State bank if its capital stock, or its surplus will be less than the capital stock or surplus, respectively, of the converting bank at the time of the shareholders' meeting approving such conversion, without prior written consent by the Comptroller of the Currency if the resulting bank is to be a district bank, or by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System if the resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a District bank), or by the Corporation if the resulting bank is to be a State nonmember insured bank (except a District bank). No insured bank shall (a) merge or consolidate with an insured State bank under the charter of a State bank or (b) assume liability to pay any deposits made in another insured bank, if the capital stock or surplus of the resulting or assuming bank will be less than the aggregate capital stock or aggregate surplus, respectively, of all the merging or consolidating banks or of all the parties to the assumption of liabilities, at the time of the shareholders' meetings which authorized the merger or consolidation or at the time of the assumption of liabilities, unless the Comptroller of the Currency shall give prior written consent if the assuming bank is to be a national bank or the assuming or resulting bank is to be a District bank; or unless the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System gives prior written consent if the assuming or resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a District bank); or unless the Corporation gives prior written consent if the assuming or resulting bank is to be a nonmember insured bank (except a District bank). No insured State nonmember bank (except a District bank) shall without the prior consent of the Corporation, reduce the amount or retire any part of its common or preferred capital stock, or retire any part of its capital notes or debentures."

CONTINUED DEPOSIT INSURANCE

SEC. 7. Section 12B (e) (2) of the Federal Reserve Act (title 12, U. S. C., sec. 264 (e) (2)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentences: "A State bank, resulting from the conversion of an insured national bank, shall continue as an insured bank. A State bank, resulting from the merger or consolidation of insured banks, or from the merger or consolidation of a noninsured bank or institution with an insured State bank, shall continue as an insured bank."

EFFECT OF TERMINATION OF INSURANCE OF MEMBER BANKS

SEC. 8. The last sentence of section 12B (1) (2) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C., sec. 264 (1) (2)), is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of this section, whenever a member bank shall cease to be a member of the Federal Reserve System, its status as an insured bank shall, without notice or other action by the board of directors, terminate on the date the bank shall cease to be a member of the Federal Reserve System, with like effect as if its insured status had been terminated on said date by the board of directors after proceedings under paragraph (1) of this subsection."

CONTINUED MEMBERSHIP IN THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

SEC. 9. Section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act (title 12, U. S. C., sec. 321) as amended, is amended by inserting after the first paragraph thereof the following new paragraph: "Upon the conversion of a national bank into a State bank, or the merger or consolidation of a national bank with a State bank which is not a member of the Federal Reserve System, the resulting or continuing State bank may be admitted to membership in the Federal Reserve System by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in accordance with the provisions of this section, but, otherwise, the Federal Reserve bank stock owned by the national bank shall be canceled and paid for as provided in section 5 of this act. Upon the merger or consolidation of a national bank with a State member bank under a State charter, the membership of the State bank in the Federal Reserve System shall continue."

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision

to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "the" and insert "this."

Page 2, line 13, after "national", strike out "bank" and insert "banking association."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "bank" and insert "banking association."

Page 5, strike out lines 10 to 16 inclusive.

Page 5, line 18, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 6, line 5, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 8, line 4, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Page 8, line 15, strike out "8" and insert "7."

Page 9, line 5, strike out "9" and insert "8."

Page 9, line 23, strike out "10" and insert "9."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT TO FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2225) to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration and of the Governor thereof under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 1751–1772), together with the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect thereto, which were transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1947, part IV, section 401, are hereby transferred to the Federal Security Agency.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the Federal Security Agency a Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, which shall be under the supervision of a director appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions and the Director thereof shall be under the general direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator. The functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, shall be exercised by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. The functions, powers, and duties of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, shall be exercised by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.

SEC. 3. There are hereby transferred to the Federal Security Agency, to be used in the administration of the functions hereby transferred, (a) all property, including office equipment, transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation pursuant to Executive Order 9148 of April 27, 1942, and in use on the effective date of this act; (b) all property, including office equipment, purchased by the Corporation for use exclusively in connection with the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, the cost of which has been charged to such functions and which is in use on the effective date of this act; (c) all records and files pertaining exclusively to the supervision of Federal Credit Unions; and (d) all personnel employed primarily in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, on the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. All funds allocated, specifically or otherwise, in the budget of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, which may be unexpended on the effective date of this act, shall be transferred by the Corporation to the Federal Security Agency for use in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended. The Corporation shall be reimbursed for the funds so transferred and shall also be reimbursed for all other funds expended by it prior to the effective date of this act in the administration of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, in excess of fees from Federal credit unions received by the Corporation, by deducting such amounts from the first moneys payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of the retirement of the stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation owned by the United States, and the Corporation shall have a charge on such stock for such amounts.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the thirtieth day following the date of enactment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 3, line 6, strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 671, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill (H. R. 6401) it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill, S. 2655, and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 6401 as passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 3 hours of general debate. It also waives all points of order. The bill is open to amendment under the 5-minute rule. It also provides for one motion to recommit. I am not personally going to ask for a roll call on the rule, but I am going to do so upon the final passage of the bill itself. The reason I am not going to ask for a roll call on the rule is that I believe the great majority of the Members of the House, after hearing debate on the bill, will be convinced that this is not a necessary or a good bill. We all want national security. The question is, do we want national security by the American way, or by coercion, compulsion, regimentation, and controls? What was disclosed before the Committee on Rules at the hearings in regard to this draft bill? I know that a few brass hats and braid and others were for this bill. The only thing they say is that there is a great emergency confronting this Nation, which necessitates shackling the youth of this country. These people say there is a great emergency, an emergency that will shackle the youth of the Nation, but at the same time they are not saying that there is an emergency in Washington, so that it will be necessary that the Congress of the United States should be here to meet it. I say it confuses me to have these people say there is such an emergency throughout the world that we need to take our young men from the mines and mills, farms and factories, and at the same time, these same individuals do not say that there is an emergency that should keep the Congress of the United States here in Washington.

What about voluntary enlistments? Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that voluntary enlistments have not been given a fair trial. I went back to my own district in Illinois last year and spent considerable time delving into this method of voluntary enlistments. I saw young boys come into my district trying to enlist these young men. They could not sell a sack of peanuts to anyone, but they would contact high-school boys and talk to them about 5 minutes—youths whom they had never seen—then go away, thinking that that 5-minute talk to a stranger would be enough to convince those young men to give up three or four of the best years of their lives.

I have heard it said, "Well, you voted for the 70-group air force. We must put in these additional young men to take care of that." The record discloses that the Air Force and the Navy are getting more applicants than they need for the Air Force and the Navy. My information is that the Air Force and Navy are not urging this peacetime draft bill.

We must all know that the history of wars shows clearly that it is not manpower in the armed services that it is most difficult to obtain when war starts, but after war is declared we know that manpower to produce equipment, airplanes, ships, and so forth, is our chief problem.

It has been said that Russia is a great threat. I think history will disclose that Russian communism does not spread through military aggression, but the method that the Communists use is through infiltration. They did that in Czechoslovakia; they are doing it in Italy; they are doing it in France; they are doing it in America. History discloses that they do not use military aggression in spreading their unfair, unreasonable, and detestable doctrines.

While some Members of Congress have taken the floor against regimentation and controls of cattle and sugar and meat and nylons—oh, they stood here and said, "We cannot have controls and regulations on nylons and sugar and cattle and sheep," but they are willing to regiment and control the lives of human beings.

I know that a strong national security is dependent upon a contented people and a solvent government. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot have a contented people when you take the youth of our Nation off the farms—out of the mines and mills and factories. Let those young people stay on and produce. Let those young men stay on the farms, in the mines, factories, or mills to produce. We have taken on an obligation to feed and take care of most of the world. We know that sending these billions of dollars' worth of goods abroad has raised prices, and will raise prices up to the sky. So, I say, let these young men remain there. Let them be carpenters or mechanics in their home life because it is also important in the event of an emergency that we have some skilled laborers.

After all, who is for this draft bill? All I know for it is the brass and the braid. That is all; a few international newspapers; probably a few top American Legion officials.

Who is opposed to it? From whom do we receive hundreds of letters? Are the patriotic groups for it? Certainly they are not for it. Are the schools for it? Most of them, Mr. Speaker, are opposed to the draft. Are the colleges for it? Why, of course not. Are the churches? No. Are the farm organizations? No. Are the labor organizations? No. Are the millions of young men for it? Of course not, Mr. Speaker, because if they were for military service we would not have this draft bill before us; they would be in the armed forces. Some people say these young boys just love military service. Mr. Speaker, I say if they loved it they would naturally be in it.

Are the millions of mothers and fathers for this bill? If they were, we would not have this bill before us.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No; not now.

So I will say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going to ask for a roll call vote on the rule, but I am going to ask for a roll call on the final vote. I believe that after you hear this debate you will be convinced that the Army has deliberately not tried to obtain volunteers, that they have intentionally raised the qualifications so high they cannot get recruits.

I may say that in the Rules Committee a change of one vote would have kept this bill bottled up.

I repeat, I am not going to ask a roll call on the rule, but I certainly will ask for a roll call on final passage, and I hope everyone will seriously consider the alternative: Do we want to go the American way, or do we want to go the way of compulsion, coercion, regimentation, and control?

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949, SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENSEN, FENTON, STOCKMAN, SCHWABE of Oklahoma, KIRWAN, NORRELL, and GORE.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the opposition that I find to what is here proposed is something that alarms me greatly. It makes me wonder if self-defense and resistance to wrong is no longer regarded as moral law. Surely no one is insensible to the danger to liberty which impends. That our country is embroiled in a world-wide struggle that the people would like to have avoided, must be apparent to all. To use the occasion to stimulate prejudice against our armed forces is to forget the gravity of the moment and to lend encouragement to the effort to undermine the foundations upon which the Republic rests.

There is in my heart no ill will toward those who have views contrary to my own, and I would not intentionally give offense, but that the strength of the Nation must now be marshaled in its own defense is my profoundest conviction. Concern for the welfare of our country must be the guide to what we do. We should not here impeach the expressed intention of what we have done. We should not sabotage the defense program that we have set up and render useless the billions and billions of dollars that we have spent and are now spending.

That Russia means to enslave the whole of mankind, the entire world takes cognizance. Her masters have said that communism and democracy cannot live side by side, that either the one or the other must perish.

To Russia's campaign of aggression, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland have fallen. Russia is in Austria, eastern Germany, and Korea. There is no place on this globe that is inhabited by man but that her agents are there promoting discord, fomenting strife, preaching revolution. Unhappily, we, simpleton-like, have permitted her to use our own resources to make war on us and the rest of the world. Shamefully, let it be confessed, we are in great measure responsible for the power which she now wields and the threat which she holds over the heads of mankind.

It has been with difficulty that the people have learned that which has heretofore been kept concealed from them, that is, that our policy of appeasement—amounting to something of a partnership arrangement with Russia—has brought this country to the verge of ruin and made necessary the spending of billions in the endeavor to overcome the most colossal blunder ever committed in the international field and to expiate the greatest crime of all time.

Mr. Speaker, what is proposed in this bill which the pending resolution is intended to make in order? The Committee sponsoring the bill has reported that the armed services needs to be increased in the interest of national security. The majority report filed is a simple, direct, plain, understandable statement of the situation as it exists. The minority report is a magnificent oration, but it is neither consistent nor convincing. In the minority report there is this language: "We feel that our objections to the conscription program in no way compromises our recognition that America must remain strong and well defended." So, the Committee on Armed Services are in agreement as the bill states, "That an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of the Nation." The difference we find between members of the committee is the method by which the needed strength may be attained, whether by voluntary enlistment or by the method provided for in the bill.

It is proposed that the strength of the Army be increased to 837,000 over its present strength of 542,000, that the Navy be increased from 397,000 to 556,882; Marine Corps from 81,000 to 110,000, and the Air Force from 364,000 to 502,600. In the light of present world conditions these increases are modest and reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony taken by the committee disclosed that the strength of all the branches of the Armed Services has been progressively diminishing with the exception of the Air Force. Let me turn to the report of the committee. From July, 1947, to March 1, 1948, the Army personnel dropped from 594,078 to 469,496. The Navy fell off from 434,000 to 351,000. The Air Force increased in its enlistment from 263,000 to 317,000.

The report of the committee discloses that the Army, resorting to every means at its command, has failed to obtain the necessary enlistments by the volunteer system. That is also true as to the Navy.

If the now authorized method of obtaining enlistments has not produced men sufficient to maintain the Army and Navy at present or presently authorized strength, then is it not reasonable to

suppose that it would fail to produce men in numbers sufficient to fill the requirements of an enlarged Army and Navy?

The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. ALLEN], insists that we should continue to rely upon the volunteer system, but if that plan has failed and cannot be made productive then what would he recommend? We must get the men by some means. The bill states that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selection as herein provided.

Let me make disclosure to you of something of which I am proud. Gentlemen opposing this bill tell you of the number of communications that they have had, telegrams and letters, in protest to the bill. I have had from my district and from the people of my State hundreds and hundreds of letters and telegrams, and up to this moment I have not had one in opposition to the bill. Now, why am I for conscription? I favor it because I do not want my part of the country drained of its young manhood in order that the full requirements of the armed services may be met. I have not forgotten that prior to World War II when relying upon the voluntary system my congressional district alone was putting more men into the armed services to fight the coming war than many of the States with their teeming millions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, obviously it is quite impossible to discuss all the details or anything like a considerable portion of the details of this legislation in a period of 6 minutes. We have before us now the matter of adopting a rule which will enable the House of Representatives to debate this question and make its own decision on the legislation. I have been contending for a good many weeks that it was the proper function, under these peculiar circumstances, of the Committee on Rules to give the House of Representatives this opportunity. The issue is too vital to be dodged, and the bill too important to be buried. For one, I rejoice that upon yesterday the Committee on Rules decided to bring in this rule which will make it possible for the Members of the House to make their decision.

I have listened, Mr. Speaker, for a good many years to debates and discussions on the problems of national defense. Some of the observations which I hear being made today and that have been made in the last several days are, unless I am very much mistaken, exactly along the same lines that I heard in 1940. Indeed, although it is not important and probably not even interesting, I heard the same sort of arguments made in 1920, when I happened to be chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate. Always the contention is made that it is not necessary to do this or that for our defense. Always the contention has been made that we can get along without this or without that. Upon a good many occasions in the past those urgings were influential and were accepted in very large degree, dating back to 1920, with the result, in my humble judgment, that we have lost thousands of lives and spent billions and billions of dollars as a result of our neglect. I know people may differ with me on that, but I cannot avoid at this time expressing that opinion, for it has been deep-seated in me for 28 years.

Among other things which so many people are apt to do when a war is over is to start denouncing the military services and saying that if they would do this differently or that differently all would be at its best. Denouncing the Army seems to be the fashion amongst a good many people as soon as the Army and the other military services have won a great victory. Expressions of lack of confidence in our military leaders are very numerous. Only a short time ago they were heroes in the minds of the public, and today those same men are not worthy of confidence in the minds of some.

I have encountered a good many of those men, and never once have I found a man who loved war, never once have I found a man who did not abhor war. Yet, charged as they are with the duty of studying our national defense and its potentials and expressing their opinions decently, one should not put aside ruthlessly the evidence which they produce.

It is not only they who produce the evidence which confronts us today. Mr. Speaker, you and I know full well that this world is in an exceedingly tense situation, exceedingly tense. I am not here to say that war is to come tomorrow or next week or in this calendar year or next year, but that the situation contains a menace to the freedom of the people of the United States cannot be denied.

If all the human race were angels or angelic characters the situation would be very different, but the trouble is that every so often in the history of our race a group arises composed of wicked people, that is, wicked in the sense that we understand that word here in the United States, people intent upon doing wrong and doing it in wholesale fashion. If those regrettable characteristics did not underlie some parts of human nature we would not have to maintain police forces in our cities. Why do we maintain them? To protect society against the wicked. Today it turns out—and we have not sought the responsibility—today it turns out that the United States is the country most looked to for the protection of liberty. Obviously we protect it primarily in our own interests, but we cannot protect our own liberty without at the same time doing our best to protect the liberties of other peoples who normally are our friends. And if we are not strong in the face of this menace, strong in the cause of righteousness, then we may very well fail.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to my distinguished friends, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who, I am sure you will join me in saying, are two of the most valued Members of the House of Representatives. Possibly it would be the better part of wisdom for "a sparrow to seek cover when the eagles begin to fly". But I am so thoroughly convinced—I have such strong convictions about this matter that I have no hesitancy in taking issue with the two distinguished gentlemen. I listened with great care to the remarks of my friend from Georgia, whom I love—and he knows it. At times he has a tongue as blistering as the tropical sun, but he has an inner spirit and a soul as refreshing as the evening dew.

I want to discuss some features of this bill now before us. At the outset I want to say this: It is thoroughly out of place for any man on the floor of the House to begin to insinuate with reference to the patriotism of any man who might oppose this legislation. I have no hesitancy in proclaiming my patriotism. I served in one war as many of you did, and if necessary to save this Nation, there is not a man in the House that I know of who would not serve in another. There is no question of patriotism involved here. It is a plain question of right or wrong. And when the gentleman from New York refers to "righteousness," he opens up a very important subject. He wants protection but is apparently unwilling to pay his protection fair compensation for services rendered unless they are commissioned officers. I am opposed to this legislation because it is undemocratic; it is not necessary. It is not in the best interests of society; it does not provide maximum safety; and it is definitely—definitely, I repeat, to the detriment of the educational system and the future of this country. Why do I say it is undemocratic? Because we are now stepping away for the first time, in times such as these, and saying that we are going to invoke the rules of regimentation. I want a strong Army, I want a strong Navy, I want a strong Air Corps and Marine Corps—but let us get them in the American way.

I say to those gentlemen who advocate this, How will you get the planes made for which you have appropriated billions of dollars? You will pay men to build them, you will pay good salaries. How do you propose to get men to build machines, and buildings to house these young men that you would reach out and take with the strong arm of this Government, and say, "You must come in"? You are going to pay them for it. That is how you will get them. Yet to the private in the Army you pay $75 a month. Does that hold any future? Is there anything there that would give to a young man an inspiration for 2 years? Talk about the morale of this country! My God, there is nothing that would

wreck it any more completely than this bill at this time and that I know.

I just witnessed the graduation of 2,300 young men and women at Duke University and the University of North Carolina. The young men were filled with optimism and enthusiasm to make good. What is the future for them? Do not tell me that young men will not go where it is attractive. They will. You do not have anything to do but make it attractive. Certainly, we want an insurance policy. But who are you and who am I to walk around and say, "I want that insurance policy furnished by someone else," when we are not even willing to pay for it? For too long the policy of this Government has been that 5 percent of the people do the marching, fighting, and dying while the other 95 percent make money.

I was struck by this statement in the bill:

> The Congress further declared that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally.

Why, certainly, it should be shared generally. Does that mean that we shall extract from these young men 2 years, black them out, so to speak, for $75 per month? No it means that we should all do our part. To those who serve as our protectors in peacetime should be paid fair compensation by those who are receiving protection. To do otherwise is obviously unfair. And certainly $75 per month for 24 hours service per day is insufficient, unfair, and unattractive.

The Navy is not enthusiastic over this bill. The Marine Corps is not enthusiastic over this bill. What is the matter with the Army? Why can they not make it attractive? Why is it that they have not encouraged their Reserve Corps? Why is it they have not given more attention to the National Guard? Why is it that they have not built the Reserve Corps? Why did they raise the physical and mental requirements of the men? Why is it they have those conditions prevailing which led the minority report to say that their lack of interest in those branches of our national defense had almost reached the point of a national scandal? Why is it they did not carry on with the National Guard and the Reserve? Why is it, when they were wanting universal military training, that they made the statement that they could get along with a minimum of 6 months' training for these men, and yet they now want them for 2 years? You and I know they have been pumping for this condition for years and years, and have been busy setting the stage. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] says he has been advocating this for 28 years, he did not make any mistake. I have been here only 14 years, but he has been grinding constantly for 14 years, to my knowledge. Certainly the Army wants more men, and more power, and no more wise statement was ever made than that men who want power and love to exercise it, should not be trusted with power. The heads are men; men are ambitious. The Congress of the United States should see to it that this country is protected against all isms including militarism.

I say to you, now watch the airplanes go up. Watch the machinery go to turning. Watch the pay rolls begin to build. This bill will set off more wartime prosperity but will present a gloomy picture to those who must serve against their will for $75 per month. Right now we have a half million postal employees. Never has it been necessary to draft them into the postal service. You have a million and a half civil-service employees, and right now we are fixing to raise their salaries, which is already many times what the private in the Army gets. But to the private you will say, if you are unwilling to serve for a paltry $75 per month, we will make you serve.

I am not fighting the Army, but the Army is supposed to tell us—the Congress—how many men they need and then get out of the picture, and not come up here and spend months and months and millions of dollars trying to propagandize this Congress and the country, trying to put over their doctrines and systems. They spent the taxpayers' money, and you know it, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], signed the report in which he very caustically condemned the Army for misspending certain of the taxpayers' money in propagandizing this country for the very bill we are now considering, and I quote from House Report No. 1073 of the first session of the Eightieth Congress:

> Your committee, therefore, reports its firm conclusion that, on the basis of the evidence at hand, the War Department, its personnel and civilian employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress, and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending before the Congress.
>
> Approved and signed by FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, HENRY J. LATHAM, CARTER MANASCO, J. FRANK WILSON.

If we need more men, then why employ the most drastic method, the draft, first? Why not arrange for fair compensation—increase the pay and see if that does not work. I am definitely of the opinion it will and am sure the Army is afraid it will.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I have never felt anything in my life more keenly than I do this. It is unjust, it is unfair, and there is enough fair play in this country, God knows, there is still enough for everybody. To say to me that with only approximately seven enlisted men in the Army for every officer right now, then I ask you what chance has an enlisted man or a drafted man for promotion? The real difficulty is that you cannot find any openings above the rank of sergeant. Your openings are below the rank of sergeant, and there is where you do not pay the men and that is why you do not get them. Make it attractive and you will get them. Do you want to build up and turn loose in this country, those of you who are interested in society and the welfare of society, do you want to turn loose a million and a half men who cannot get married, who cannot support a family if they get married; the wife must go back home to her parents? If they do not get married, they roam this country jumping back fences. That is not such a nice picture. Treat them fairly and pay them and you will not have these problems that are confronting you. If you reach in and draft the young high-school and college boys, where are you expecting to get your future scientists, doctors, and engineers from? A boy is seldom prepared to enter medicine before he is 21 or 22 years old.

In my opinion, this bill will unnecessarily set education back 2 years at least. If it was necessary, if the threat justified it, if war was in the foreseeable future, it might be justified. But fair pay, fair treatment, and a reasonable effort put forth by the armed services will, I am sure, produce the desired results, which is an adequate Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, there are certain incontrovertible facts with respect to this legislation that even the proponents must admit. The first is that this is a major step toward war. The second is that it militarizes the youth of the country. The third is that conscription plus military appropriations to the extent to which we have gone will beyond any doubt place this Nation on a basis of a war economy. I for one would support such a program if such a program were in the interest of the defense of the American people and the best interests of the common people of this Nation. It definitely is not. Despite the tons of newspaper headlines and the millions of radio words we are not in danger of attack.

This program of war and consequent depression is not a program in defense of the best interests of the American people. It is merely a military implementation of the foreign policy which protects the expansionism of Wall Street monopoly capital all over the world.

We must examine this war policy in the light of past and present events.

Our policy in Greece is not a policy in defense of the interests of the American people; it is the policy of imperialistic aggression even going to the extent of establishing and supporting an out-and-out Fascist government.

Our policy in China certainly is not a policy in the interests of the democratic rights of either the people of this Nation or of Asia; it is a policy of supporting Wall Street's imperialistic expansionism there even to the extent of repeating in China, in Asia, what Wall Street did in Europe prior to and subsequent to Munich; that is, the protection of the Hitler of China, Chiang Kai-shek.

This legislation, therefore, is merely an implementation of a program of Wall Street, Wall Street capital, that has gone into Europe, that went into Europe even before the last shot was fired, and is taking over the economy and destroying the liberties of all the people of the world. For that imperialism, we first use the money of the American people; for that

imperialism we are now asked to destroy the very liberty and future of America's youth. Conscription, not for defense, but for Wall Street profit is the proposition before us. For me, the blood of Americans comes before the profits of the big trusts. Yes, the same trusts that impoverish Americans and now would have us take the sons of Americans to guarantee the big trust exploitation of the peoples of the world.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I beg the privilege to introduce myself in connection with this proposed legislation to those who may have forgotten or who never knew how I stood in 1941 before Pearl Harbor, and every day thereafter. I did not fail to vote for any method or any bill for the defense before Pearl Harbor, after June 14, 1941, and until it was all over.

War was abroad in the world. There was no reasonable ground to believe that we would not be drawn into it. Some of us insist that every effort was made to keep out of it and to persuade the warring nations to cease their warfare and compose their differences. Some very patriotic men said we waited too long. I do not reckon that we did.

But I am opposed to this bill. I think it is one of the most awful contemplations I have ever known in all of my life. In a day when there is only a little skirmishing going on, and with which we have no part, we propose to enact a law that would take and put into what we call selective service—but when you call it correctly, it is conscription—our boys from 18 and 19 to 26 years of age, at the very time when they ought to be at home, at the very period in their lives when to take the youths within those ages is the most harmful thing we can do to the growth of the morale and the morality of the growing youth of the land.

I got mighty tired of voting to send these boys into war when it was on and when it was inevitable, but I had to do it. We do not have to do it now. It is a difference of opinion, a contemplation, largely a matter of hysteria among some people. I am not going to say anything that reflects upon the military people of this Nation other than to say that we have been fed too much of it in this world.

There has been too much of a disposition on the part of the civilian population to accept that idea of danger 100 percent that is suggested to the Congress and to the people by the military mind. What we are doing is a futile thing anyway. The day of ground forces is gone. The time of airpower with all of its destructive implications and possibilities is here. We are chasing rabbits in a fox race when you run off conscripting boys between 19 and 26 years of age to fight with guns and toy pistols and things like that in the face of airplanes and atomic power. They did a glorious job in the war with Germany, but the war was finally brought to an end by the bombing of the cities of Germany that brought them to their knees. In one or two nights Japan was brought to her knees and to surrender, by atomic power and not at the sacrifice of lives of the boys who had been conscripted.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the House, we are presented here with a very important and far-reaching issue in American life. For my part let me say at the outset that I expect to support the resolution for the rules, and I am prepared to recognize that the circumstances may require, the situation in the United States and in the world may require, and the needs of the armed services may require a reasonable, fair, and proper draft bill. Gentlemen, if we must have a conscription law, must we have the worst conscription law in the entire western world? Stop and think of this a moment. In all the countries of western Europe where conscription exists there is not one that has a term of service in excess of 1 year. Great Britain, 12 months commencing next January; France, 12 months; Belgium, 12 months; Holland, 12 months; Sweden, 11 months; Denmark, 11 months; Norway and Italy, 12 months. Moreover, the age categories subject to immediate induction in those conscription countries is generally limited to 18 or 19 through 21. Yet, for the first time that we are called upon for conscription in the United States, in a period when no great war is being waged in other parts of the world as in 1939, we are asked to impose upon the American people the harshest and most ruthless draft law in the Western World. And there is no conscription at all in any country in the Western Hemisphere.

Now, just stop and think for a moment what this bill provides. The 19 to 26 provision in the pending bill means that in effect every boy who registers at 19 will be subject to call with a Damoclean sword hanging over his head between the ages of 19 and 26, unless he be called early in the game. That means that for the period of time between registration and actual call to service he will have no freedom of choice or action; he will be frozen in suspense; he will be paralyzed in his occupation; he will be unable with assurance to start a career, learn a skill or undertake a new business, or plan to carry through his education.

I am going to propose amendments at the appropriate time, and I hope the Members of the House will support me, providing, first, that the term of service be reduced to 1 year for the individual, and second that the age groups subject to immediate induction, be limited to men between 19 through 21 years of age.

The third amendment has to do with categories. In the deferment provision of the pending bill the President is given authority to defer any category or class of persons as described. Who can forget the scandal that arose out of the First World War draft when categories of persons were exempted? Do you remember the case of one of the great pugilists, who had become a shipyard worker and, as a member of such category, was exempt from military call? These amendments will make available practically all men in three age classes, 19, 20, and 21. Each year an additional group of 1,138,000 young men turn 18. This makes a very large pool of manpower available for call.

It seems to me that we do not have to follow blindly the dictates of the generals. Of course, they prefer the easier course for themselves—to wit, the longest possible term of service. Should we not give some attention to the people who are going to suffer the impact of this draft? Should we not think a little bit of the young man who is going to have 2 years taken out of his formative period, and perhaps 7 years of his life frozen by liability to a delayed call?

I hope the Members will be here at the time these amendments are offered and will support them.

THE $15,000,000 MILITARY PROPAGANDA HAS PREVAILED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen favoring this legislation say that it may be necessary for the defense and protection of our country, but in view of the President's statement in California in which he stated he was working for peace and the strengthening of the authority and power of the United Nations and in consideration of the opinion of the Honorable James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State, the Honorable Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, and many military authorities that there is no danger of war, and that it has been widely publicized that Russia is gradually making overtures and suggesting negotiations for the purpose of bringing about peace and reduction in armaments, I feel that these are factors that should be seriously considered by the membership before voting on the bill.

It is my opinion that it is unwarranted to force conscription on our people in peacetime. All the kings and emperors of Europe forced conscription on their subjects through all the years, and what good did it do them. Do we want to follow their foolish policy? Conscription and militarism will not aid anything; in fact, it will endanger our Nation. Consequently, I have been and am opposed to this bill to conscript young men in peacetime, affecting as it will from five to six million of our youth and unnecessarily disrupting their lives.

This legislation will add to the already heavy war burdens, increasing the expenditures for our armed forces to $33,000,000,000, and will reach the staggering sum of $45,000,000,000, which is more than the total income of the Nation in 1932. It will put a strain on the taxpayers of our country and I fear the increase in taxes that will be necessary to carry out the program will affect and weaken our economic policy. Where will the money come from? How long can a nation, though rich, be able to stand these expenditures? To me our country's sound economy is stronger than conscription.

Mr. Speaker, I have received within the last 4 or 5 days, as a member of the Committee on Rules, at least 1,800 tele-

grams and letters from churches, universities, colleges, and organizations of all kinds protesting the enactment of this legislation. I venture to say that 90 percent of the American people are against peacetime conscription. I want you to believe me—if I thought that our country was in danger now and needed conscription I, naturally, would support this resolution for a peactime draft. I voted in favor of a declaration of war in the First and Second World Wars and the interests of my country are closest to my heart.

I love my country and I want to preserve its democracy, its freedom, and its liberties, but I am not willing to turn the country over to a militaristic gang that spent, according to the testimony before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, $15,000,000 in propaganda to create hysteria and fear throughout the Nation, and especially in the hearts of the mothers of our youth. It is regrettable that the membership should be swayed by this hysteria. It has been made clear by those having the real interest of our country and our democratic form of government at heart that the conscription of our youth is not necessary at this time because the records of enlistments show that our Air Force and Navy are able to obtain more men than either of these branches actually need and are rejecting many applicants. It is charged that the war-minded gentlemen in the War Department have deliberately failed to make an honest effort to obtain the required personnel through voluntary enlistments. They have ignored the National Guard and Air Force Reserve and have flooded the country with propaganda that there is a shortage in the armed forces. Yes; it has been stated that it is selfishness on the part of the military gentlemen who advocate the expansion of the armed forces because it means promotions and increased compensation for them. If the military leaders would accord better treatment of the enlisted soldier, provide them with better quarters, increase their compensation, give consideration to the National Guard, and draw on and utilize the 2,000,000 men in the Reserves, there would be no difficulty in obtaining the men they claim are needed without resorting to conscription.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot add much to what has been said by the loyal and sincere members who have preceded me. They have made it clear that it would be unfair and unwise to pass this legislation. I am confident that if the membership had been present at the meeting of the Committee on Rules and heard the testimony of the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], and the ranking member of the Committee on the Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], no amount of pressure could make you vote for this legislation.

It has been stated by the sponsors of this legislation that the proposed conscription will be for a temporary period, but the fear is expressed by those protesting the enactment of the bill that it will be permanent and will be the first step in turning our Government over to the militaristic forces. Members of the Committee on Armed Services state that this is not a bad bill but, to me, nothing could be worse than a bill that would disrupt the lives of millions of our young men.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say and hope that after the conclusion of general debate, when the Members have all the facts before them, I am confident they will vote against the bill and will approve the action of those members of the Committee on Rules who sought to save the House from voting on this legislation at this time—legislation that, if enacted, would tend, yes, threaten to destroy our democratic form of Government and give the selfish militaristic clique the power to rule the country. If we have the actual interest of the country at heart, we will first show our appreciation to the millions of ex-servicemen and their kinfolk who, for years have been unsuccessfully seeking a decent place to live, by passing the housing bill to provide them with low-cost homes within their financial reach; we will adopt legislation that will stop the ever-increasing cost of living which is creating unrest and discord in our Nation; we will pass decent social security legislation instead of passing a bill that will take away social-security benefits from 750,000 workers; we will pass a 75 cents an hour minimum wage bill to help the low-paid wage earner meet the 40-percent increase in the cost of living; we will pass the oleomargarine tax repeal bill in the interest of the American housewives; and at least give consideration to the Fair Employment Practices Commission bill. Favorable action on this and other meritorius legislation would bring about contentment instead of fear and misgivings to a great majority of the American people. It is the record of the Republican majority of the Eightieth Congress that they have not legislated in the interest of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I have yielded more times to Members who desired to speak than I had anticipated and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein excerpts from a few of the 1,800 telegrams and communications which I received and which I intended to read to indicate to the membership the strong opposition to this proposed peacetime conscription. They give the sentiment of persons and organizations from every section of the United States and are in much stronger terms than I could express. I urge the Members to read these communications before they cast their vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

From the pastor of the Lewiston, Mo., Methodist Church:

It drafts boys who are not even privileged to vote into this caldron of hate and blood and death. They are helpless and voiceless.

It ushers immature boys into the atmosphere of vice, nicotine, and liquor.

The measure is war-provoking in several ways. Russia will say we are warlike. Our own military leaders will be less inclined to be patient, and incidents will occur leading to war.

Following from the Northern California Baptist Convention:

Compulsory military conscription in time of peace is contrary both to the American ideal of religious and civil liberties.

History has demonstrated that compulsory military establishments in time of peace have not forestalled war.

Compulsory military conscription would be destructive of the morals of our American youth.

Some of us are thoroughly convinced of the evil of such universal military conscription, and feel that if it is fastened on our Nation, our dream of world peace will be pushed farther and farther away. We feel that our young people should be protected from such regimentation, and indoctrination for war.

From the pastor of the First Evangelical United Brethern Church in Elgin:

I am convinced that this is a step toward totalitarianism, and that it may lead us into another futile and destructive war.

From the pastor of the Asbury Methodist Church, Chicago:

We have fought two devastating wars against militarism on the claim that we stand for the democratic way of life. We have argued that an intelligent democracy can defend itself against aggression without surrendering its freedom of life in time of peace. And we have proved to the world that our position is sane and safe. We did defend ourselves. Why surrender those convictions now? A regimented mass of militarily trained people may be as outmoded in the next war as were the Hindenburg and the Seigfried lines in the last.

The minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Syracuse, N. Y., writes:

It is my conviction that such legislation would divert vast amounts of funds from more adequate means of defense and would fasten upon the United States a military mentality and a military system which would in a very short time do violence to our cherished way of American life.

The minister of the Ridge Farm Friends Church, Ridge Farm, Ill., writes:

I, too, am opposed to UMT. First, on the grounds that it has never prevented wars (European history is clear on this point). Second. UMT would be just another "rathole" spending operation, and yet could not make the United States effective militarily, in a defensive war in this atomic age. Third, UMT is, obviously, not an American institution, and is more likely to lead to totalitarian practices than to a greater democracy.

The general secretary of the Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Philadelphia, writes:

We reaffirm our historic position of opposition to peacetime military conscription as constituting a dangerous extension of regimentation by Government, an inadequate measure of defense in an atomic age, and a violation of the spirit of our present determination to secure the multilateral reduction of arms and armies.

A California writer points out, that as Washington said, "The greatest single threat to a Republic is an overgrown military establishment."

A letter from a man in Seattle, Wash., states in part:

If Congress votes in a conscription or draft law, thereby capitulating to the military, the whirlwind which we American people will ultimately reap will be deserved. A draft law will signify to the world that we are more

interested in mobilizing for war than for peace. It will signify to the world that we are willing to fight again in spite of the fact that the Nobel Prize scientist, Harold C. Urey, has said, "As a scientist I tell you there must never be another war." It will notify the world that we are willing to put an end to this our civilization in order to fight what will undoubtedly be called, when the time comes, a defensive war.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building:
As First World War veteran and father of Army pilot in last war urge more study before passage of first peacetime draft in Nation's history. Leaders of all religious faiths nearly unanimous in opposition to conscription which guarantees neither peace nor victory. No good reason for passage this session with war not impending.
JOHN J. IRWIN,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building:
National Youth Council of Church of Brethren composed of 100 youths representing 40,000 youth in 35 States unanimously instructed me today to urge barring draft bill from House debate. Urge consideration constructive efforts to raise living standards at home and abroad and develop international harmony through United Nations.
CHARLOTTE WEAVER,
President, Chicago, Ill.

Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Earnestly urge you to oppose peacetime draft the threat of military control of civilian life the military conditioning of youth and the hostile international gesture make this an unwise reversal of our national policy.
HAROLD LEONARD BOWMAN,
Minister, First Presbyterian Church of Chicago.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Deeply concerned Senate action on selective service; 132 representatives Woman's Society Christian Service Methodist Church from nine North Central States in annual session strongly urge bill be kept in committee. Feel bill inconsistent with policies we accepted as members of United Nations and imperils peace of world.
WOMAN'S SOCIETY, CHRISTIAN SERVICE, NORTH CENTRAL JURISDICTION, METHODIST CHURCH,
Lake Forest, Ill.

Representative A. SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.
We commend your opposition to conscription. We fear any such step toward military totalitarianism. Our security rests in United Nations and sound democracy at home.
DELBERT BLICKENSTAFF,
President, Wesley Foundation, St. Paul Methodist, Chicago, Ill.

Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.
Just returned from Illinois Methodist conference where lay and ministerial delegates from 700 churches showed much alarm at Senate action on conscription and order telegrams sent to Representative ALLEN urging House leadership to seek prevention of such legislation by any legal means.
C. W. GAMER,
Monmouth, Ill.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge vote to keep unnecessary un-American warlike draft in Rules Committee rather than letting brass hats run Nation.
Mr. and Mrs. H. C. GEMMER,
Rev. ROBERT GEMMER,
Indianapolis, Ind.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Washington, D. C.:
As military leaders admit no immediate danger of war I urge delay of action on draft to afford time to counteract misleading illegal Army propaganda.
GELSTON MCNEIL,
Baltimore, Md.

Representative A. J. SABATH,
House Office Building:
Peacetime conscription seems absolute repudiation of our peaceful protestations in view of recent Russian softening entirely needless. We should explore this softened attitude as Secretary Marshall seems inclined to do. There is plainly no immediate crisis and no need for haste. I urge strongly rejection of selective service bill now.
HALE SUTHERLAND,
Bethlehem, Pa.

ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Army propaganda and military hysteria threaten our democratic way. Vote against peacetime conscription.
Mr. and Mrs. J. A. CADWALLADER,
Yardley, Pa.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Washington, D. C.:
A peacetime draft is un-American, breeds suspicion and pessimism, overtaxes our economy, and strengthens fascism without overthrowing communism. Please vote against draft.
JOHN ANNAS,
Syracuse, N. Y.

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives:
Please don't destroy precious American freedom; pigeonhole freedom-destroying un-American draft bill. Stop fanatical warmongers; be a patriot; fight for American liberty; kill the draft.
A. MUNZLINGER,
Pasadena, Calif.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building:
This is to commend you for your admirable stand to protect this country from peacetime militarism. Please do everything you can to prevent the House from making a hasty, ill-advised decision on this bill—the greatest internal threat in history to American individualism; a proposal to surrender our youth to the tutelage of military minds. The Nation will be grateful to you.
HENRY WOLFF,
Baltimore, Md.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House Building, Washington, D. C.:
Defeat draft bill. Military means for solving world problems outmoded since Hiroshima. Create Secretary of Peace, also international students exchange.
COMBAT VETERANS LOUIS and
MERYL IJAMS,
Chicago, Ill.

Hon. ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Most evidently the real purpose for the proposed draft is not to defend the United States against an invasion but to force our boys against their will and convictions to give their lives, health, and freedom for people who are divided against themselves. I understand that you are wisely against this peacetime draft for such a purpose and urgently request you to vote against it in the House Rules Committee, where your vote will be most effective and consistent with your convictions. If service for such a purpose cannot be secured by our voluntary system than our Representatives should never force it on the American people. The proposed draft will never solve the problem. Please vote against it every time and do all in your power to prevent its passage.
R. R. WALL,
Bluefield, W. Va.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

(Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the House and in the Committee of the Whole, and include some extracts.)

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I fear if this bill is passed that we will have conscription in this country for years and years to come, not only because the Army is after 800,000 more men at the present time, but because we are building up an armed service in this country so that we will be domineered by the armed services branch of the Government. The fact of the matter is that I am afraid the armed services of the Government will take the country over. We are headed in that direction. This is the beginning of driving this country into socialism—into communism, it might come to that point—but certainly it will drive it into militarism.

Militarism is what Hitler gave to Germany after World War I. It brought on World War II. Should we pass this bill it means that the military arm of our Government, Navy, Air Corps, Militia, Marines, will control the destiny of our great Government. None of that for me, I want no part of it in Government control.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] made the statement that this bill was too vital to be buried. I say, if you do not bury this bill now you will bury hundreds and thousands of our young men in the future, and you will bury many, many heartbreaks that are bound to come because of this bill. To my mind, it is one of the most uncalled-for pieces of legislation that has ever been presented to the Congress since I have been a Member of the Congress. Kill the bill before the bill is the cause of your slow death in enslavement of the armed forces.

It seems to me that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] hit the nail on the head. Under this bill you will go out and conscript the youth of this Nation, 19 to 25 years of age, and throw them into the Army against their will. Just think of the fathers and mothers who have counted on their boys to go out and do the things they would like to have them do, in the professional life, in business life, or any other walk of life that they may wish to enjoy. Here, you are compelling them now to go into the Army. Never in the history of our country in peacetime have we done that.

There are many, many boys who would join the Army if they were given the same advantage and the same opportunity that men have in industry, that men have in professional life, or that men have in any avocation they choose to follow.

You are going to take this man's boy and put him in the Army at $70 a month, when your neighbor's boy, who may be exempt because he is physically incapacitated, will be able to go out and earn two or three or four hundred dollars a month, and he will have a grand time doing it. When you put that boy in the Army against his will, for 2 or 3 years, at only $70 a month, is there anything right or just or honest in a bill of that kind? If that is the kind of legislation you Members of this Congress want to vote for, that is all right with me, but I would not vote for it under any consideration. I think it is unfair and unjust, as much so as any legislation that has ever been presented to this House since I have been a Member of it.

Why are you passing this legislation? Has anybody shown you any reason why we need it? It has never been brought to my attention since I have been a Member of this House or a member of the Rules Committee. I have heard all kinds of arguments, but the only thing is that we need more men in the Army. Who wants it? The armed forces themselves want it. They are not treating the volunteers right now. They have put the pressure on that. They have raised the qualification tests to 80 points. If they would put that down and shorten the enlistment period and give them better housing and give the Organized Reserves an opportunity, and pay the enlistees $125 per month you would not need to draft one single man. They would fill the quota in 3 months, and this un-American bill would not be necessary. I would vote for a bill for national defense if the conditions warrant. They do not warrant it now. That has been reliably told to us by our Intelligence Service. We have not the $3,000,000,000 to waste in this program. This bill will put our armed services expenses for past wars and for our armed services annual expenditures up to over thirty billions a year. Add to that the interest on the debt of five billions, then add the cost of government, and you have a budget annually of over forty-five billions a year. It will wreck us financially, and a nation that is not solvent cannot support such a budget. This bill is wrong for our Nation at this time, and I hope we can defeat it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were—ayes 128, noes 44.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and there were—yeas 329, nays 61, answering "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—329

Abbitt	Dorn	Karsten, Mo.
Abernethy	Durham	Kean
Albert	Eaton	Kearney
Allen, Calif.	Eberharter	Kearns
Allen, Ill.	Elliott	Keating
Allen, La.	Ellsworth	Kee
Andersen, H. Carl	Elston	Keefe
Anderson, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Kelley
Andrews, Ala.	Engle, Calif.	Kennedy
Andrews, N. Y.	Evins	Kersten, Wis.
Angell	Fallon	Kilburn
Arends	Fellows	Kilday
Bakewell	Fenton	King
Barrett	Fernandez	Kirwan
Bates, Ky.	Fisher	Kunkel
Bates, Mass.	Flannagan	Lanham
Battle	Fletcher	Larcade
Beall	Fogarty	Latham
Beckworth	Foote	Lea
Bell	Forand	LeCompte
Bender	Fuller	LeFevre
Bennett, Mich.	Fulton	Lesinski
Bennett, Mo.	Gallagher	Lewis, Ky.
Blackney	Gamble	Lewis, Ohio
Bland	Garmatz	Lichtenwalter
Blatnik	Gary	Lodge
Bloom	Gathings	Love
Boggs, Del.	Gavin	Lucas
Boggs, La.	Gearhart	Lusk
Bolton	Gillette	Lyle
Bonner	Gillie	Lynch
Boykin	Goff	McConnell
Bradley	Goodwin	McCormack
Bramblett	Gordon	McCulloch
Brehm	Gore	McDonough
Brophy	Gorski	McDowell
Brown, Ga.	Gossett	McGregor
Bryson	Graham	McMahon
Buchanan	Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.
Buck	Grant, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.
Buffett	Gregory	Mack
Bulwinkle	Gross	MacKinnon
Burke	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mahon
Burleson	Gwynne, Iowa	Maloney
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagen	Manasco
Camp	Hale	Mathews
Canfield	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meade, Ky.
Cannon	Hall, Leonard W.	Merrow
Carroll	Halleck	Meyer
Carson	Hand	Michener
Case, N. J.	Hardy	Miller, Calif.
Case, S. Dak.	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Conn.
Chadwick	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Md.
Chelf	Harris	Miller, Nebr.
Clason	Harrison	Mills
Cole, Kans.	Hart	Mitchell
Cole, N. Y.	Harvey	Monroney
Colmer	Hays	Morgan
Combs	Hébert	Morris
Cooley	Hedrick	Morrison
Cooper	Heselton	Morton
Corbett	Hess	Muhlenberg
Cotton	Hill	Multer
Coudert	Hinshaw	Mundt
Courtney	Hobbs	Murdock
Cox	Hoeven	Murray, Tenn.
Cravens	Hoffman	Nicholson
Crawford	Holmes	Nixon
Crow	Hope	Nodar
Curtis	Horan	Norblad
Dague	Huber	Norrell
Davis, Ga.	Jackson, Calif.	O'Hara
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson, Wash.	O'Konski
Dawson, Ill.	Jarman	Pace
Dawson, Utah	Javits	Passman
Deane	Jenkins, Ohio	Patman
Devitt	Jenkins, Pa.	Patterson
D'Ewart	Johnson, Calif.	Peterson
Dingell	Jones, Ala.	Phillips, Calif.
Dirksen	Jones, N. C.	Phillips, Tenn.
Dolliver	Jones, Wash.	Pickett
Domengeaux	Jonkman	Ploeser
Dondero	Judd	Plumley
Donohue	Kasscer	Poage
Potts	Schwabe, Okla.	Potter
Poulson	Scott, Hardie	Thompson
Preston	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Tibbott
Price, Fla.	Scrivner	Tollefson
Price, Ill.	Seely-Brown	Trimble
Priest	Shafer	Van Zandt
Rains	Sheppard	Vinson
Ramey	Sikes	Vorys
Rayburn	Smathers	Wadsworth
Redden	Smith, Kans.	Walter
Rees	Smith, Va.	Weichel
Reeves	Smith, Wis.	Welch
Riehlman	Snyder	Wheeler
Riley	Somers	Whitaker
Rivers	Spence	Whitten
Rizley	Stanley	Whittington
Rockwell	Stefan	Wigglesworth
Rogers, Fla.	Stevenson	Williams
Rogers, Mass.	Stockman	Wilson, Tex.
Rohrbough	Sundstrom	Winstead
Rooney	Taber	Wolcott
Ross	Talle	Wolverton
Russell	Taylor	Wood
Sadlak	Teague	Woodruff
St. George	Thomas, Tex.	Worley
Sanborn	Thompson	Youngblood

NAYS—61

Arnold	Havenner	O'Brien
Banta	Heffernan	Philbin
Barden	Holifield	Powell
Busbey	Hull	Rankin
Butler	Isacson	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Jensen	Rich
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Sabath
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Cole, Mo.	Kerr	Schwabe, Mo.
Crosser	Klein	Scoblick
Davis, Wis.	Knutson	Short
Delaney	Landis	Simpson, Ill.
Doughton	Lemke	Smith, Ohio
Douglas	McCowen	Stratton
Ellis	McGarvey	Twyman
Elsaesser	Mansfield	Vail
Feighan	Marcantonio	Vursell
Folger	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Granger	Mason	
Griffiths	Murray, Wis.	

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

Chenoweth

NOT VOTING—39

Andresen, August H.	Hendricks	Peden
Auchincloss	Herter	Pfeifer
Bishop	Jennings	Regan
Brooks	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Buckley	Kefauver	Sarbacher
Byrne, N. Y.	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Chapman	Lane	Smith, Maine
Clark	Ludlow	Stigler
Clippinger	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Coffin	Madden	Towe
Cunningham	Meade, Md.	West
Hartley	Norton	
	O'Toole	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Towe with Mrs. Norton.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Lane.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. NICHOLSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HERTER. If he were present he would have

voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6935, Rept. No. 2349) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, tentatively I reserve points of order on the bill, subject to any agreement which the gentleman from New York desires to submit to the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that title III of the bill and section 401, the penalty-mail provision and the provision for renegotiation of contracts may be considered in order in consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was reported out unanimously by the subcommittee and by the full committee. The suggestion of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, that the two titles to which he referred be made in order meets with the approval of the minority members of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the remainder of the bill.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, many Members have inquired whether or not it is planned to have a night session tonight in order to bring about final action on the pending measure. I wish the Members to know what the program is and arrange their own plans accordingly.

I may say, at the outset, that the measure before us is one of great consequence to the country and one with respect to which we carry a very great responsibility.

It is my hope, as I stated on yesterday, that we can proceed expeditiously with the consideration of the bill. I am sure, however, that action cannot be completed this evening, so it is my idea that we work along until a reasonable hour this evening, disposing of general debate and such amendments as may be offered to the bill and that we continue consideration of the bill and amendments tomorrow.

I do very much hope that all of the amendments which may be offered may be considered tomorrow so that by some reasonable time in the afternoon we can conclude our action on the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman be agreeable to the Committee rising at 5:30 this evening?

Mr. HALLECK. At 5:30 or 6. That would be my idea of a reasonable time, particularly having met at 10 o'clock this morning. That probably would represent a very good day's work.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON STREAM-POLLUTION BILL

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill S. 418, the stream-pollution bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in regard to the President's veto of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill; and to extend his remarks by including an endorsement of the Conference of American Small Business, comprising 600 organizations.

Mr. NODAR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement of certain benefits to veterans in North Carolina.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained from attendance at the proceedings of the House on yesterday. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on roll call 103, "no" on roll call 104, and "aye" on roll call 105.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401), to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6401, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I announce that the time on the minority side will be under the control of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, general debate will continue for 3 hours, one-half of the time to be under the control of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and pursuant to the announcement by the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who will those opposed to the bill apply to for time in general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. To either of the gentlemen mentioned, who will yield the time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself not to exceed 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to say, referring to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that I have been in consultation with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who generally heads the opposition on this bill in the Armed Services Committee on the Republican side, and we have reached an agreement as to the disposition of time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The time in opposition to the bill, as well as that of those in favor of the bill, has been allotted in accordance with consultation with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. Chairman, the committee reported this bill by a vote of 28 to 5. Seventeen out of nineteen Republicans—there may be some who have changed their minds—voted in favor of it, and 11 out of 14 on the minority side.

I had nothing to do with the allotment of time. If I had my way about it, this bill would have been before the committee a month ago, and we would have 2 days' general debate; but, as I say, I have had nothing to do with the allotment of time, and was not consulted. We have received 3 hours of general debate, which is 90 minutes for each side.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York now addressing you, who has unsuspectingly but

courteously yielded, has announced he is not a candidate for renomination or reelection.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to the Congress, I became second or third, or thereabout, in rank to the gentleman from New York on the Military Affairs Committee. No better man has ever served the country than the gentleman from New York, old HAM ANDREWS, in Congress or out.

It will be a great loss to the Congress, to the United States of America, and to all of us when he puts more of his furniture into that old car and moves up to Buffalo to stay, leaving us down here alone.

We all regret his departure. I wish to assure him right now that we will all miss him, as we wish he may realize the fruition of his hopes so long as he enjoys the relief from the great and tremendous responsibilities as have been his. You have earned a vacation, HAM. Our best wishes go with you from all sides of any aisle. Sorry I took advantage of your good nature, if you have any, but it was my last chance. More power to you.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Members of the Committee, if I may have your attention, this bill will be well discussed by many of the committee during the debate, but I want to bring to your attention some observations. It was not much over 400 years ago that we discovered that the earth was round. It was 250 years before this country was really colonized. Everybody in this country today is here because of oppression, social, economic, or religious. We have within the citizenship of this country the prototype of every civilization on the face of the earth, with the possible exception of the yellow race. I sat in this Chamber in 1937 on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary commemorating the Constitution of the United States, at which time Chief Justice Hughes delivered the address. On that occasion he was about 75 years of age, and therefore at that time, twice his age or twice the life of any man 75 years of age was the entire constitutional life of this country. During the last 75 years practically all of the inventions in the world have taken place. Almost everything you can think of in modern science has taken place in the last 75 years. During the 150 years in the constitutional history of this country we have had seven wars, starting with the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I and then World War II. After each of these wars up to the present time we have let down our guard; we have collapsed; the pacifists have taken over; we have given in and failed to continue our preparedness. About every 20 or 25 years we have had a war, even with the ocean separating us. Think of how civilization has developed in that time. If there was a continent in the Pacific Ocean today with untold riches on it, and the world had not developed, we would not be able to stop cars on the way to San Francisco or Los Angeles to get there. We reached the point 50 years ago where there is not a solid square foot of ground on the face of the globe on which some country's flag does not fly. We fought World War I, presumably, for democracy, and we fought World War II to end wars but one strong ideology contrary to all our belief remains, and it is the ideology of communism.

This bill that we have before us today is a bill that comes from the desire of those who support it to give us reasonable strength insofar as the armed forces are concerned. It is not a harsh bill. You will hear much criticism of it, and I shall come to the rebuttal of some of the arguments during the amendment period. The cold facts are that the armed services, the Army in particular, will need in the next current year roughly between 800,000 and 900,000 men to take care of the attrition in the regular forces, that is, those whose enlistments have run out.

It is presumed that a portion, we will say roughly half of those, will be secured by induction and the other half by voluntary enlistment.

Statistics show all the way through that enlistments are up at the highest peak when selective service is in being. The Navy is always a great beneficiary of voluntary enlistments when selective service is in being. The services need many men. It will be claimed that the Army is not trying hard to get men to enlist, or the services generally are not, but as a matter of fact, the enlistment record of the services over the last 2 or 3 years is the most remarkable record of voluntary enlistments on the part of any country in the entire history of the world.

It will be said that the qualifications are too high. Only 12 percent have been refused for enlistment because of inability to meet the requirements. The tests are very fair, in spite of what you may have heard to the contrary. This bill is opposed by every radical, subversive organization within the United States. It is also opposed by some very fine organizations, but I do not believe they are enlightened, that they quite understand what is behind it. This bill has the support of every veterans' organization and every patriotic organization in the United States.

After World War I we had a world court, but it fell through. We have made a reasonable start with the United Nations. Our experience with the United Nations is, however, far from a happy one as yet. We have nothing with which to enforce our views—even through the United Nations.

I shall go into the other details of the bill as the various amendments arise.

In conclusion, I should simply like to say this: It is those who wish to remain weak, whether they realize it or not, who invite possible future disaster. It is those who would be strong only who stand for freedom and an ultimate chance for permanent peace.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, those of us on the Committee on Armed Services appreciate the fact that we have here a heavy duty and responsibility. I can assure you that it is not one that we sought, nor one that we relish, but one that we realize and appreciate, and we feel that we have brought here the type of legislation which is essential at this time in view of the present situation in the world.

I would not attempt at this late hour to convince the House that international affairs are in a very troublesome state. I think it would be futile now to attempt to convince the Congress of the United States, which embarked upon Greek and Turkish aid, and the European recovery plan, and which has implemented those programs with appropriations amounting to billions of dollars, that there is a troublesome condition existing in the world. I take it that by the recurring votes of both Houses of Congress that has been well established and thoroughly recognized.

In addition to the programs which we are now carrying on throughout the world to prevent the further expansion of communism, we are convinced that we must be adequate in a military sense. We feel that a nation which possesses some 235 divisions at this time, and a large air force, and which has embarked upon a program of expansion, cannot be expected to listen to arguments, no matter how logical, unless the one with whom she is arguing possesses the requisite strength with which to reinforce the arguments and the logic used.

Quite some time ago, the Congress of the United States determined what would be a reasonable force for a nation such as ours in the conditions which then existed in the world. At that time we said that the Army and the Air Force should consist of 1,070,000 men, and that the Navy and Marine Corps should consist of 666,882 men. Now what is the situation? We find that the services have not been able to maintain those authorized strengths. They were not fixed by the armed services, but they were fixed by the Congress and written into law. Even at those modest strengths, we have not been able to maintain the services at the figures set. There may have been some who are at fault. I am not willing to say that no one is at fault. On the other hand, the situation does exist that we do not have what we regarded as a minimum necessary strength. We feel we must secure the minimum necessary strength, and secure it promptly. Voluntary enlistments thus far have failed, and we see no other alternative but to embark upon this limited program.

Let me emphasize the fact that this is a limited program. It will not be the unlimited program that we had during the war under the Selective Training and Service Act, because during that time all ceilings were removed. One of the very first provisions of this bill fixes the authorized strength of each of the three military establishments. None of them can exceed those maximum strengths. Of course, in no event can they exceed the amount appropriated to carry out the program and to provide for the size of the Army. We are providing here a

maximum of 837,000 for the Army, a maximum of 662,882 in the Navy, and the Air Force 502,000. Who has fixed these figures? These recommendations have been made to you by your Committee on Armed Services after hearings and much consideration. As to the Air Force, I can say that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States have fixed those figures because we overwhelmingly passed the 70-group air program and passed it over some rather strenuous opposition of persons within the administration. So those are the figures that we have determined on in the committee and recommended to you as being adequate for our defense at the present time.

I would like to give a brief outline of the provisions of the bill. It requires all persons between 18 and 30 years of age to register. It makes liable for service persons between 19 and 25 years of age inclusive. There is a provision under which members of the medical professions will be subject to service until they are 45 years of age, in accordance with a formula provided in the bill.

The exemptions are most liberal under this bill. Personnel on active duty are exempt.

All holders of the Purple Heart are exempt.

Veterans with over 12 months' service are completely exempt.

Veterans with 90 days' to 12 months' service are exempt if members of Organized Reserve units.

All veterans with combat service are exempt.

Reserves in organized units on effective date of the act are exempt.

Persons entering the Organized Reserve units after the act is passed, but before they are 18½ years of age, will likewise be exempted.

Of course, ministers and ministerial students and nondeclared aliens are exempt.

Deferred from service are members of the ROTC and the Holloway plan; the Holloway plan being the reserve plan of the Navy.

Accepted aviation cadets are deferred for a period of 4 months.

Persons elected to office by the people of an entire State and Federal elective officials are deferred.

Essential workers; persons with dependents; physically and mentally unfit; high-school students are deferred, until they complete their high-school education or become 20 years of age or fail to satisfactorily pursue their course of study. So that high-school students will be permitted to complete high school before they are subject to service under this bill.

College students enrolled in the academic year will be deferred until the end of the academic year in which they are enrolled.

Conscientious objectors, objecting to any type of military service, are also deferred.

In those cases in which there is a sole surviving son in families in which a deceased son or sons were killed or died in line of duty in service will be assigned to noncombat duty.

Another thing that is of importance to a great many States; not only will calls be made on a quota basis, but every State will get credit against its quota for those already in the service. As each quota is made and each call is sent out, each area will get credit against the quota for those who are in the service.

It has reemployment rights comparable to those of the Selective Training and Service Act, as interpreted in Supreme Court decisions. Of course, it sets up a Selective Service System and provides penalties for its violations.

The bill, as reported by the committee in section 23, the last section of the bill, provides that induction shall not begin prior to a period of 90 days after the effective date of the act. However, the committee has voted to offer as a committee amendment a new section 23. That amendment will provide that inductions will not be begun until a proclamation has been made by the President. It provides that he may make that proclamation no earlier than 75 days after the effective date of the act, and that thereafter the inductions cannot begin for a period of 15 days. This is a provision requested by many of the members. It places the legislation in a standby position and does not become operative until the President has issued a proclamation that voluntary enlistments have not been sufficient and it has become necessary to place the provisions of this bill in effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Then, it is the feeling of the committee that an imminent emergency does not exist.

Mr. KILDAY. The committee has never taken the position that there is an imminent emergency or it would never have included a provision for 90 days' delay before inductions may begin. We do feel we are in a position of great stress. We do know that we do not have our armed forces up to what is regarded as being the minimum strength that we should have.

Mr. BUFFETT. The bill, as it will be finished with this amendment, does not provide that the draft can take place before December 1, or 6 weeks after the election. Is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman can add 75 and 15.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman mentioned the strength authorized under this bill. I wonder if the gentleman would give us the latest figure as to the present strength of the different services.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, as the gentleman understands, they are constantly coming in and going out. The attrition is one of the things that is bothering us at this time because of the men who enlisted shortly after the cessation of hostilities.

As of July 1 1948 it is expected that the Army will have 540,000, the Navy, 427,000, the Air Force, 395,000, and the Marines, 82,000.

As of February 1, to give you an idea of the attrition, the actual strength of the Army was 552,150, the Navy, 395,936; the Air Force, 353,143; and the marines, 79,659.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. Will these draftees get the benefits of the GI bill of rights?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill does not provide that the inductees shall have the privileges of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. HEDRICK. Is there any clause in the bill that will take care of them as far as schooling is concerned when they get out?

Mr. KILDAY. No. This does not contain any of the provisions of the GI bill of rights. The matter was discussed at great length in the committee. It was recognized in the committee that the GI bill of rights was adopted for the benefit of those who participated in actual combat during the period of the actual shooting war, and it was not felt that the same situation exists at this stage of the game as existed at the time the GI bill of rights was adopted.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me as to whether or not the Army has recently increased its standards for voluntary enlistment?

Mr. KILDAY. Physical standards?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Physical and mental.

Mr. KILDAY. No; there was no material increase in the standards other than that during the war they had two categories, one for limited service and one for general service. They do not now maintain the limited-service category.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand that the Army recruiting officers are not taking new recruits for 2-year enlistments.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct; except that under our bill we make them do it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am now, of course, talking about the voluntary recruitment program. Are you complying with that law in respect to 2-year enlistments?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; they are complying with the law. The law provides for 2-, 3-, and 4-year enlistments. They have by regulation and policy been refusing to accept voluntary enlistments for a period of 2 years. The bill we have under consideration, however, requires them to accept men between 19 and 26 for a period of 2-year voluntary enlistment. That is as to the Army. That does not apply to the Navy or Air Force.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. How do the standard requirements of the Army recruiting office compare with the standard requirements of the Navy and the Marine Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. I am not sure. Some other member of the committee might

be able to answer the gentleman, but I feel quite positive that the Navy standards are a little higher than those of the Army.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The standards of all the other services are much higher than those of the Army.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The reason I asked the question is because I received a letter from a mother in my district whose son desired to enlist voluntarily in the Army. He appled at the recruiting office and was turned down because he did not meet their requirements. He walked right over to the Marines recruiting office and was accepted.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, many have known of one doctor saying something is wrong with a person and another saying there is not.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The reason I bring this out is because it looks to me like the Army is doing all it can to discourage voluntary enlistments in order to justify their demand for selective service or UMT and that they are rejecting many of those who voluntarily apply for enlistment to accomplish this.

Mr. KILDAY. That argument has been made and it furnishes a nice escape clause for those who do not want to vote for this bill, but I do not believe it can be sustained by the facts.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the distinguished National Guard man from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I wish to ask the gentleman a question with reference to paragraph 3, on page 13, and section 22, on page 49. It seems to me these sections are in direct conflict with each other. They pertain to the calling out of the Organized Reserves and the National Guard. One states that the President is authorized to order into active service those civilian components provided he has the consent of the governors of the various States. As I read the section on page 49, it is the Congress of the United States who calls out the civilian components.

Mr. KILDAY. That is when the Congress has declared an emergency. That has been the situation all along. They are subject to active duty without their consent in that instance. The other refers to those instances in which the governor grants his permission for portions of the Reserve components to be called.

Mr. KEARNEY. That being so, may I ask if the provision on page 13 with respect to ordering members of the National Guard of the United States into active service of the United States should not be stricken from the bill?

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, I am familiar with all of the talk that we have had with reference to the National Guard, its recognition, and so forth. Until there should be a declaration of a national emergency, I would not agree that the National Guard should be called without the governor's consent. The National Guard is our militia; it is protected by the Constitution; and in time of peace constitutes the only military force at the disposal of the governor. I do not believe that the Federal Government in time of peace should be in a position to deprive any State of its National Guard unless the governor gives his consent.

Mr. KEARNEY. With the consent of the governor, they can be ordered into the service of the United States for a period of 24 months?

Mr. KILDAY. Each individual governor knows the situation in his State. It might be that a civil commotion is imminent. The governor would know that. In that situation I do not think it would be good policy for the Federal Government to deprive the State of its military force.

Mr. KEARNEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. With reference to the discussion had with the gentleman from Missouri, it might be well to call to the attention of the Members that almost 30 percent of the people who served in the armed forces in the recent war have filed applications for disability on account of injury or something that occurred during their service. It is extremely important to the country and the people that these boys be well screened physically, that every applicant be screened carefully before service in the armed forces.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. With further reference to one of the questions of the gentleman from Missouri, can the gentleman tell us why the Army will not accept a 2-year enlistment?

Mr. KILDAY. The Army takes the position, and has in the past, that it is not economical. I have been through that fight before. Those 18-month enlistments that we had right after the war were the result of my amendment which I got adopted here on the floor. At that time, a man who was in the service as much as 6 months, had his equipment and his basic training, could be enlisted for an additional year. I am now convinced that perhaps the Army knew more about this than I did. They did not get very much out of the so-called 18-month tour of enlistment. We spent most of the time getting him in and getting him out, and darned little time using him. The same is true when you cut this down. The further you cut it down the less you get. It costs money to bring a man into the Army. The first year costs about $5,000, and every year after that costs you between $3,000 and $3,500. When you talk about getting him into the service and equipping him, it costs $5,000 for the first year, which runs very high.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman suggested that under this bill we are forcing them to do that.

Mr. KILDAY. We are.

Mr. MORRIS. If it was not economical then, why is it now?

Mr. KILDAY. The Army contended in the past it was not economical, which I explained. During consideration of the rule the gentleman stated he intends to offer an amendment to reduce this to 1 year. Now, you might just as well take the $5,000 and throw it away, if you are going to reduce it to 1 year.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The gentleman from North Carolina stated the contrast of the young man who went into the airplane factory; he was induced to go there by virtue of the high wages, and the young man who went into the Army at a very much lower rate. Does the committee intend to bring out the point that nothing more can be done by way of making the salary more attractive or by raising the salary so as to bring it to a voluntary basis?

Mr. KILDAY. There are members of the committee who have spent a good many years studying this thing from an objective standpoint. It is one of my hobbies about how you are going to make military service attractive. Shortly after the war we increased the pay 50 percent for the private. We took him from $50 to $75, but it did not produce results. The pay inducement alone does not do it; we have seen that; we have tried it and it will not work. The same thing exists here. It proves itself. The Air Force does not feel that it is going to have to take one person by draft under this bill if passed. The Navy feels that it will not have to take one person by draft under this bill, because when the young man goes in the Air Force they promise to make a meterologist or an airplane or engine mechanic out of him; one of dozens of specialties. In the Navy it will be the same thing. He will be a machinist or learn some other trade. The Army can tell them that "We will make the finest infantryman out of you that ever lived," but that is not something that holds a future for him except in the military service. So, at the same rate of pay the Navy and the Air Force are able to get their men but the Army finds it difficult to do so. If we cannot get them by voluntary enlistment we will have to get them the best way we can. It is not a task that we relish, but it is one that we feel we are forced to undertake.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMPSON. Has there been any special deferment provided for premedical students?

Mr. KILDAY. There is nothing by name in this bill but ample authority is given the President for that purpose,

and the National Resources Planning Board has its program to take care of that. Now, we started out to put in medical students, then we put in something else, and by the time we got through we had 8 or 10 different categories, and then we were not sure that we had covered the necessary elements, so we left it in general language, because when you stress some few of them, you exclude all others.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the gentleman explain what is the meaning of "between the ages of 19 and 26"? What are the limits?

Mr. KILDAY. He must have reached his nineteenth birthday and not passed his twenty-sixth.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. As I understand the bill, the man who attends a military school and takes 4 years of ROTC, is then required to serve 3 years on active duty; is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. Let us be practical about it. The gentleman is one of those, but he received his commission when he came out though, did he not?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. And practically all of these will.

Mr. TEAGUE. Still, by awarding the man, or complimenting the man for having taken ROTC, it appears to me you are changing that here and you are requiring that he serve 3 years after he gets his commission. Are you not going to drive men away from the ROTC school?

Mr. KILDAY. No.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is only because we educate these boys at no cost to themselves.

Mr. TEAGUE. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the ROTC and the Holloway plan.

Mr. KILDAY. Not the ROTC.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The ROTC plan, then.

Mr. TEAGUE. Will the gentleman comment on that a little bit?

Mr. KILDAY. Those boys have prepared themselves militarily, that is true, while they were acquiring their education. Then they are qualified for a commission, and most of them will have their commissions, or get them when they will go on active duty. I do not see why you feel there is any penalty involved because of that man going on active duty with the others of his own age group and family relationships.

Mr. TEAGUE. If he is needed, yes; but you do not say "if he is needed." You say that he must serve 3 years.

Mr. KILDAY. The whole bill is based on whether he is needed, and the quotas will be set.

I trust that this bill will be adopted by a very substantial majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of advising the Committee that when we reach the amendment stage of the bill it is my purpose to offer the military-justice bill as title II of this bill. Since the military-justice bill passed the House last January, it is possible that some of the members of the committee may not be entirely familiar with the history of efforts to amend the Articles of War and improve the Army system of justice. During the year 1944 the Secretary of War appointed Col. Philip McCook, a distinguished New York jurist, to investigate complaints about the administration of military justice. Thereafter, on March 25, 1946, the Secretary of War selected the War Department advisory committee on military justice, the chairman of which was Hon. Arthur T. Vanderbilt. This committee consisted of nine eminent lawyers and jurists. It held hearings all over the United States and rendered a report that was given consideration by the Secretary of War and by congressional committees.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress, after many Members of Congress had received complaints about the administration of justice in the armed services, the Committee on Military Affairs, through a subcommittee, the chairman of which was the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], conducted about a year's investigation and rendered an excellent report, but no legislation was forthcoming at that session.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think it should be pointed out that the bill the House passed, from a subcommittee of which the gentleman from Ohio was the chairman, contained a major recommendation of the American Bar Association's report. In other words, they stressed one thing, and we adopted that.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes, the gentleman is entirely correct about that. The recommendations of the American Bar Association were given every consideration by our committee. The gentleman from California was a member of our committee and made a very valuable contribution to the report we finally made and to the writing of the bill finally adopted by the House.

Shortly after this Congress convened, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services designated the legal subcommittee to conduct hearings and to consider the writing of a military-justice bill. Our committee conducted hearings extending over a great many months. As the gentleman from California has pointed out, we took into consideration the recommendations of the American Bar Association. We also took into consideration the report of the Vanderbilt committee and the Durham committee report from the previous Congress. We heard from all of the veterans' groups and from all other groups and individuals who asked to testify.

After the House passed the military justice bill on January 15, 1948, it went over to the other body and was referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. That committee did not conduct any hearings, but when the selective service bill was before that body a few days ago the bill passed by the House was offered as an amendment and was adopted by a vote of 44 to 39. Therefore, as matters stand today, the Senate bill contains the military-justice bill exactly as it passed the House.

The purpose of offering this amendment in connection with this bill, if it is held to be germane, is to make our bill correspond with the bill as passed by the Senate, at least so far as the military justice feature is concerned and to assure passage at this session of legislation which will improve our present system in the Army and the Air Force.

To enumerate a few of the provisions of the justice bill: It provides for enlisted men on the court, if enlisted men desire them. Officers are made subject to trial by special court martial.

An accused person is entitled to counsel in the pretrial investigation. Review and appellate provisions have been greatly strengthened, a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps has been established, and command influence over the courts has been curtailed.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I shall offer will guarantee a fair and impartial trial to any inductee under the pending bill should he at any time be charged with a military offense.

OPPOSED TO DRAFT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, before determining to oppose the selective-service bill, H. R. 6401, which is now before us, I read and carefully considered all the arguments, pro and con, which I could lay my hands on. For weeks I refused to take a stand, in the face of terrific pressure from both sides. I thought that I owed my country and my constituency more than a snap judgment.

Now, having maturely considered the arguments, I am forced to the reasoned conclusion that the proponents of a peacetime draft have failed to make out a case.

I must oppose this bill.

The proponents have claimed that a danger to our national security of emergency proportions exists. They have failed to prove it.

They have claimed that they have exhausted the possibilities of voluntary enlistments to maintain the armed services at safe strength. They have failed to prove it.

FAILED TO DISPROVE OPPOSING ARGUMENTS

On the other hand, they have failed to disprove the arguments of opponents that the proposals for a peacetime draft

are and must constitute a Trojan horse under which military control of civilian life is to be introduced into the United States.

I am not a baiter of the armed services. I have many friends among officers and enlisted men. I honor their courage and sacrifice in time of danger and I do not for one moment impugn the honesty, the patriotism, or the motives of those who have called for this draft. I was prepared to support this measure if the arguments in favor of it carried in my own mind.

My decision is the product of reason, not of emotion.

NO NATIONAL DANGER PROVED

The mere absence of amicable international relationships with a single great power does not constitute a clear threat to American security. Something more than mere words is necessary to prove an aggressive intent.

The American people have been subjected to an unceasing bombardment of incendiary propaganda for 3 years from our own militarists. They have had the help of the Soviet press and radio, which has spared no exaggeration, no innuendo, no blanket charge, however absurd, in the crusade.

This has been a political war, in which the clank of tanks and the roar of big guns and the click of the Geiger counters were sound effects for both sides.

There has been a lot of shooting but it has all been with the mouth.

International crisis has resolved in anticlimax.

It is not my purpose to absolve the Soviets of their share of the blame for our own hysteria; neither is it my purpose to absolve Americans for their self-fed fears.

We are a great and powerful nation with a productive capacity beyond the dreams of man of only a few years ago. We have a way of life which leads to strength because it is a free way of life. It is incomprehensible and incredible that any nation exists today so completely insane as to clearly challenge our military and industrial might and our atomic bombs.

MANY VOLUNTARY METHODS STILL UNTRIED

It has proved equally fruitless for the proponents of a peacetime draft to attempt to prove that they have exhausted the resources of voluntary methods.

Little or nothing has been done to implement the recommendations of the Doolittle report.

On the contrary, we hear frequently of favoritism and special privileges for officers out of all proportion to their rank; of arbitrary court-martial sentences, of special duties, and pulling rank against enlisted men.

When enlisted men in our armed services can feel that they are not discriminated against, that voluntary Army service is not an unjust sacrifice, that they have not surrendered the proud title of citizen because they have acquired the title of soldier, and when their pay has been adjusted to meet the needs of their dependents, they will prove less reluctant to join.

Furthermore, the armed services themselves have reduced the proportion of eligibles in imposing physical standards so high as to be selective beyond all reason.

During the war, when manpower was even more acutely in short supply and demands of the armed services were given top priority, there were a score of jokes. We all remember them. One was, "If he's breathing, he's as good as in the Army."

None of us expects the peacetime Army to be that indiscriminate, but neither do we expect it to become an elite corps of supermen.

QUOTA SYSTEM RANKLY EXTRAVAGANT

Furthermore, the armed services continue to maintain their cruel and extravagant quota system of racial discrimination.

It is a simple statement of fact to say that, economically, our Negro Americans are the most depressed as a group. To them, more than to any other group within the framework of American democracy, Army life is economically more desirable than civilian life. It has social advantages, educational advantages, housing advantages as well.

Yet a rigid system of segregation, limitation of enlistments, and discrimination in ratings and assignments has been practiced by each of the armed services, differing only in degree.

In spite of the blind prejudices of some of our high-ranking officers, the facts speak for themselves. Here are thousands upon thousands of young Americans, anxious to serve their country in the full status of citizens, many of them of the highest possible physical development, going to waste while the services cry for men.

DEMOCRACY WOULD SUFFER FROM DRAFT

There are clear and present dangers to our democratic way of life in the introduction of a professional military caste into American life through a peacetime conscription act.

Already our Government is filled with military men in key positions—men whose courage and patriotism and honesty I do not question, but who are astigmatic because of their military training.

What the future might be with a nation of young men graduated from the hard school of Army training I shudder to think.

The object of democratic education is to make good citizens, capable of thinking for themselves and of governing themselves.

The object of military training is to make good soldiers, disciplined, unquestioning, automatic in reaction to given commands.

While more limited in its scope than earlier measures, the present bill is sweeping in its powers over private property and private lives. It would necessarily make the National Defense Establishment the pivot of our foreign policy and our domestic polity and economy.

MEASURE IS DANGEROUS

I must oppose this measure just as I have opposed all other efforts to whittle away individual freedoms by repressive laws.

While I do not impute to the proponents of this bill the unworthy motives that I have found for some other repressive measures, the effect is the same. A peacetime conscription act, calling for universal military service, must call also, and does call, for universal registration. That will be followed by a system of espionage intolerable to a free people, not because we intend it to follow, but because it is an inevitable consequence in the train of events.

No, Mr. Chairman; this measure is too dangerous—too dangerous to our country and to its institutions, too dangerous to world peace, too dangerous to free private enterprise and to free world trade.

I must vote against it, whatever the political penalties which may be assessed against me, and I hope profoundly that a majority of the House joins with me in that vote.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio advise the Committee that he intends to offer the so-called court-martial legislation which we have already passed in this body, as an amendment to this bill. There has been a great deal of study given to this subject, and you Members who care to add some incentive to the services, in my opinion, will be rendering a great service if this is enacted into law, because we all know there were many, many cases of unfair court martials which were uncovered before the committee. The gentleman from Ohio is rendering a service by offering this amendment.

I firmly believe that today America holds the peace of the world in her hands. The decision rests with us whether the weaker nations of the world can live and breathe under our banner of freedom or whether they will be gradually engulfed by their more powerful neighbors. We cannot close our eyes to the lessons of history or overlook our bitter experiences since the war, that if we desire peace we must maintain adequate armed forces. The size and level of efficiency of these forces must be such as would deter any further acts of aggression throughout the world.

We have gambled too long already with world peace by allowing our armed strength to reach a dangerously low level. The folly of such action is only too apparent to all of us.

Conflicts which have arisen might have been avoided if we had only maintained our strength. This is our last chance to correct that deficiency.

When our Nation assumed its position of world leadership, it assumed also world responsibilities — responsibiliites which we can no longer shirk. Just as a boy when he becomes a man assumes the responsibility of manhood, so must we justify our growth to world leadership by assuming our world obligations. One of these obligations is to maintain strength commensurate with our world posture. To do this requires the present form of selective service. I honestly wish that there was some way we could

avoid this draft in time of peace. I honestly wish we did not have to spend the money required. I am just as reluctant as any of you to spend these billions of dollars on military expenditures. I am only too well aware of the vast reconstruction and educational programs which have yet to be completed in our own country for which this money could be spent. However, I feel that these latter programs must wait, for to complete them without providing the strength to back up our moral obligations would be an invitation to national destruction. We would be impotent in a world which is still run largely by force. The days are gone when we can consider our own economy alone. We can no longer confine our views to our own horizons. There are too many dangers to our own security and to our own homes peering over these horizons.

Let me assure you that your Armed Services Committee investigated all alternatives before recommending the draft bill in its present form. Each section of the bill was accepted only after a complete analysis of its provisions had been made and after all the arguments against it had been considered.

There are several provisions which were the subject of considerable discussion and for this reason I would like to clarify them for you.

The first question very naturally was why do not the armed forces get their men by voluntary means? The answer is very obvious but worth developing. For 2 years the armed forces have tried to do just this and have not succeeded. For 2 years they have conducted the greatest recruiting campaign in the history of this or any country. In spite of all their efforts the numbers of men required cannot be obtained by voluntary means alone.

Many of the opponents of the bill contend, honestly or otherwise, that if the mental standards were lowered the services would obtain all the men they needed without resorting to a draft. Recruiting statistics show that such assertions are absolutely erroneous. Only 13 percent of the men who apply for the service are rejected because of mental requirements. In numbers this amounts to about 2,500 men per month. The actual shortage per month for the Army alone, over and above some 20,000 volunteers, is 25,000 or 10 times the number rejected. Even if the armed forces took every one who volunteered, they could not possibly meet their quotas.

However, I do not subscribe to an elimination of standards. I personally am in favor of our services continuing to maintain some reasonable set of standards for enlistment. If all the bums, misfits, and morons are to be enlisted as our first line of defense, our national security will certainly be resting on a feeble foundation. Furthermore, in talking to many of the men now in the service I raised this same question of standards with them. They said if the standards are lowered to permit a free entry of the lowest elements into the services, they, themselves, would leave immediately. I personally want to see our armed forces the best and most efficient in the world and they will be anything but that with substandard personnel.

There is a final point I wish to raise for it is one which the Committee considered at great length. That is the question of the length of service to be required of the selectees. Our committee wisely agreed on a 2-year term of service for these inductees for three major reasons. Actually the services would have preferred 3 years.

First, it would be impossible, in view of the many details involved, to obtain any satisfactory service from a man if he were to serve less than 2 years. As you know, the missions our armed forces are carrying on today require not partially trained men, but on the contrary, men of the highest qualification and experience. Eighteen-month servicemen could never fit the bill.

Second, the cost jumps radically as the term of service decreases. The reduction of, as little as, 6 months in the term of service would increase the personnel cost alone almost a half a billion dollars while at the same time increasing the number of men needed.

Third, and most important, it is doubtful if our manpower pool will permit a change in the term of service unless we want to draw upon the veterans and married men who, under the bill as now written, are deferred.

Addressing myself now to the first reason, namely, the unsatisfactory state of training and inefficiency that would result if the service period were reduced from 2 years. This is a selective-service bill. The purpose of selective-service is to provide necessary reinforcements for our occupation troops, and equally, if not more important, to furnish a trained and mobile force in being in this country capable of taking effective military action.

A provision of less than 2 years of service would effectively prevent these men from being used for overseas assignments. The time required after induction for processing, training and transporting, plus the time required at the end of their term of service for return transportation and separation would for practical purposes render their use in overseas areas impossible.

The second objection to less than 2 years of service is the prohibitive cost involved. It is a proven fact that the first year of service necessarily involves the original training and equipping of each man and involves an investment completely out of proportion to the service to be obtained from that man. Only by spreading this investment over a 2-year period can a satisfactory return be had. As an example, it has been estimated that the cost of maintaining an 18 months' enlistee in overseas peacetime service costs approximately $1,000 per month of such overseas service. By extending the period of enlistment to 24 months or longer this per month cost would be substantially reduced.

Finally, the manpower statistics prove conclusively that there just are not enough men within the age groups concerned who are available to serve on less than a 2-year basis unless the World War II veterans group and perhaps fathers with dependent children are also made subject to the draft.

For these reasons I submit that the proposal to reduce the term of service, attractive though it may seem, is not practicable and, therefore, was not approved by your committee.

In closing, let me state that although some people have arrived at the theory that the American people are unwilling to accept their personal duty and responsibility as citizens to share in the common defense, I personally do not subscribe to that theory. Our history bears concrete evidence to the fact that Americans are willing to make any necessary sacrifices for their country and their ideals.

I would be deeply embarrassed if any Member of Congress would propose that the obligation for service in the armed forces, in this emergency, should or must be accompanied by the payment of some bonus. This would mean that men from the wealthier classes could easily avoid their responsibilities by foregoing some trifling amount of money, thereby placing the burden of national security on our poorer and less fortunate classes. In addition to maligning the character of the American citizen such a suggestion presents clear evidence to the peoples of the world that we are in favor of world peace and security only if it does not interfere with our own lives. We will give anything but ourselves.

True world leadership cannot be exercised by a nation which has grown soft. The world knows it. I do not believe that we can shirk our world responsibility and I do not believe our citizens expect us to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time within a decade that Congress has given its attention to compulsory military service in a period of nominal peace. It is the second time within that period that events in the world have impelled this country to consider, in the interest of its own security, steps which are novel to its traditions.

The visible dangers to the security of the United States are as great in 1948 as they were in 1940—perhaps greater—and the demand for prompt action is no less urgent. But the world situation of 1948 is not closely analogous to that of 1940 and it would be erroneous to attempt to draw too close a parallel. The odds on peace are much greater in 1948 than in 1940, provided the American people can properly evaluate the situation and take the necessary steps to cope with it.

In 1940 the greater part of the civilized world was already at war. When Congress debated the Selective Service Act in September Poland had been gutted and France overrun by the German blitzkrieg. The British had withdrawn the remnants of their ill-fated expeditionary force at Dunkerque and the desperate, decisive battle in the air over England was in full sway. In short, the battle lines had already been drawn and the armies committed. There was no

real hope in September 1940 of limiting the conflict or negotiating a peace. Twenty years of sterile and negative diplomacy on the part of the western democracies, including the United States, had ended and the American people belatedly realized their own survival was at stake.

In 1948 the situation is markedly different. In spite of an unremitting political struggle between the only two great powers to emerge from the Second World War, the world is nominally at peace. The armies have not been committed and the situation has not yet drifted beyond the point of "no return."

The purpose of reviving selective-service legislation in 1948 is different also from the purpose of 1940. It is not primarily to prepare this country against any eventuality arising out of a situation that has clearly got out of control, although without question this is one of the purposes. The primary purpose is, on the contrary, to prevent the situation from getting out of control. We require an increase in our standing armed forces today in order that American military strength—actual rather than potential—may be effectively applied as a stabilizing influence in world affairs and as a deterrent to aggression.

The need for such a stabilizing influence is unmistakable. The complete collapse of Germany, and the near-exhaustion of those other European countries who struggled to defeat her, have created a power vacuum throughout western and southern Europe which, by the law of nature, invites the encroachments of power systems outside that region. Life in Europe has been rendered, as a result of the war, precarious and unstable, and attempts at positive reconstruction have been—until the launching of the Marshall plan—inhibited by the fear of invasion from the East.

Such a fear is real and exists today. From the termination of hostilities to the present, the Soviet Union has consistently sought to frustrate and thwart European recovery, hoping in this way to create such intolerable political and economic conditions in western Europe that freely elected governments could not stand, and that desperate, hungry peoples would at length deliver themselves to the tightly organized Communist minorities, who at least promised food in exchange for political servitude. By thus fomenting economic misery, the Soviet Union hoped to achieve domination of the entire European Continent without open war.

The enactment of the European recovery program, which bears such great hope for the democratic future because it points a way out of the present morass, has not altered the Soviet aim but only frustrated its original tactic.

Europe is now on the road to recovery. That is a fact which the Cominform has not been able either to obscure or prevent by any means short of war. Vituperation in the press and on the radio, demonstrations, strikes, and riots by Communist followers in Italy and France have all failed to kill the hope which the anticipation of ERP had kindled in the minds of Europeans who earnestly seek a future for a free Europe. Europe is on the road to recovery—and a free, united Europe, as we have learned from painful experience in two great wars, is a basic requirement for the continued security and tranquillity of the American people.

Why, then, if recovery has been successfully begun, must the United States now undertake, in an atmosphere of urgency, to augment its standing military forces? The answer is simple if we will keep in our minds the inherent nature of the Soviet Empire and its overriding, avowed objective—Communist domination of the world.

I said a moment ago that the enactment of ERP did not alter the Soviet objective in western Europe, but merely frustrated its original tactic. It has also altered the tactic. Having failed to destroy the ERP, the Soviet Union immediately undertook to consolidate its position in those countries on its borders which, through fear of Russian disapproval, had refrained from participation in the Marshall plan. If the ERP could not be destroyed, then the Soviet Union was determined that its effectiveness should be geographically limited and the strategic position of the Soviet Union improved in the process. Thus there followed the blatant coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, the démarche on Finland, and the excessive pressure put upon the entire Scandinavian peninsula for alliances with the Soviet Union. To these were added the severe and annoying restrictions put upon the American occupation forces in Berlin and Vienna.

The coup in Czechoslovakia contains a very special lesson for those who still wish to believe that our economic support of Europe is sufficient by itself and need not be buttressed by American armed strength. For that event proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that Soviet communism does not expand the areas of its control through economic misery alone, but that it spreads as well by the application of political pressure backed by poised military strength. Czechoslovakia did not fall to communism because its economic system had failed, nor because of widespread discontent with its political structure. It fell because it was intimidated by the threat of physical force and organized terror which it could not match. Recovery in France or in Italy could be as abruptly terminated, however great the American monetary contribution, if the Soviet Union should feel a compelling necessity to prevent recovery in those countries by overt means.

Taken collectively, this series of Russian actions reflects unquestionably the severe impact of ERP upon Soviet ambitions in western Europe, and indicates a stepping-up of the tempo of Soviet resistance to the emerging unity of that region. What is the significance of these events? In my view, these Soviet actions raise the very real possibility—which it would be criminal negligence to ignore—that the Soviet Union may now be willing to use overt means to dominate key areas in western Europe on the assumption that present American policies, unless interrupted, can lead only to the conclusion which would permanently frustrate Russian ambitions—the recovery of Europe as a free and productive community.

In order to deter any such rash decision on the part of the Soviet Government, it is imperative for the United States to transform without delay a reasonable measure of its armed strength from potential to actual.

It was to be expected that we would have to protect our investment in American security, which is simultaneously an investment in European recovery. Now that the nature of Russian resistance has become clear, we must without hesitation take the steps necessary to cope with it. American economic and military efforts to achieve world stability are each the corollary of the other and they are interdependent. This is the crux of the matter.

The need for an increase in our armed forces therefore exists. Why must we invoke a compulsory draft in order to achieve the necessary increase? The answer is fundamentally simple: Because even extraordinarily successful efforts at voluntary recruitment have proved insufficient. As is set forth extensively in the majority report on H. R. 6401, the recruiting efforts of all the armed forces since the termination of hostilities have resulted in the establishment and maintenance of 1,385,000 men—by far the largest voluntary force in the Nation's history.

The magnitude of the achievement is further emphasized by the circumstances surrounding it: The Nation is nominally at peace, has just concluded an exhausting war, and is enjoying an unprecedented level of employment and prosperity. Ready employment at good pay is available in civilian life.

Notwithstanding the success of this recruiting program, it is evident that the top limits obtainable through voluntary means have already been reached in the Army. In the Navy voluntary recruitment can produce additional men, but not to the level of their authorized strength under existing law. The Air Force expects to meet all of its needs through voluntary recruitment, but this expectation appears optimistic, at least in the absence of a selective-service law. Two of the three military services could not, therefore, achieve by voluntary means alone the increases proposed in the Andrews bill, which are considered minimum requirements in the light of present world conditions. It is thus clear that the voluntary-recruiting program must be supplemented by a system of compulsory selective service, unless the country is willing to gamble dangerously with its own security, or to see the integrity of its vital policies compromised and rendered ineffective by default.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that the House will act promptly on the Andrews bill. I believe such action would be in the highest interest of the United States.

In the light of the circumstances in which we now find ourselves, the proposals in the Andrews bill are not excessive. Their implementation would not put the country on a war footing, but would merely provide an adequate foundation upon which to build in the event

a greater mobilization were required. They would provide for the recruitment of a respectable, but not overwhelming, force capable of restoring a balance between our heavy commitments in the world and our ability to cover them—a balance we have not enjoyed since our hasty and misguided demobilization in 1945.

I wish to emphasize the limited nature of this measure. The Andrews bill would permit an over-all increase in the standing forces of approximately 620,000 men. It would provide the Army, in addition to its occupation forces overseas, with five full-strength divisions to be based in the continental United States. In addition, it would permit the maintenance of six fully-trained and equipped divisions of National Guard and Reserve troops to serve as a first-line reserve in being. This would constitute the emergency force, or strategic reserve, or deployable, uncommitted troops. Such a force is now required for three basic reasons: (1) To support our minimal occupation forces in the event of internal trouble in Germany, Japan, or Korea; (2) To serve with the United Nations' police force, if such is established, in the common effort to reduce existing tensions throughout the world; (3) To seize and hold advance bases for the Air Force in the event of war. The day of intercontinental warfare is many years away. Unless we possess a mobile striking force able, in the event of war, to secure air bases within reach of the enemy, the finest American air force will be, for the next several years, virtually limited to the defense of the Western Hemisphere; the present and foreseeable range of aircraft will not permit American planes to strike an enemy in Europe or Asia with decisive effect from bases within the continental United States.

The bill would permit the Air Force to attain the number of men required to man 70 air groups, which the Congress has already authorized and for which funds have already been appropriated.

The bill would also permit the Navy to achieve its presently authorized strength, to strengthen the complements of ships now in commission, to activate additional air units and other facilities proportionate to the Navy's increased mission, as required by the activation of 70 air groups and the increased strength of the Army.

Surely, this does not constitute an overwhelming force in the light of present dangers, future uncertainties, and the immense responsibilities that have fallen to the United States—however unwittingly—because of our vast material wealth, our strategic position, and our success as a free democracy. If to these is added—and it cannot be ignored—the condition of basic instability existing in a world that is in the throes of a politico-economic revolution, accelerated by a profoundly significant shift in the power balance, it becomes unmistakably clear that the proposed strengths in the Andrews bill are not disproportionate to the problems that face us.

In closing, I should like to restate my belief that this measure, if enacted, will not tend to provoke war, but will, on the contrary, serve as a definite deterrent to any rash decision that may be contemplated by the Soviet Government. It will strengthen the security of the United States by assuring that the European recovery program and similar constructive policies pursued by other free governments will be permitted to proceed, without interference, to their logical conclusion—the reconstitution of a healthy and productive world community.

This Congress has over the past year set in motion several great constructive enterprises which made the hope of world recovery and world stability far more real than appeared possible a year ago. We must now sustain these enterprises against new difficulties which have arisen until they can come to fruition. This will require continued maintenance of adequate armed strength and, above all, perseverance.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the members of the House Armed Services Committee who subscribed to the minority report in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 6401, which is entitled "The Selective Service Act of 1948."

I think I have devoted as much time as any other member of the committee, except the chairman, in attendance at the hearings on the bill, and I have attempted to assemble from the RECORD in consecutive form what I regard as compelling reasons against the enactment of this legislation.

I voted for the Selective Service Act of 1940 because I was convinced that the American people were at that time in the shadow of a great national emergency, and that the registration of all able-bodied male citizens was essential in order to protect our Nation against imminent danger of military attack. Subsequent events prove that my conviction was well founded. I would vote for such a measure again under similar circumstances.

However, the present bill has been presented to Congress as a peacetime preparedness measure. All of our top military experts have assured the Armed Services Committee that this is not an emergency measure, based upon the imminence of war. They have declared that the United States is not confronted with a national emergency in that sense. They say, instead, that the world is in a state of tension, and assert the belief that some form of permanent compulsory military service is essential to adequate preparation for the national defense in the future.

During the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee on the pending bill all of the titular heads of the National Military Establishment, from Secretary of Defense Forrestal down, were repeatedly asked whether they expected this country to be involved in another war in the immediate future. In every instance the response was in the negative. All of our military experts, as well as spokesmen for the State Department, expressed the opinion that the present program of the Russian Government does not contemplate the use of armed force at this time.

The principal reason which they advanced in support of their advocacy of the enactment of a selective-service law now was based upon the allegation that the Army was unable to obtain a sufficient number of men through the present system of voluntary recruitment to maintain its authorized strength. Spokesmen for the Navy Department and the Department of the Air Force testified that they did not need selective service in order to obtain their manpower requirements.

It appears, therefore, that the only semblance of a national emergency upon which any necessity for the enactment of a peacetime conscription law at this time can be argued is the alleged inability of the Army to maintain its authorized strength through voluntary enlistment. I will explain later why the minority members of the Armed Services Committee do not believe that the Department of the Army has exhausted the possibilities of the voluntary recruitment system.

First, however, I want to correct a false impression which has been created in the minds of the American people that the enactment of a selective-service law at this time would be merely a temporary measure. Proponents of the bill have contributed to this false impression by pointing to the fact that this bill contains an expiration date. I wish to emphasize the fact that the record of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee is replete with forthright statements from Secretary of Defense Forrestal and other authorized spokesmen for the National Military Establishment that this selective-service program is designed to remain in effect indefinitely until universal military training is adopted as the permanent law of the land. There can be no doubt that this is the purpose of the sponsors of this bill.

In my opinion the testimony taken by the House Armed Services Committee proves, beyond reasonable doubt, that the National Military Establishment has deliberately refrained in the recent past from making all-out efforts to bring the Army up to the full strength authorized by Congress through the system of voluntary recruitment now provided by law. The Army has refused to accept applications for voluntary enlistment by men who do not make a passing grade of 80 percent in the arbitrary entrance tests which have been revised sharply upward during the recent postwar period. In response to questioning before the House committee, a spokesman for the Army attempted to justify the rigorous new entrance examinations by stating that they want every man in the service to be capable of functioning as a one-man

army when stationed on a post alone with a rifle. I desire to point out that some of the outstanding heroes of World War I and World War II were men who could not have met these new entrance tests. The only conclusion I could reach after listening to this kind of testimony was that the Army chiefs are determined to take only the best-educated young men of America out of civil life and bring them into the armed services.

The National Military Establishment has failed to maintain the National Guard and the Reserve organizations on an efficient basis. Before the Armed Services Committee General Bradley testified as follows:

If our reserve units were filled with men with proper training we believe we could reduce the size of our Regular Army. And it might get it down to a point where it could be maintained by voluntary enlistment.

The bill before you will do nothing to increase the strength and efficiency of the Reserve components. On the contrary, Gen. E. A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, on May 3, 1948, wired each of the members of the House Armed Services as follows:

The enactment of H. R. 6401, as now drafted, will mean the complete dissolution of the National Guard of the United States by June 30, 1950. The security of the Nation cannot be assured by destroying its Reserves. If there is a possibility of war the measures proposed are utterly inadequate. If there is no possibility of war, then the measures proposed are excessive.

General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, told the Armed Services Committee that the Army had done very little to help the Reserves, had done nothing to furnish equipment, and did not contact or put in units the members of the Reserves. General Evans added:

I am not talking about procurement; all I am urging and begging and what I have been trying for 3 years is to have somebody to do something with what we have now.

General Evans agreed that—

There would be no need for a draft, UMT or anything else if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to bring them up.

He supplemented this testimony by saying that he had heard the statement made that the Army leaders "felt they need not build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard because they were going to get UMT or the draft."

The recruiting program is an Army problem, since the Air Force and the Navy are able to get the recruits they need. It is in no sense an unsolvable problem. The following steps would, in my judgment, substantially improve Army recruiting:

First. Revision of the court-martial system so that enlisted men would feel that they would get as fair and equitable treatment as officers.

Second. Improvement of relationships between officers and enlisted men as recommended by the Doolittle board.

Third. Provision for adequate housing for enlisted men.

Fourth. Acceptance of 1-year- and 18-month-term reenlistments.

Fifth. Acceptance of men who make a 70-percent grade in the Army general classification test.

Sixth. Increase the pay scales for enlisted men.

There is apparent disagreement among Army officers about the proper score for admission of applicants. A recently published pamphlet, The Fort Knox Experiment, printed in the Senate hearings, refers to the 70-percent minimum which is usual for Army enlistments.

General Eisenhower, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 2, said:

I thought I had directed before I left as Chief of Staff to drop, for the Ground Forces at least, the figure back to 70, so that we could fill up certain places.

Lieutenant General Paul, in a letter to the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated that the Army did have men of prior service with good records whose score is between 70 and 80. Other witnesses expressed the belief that men who were good noncommissioned officers of the Army would not now be able to enter if they had to pass the present tests.

There is an abundance of experienced military opinion that the Army should lower its intelligence requirements.

In my opinion, the obvious conclusion is that the National Military Establishment has purposely permitted the voluntary recruitment system and the whole Organized Reserve system to deteriorate in order to substitute a permanent compulsory program in peacetime. The only statement by Pentagon spokesmen on this subject is that they have done what they could with the funds given them by Congress; but the records of the House Appropriations Committee do not show that any urgent appeal has been made by the National Military Establishment during the postwar period for additional funds to build up the Reserves and the National Guard.

There are other significant facts in the official records of this postwar period which strengthen my conclusion that the National Military Establishment has deliberately blocked the development of a strong and effective Reserve system in order to substitute some method of compulsory service. The Selective Service Act of 1940 contained directives, which were purposely inserted by the Congress, that the veterans of World War II should be placed in a Reserve status for a period of 10 years after they were discharged from active service. This provision was specifically extended by the Congress at the time the old Selective Service Act expired.

I now quote from the testimony of Mr. B. N. Harlow, a member of the technical staff of the House Armed Services Committee, on page 6532 of the House committee report of the hearings on the pending bill:

The services did not abide by this provision. The service position was originally to abide by the law. Then, as I recall it, they took a certain proportion of the discharged men in the Reserve. Later, for some reason which I never was able to discover, they discontinued that procedure.

The issue became very warm inside the War Department, and the Department went to the Judge Advocate General to find out what they should do about the situation. The Judge Advocate General came to the conclusion that the President had the authority to discharge these men under another act of Congress, and their position is predicated upon that act.

While this subject was being discussed in the committee hearing, General Evans called attention to the concluding paragraph of the Judge Advocate General's opinion, reading as follows:

It is proper to add that, although in my opinion discharges may be ordered in appropriate cases, such complete separations from the service should be based upon adequate grounds, and effected in accordance with sound policies. Otherwise it is quite likely that accusations may be made that discrimination is being practiced or that one of the major purposes of the act; i. e., the creation of a large trained reserve, is being defeated.

General Evans described this concluding paragraph as a warning from the Judge Advocate.

Despite this warning from their chief legal adviser, the War Department and the other branches of the armed services proceeded thereafter to discharge the millions of men who had served in World War II without transferring them to a reserve status, thereby defeating the major purpose of Congress to create a large trained reserve in the postwar period.

Gentlemen of the Committee, you can draw your own conclusions as to the reasons which impelled the armed services to disregard the emphatically expressed intention of Congress that a large trained reserve should be automatically created in this postwar period. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have not been able to get any satisfactory explanation of this unprecedented evasion of a congressional mandate. In my own mind it is unmistakably associated with the deep-seated determination of our military high command to force some form of compulsory service upon the American people at this time.

I am sure that all of the members of the Rules Committee are familiar with the reports made by the publicity and propaganda subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, following their investigation of the participation of Federal officials of the War Department in publicity and propaganda relating to universal military training. For the purpose of this record I ask permission to read an excerpt from a letter addressed to the Attorney General of the United States by the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman of the subcommittee, dated July 23, 1947:

I am impelled to call to your attention what the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments concludes

to be improper and unlawful activities of Federal officials of the War Department in propagandizing for legislation now pending before Congress, relating to universal military training.

The subcommittee report which was transmitted to the Attorney General with the letter referred to above ends with the following statement:

> Your committee reports its firm conclusion that, on the basis of the evidence at hand, the War Department, its personnel, and civilian employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress, and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending in Congress.

This report was signed by the following Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, chairman, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Hon. HENRY J. LATHAM, Hon. CARTER MANASCO, and Hon. J. FRANK WILSON.

To sum up the foregoing statements, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the failure of the National Military Establishment to make any adequate provisions for an efficient Reserve and National Guard in the postwar period, the arbitrary restrictions imposed by the Department of the Army upon the voluntary recruitment system, the amazing refusal of the military high command to comply with the mandate of Congress to transfer millions of men into a reserve status after World War II, and the improper expenditure of tax funds by the War Department on propaganda in support of universal military training clearly demonstrate that the insistent demand from the above-mentioned military sources for the enactment of this bill is not based upon any grave emergency which imperils our national security, but is the culmination of a long-term, carefully conceived campaign to compel Congress to approve some kind of compulsory military service at this time.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that my fundamental objection to this bill arises from a grave apprehension about its impact upon the American way of life. The enactment of this measure would mean the abdication, perhaps for all time, of one of the basic principles upon which the free democratic society of America has endured throughout the history of this Republic. That principle is freedom for all of our citizens from any form of military compulsion in peacetime.

The military leaders of this country have always favored some form of peacetime compulsory military service. But the American people, in their wisdom, have always rejected this doctrine. They have insisted that civil authority should be superior to military authority in the affairs of our Government, and public opinion has up to this time prevented the injection of military compulsion into the fabric of our free democracy, in time of peace.

Under this traditional peacetime policy, the United States of America has become the greatest and most prosperous Nation in the history of the world. In the past three decades, without adopting either peacetime conscription or universal military training, this Nation has fought and won the two greatest wars in all history. It was no mere accident that the free democracies of the west—the United States and Great Britain—without a long peacetime period of conscription and a well-developed military bureaucracy, were enabled to assemble a more powerful striking force than the Axis Powers. World War II was a war of modern machines, and the unprepared western democracies demonstrated a clear superiority in this type of warfare. I am convinced that this superiority is based upon our incomparable ability in the all-important field of production which would be even more important in the scientific warfare of the future.

The disruptive effect of this kind of legislation upon the American home was the subject of thoughtful discussion in the minority report upon this bill. I quote briefly from the report:

> In the American home are centered the hopes and aspirations of fathers, mothers, and children; there is the sacrifice that has spelled much of our great achievement as a people; there is the love and understanding that binds us together in millions of families having common aspirations, common hopes, common beliefs. Anything which will undermine such a cultural force, such a religious strength, such a source of national patriotism, is not to be legislated lightly into existence.
>
> Yet this compulsory draft bill proposes to invade the family and disrupt its character. It will take the sons away from the home in the most formative and impressionable years, removing them from the steadying hand of a father and the abiding faith and love of a mother. It will interrupt, and in many cases permanently prevent, the college educations of thousands of our young people. It will deny to many needy families gainful returns from employment of their younger members.
>
> If there were war, or the threat of imminent war, no members of this minority, and no patriotic father or mother in this great Nation of ours would refuse to make the sacrifice of their sons, as they have done in the past. But even in this period of international tension no evidence has been produced by the military authorities, by the State Department, or by any responsible witness, that would warrant a peacetime draft which will so drastically affect all American families.

Mr. Chairman, in these times we hear much of the threat to the American way of life from certain alien ideologies. I am as much opposed to the tyrannical cults which are embodied in those alien ideologies as any other American can possibly be. But I believe that the most immediate threat to our cherished American way of life is from the ideology of militarism. This ideology is as old as civilization; yes, even older. It has always sought to fasten itself upon the societies of free men. Whenever it has succeeded in doing so those societies, ancient and modern, have been marked for destruction.

Mr. Chairman, it is the ideology of militarism, that is inherent in this bill, which makes me fear it so much. I earnestly hope that it will never become the law of our land.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to and I shall vote against the pending bill. It is in my opinion unwise, unsafe, unnecessary, undemocratic, and un-American.

Every impulse of my mind, heart, and soul cries out against militarism and military slavery in peacetime, and in my opinion that is just what this bill implies.

It is with sincere humility that I approach the great issue of peacetime military conscription. The factors to be considered are so diverse and complex that it would be easier, perhaps, to conclude that the military leaders know what is best than to weigh the effects of passing or rejecting the selective-service legislation, and to come to an independent decision.

Having served in Congress during two terrible wars, I fully realize the necessity of an effective, efficient military organization in an international crisis. Yet, as the military might shields us in war, so, if unchecked in peace, it will curtail and oppress the very liberties so dearly defended against the foreign enemy.

My determination to oppose the pending bill (H. R. 6401) is the result of the most solemn and prayerful deliberation on the following questions:

First. Does a peacetime draft law present a serious threat to democratic government and to individual liberty and morality?

Second. Is a draft law at present necessary to obtain the required manpower for the armed forces?

Third. Is the cost of establishment of a system of selective service now justified?

Fourth. Would enactment of a peacetime draft provide the most effective preparedness program?

Fifth. Would not passage of the pending bill overshadow the basic, long-range program to assure a lasting peace?

First, let us weigh the dangers of peacetime conscription to democratic government. Although the pending bill deals solely with selective service, the Minority Report of the Armed Services Committee points out that "the record of the hearings before the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress is replete with forthright statements from authorized spokesmen of the National Military Establishment that this program is designed to remain in effect indefinitely until universal military training is adopted as the permanent law of the land.

So we must not delude ourselves that we are passing upon selective service alone. If this bill passes, the military leaders, by their own admission, will not desist until they have obtained universal military training. The ultimate result will be a perpetual military yoke about the family freedom of the American home. The young men of the Nation—and eventually the women—will be sub-

jected during their most impressionable years to military discipline and training. The caste system of the military is the antithesis of democracy. Young people will be taught to obey without question at a time when the power of independent thought and decision should be fostered. Without such fundamental education, Mr. Chairman, democratic government cannot long endure.

And would anyone dare say that military camps are a beneficial influence upon the cultural, moral, and religious development of the youth of the Nation? Citizenship and morality, my friends, can best be developed in the homes, schools, and churches. The Army has but one object and that is to turn these young men into precision military machines.

Not the least in the sinister influences of militarization is the present and potential power of the brass hats over the economy of the country. The spending of $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 a year is not to be entrusted lightly to a small group of military dictators who all too frequently use army discipline and security regulations to cover up their own mistakes and ambitions. Nor can we neglect the dangerous influence of military men, with billions to spend, upon the freedom of deliberations of the legislators who authorized such vast expenditures.

Even the freedom of the press may be endangered by military advertising budgets and constant propaganda. My grave fears, therefore, of the adverse effects of peacetime conscription—as a prelude to universal military training—upon the youth of the Nation as individuals, and upon such fundamental American institutions as the family, the private-enterprise economy, a free press, and a Congress answerable to civilians and not to the military, impel me to the conviction that its adoption would be a terrible plague upon the body politic.

Our forefathers braved the wilderness of the New World to be relieved of despotism resting upon compulsory military training. Even in the darker hours of the American Revolution Thomas Jefferson advised against the draft, in a letter to John Adams:

> It ever was the most unpopular and impractical thing that could be attempted. Our people under the monarchical government had learned to consider it as the last of all oppressions.

The Congress today may well heed the advice of this great President and author of the Declaration of Independence.

Second, even if the hazards of selective service could be safely assumed, is it necessary at the present time? On this question civilians—whether on the farm or in Congress—may admittedly have to decide without knowing all the facts. Yet, as Mr. J. T. Sanders, spokesman for the National Grange, told the House Armed Services Committee on April 20, 1948:

> Frankly, and with no more information than we now have, we have our serious doubts that there is impending a war crisis that justifies an immediate resort to selective service. We grant that certain information must be kept confidential; but unless there is a far more serious threat than we know about, and on which the people cannot now safely be informed, we can see no imminent danger that would call for either the draft or universal military training.
>
> With a more sensible respect and treatment of servicemen by officers—with more liberal pay, with greater educational advantages and opportunities, and so forth, we believe an adequate armed force will volunteer.

But the doubts of us civilians about the real necessity for conscription are supported by military spokesmen who may be presumed to have ready access to classified information on our international relations.

Secretary of Air Symington told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13, 1948:

> We do not feel that selective service is necessary, in order to get the people up to the 502,000, based on our calendar for the Air Force.

General Spaatz on the same day agreed:

> I have no doubt in my mind but what the Air Force will get sufficient recruits to maintain the Air Force proper on a voluntary enlistment basis.

Secretary of the Navy Sullivan told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13:

> We do not know whether we can get those additional people without selective service. We believe that the way our enlistments have been running we probably will be able to do it.

And Admiral Denfeld, on whether the Navy could maintain its strength without the draft, said:

> I think you can get it if the present situation continues.

Since the Air Force, and the Navy probably do not need conscription, only the Army is involved. As the minority report of the House committee summarizes this question:

> The immediate excuse for the measure boils down to the alleged inability of the Army to secure voluntary enlistments for the Ground Forces. Both Air Corps and Navy spokesmen have admitted that voluntary methods will be sufficient to their needs. The committee records show that the Army has deliberately refrained from making all-out efforts to utilize voluntary recruitment methods. Just as little interest has been shown in supporting the Reserve establishments as long as the Army feels that universal conscription is obtainable, so the Army has been unwilling to pursue energetically the problem of making Army service more desirable to the average potential soldier.
>
> The revision of the court-martial system in accord with the Doolittle report, the improvement of relations between officers and enlisted men, provision of adequate housing for married enlisted personnel, shorter term enlistments, and more realistic general classification-test requirements, are all feasible measures which we believe would substantially improve recruiting.

And I should add to these suggestions an adjustment in pay scale with a more substantial reward in increased pay based upon length of service. Moreover, if fewer men in uniform were assigned to desk jobs that civilians could readily perform, the Army needs might very well be met by voluntary enlistment. Nor has anyone explained satisfactorily the sudden increase in the passing grade for recruits from 59 to 80.

Of particular merit, in my opinion, is the alternative of proper utilization of the 2,400,000 Organized Reserves. Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee charged the Army with neglect of the voluntary Reserves and the National Guard in order to get compulsory military training. In the Senate hearings, General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, said:

> There is an apparent policy which exists in the Pentagon today which says we will do very little with the Reserve program until the National Guard program is 100-percent organized. It cannot be 100-percent organized in the manner in which it is supposed to be, completely, until the passage of universal military training.

In desperation our military leaders have suggested the possibility of war to substantiate their clamor for peacetime conscription.

On May 13, 1948, General Bradley told the House Appropriations Subcommittee:

> The precipitation of armed hostilities, either by a deliberate or accidental incident, is a plausible possibility so long as our forces face each other on opposing frontiers in this strained atmosphere of distrust and tension.

Stripped to a simple subject and predicate, I interpret the general to say:

> War is now a plausible possibility.

Since I felt sure that General Bradley's statement was the result of painstaking preparation, I decided to scrutinize it with equal care. War, of course, for as long as there shall be independent nations, is always a possibility. But just what is "a plausible possibility"? For that I had to go to Webster's New International Dictionary, where I found the following definitions of "plausible":

> Worthy of being applauded; obtaining approbation or favor; agreeable; affable; obtaining general approval; popular; superficially fair, reasonable, or valuable; apparently right or trustworthy; specious; using specious arguments or discourse; fair-spoken; applausive; and plauditory.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that not one of the meanings of the adjective "plausible" is applicable. Stripped of all its unnecessary verbiage, all that General Bradley said in support of his request for a supplemental budget for the Army was: "War is a possibility."

Let us discuss now the third question of whether the cost of selective service is an unnecessary expenditure and burden under present conditions. If we assume—without conceding—that world conditions may warrant a stronger military force, we still should consider whether the draft is the most economical method of preparedness.

Secretary Forrestal on April 12, 1948, stated that the draft program for fiscal year 1949 "involves a supplemental budget request of $3,000,000,000 in cash

and contract authorizations, over and above the authorizations which have already been requested." We should also add the cost of reactivating the draft boards, which would be $40,000,000, since the armed forces intend to maintain their recruiting program in addition to conscription. The Armed Services Committee minority report, however, summarized the cost of the program as follows:

> The cost of the program provided by the bill appears as two substantial items. One amount of $2,149,000,000 would be expended for the training equipment and the initial machinery setting the program in operation. In addition, an estimated $3,900,000,000 for reequipping the 25 divisions of the Army will be required in fiscal 1949. These items are in addition to the $11,000,000,000 budget appropriation, the $3,000,000,000 supplementary appropriation and the $822,000,000 Air Corps appropriation. Thus, the total military budget for 1949 is seen to be more than $21,000,000,000.

The annual cost of selective service per man has been estimated at $8,000 the first year and $5,000 the next. Consider for a moment what a fine college education could be provided for every inductee with such sums, and what a contribution this would be to their own lives and to cultural and scientific advancement.

Fourth, a vital question to the very existence of this Nation is whether selective service—and its contemplated successor, universal military training—will provide effective preparedness against the eventuality of another war.

With such fearful weapons as the atomic bomb, rocket propulsion, and bacteriological warfare available to our potential enemies, I am compelled to agree with Admiral Schoeffel of the United States Naval Ordnance that—

> It will never again be possible for us to depend upon dusting off the weapons of a previous conflict when war breaks out. It would be like reverting to the bow and arrow.

Yet the military, through stress upon peacetime conscription, would create for us a Maginot defense line of drilling foot soldiers.

Instead we should for the present build up our atomic stock pile and expend our resources and energy in the advancement of scientific research. Only thus can we maintain a preponderance of power to guarantee national survival if war again should come.

Finally, all this talk by our military leaders about the plausible possibility of war and the necessity for universal military training and the draft are loathesome burdens as we seek the path toward a permanent peace. Instead of concentrating so heavily upon numbers of military personnel, we should, I firmly believe, work toward the following goals, without which our civilization cannot survive:

First. The United Nations must be strengthened by abandonment of the veto. It must be made to work, for there are no differences between nations that cannot be solved at a conference table to the betterment of all concerned far more wisely than by resorting to modern weapons of war. To the extent that this involves a surrender of sovereignty to the United Nations, I think we might accept it as the only rational alternative to world anarchy in which the will of a single nation is allowed to obstruct the desires of all the rest. Accordingly, I believe that the United States should initiate action under the terms of article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations. This article provides that a general conference of the members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

Second. When the stature of the United Nations as a force for maintaining peace and security among nations is fully developed, world disarmament will logically follow. It will be impossible then to justify military forces in excess of those required for internal police within a country and for meeting the commitments of a nation to the forces assigned to the United Nations. Universal disarmament would, of course, involve the adoption of the Baruch plan for atomic-energy control, and would mean the universal abolition of military conscription.

In conclusion, a peacetime draft with the forecast of universal military training, is a negative and dangerous departure from our democratic tradition against militarism. It is an unnecessary, costly, and ineffective preparedness program—that is utterly inconsistent with our proclaimed policies of peace. This bill would impose an unnecessary load on the already overburdened taxpayers of America, and a galling yoke of military servitude upon the necks of American youth. I fear the way we are headed is exactly contrary to the direction in which we say we want to go. On these earnest convictions I must rest my opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to peacetime compulsory military conscription for many reasons. One of the most important reasons is that it is contrary to the philosophy of our American constitutional republican form of government. A very large percentage of early immigrants to this land came here to get away from the very thing this Congress is now asked to set up. In my opinion one of the best ways to begin the destruction of the freedom of the individual and our freedom in general is to pass this peacetime draft which would be a radical change in our Government, the first peacetime draft in our history when no emergency existed.

Our top military authorities have testified before the Armed Services Committees that there is no immediate danger of war. James A. Farley, a Democrat high in the councils of his party has said the same thing in the press. The United States News very recently carried the same statement. It has been testified also by high military authorities that the draft is not needed for either the Navy or the Air Force, and that the shortage in the Army is only about 250,000. It is also freely charged that the Army raised its standards which caused the rejection of many volunteers and that it has not exhausted its power to get volunteers.

If Congress can give billions of dollars to Europe, why could it not raise the salaries of enlisted men and thereby cause many to volunteer who would do it willingly, and thus fill the small shortage.

No, the great purpose of this compulsory peacetime military draft is to fasten on this country forever, a system that has led to the downfall of every country in all history that has had it.

If this draft law is passed and goes into effect in the form the bill is in now, look for rationing and gradually increasing regimentation of our people in the United States. The bill should not pass.

If there were a real emergency or if war were imminent, I would vote for the draft. But neither situation now exists. I voted for all defense measures including that for the large Air Force. I am for a strong national defense and have uniformly voted for it, and expect to continue to do so. But this draft bill is not now necessary.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has just made an excellent statement and I agree with him on the point that the Army has not exhausted all of its possibilities to obtain recruits to bring the armed forces up to authorized strength. I shall later offer an amendment that would provide for an honest, intensified campaign for voluntary enlistments before this act could be made effective.

In this connection I had an unexpected and significant experience this morning. A prominent businessman from Elmira, N. Y., called on me and we took seats in the gallery while the rule on this bill was being discussed. I explained the situation in the House and he made the observation that he doubted if a peacetime draft is necessary. He then said:

"Coming into Washington this morning in the diner I had breakfast opposite a young man in uniform. We passed the time of day and I asked him about his service in the Army. He finally told me that he was in the recruiting service."

My friend from Elmira then asked the young man if he were on his way to Washington on a furlough.

"Oh, no," the young man replied. "My parents live there."

The gentleman then asked, "Do you get home often?"

"Oh," the soldier replied, "I'm there about 3 weeks out of each month."

"How do you do that?" my friend said he asked.

The soldier replied, "My quota is 12 men per month. I work hard and get my 12 men in 5 days or a week, and then I am able to spend the rest of the month in Washington."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that conversation was related to me in the gallery of this House not more than an hour ago by a very responsible businessman. I have no reason whatever to doubt his word.

I had previously received reports that the Army had placed quotas for recruiting in certain districts but my friend's casual story of his chance meeting with this recruiting sergeant was the first verification of such quotas that I have been able to obtain.

Mr. Chairman, certainly if quotas on recruiting are ordered by the armed services, their statements that they are unable to get sufficient recruits through voluntary enlistments, can be questioned by Members of Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not want to take the gentleman's time but I do want to say that I have had protests from people in my district whose sons have been let out before the expiration of their enlistments. These boys did not want to get out. They volunteered, but the Army let them out.

Mr. SHAFER. There is no question but what that has happened. There is also no doubt but what the Army has raised the requirements up to 80 points, 10 points above what it should be; and there is no doubt that they have rejected enlistments of boys who have sought to enlist for less than 3 years.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to confirm his statement. I have had similar complaints from my district.

Mr. SHAFER. I thank the gentleman. I say the Army is taking this Congress for a bunch of suckers. There is no doubt about it.

We are getting the cart before the horse on this thing. A most inconsistent spectacle took place in the Rules Committee yesterday. Being chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Armed Services Committee I am particularly interested in the strategic materials stockpiling program. This Congress knows that this program has not been carried out according to the intent of Congress in legislation that we passed 3 years ago. It was not until after I called the attention of the President on February 24 this year that the administration decided to reinstate some $400,000,000 for purchasing in that program. But yesterday during the Rules Committee session we had the Russell strategic materials bill before the committee and they refused to grant a rule on that bill despite the fact that it is vitally important that we have that legislation if we are going to have strategic materials with which to provide our armed forces with the proper arms and munitions. I repeat, this bill puts the cart before the horse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal briefly with the purely military considerations which make necessary the enactment of selective service at this time—that is to say, the military judgments of professional soldiers whose primary function is to prepare measures for the adequate security of the United States and its interests in the world. While the condition of international relations is a factor which cannot be divorced from the determination of security requirements, military judgments as to these requirements are based generally upon the capabilities of possible enemies, without regard to their hypothetical intent.

The armed forces of the United States are charged with certain missions which they must be capable of carrying out if the country is to be assured of reasonable protection from foreign attack. These missions generally remain constant, but the requirements in weapons and manpower to carry them out tend to vary with the change in the capabilities of possible enemies. For example, there was a time in our country's history when the expanse of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans afforded us a splendid isolation. This geographical remoteness was a defense in itself and required for its complement only a negligible armed force. Today our geographical isolation is gone. We are vulnerable, under certain conditions, to direct attack from the air, and, accordingly, we must maintain a substantially larger armed force if we are to have reasonable security.

On the basis of present developments in weapons and the known strength of Soviet armed forces, the Chief of Staff of the Army has determined that he needs a minimum of 822,000 men to carry out the missions assigned the Army by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. How does he arrive at such a judgment? Let us look first at the Army missions.

First. As a result of the war, the Army is now burdened with the job of occupying Germany, Austria, Trieste, Japan, and Korea—a job which, to paraphrase General Bradley, has rendered the Army primarily an administrative rather than a military force. Over half the present armed strength of the Army is spread over this vast area, and yet these occupation forces number only 253,000 troops. The Chief of Staff believes that the occupation forces should be increased by 14,000 men; if this is done he will regard the size of the occupation forces as an acceptable risk, provided there is behind these thinly spread troops an emergency force in the United States, able to support them promptly in the event of internal trouble in the occupied areas.

Second. A second Army mission is to occupy, in the event of war, those strategic areas from which air attack could be launched against our industrial cities. General Bradley, in a convincing statement before the Armed Services Committee on April 14, said bluntly that there are now neutral areas in the world, accessible to possible enemies, from which aircraft could attack the continental United States with decisive effect. I quote from his statement:

> If we, as a result of weakness in land or naval strength, permit any enemy power to seize such bases as Alaska, Greenland, Iceland, Spitsbergen, or the Azores, then we shall have laid our industrial and population centers open to air attack. All the air force and antiaircraft artilleries of the world could not prevent it. Only troops actually occupying such bases could give us protection. Those troops are the Army.

What does this statement mean to the people of this country whose hope is to live out their lives in security and with whose welfare the Congress is directly charged? It means that if war should come, the American people will be forced to fight it on their own soil, unless there are sufficient ground forces available on the very first day of the conflict to seize those neutral areas from which an enemy could organize and launch attacks against our homeland.

I do not believe there is any doubt as to the decision the American people would make if, these facts were clear to them. I wonder if there can be any rational man who would prefer to fight a desperate, defensive action on the American continent—if war should unfortunately come—if it was in his power to prevent such a disastrous occurrence.

And I ask you to mark well this particular point: The only way to prevent attack upon this country, in the event of war, is to hold the bases from which the enemy can reach us with his aircraft and his airborne troops. Antiaircraft batteries and interceptor aircraft based in this country may be able to destroy a substantial portion of an attacking force, but they can never prevent destruction of our cities and devastation of our population.

Third. The Third Army mission is to seize overseas areas of vital importance to the counteroffensive efforts of our Air Force, in the event of war. Although a Senator from Ohio has seen fit to believe that air power alone is a panacea for national security—and I regret to say there are some Members of the House who hold the same misguided view—the best military judgment is that the American Air Force, regardless of its size, could not operate effectively against an enemy in Asia or Europe from bases in the continental United States. It would be necessary to obtain bases much nearer the target areas—bases which would most certainly have to be seized and held by American ground troops, and supported and supplied by the American Navy. Obviously, this means that trained combat troops must be available in adequate numbers, or our Air Force will be virtually limited to the defense of the Western Hemisphere in any conflict that may arise within the foreseeable future. The day of intercontinental warfare is many years away.

Fourth. The final mission of the Army—and perhaps the most easily understood—is to protect the continental United States; to repel attacks against it, and to protect its population against bombing and sabotage.

The Army thus has four basic missions in addition to the burden of occupation: First, to support the occupation; second, to be ready to occupy neutral areas from which an enemy could launch air attacks against us; third, to seize advance bases for the Air Force in the event of war; and fourth, to protect the continental United States. These are staggering tasks. All of them, with the exception of the last, are tasks peculiar to the Army which only the Army can carry out.

How many combat troops do we now have in this country, ready, mobile, and uncommitted to other tasks? We have 54,000—two and one-third divisions, no one of which is up to full strength.

I ask you quite frankly whether any sensible man can possibly consider this tiny force to be adequate to carry out the assigned missions of the Army. I ask you whether any sensible man would suggest eliminating one or all of these missions on grounds that it is unnecessary to the national security.

Fifty-four thousand men do not go very far when they are required simultaneously to support occupation forces overseas, to protect the vast land area of the continental United States, to prevent enemy seizure of air bases within range of the United States, and to spearhead the advance of the Air Force in the event of war. It should be obvious to everyone that 54,000 men would scarcely be adequate to carry out one of the above missions. To carry out more than one would spread such a force impossibly thin.

I submit there is no doubt of the compelling need to augment at once the effective combat strength of the Ground Forces.

The Andrews bill will provide the Army with only moderate increases. It will increase the combat strength within the continental United States from 54,000 to 223,000. Translated into units, this will mean five full strength divisions to comprise the emergency force, supplemented by six fully equipped and trained divisions composed of National Guard and Reserve troops. It should be understood that these Reserve divisions will not comprise a standing force, but rather a reserve force in being.

The Andrews bill will not provide, then, an overwhelming force. It will provide a minimal strength below which we dare not go without seriously jeopardizing the national security. Even then the Ground Forces will be, as General Bradley has said, "essentially a stopgap, one-shot Army, a plug in the dike until we could rally sufficient and effective reserves."

The Air Force and the Navy have equally vital missions, for which they must possess the capability to carry out, if the country is to be secure. Maximum security can be achieved only through the maintenance of carefully balanced land, sea, and air forces trained to operate as a team. No one military service can safeguard the country alone in this day of three dimensional warfare.

Congress has already taken steps to see that the Air Force shall be capable of carrying out its essential missions: First, to wage successful strategic air warfare; second, to gain and maintain general air supremacy; third, to control vital air areas.

The Navy is already capable of maintaining general sea supremacy and of controlling vital sea areas. It has, however, direct and specific need of selective-service legislation, if it is to provide sufficient naval forces for the conduct of joint amphibious operations in support of 70 air groups. Make no mistake about it, a 70-group air force, if it is to be effective, must be adequately supported and supplied by naval vessels and naval escorts, as well as by Army Ground Forces. Although there is no question that the Air Force has become the most important element of military strength, nevertheless an air force remains the most immobile and ineffective element if it is inadequately supported.

I am prepared to hear the time-worn arguments of those who oppose this bill. I do not believe they will be illogical enough to attack the validity of the missions assigned the several services, nor the need to increase the combat strength of each of them; but I assume they will insist—as they did repeatedly in 1940—that the armed forces can achieve the required increases by voluntary means alone. They cannot.

In the light of present circumstances, the recruiting record of the armed forces since the termination of hostilities is a very impressive one. In a period of nominal peace, when the Nation has just concluded an exhausting war, when we are enjoying an unprecedented level of employment, the armed forces have recruited and maintained a voluntary force of over 1,300,000 men—the largest voluntary force in the history of this or any other nation. This is factual.

The circumstances in which we now find ourselves require, however, that we further increase the strength of our standing forces. The required increases cannot be achieved by voluntary means alone, except in the Air Force. It is evident that the top limits attainable through voluntary recruitment have already been reached in the Army, and that although the Navy can enlist additional men, it cannot hope to reach the level of strength provided in the Andrews bill without the aid of selective-service legislation.

The missions assigned the armed forces are valid; the judgments of our trained professional officers, as to the manpower required to carry out these missions, are unquestionably proper in the light of the present world situation.

The United States has emerged from the recent war as the most powerful and influential nation in the world. It is now clear that if the world is to achieve a new equilibrium the United States must exercise the full measure of its leadership, and must accept the full responsibility that is the obligation of greater power.

The United States must do these things in its own interest, if for no other reason, for if leadership is not exercised, it is always lost; and if we do not strive, commensurate with our immense influence, to achieve the kind of world in which we hope to live, then there is no doubt that others will shape the world according to concepts entirely alien to our own.

The American people have accepted this great challenge to their leadership, which has been unwittingly thrust upon them as the result of victory in the recent war.

If the voice of the United States is to be clear and resonant in world councils, then it must be backed by strength, for weakness cannot negotiate; it can only beg.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, in the short space of 5 minutes it would be impossible for me to adequately express my opposition to peacetime conscription.

Accordingly, these remarks will be brief and, when they appear in the RECORD, they will include additional material.

In this proposal the House is debating a scheme to regiment the youth of America. Yet this House has not had the need of this scheme honestly explained to it.

Why do I say that?

Because, despite all the bombast about the world situation, our so-called commitments abroad, the threat of "aggressor nations," and so forth, no Member of Congress can tell the House or his people what the present national defense program embraces.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that. No Member of this House can tell any prospective draftee what our military and foreign policy is—in plain, understandable English.

Just as during the war, Members of Congress could not tell what we were fighting for except perhaps to mumble about the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter—now both in the wastebasket, neither can a Member of Congress tell what our present military policy includes—whether we are trying to dominate the non-Russian world, prop up the British Empire, or what. No one can answer. Why not?

AMERICANS, LIKE RUSSIANS, KEPT IN DARK

If this bill is passed, the House will be shoving down the throats of the American people the despotic concept of—

> Theirs not to reason why;
> Theirs but to do and die.

More than a month ago I asked Secretary Forrestal what our defensive boundaries are. I received a reply that can mean anything you choose to make of it.

Once the need for larger manpower is determined, then it should be shown that every intelligent method of enlarging the forces by volunteer methods has failed. That has not been done.

Increased pay, 1-year enlistments, the morale-building proposals of the Doolittle report, and changes in the court-martial system—all of these have been given what amounts to the run-around.

H. R. 6401 would establish in America, without the people having any genuine voice in the decision, the totalitarian concept that the state owns the individual.

Such a lesser abridgment of liberty as the prohibition amendment, even after being taken to the people, failed because popular support evaporated.

This measure would cause a steady deterioration in the morale of the American people to the point of disaster.

This measure would declare to the world that Hitler was right—that the threat of communism externally justified militarism and regimentation at home.

Congress would be surrendering to the militarism that it sent 400,000 American boys to die fighting against—thereby outlawing the Declaration of Independence concept that man is endowed with certain inalienable rights.

(a) Having made this surrender of human liberty, Congress can no longer effectively defend the rights of the people from aggrandizement by the state. You cannot enslave youth and then defend lesser individual right.

CONSCRIPTION MAKES ERP A CERTAIN FLOP

Passage of this bill would practically guarantee that ERP will be operation rat hole. It will be a signal to shrewd people everywhere that United States hostilities with Russia are to be expected.

That prospect would cause the people of Europe and Asia to abandon most plans for private domestic investment. No sane person makes permanent investments on a prospective battlefield.

Passage of this bill would play right into Stalin's hands.

(a) It would imitate the Communists by adopting the principle of article 132 of the Russian Constitution—peacetime conscription.

(b) It would multiply the tensions among our own people. It would enable the Communists to truthfully proclaim that our talk about the dignity of man and freedom was rotten hypocrisy.

You cannot send a conscript, who has been deprived of freedom, to Germany to teach the German people about the blessings of freedom.

HYSTERIA FANNED HERE IN HITLER FASHION

This bill seems to be the product of carefully created hysteria designed to stampede Congress into full-blown militarism.

(a) Great Britain is spending only 23 percent of its budget on military costs whereas we are about to spend at least 37 percent. That amount is almost 60 percent larger than Britain.

(b) Canada has no draft and is spending only $20 per capita on defense, against over $100 per capita here.

(c) Many people have swallowed the propaganda that our 1948 military position is comparable with 1938. They have accepted the deliberate untruth that our defense is a hollow shell. Nothing could be further from the truth.

First. Our military expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 will be around $15,000,000,000. The enormity of this amount is shown by the fact that in the 18 years ended July 1, 1939, our total military expenditures were just over $15,000,000,000.

Second. In 1939 Army ammunition on hand was nil. Today it is 8,500,000 tons.

In 1939 Army matériel on hand was nil. Today it is 9,000,000 tons.

Third. Our Navy today is larger than all the rest of the world put together.

Fourth. We have the atomic bomb. We have powerful bases, especially air, almost around the world.

(d) Continued hysteria and surrender to the militarists would repeat France's fatal stupidity of the twenties when her surrender to the militarists weakened her civilian economy so that it collapsed when the test came.

IS CONGRESS BECOMING SUBSERVIENT TO MILITARY?

H. R. 6401 may move Congress decisively into the realm of impotence in the direction of national affairs. The military already has the fearful power inherent in the spending of close to $15,000,000,000 annually.

The additional coercive powers surrendered to the military by this bill can make the civilian branch of the Government completely subservient to the military. Already there is much evidence to indicate that Army spending and interference in civil government approaches the point of domination.

For 160 years a youth born in America has been assured at birth of opportunity and freedom unsurpassed on this planet.

This measure would destroy that heritage and reduce an American boy to a second-rate degree of freedom compared with the youth of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other lands.

Congress should not make such a surrender of liberty on the basis of 10-day hearings.

AN ECONOMIC PEARL HARBOR IS PARAMOUNT DANGER

Passage of this measure would accelerate the wholesale Government spending that will eventually cause run-away inflation. That is made to order for our enemies. You cannot achieve economy in public spending in an America that is conscripting its young men. The Communists could win their aim of world control by avoiding open hostilities.

Once run-away inflation occurs here, the military advantages we have today will evaporate.

Mr. Chairman, the most plausible excuse for this bill is, to quote its advocates, "to show Russia that we mean business."

Let us examine this claim realistically. Do you remember 2 years ago when Byrnes started "talking tough" to Russia? What did that accomplish?

Or do you remember Marshall's claim that we would erect a dollar curtain that would halt Russia? Already that claim, used to put over the Marshall plan, has been exploded by Marshall himself in demanding the draft.

BILL PROMOTES RUSSIAN AIMS

Mr. Chairman, instead of stopping the Russian menace, the so-called show of force embraced in the draft bill actually promotes the Soviet objective.

That objective today, as always, is an economic Pearl Harbor in America.

Mr. Chairman, the record proves that this administration does not comprehend the real tactics of Russian expansion.

Their aggression is based upon inducing America to become more and more economically overextended—without a let-up. Thus far that policy has worked perfectly—for Russia.

By cleverly opposing our economic blood-letting scheme, the Communists may have promoted their adoption. They have given us a long rope, which the administration has grabbed enthusiastically. This bill would wrap that rope around our neck.

This bill would constitute an unsurpassed grant of power to an administration with an unbroken record of bungling in our foreign and domestic affairs. For Congress, with full knowledge of this record of failure to make this surrender seems to approach the irresponsible. That, I believe, is the kindest appraisal you can make of such action.

HAS HOUSE LOST FAITH IN FREEDOM?

In meeting the challenge of the times we have three roads open to us. One is appeasement—finally the leadership that now demands conscription claims to have abandoned that stupid policy.

Now that same leadership demands an equally stupid course, the Hitler road of militarism, regimentation, and economic collapse at home.

The third course open to us is to remain free and strong, to keep the lights of liberty burning on this Western shore as an inspiration and example to those struggling for liberty elsewhere.

Extinguish liberty here by conscription, Mr. Chairman, and the powerhouse that sends out the current of liberty to other lands will slowly or quickly atrophy. That is the unbroken record of history.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services for affording me an opportunity to speak on this legislation about which I feel most keenly. During my short tenure in Congress I have heard many men in the well of this House praise the Air Force and say that our national defense, our national security, is well provided for by our possession of the atomic bomb and in our scientific warfare. It so happened that in World War II I served as an infantry officer, a doughboy, with that grand old Pennsylvania Division, the Twenty-eighth National Guard Division. I recall at that time there were a lot of other men that were serving in the infantry, approximately 4,000,000 carrying rifles; not a very glamorous branch of the service. I assume that those men, too, played a part in winning the victory in World War II as well as our fine Air Corps.

I recall the battle of St. Lo. I saw the Eighth Air Force come over and destroyed St. Lo, France, but there were several divisions waiting at the edge of the town and we had a terrible battle to secure that city that the Air Force had destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the proponents of a strong Air Force, and I agree with them it is necessary to our national defense, and it is perhaps the more glamorous way and the easiest way to have national security. However, I am inclined to believe that we are still

going to need men on the ground. All the arguments I have heard today deserve considerable merit. Certainly we need to have a stock pile of strategic materials.

We need our strong Air Force, we need our strong Navy, but we are still going to have the man—a trained man—with the rifle in case of any eventuality that we might encounter. At the present time we do not have aircraft that can leave the continental United States on a military mission and travel to any potential enemy and return. How are we going to secure that base for our aircraft to take off from? I believe it was mentioned a while ago that it is going to be necessary for somebody to seize and secure those bases. That can be done only by trained ground troops. After sites have been secured it is necessary then to protect these installations, and that only can be done by trained ground troops. Therefore, despite our proposed 70-group air force, I am firmly convinced that our strength lies in properly trained ground troops. The history of the United States military operations has been that our strength lies not in our professional Army but, rather, in citizen soldiers, who are trained for any emergency. In the past wars we have had sufficient time to train citizen soldiers from the time war was declared until actual operations began. We have been fortunate enough to have allies who bore the brunt of initial attacks. However, we have no assurance we can plan on this condition ever existing again.

As I have said, I believe trained manpower is necessary for a balanced defense set-up. However, I am reluctant to support this draft legislation for the reason that a few men between the ages of 19 and 25 will be selected to go into the armed forces, while other men in the same age group will not have to assume that responsibility. The Member who supports this legislation should realize that he is actually voting for legislation that drafts the poor boy, the boy whose parents do not have influence, politically or otherwise. They are the boys who will be called upon to protect all of us. I am personally ashamed and embarrassed by this type of program. I believe each of us owe many obligations to our country. We brag about the equal opportunities that this country affords to each of us. Why is it not logical for us to equally share our responsibilities—and one of the greatest responsibilities is to provide for our national security. We all pay taxes—that is a responsibility each of us as citizens owe. So training to preserve our country should be shared on an equal basis. It is a little ironical when just a few years ago men were called into the armed services to save this great Nation of ours. It does not seem unjust to me that we should ask the present generation to preserve that which many of us spent 5 years to save.

Personally, I have advocated a universal-military-training program for some time. If that had been adopted there would be no need for us to be considering the draft today. You would have your trained citizen Reserve and your professional Army could be left at the required minimum.

My deepest condolences go to the members of the selective-service boards who have to make the decision as to what boy will be selected of his community to assume the responsibility for everyone in that community. The pressure on those men will be tremendous.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, on the threshold of this historic debate of the peacetime Selective Service Act of 1948 may I take this opportunity before we have engaged in it, before we have actually entered into the arena, to serve notice that I will not tolerate any gentleman's agreement in respect to the civil-rights amendments which I am going to offer.

It has been indicated before in this Eightieth Congress by Representatives on both sides that there have been gentlemen's agreements concerning the question of civil rights. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7 bears printed proof that such an agreement was made.

I am demanding that such a momentous question as peacetime military conscription shall not in any way be gagged by any gentleman's agreement. I am assuming the leadership of this fight to bring out the Selective Service Act which, at least, will have some of the decencies of our rapidly being jeopardized as a democracy.

We took our time in debating the Marshall plan, aid for Europe. Do we hold the American plan so cheaply that we are going to gag full discussion, gag a full, free, and complete discussion? Well, I am not going to tolerate it. The leadership of this House wants to get out by this coming Saturday. There is a lot of important legislation which must be finished by then. I intend to ask for full and complete discussion under the 5-minute rule of all of the amendments presented by all Members of this House, whether on the question of civil rights or not. I have prepared 31, all of which will not be offered by me. Some are going to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], by our colleagues the gentlemen from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. ISAACSON], and others. Let us stay in session all night, if necessary. I want to be blunt and state that if there is any attempt to limit the time in a way that will prevent any opponent or proponent from discussing each amendment to the fullest, then I propose to object to every unanimous-consent request for the balance of this week, to demand an engrossed copy, to ask for quorum calls. May I emphatically state that I do not mind an honest vote on each amendment, in other words, I am not making this statement from the basis that I demand that the amendments be passed, which would be thoroughly undemocratic, I am making this statement from the basis that I demand that full time be allowed which is consonant with the highest principles of democracy.

Under time which I am sure will be granted to me under the 5-minute rule, I will more thoroughly discuss my opposition to various items in the peacetime draft.

In the first place, I am opposed to this draft as a Christian. All of my life I have believed in the power of nonviolence. All of my life I have been a pacifist. I never changed that position until Pearl Harbor. I have never seen wars solve any solution—any problem.

JESUS—HIGHEST AUTHORITY

In the second place, I am against this as an American citizen. I am against the staggering, needless cost. I am against the doing away with rule by majority and substituting wars that destroy.

Third, I am against this bill as a human being because it will destroy our educational system, it will completely disrupt and corrupt family life, it will jeopardize the moral life of the cream of our manhood. Europe has tried it and failed. And I prophesy that if it is passed, America will be reduced to the second-class status of western Europe.

I am against this bill in the fourth place because a vast majority of specialists who have come before the Armed Services Committee or who have been quoted in the public press, including our military leadership, did not state a necessity.

THE PROPONENTS OF A DRAFT DO NOT PLAN TO MAKE IT TEMPORARY

Read the history of how the militarists twisted our wartime selective-service laws to meet their own ends. This could be obtained from the National Council Against Conscription at 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington. A temporary draft of 19- to 25-year-olds could easily become permanent peacetime conscription and total regimentation.

On April 12, when Secretary Forrestal testified before the House Armed Services Committee the following conversation occurred:

Congressman HÉBERT. I understood you to say that selective service is merely a temporary measure?

Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HÉBERT. Which will be on the books so long as you do not have UMT; is that correct?

Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. HÉBERT. Then it will be as temporary as some of those buildings on Constitution Avenue which were erected during World War I which are still there—if we do not have universal military training?

Secretary FORRESTAL. That is my opinion. (House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6114.)

Our opposition to peacetime conscription is based upon our studied conviction that:

First. The draft is not necessary. This is documented on the accompanying sheet. Secretary Symington told the House Armed Services Committee:

At one time from the standpoint of pilots that have served we had some 80,000 applications for 6,000 jobs. (April 13, House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6142.)

Second. It could be a first step toward a war. Our scientists say that no one could hope to win in a major war.

Third. The draft for military service could be followed by drafts or regimentation of labor, capital, industry, and loss of our democracy in America.

Fourth. It is contrary to the American way of life. Read the testimony of one of America's best-loved and leading historians, Dr. Charles A. Beard, pages 1053–1057 of the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings. This is a solemn warning that all should heed.

Even the most ardent protagonists of the draft admit that the present world situation is not such as warrants emergency measures. They think of peacetime conscription as a permanent change from our American way of life. Colonel Taylor, of the American Legion, ardently desires UMT and the draft. He testified to the House committee that this is not an emergency when he said:

> When the emergency comes you are going to take them all in anyway. (House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6560.)

Some of the proponents of the draft do not now recommend regimentation of industry. If the international situation warranted emergency measures they should not call for conscription of industry as well as of young men. Many Americans do not realize that those measures would follow the adoption of the draft program. Note carefully the testimony of Secretary of Defense Forrestal on April 12 to the House committee in response to questioning by Mr. VINSON, House Armed Services Committee hearings, pages 6099–6100.

It is very unwise to even consider such a revolutionary change withing thinking of the cost. The effect of this measure upon our national economy could be disastrous. A $21,000,000,000 defense budget could break our American economy. These figures are found on page 6600, House Armed Services Committee hearings.

It appears that a deliberate attempt has been made to justify the demands of selective service by juggling figures. Study the figures presented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 4, 1948, on pages 5239–5240.

The draft is absolutely unnecessary to bring our forces up to the authorized strength. Read the testimony of Dr. Alonzo F. Meyers to the House Armed Services Committee on pages 6464–6474 in House Armed Services Committee hearings. Read also the minority report on this question.

We feel that an honest effort should be made to make our American voluntary system of recruiting work. The proposal of Chairman ALLEN of the House Rules Committee that the men who serve should receive the extra benefits has merit we feel. From July 1, 1946, to March 31, 1948, selective service cost $1,155 per man drafted. That money could be given to boys as an inducement for voluntary enlistment.

Any form of even temporary draft legislation would be a step in the direction of permanent peacetime regimentation for military purposes—House Armed Services Committee hearings, page 6114.

Note: The majority of the protagonists of UMT and/or a temporary draft have favored peacetime conscription since World War I.

The churches of America have stated repeatedly their opposition to UMT and/or peacetime regimentation for military purposes—see House Armed Services Committee hearings, pages 6295–6305.

The protagonists of peacetime conscription argue that war is inevitable—Senate Armed Services Committee hearings page 1012. Read the statements of our atomic scientists who warn us that we dare not have another war. The article by William T. Holliday in the January 1948 Reader's Digest points this up.

The propaganda to regiment America with UMT has been carried on improperly and illegally by public tax money according to the findings of the House Committee on Expenditures. A copy of this report can be obtained from the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS.

The effort to promote peacetime regimentation for a military dictatorship upon the American Nation has been promoted by deliberate lies and double talk. For example, former Justice Owen J. Roberts has charged that the "Communists are the solid core of opposition to UMT." Justice Roberts knows that the Christian people who really believe in American democracy are firmly opposed to UMT, the draft, and all unnecessary peacetime regimentation. Read the top paragraph on page 1001 of Senate Armed Services Committee hearings.

On May 4, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative LEO ALLEN, chairman of the Rules Committee, came out with a bill (H. R. 6444) which is a sincere attempt to get away from the un-American conscription features of our militaristic administration. It calls for lowering the Army general classification test grade from 80 to 70. It was 59 during the war. It would give bonuses of $1,000 or $1,500 for men enlisting for 2 and 3 years respectively after March 31, 1947, or give them the benefits of the GI bill for school.

President Truman called Mr. ALLEN'S proposal asinine. At a press conference Mr. Truman said that Mr. ALLEN'S suggestion was the most asinine thing he had heard yet. Note: When sound reasoning fails we call names. Remember that selective service spent $22,878,000 from July 1, 1946, until March 31, 1947, in order to draft 19,797 men at an average cost of $1,155 per man.

Sixty-four dollar question: Is it asinine to give $1,000 to the boy who enlists instead of to generals, colonels, and draft-board personnel who conscript the boy for military service against his will?

Every Congressman should ponder this question in light of our tradition of a peacetime voluntary Army.

How large an Army do we need? On January 6, 1948, President Truman in his budget message recommended an Army strength for the fiscal year 1949 of 560,000 men. At the Senate hearings on March 18, 1948, it was revealed that as of March 1, 1948, our Army had 542,000 men. That is 18,000 short of the budgeted strength of the Army. General Hershey told the House Armed Services Committee that Selective Service required 25,000 paid personnel and 185,000 volunteer personnel during the war. It is obvious that it would be unwise to set up expensive selective-service machinery and hire thousands of men to draft 18,000 men.

In order to justify a draft the figures have changed rapidly.

On March 25, 1948, Secretary of Defense Forrestal proposed an Army of 782,000 men. On April 14, 1948, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended an Army of 837,000 men. On April 15, 1948, General Bradley recommended an Army of 822,000 men plus 15,000 if a 70-group air force passes, plus 95,000 men if UMT passes—totaling 932,000 men. On April 21, 1948, the Secretary of Defense suggested that with a 66-group air force we should have an Army of 790,000 men. The above figures are all documented in the May 4, 1948, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 5239–5240.

Ike's tricky memory: When General Eisenhower was asked whether a lowering of the AGCT grade from 80 to 70 would make SS or UMT unnecessary, he replied:

> My memory is sometimes tricky, but I thought I had directed, before I left as Chief of Staff, to drop, for the Ground Forces at least, the figure back to 70, and I thought there is where it was. (Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on UMT, p. 1001.)

Remember, on March 18, Senator BYRD asked Secretary of Defense Forrestal how they planned to run the draft. Secretary Forrestal said:

> I would prefer to not get into a detailed analysis, because I have not approved a plan nor have I thought that plan through in detail that I think would satisfy your question, and I would rather not try to speculate upon the answers. (Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 43.)

The big question: When did our Secretary of Defense first hear of the Truman draft proposal? A week later he had plans.

The Air Force does not need it. Secretary of Air Symington told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13:

> We do not feel that selective service is necessary in order to get the people * * * for the Air Force.

General Spaatz added:

> I have no doubt in my mind but what the Air Force will get sufficient recruits to maintain the Air Force proper on a voluntary enlistment basis.

The Navy does not need selective service. Secretary of Navy Sullivan told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13:

> We believe the way our enlistments have been running we probably will be able to do it without selective service.

Admiral Denfeld, in reply to a question as to whether the Navy could get its strength without a draft, said:

> I think you could get it if the present situation continues.

The Army has not made a case for selective service. Secretary Royall told the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 25 that war is not imminent. The Italian elections went off smoothly without selective service.

On March 18—after the President's appeal for selective service—Secretary Forrestal told the Senate Armed Services Committee "the authorized strength of the Army is 670,000, and they have a current strength of 560,000," page 37 in Senate Armed Services Committee hearings.

On pages 636 and 640 of the President's budget for 1948 we find the strength recommended for the Army is 560,000. In other words, if Secretary Forrestal's figures which he gave in his testimony were correct, the Army has its strength as provided by the President's budget. On March 25 Secretary Royall testified—Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, page 343:

> At present, as of March 1, we have 542,000 in the Army.

If Secretary Forrestal was correct on March 18, there was no deficit in the budgeted strength of the Army. If Secretary Royall was correct we were short only 18,000 men, which is a poor excuse for a very expensive and undemocratic draft in peacetime. Also the country should realize with what ease mistakes are made in figures in places of high responsibility.

Are the Reserves being used? Read April 10 Collier's, Does the Army Want the Reserves? On April 21, page 6536 in House Armed Services Committee hearings—before the House Armed Services Committee, General Evans, of the Reserve Officers Association, testified:

> It is true we have 600,000 on paper; but they have not been contacted. They have not been put into units. They have not been given any training.

He pleaded:

> All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we now have.

Does the world situation necessitate selective service now? General Clay in Germany says the crisis is "a political one and not a military one"—New York Times, March 26, 1948. Secretary Royall told the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 25 that "war is not imminent." Secretary Forrestal on April 26 told a Senate committee:

> I don't want to give the impression that we think war is near. But I do believe we are in a state of tension that may last for many years.

He explained that if he had felt war was likely he would have asked for twenty-five to fifty billions instead of the requested appropriation.

In thus stating its case, the Army should have pointed out that rapid mobilization really would have to be instantaneous mobilization to be worth anything. The testimony of the atom scientists is clear that if there is another war there will not be time for mobilization.

. For example, Dr. Morris Perlman, according to the Washington Times-Herald of October 28, 1945, told his fellow scientists that "victory for an aggressor nation can be assured in a few terrible hours in an atom war of the future." In support of this is the statement of a former Lockheed executive, Harry E. Stowe of Los Angeles, who, as assistant to the president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce of America, said on June 8, 1945:

> The future aggressor's aim would be total destruction of his victim in the first 24 hours of hostilities.

Admiral Halsey confirms the statements of General MacArthur, the atom scientists, and others, that if there is another war it will be over in a very short time. Halsey is reported in an October 29, 1945, UP dispatch from St. Louis as having said at a Navy Day Victory War Loan Rally that the next war probably will not last 6 months and that when the term "duration and 6 months" is applied to future struggles the 6 months are likely to be considerably longer than the duration.

Contrast these statements with General Marshall's in his last biennial report that it would take a year fully to muster those who have had their peacetime training and have returned to civilian life. In line with General Marshall's comment is the testimony of Admiral King on November 16, 1945, before the House Military Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Iowa, Representative MARTIN asked: "The principal value of your peacetime training would be in the early weeks of the emergency."

Admiral King replied: "I think, Mr. MARTIN, it would be rather a matter of months than weeks."

Secretary of War Patterson also spoke of the difficulties of mobilization when at a press conference in San Francisco, according to the September 3 Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, he said:

> It would take 6 months to mobilize the strength we had a year ago.

Patterson was speaking of boys who had a lot of military service and who would be mobilized by trained and experienced draft-board personnel.

Moreover, boys trained under the Army plan would, after mobilization, need to be retrained before they could be used. General Palmer in the August 1944 Reserve Officer wrote:

> Every able-bodied young American should be trained to fight for his country if a war should come within 3 or 4 years after he completes his training.

In other words, a boy trained at the age of 18 will be useless after he is 21 or 22 unless he is trained all over again. General Eisenhower goes further to indicate that without any 3- or 4-year time limit all will have to be retrained in the event of war. He said in June 1945 to the House Committee on Postwar Military Policy:

> Physical training will always have to be repeated after the war starts, but takes the least time. Psychological indoctrination * * * requires the longest time but fortunately it is never completely forgotten.

Furthermore, those who would have had their training and gone back into civilian life would not be brought back into the Army as members of teams as the War Department plan proposes. Once the training is over the teams would be broken up and men would be drafted and placed in the Army according to General Marshall's statement in his biennial report "just as men are now called by a committee of local neighbors in an order of priority." The Army has never proposed any other plan than selective service, which automatically breaks up teams. Many men trained in teams will become indispensable in industry and will never be called in the event of war.

Nor would the compulsory-training proposal provide "individual specialists" as the War Department plan claims. Any training in the technical schools and colleges would be gotten by men in civilian status as readily as if they wore uniforms while attending college. Other than such training there is no real likelihood of specialists developing. Certainly they will not develop in the 6 months the Army suggests. Many military leaders have pointed out that it takes a year or more for ordinary training, to say nothing of specialist training.

For example, General Chennault, according to the October 29, 1945, Washington Post, called for 18 months' training, saying:

> It takes 12 months alone to teach men to operate modern weapons. The man should also perform some field service if the training is to be of any benefit.

Admiral King is quoted in the October 28, 1945, Washington Star as saying that from the naval point of view, 1 year's training would probably not be enough. He thought it would require 15 to 18 months.

The Army completely omits reference to the problems involved in mobilization in the event of atomic war. We have the testimony of the scientists that any aggressor could in a few hours time destroy New York, Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and other large cities, killing 40,000,000 people, almost a third of our population. No mobilization set-up would be possible before America could be completely destroyed. In the initial attack railroad centers, transportation devices, ships and docks, selective-service headquarters, trained officers and men—all necessary for mobilization—would be wiped out. In such an event, how would the Army carry out its purpose of mobilization rapidly in an emergency?

Even if it were possible to mobilize the peacetime conscripts, they could not be used for the invasion of enemy lands or to prevent further atomic attack. Commodore H. S. Schade, formerly chief of the United States naval technical mission in Europe, told a Senate subcommittee—page 271, Senate hearings on Senate Resolution 107—that if Germany had had enough atom bombs, the Allied landings on Normandy's beachhead would presumably have been unsuccessful. Gen. Henry A. Arnold, the commander of

Army Air Forces, in reply to the question, "Can the United States be invaded by a water-borne armed force in the face of planes with atomic bombs?" said, "Who would want to invade by water if they had the atomic bomb?"—Capitol Gist, volume 8, No. 4.

As a result of circumstances such as these, Charles Bolté, chairman of the American Veterans Committee, wrote in the September 29, 1945, Nation:

A conscript army could hardly be assembled, and, if assembled, would hardly find a place where it could fight to any good purpose—I hasten to withdraw my argument in favor of universal military training.

The second major purpose the Army gives for compulsory training is—

The readiness of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserve Corps can be maintained at the highest level during peacetime due to prior intensive training of enlistees.

Unless the War Department assumes that every young man who has had compulsory training will or must later serve for a period in the Army, the Guard, or the Organized Reserves, why not on a voluntary basis give prior training only to those who will serve in one of these military organizations. There is no point in forcing everyone into the same mold so that the few who enlist in military service may have prior training.

There is also an undefined element in the term "maintained at the highest level." Will the highest level mean anything in the event of actual war, or will further training be required? Ranson Baldwin, Annapolis-trained military analyst of the New York Times, said in that paper on December 1, 1946:

No part-time soldier, such as the National Guard man, can ever become, even with the best will in the world, ready for service anywhere in the world on M-day.

On October 23, 1946, Baldwin wrote:

Six months of training, even though followed by part-time training in the Guard or Reserve components, is too short to make an efficient soldier.

The fifth purpose of the Army is to train men who would be able to defend and assist in the community in the event of local disasters resulting from initial enemy action which may be expected in the early stages of a war of the future.

The Army does not suggest how it will through military training prepare boys after they have returned to civilian status, to defend local communities from atomic bombs. In an article, There Is No Defense Against Atomic Bombs, W. A. Higginbotham, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, writes in the November 3, 1946, New York Times of the difficulties which the defenders of London and Antwerp faced against ordinary rockets.

You could not entrust to boys of a year's training such defense and no other defense even approaches realism. Not only would no real defense be possible, but the Army has not indicated how it would train disaster units. No scheme was worked out at Bikini except to keep men out of the areas of radioactivity. Real disaster training should be civilian, not military, and it should include first aid, mechanical, fire fighting, and other skills which do not require generals and colonels for instructors.

General Eisenhower himself, perhaps inadvertently, revealed the Army's real uncertainty and indecision when on September 28 from Frankfurt-on-the-Main, Germany, he replied to a question from a United Press correspondent:

What the atom bomb is going to mean to us is a matter over which we study and sweat blood every day. I think there is no one who can say what this means to the numbers and equipments of armies.

I am against this bill in the fifth place as a lover of pure democracy. This bill is a rape of democracy. The Mundt-Nixon bill began it and this bill will finish it. The Republican-dominated Congress will not be kissing democracy good-by. It is a military coup. It is a bloodless revolution on the part of brass hats.

And lastly, I am against this bill not because I am a Negro but because I know that until this Nation of ours faces the Negro problem squarely and stops preaching democracy for Europe and denying it in America, we are going to have trouble and plenty of it because no nation in this world is going to view us with any respect. The greatest propaganda used in the Pacific and in Europe during wartime by the Nazi-Fascist-Jap military axis was the way American people were treating Negro people.

Now do not think for a minute that this speech is demogogic politics because it is not. Let no one bring out the bugaboo of communism either unless you want to charge the members of the President's commission on peacetime conscription as being Communists, unless you want to charge the Federal Council of Churches, unless you want to charge the Protestant churches of the State of Indiana, where our majority leader comes from, as being Communists. Let no one bring up the issue of partisanship because I am placing the blame squarely where it belongs. If this bill is passed, it will be the fault of the Republicans. And I further charge that if the President of the United States signs this bill in its present shape, he will be branding himself as a two-faced liar talking civil rights out of one corner of his mouth and refusing to practice them out of the other corner.

As I said before, I intend to go through all of these items very carefully under the 5-minute rule, and as we debate through the week on this subject, that is if the time is given me. And if not, I intend to resort to every parliamentary trick to keep this House in session.

I make no apology for what I have said, will say, or plan to do. There is a higher authority than this House of Representatives, even higher than our Supreme Court, yes the Constitution and the Bill of Rights included, that authority since the foundation of the earth, has laid down the inexorable, indisputable law that there is none and therefore shall be no difference between the races of people.

Finally, let no one say that these amendments which I propose to offer are not germane.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, 4 minutes is a very short time in which to try to compress some 35 years of interest in this particular subject. Anticipating that, I put my speech in the RECORD. It appears in the Appendix of today's RECORD at page 3864. I could not possibly cover that speech in 4 minutes' time, so I will discuss some of the points a little further. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for the opportunity to speak in opposition to this bill.

I believe I am the only retired Regular Army officer in the House. I claim no military prowess because of that, because I served my last duty 25 years ago. I finished my final service in October 1923, as assistant professor of military science and tactics at the University of Iowa. I taught military policy. I thought I had worked out a policy that would bring us national defense. Throughout my entire life I have opposed anything drifting toward militarism. I do not confuse militarism with defense. I believe I know enough about this subject to draw a clear line of demarcation between them. I have given more time in Congress to the matter of adequate equipment of our armed forces than any other one subject. I was on the conference committee between the House and Senate in 1939 on Public Law No. 117, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the first strategic materials bill. I am one of two survivors of that conference committee now in the House. I served on the subcommittee that developed Public Law No. 520 in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I served on Special Committee No. 3 of the Military Affairs Committee to investigate the war program in 1941, in which we pointed out the weakness of this Nation in our strategic and critical materials.

To my amazement, in the year 1948, June 11, I find before the Ordnance Association in Detroit a statement quoted in the Evening Star, which reads:

The Army has nearly enough World War II stocks on hand to equip the additional six and one-half divisions it has asked Congress to authorize, but a spokesman said today the equipment would be "out of balance."

By being unbalanced we mean, for instance, that we have sufficient artillery but no prime movers to pull that artillery, and, similarly, we have plenty of antiaircraft guns, but no modern fire-control equipment; we have weapons of great technological advances and design, but no ammunition for use of this equipment in either training or in combat. Examples of this type of unbalance are manifold and these are but a few pertinent examples.

Then I got hold of General Bradley's speech before that same Ordnance Association, delivered on June 9. He said:

Contrary to popular belief, the Army does not have sufficient balanced stocks of weapons and other equipment to tide us through industrial conversion in the event of another war.

Skipping a bit, he said:

The military value of our existing reserve stocks is limited not only by their inadequate over-all quantities but likewise by their unbalanced composition.

Even with the best advanced planning of civilian consultants to the Munitions Board, and even with the full cooperation of industry, we shall face an irreducible lag of 1 year or more in the production of munitions in the event of war. Our ability to defend sensitive outposts and to support a limited offensive during that first year of waiting will depend entirely upon our stock pile of equipment reserves. Without this margin of safety, we could conceivably lose a war or certainly prolong a costly conflict, long before our industrial plan could be brought into action.

As the range and power of offensive weapons are increased with each passing year, it becomes more and more necessary for us to bank upon strength-in-being rather than upon our potential reserves.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment my very good friend and colleague from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who has a very distinguished war record, serving under Gen. Dan Strickler of the Twenty-eighth Division. I was pleased and greatly impressed with what the gentleman had to say today.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I gladly yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. The General, he was Colonel Strickler then—was my battalion commander and one of the finest, grandest soldiers that ever lived.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan. I know General Strickler will be pleased to hear of this fine tribute that has been paid to him.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take my time to discuss with the membership amendments I intend to introduce at the proper time. They read as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 6401

After section 11, page 41, line 4, insert the following new sections to be numbered 12, 13, and 14, respectively, and renumber the existing sections 12 through 23 accordingly:

"SEC. 12. Under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps) and the United States Air Force from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age for enlistment periods of not less than 3 years: *Provided*, That the total number of aliens who may be enlisted pursuant to this section shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time. Persons enlisted pursuant to this section shall, upon completion of 3 years' honorable service in one or more of the armed forces of the United States, be eligible, subject to such qualifications and examinations as may be prescribed, for naturalization in accordance with the provisions of section 324 of the act approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149; 8 U. S. C. 724), and other provisions of applicable law.

"SEC. 13. Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlisted in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps), or the Air Force, under the provisions of section 12 of this act, nor to their dependents or beneficiaries.

"SEC. 14. So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads '; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army,' is hereby repealed."

Section 12 is similar to an amendment adopted in the Senate to the selective service bill known as the Lodge amendment. Let me point out the difference between my amendment and the Lodge amendment.

The Lodge amendment would authorize only the Secretary of the Army until June 30, 1950, to accept not to exceed 25,000 enlistments in the Regular Army whereas my amendment would authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, indefinitely to accept enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy, and the Regular Air Force provided the total number of aliens who may be enlisted shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time.

The Lodge amendment would establish a maximum age of 35 years whereas my amendment would contain no such restriction.

The Lodge amendment would set a minimum enlistment of 5 years whereas my amendment sets one of 3 years.

The Lodge amendment makes no mention of naturalization whereas my amendment spells it out and insures an alien after completion of 3 years' honorable service of becoming eligible for naturalization.

The Lodge amendment would suspend until June 30, 1950, the present prohibition on original enlistment of aliens which is now effective in time of peace whereas my amendment would repeal the prohibition.

This amendment, if adopted, will give us an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of securing the services of some hundred thousand aliens, stateless people in most instances, who are anxious to become citizens of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, on several occasions during the past 3 years I have discussed at length on this floor the reasons why I am fundamentally opposed to compulsory military training in peacetime. They are well known to the Congress and to the people of the Fourth Indiana District.

Peacetime military conscription has never prevented a war in the past. It has been weighed in the balance and found wanting in many European countries. In this atomic age it is a futile gesture toward preventing a future war. It is significant that every major nation in history which has had peacetime conscription inevitably has been led into war and eventually to defeat and ruin.

Compulsory peacetime military conscription is, as a matter of fact, a breeder of wars. The conquests of Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon have proven that military-minded nations have become aggressor nations. When nations arm to the teeth and put forth their energies into the establishment of huge armies and navies, situations arise or create themselves for the use of these forces.

We are interested in preserving our American form of democracy and this can best be accomplished by devoting our energies toward the establishment and maintenance of world-wide lasting peace.

The majority report of the Committee on Armed Services has been widely quoted in support of this measure. The opposition report of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and his colleagues however, makes a lot more sense—in my opinion.

In recommending a stepped-up program of voluntary recruitment for the Army, the report points out the Army has deliberately refrained from making all-out efforts to utilize voluntary recruitment methods. "Just as little interest has been shown in supporting the Reserve establishments as long as the Army feels that universal conscription is obtainable, so the Army has been unwilling to pursue energetically the problem of making Army service more desirable to the average potential soldier," the report states.

Summing up arguments against this bill, and in support of our traditional peacetime volunteer methods, the report asserts:

We have taken all steps necessary to provide the United States with an adequate defense against any enemy. The most modern weapons, the greatest Air Force and Navy in the world, the possession of the newest and most effective atomic bombs, and a modernized Ground and Service Force backed by the productive resources and manpower of the United States are a formidable defense.

The men needed to complete our Ground Forces can be secured, just as those of the Navy and Air Force are being kept at peak requirements, through voluntary enlistments. Backed by a Reserve force and a National Guard brought to full strength, the Army will be of such size and quality as to meet all our defense requirements. Ample evidence is available * * * to prove that no compulsory peacetime draft is needed to build up the Army to required strength.

Various public-opinion polls have been cited by proponents of this measure in an attempt to prove that a majority of the American people favor this radical departure from traditional American policy. Questioning the accuracy of these polls, I conducted one of my own in April of this year among the citizens of the Fourth Indiana District. A detailed report of this poll appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, May 11, 1948.

More than 60,000 ballots were sent out containing the following question: Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training?

In spite of the tremendous Nation-wide propaganda campaign which has been carried on in support of this measure, only 37.8 percent replied in the affirmative. Expressing opposition were 59.8 percent, while 3.4 percent had no opinion on the question.

I intend to vote against this bill because I believe, along with many other sincere Americans, that peacetime military conscription is a form of slavery which will wreck our free institutions; that it will turn America into a militarist Nation and that, instead of insuring peace, it will surely and inevitably lead to another devastating war.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill to induct into the Army certain of our young men. We are told that need for this compulsion has been proven by the failure of voluntary enlistments. Other Members have emphasized the fact that the methods and regulations of the Army itself have been to a very great extent responsible for this failure. I shall not go into the details already put before you. But I cannot refrain from protesting the regulations now current governing enlistment and reenlistment. The high I. Q.'s demanded, the consequent difficulty in obtaining reenlistment or enlistment all have a very real bearing on what is considered the failure of voluntary enlistments. I want to point out to you that high I. Q.'s are not necessarily the best material for a hard-fighting two-fisted army. We need intelligence, yes, but we do not want nor can we handle, as we certainly proved in the last war, the high-tensioned nervous systems of some of the high I. Q.'s. That sort of sensitivity makes poor soldiers. The high-strung boys who are between boyhood and manhood, who are to be requisitioned under this bill, and subjected to Regular Army life, not to training as such, may not be the material that we are supposed to need so dramatically. Under this bill you propose to take a group whose feet are not yet secure upon life's road. You take them away from their families. You put them into situations for which they are not prepared, unless they exempt themselves by hasty marriages, emotional instability, psychiatric unbalance, categories of that kind, and by all the things they can find to do to escape compulsory service as they did before. You will put these boys into situations for which they are not ready. You take some of them, only a small number of lads of these ages, filled with the ambitions that are so strong in the early years and what do you give them? Security? Strength? Balance? Surely not! You give them obsolete methods, Mr. Chairman, for if the world goes to war again nothing we now know will hold.

Can you not see that the military service you are setting up under this legislation actually defeats itself? You will recall that the trained armies in Europe and Asia did not get very far until the fresh, inexperienced, green troops from this country appeared on the scene. Yes, they were raw troops, and undisciplined, but they were vigorous and they brought a new force the trained armies did not possess.

True, we lost men who did not know how to protect themselves, boys taken by the so-called selective service on their eighteenth birthdays and shipped over to their death, in spite of the assurance given the country by the Army that such inadequate training would not be possible.

Where is the American tradition in this bill as submitted to us? A small group of boys only—is that democratic, Mr. Chairman? How will they be chosen? What pressures will be used to force some in and keep others out? What is intelligent about refusing additional service to men who want to stay in the Army through reenlistment and then declare the voluntary system a failure?

It has been said on this floor that failure to pass this bill will be a sign to the U. S. S. R. that we will not back up our protests in language they understand. This is not true. What will be a signal to them is that we know what we want and that we will do just that, no more, no less.

No Member of this House is more sincerely interested in keeping America strong than I am, but that strength must rest upon firm foundations. In company with many others here assembled, I do not find justification for action so far removed from our American tradition as is peacetime compulsory military service. I have not been able to find sound reason for this action. Nor do I believe it is an adequate solution for the security of this country and the peace of the world.

I shall support certain amendments that are to be introduced, Mr. Chairman. Without these it will be legislation I cannot in good conscience support.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all the testimony that was given on this problem to our committee. What we propose to do today is, under ordinary peacetime conditions, contrary to our traditions—it is contrary to our democratic way of life—yet I believe that the wise step for us to take is to pass this bill.

Why do I say that? Why do I feel that way when I have been opposed to militarism or anything military all my life? The reason is simple and plain. I have traveled around the world trying to find out what the condition of things is in various parts of the world. All over the world, following the terrible destruction of four long years which you cannot imagine unless you have seen it, are kegs of powder, dynamite, tinder. I am terribly afraid that we might light one of those spots in Korea, in Austria, perhaps in France or in Trieste, or even in China.

We are not living in an ordinary time. We have not peace in the sense which we used and interpreted that word 10 or more years ago. We are living in a world of fear, of chaos, of uncertainty, and, to a certain extent, of hopelessness. After the great destruction caused by 4 years of war, the world is having a hard time to get on a peace basis. Our efforts at bringing about peace have been obstructed, delayed, and frustrated. Why? Partly the fault is ours because of bad commitments we made and for other reasons. But it is useless to dwell on our failures or mistakes. We are confronted with the problem—how can we forge the peace?

I believe that we can lead the world to peace by retaining or building our military strength. We are the one nation that has that obligation and the capacity to carry out a strong program for peace. Our able colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who as a young soldier, fought with the Twenty-eighth Division, the great Keystone Division, pointed out to you that the land soldier is still a very important cog in our military machine. We do not yet have the long-range airplanes that can go from our continent to a target abroad and return. Our fliers can go to the target, but we cannot get them back. So, in the event that trouble should come—and we all pray that it will not come—we must have the land soldier to hold the bases that we will require to strike back. It is true that our military men say that there is no direct evidence that war is upon us. But, do you not see that if we get weak and one of the great powers of the world interferes politically, economically, or subversively with other countries, the very crisis that we are trying to avoid might be upon us. I believe that if we will retain our strength, if we are prepared for any eventuality, that that eventuality will not come. That is why I am going to support this bill. It goes contrary to our ideas in peacetimes to do a thing like this, but there is no greater mission that we have to perform than to try to make the peace. We are the ones that can furnish the leadership through our economic, our military, our social, and our political strength. This is one of the steps that I believe will bring this about. If we do not do it we are going to waste 300,000 lives and we are going to disappoint a million wounded men that are lying in the hospitals, who fought for freedom. Security is the very cornerstone of freedom. You cannot have liberty unless you have security. This bill will help bring about world security, in my opinion. The little countries of the world, like Norway, the home of my mother, look to us to furnish the strength that will protect them, and if we protect ourselves then these little nations of the world, these small peoples, and the American citizen on our own continent, will have the freedom that we all cherish. But, we must retain our strength. We must live up to the status of the great world giant in the military field, in the

industrial field, and in the productive field. We are the colossus that can lead the nations out of this chaotic, transitory world into a world of peace, and it is my opinion that this bill will help to solve that situation.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a step in the direction of militarism. It is a realistic step toward peace. It is a temporary step that world conditions require us to take if we wish to bring the peace that our fighting men fought and died for. The law is limited in its duration. It is one of those contradictory things that we must do to really win the peace that the war was fought for. It is a positive step as distinguished from "drifting" that has gotten many nations into war. The one symbol that any antagonist will look at with respect is strength—military, productive, and social strength. This is evidence that we not only intend to remain strong but that we are determined that we will have security and freedom even at the risk of fighting for it. Our 70-group air force; our mighty Navy and a strong Army, well drilled and disciplined will bring the respect that will result in agreements and compromises that will produce the peace. That briefly is my reason for supporting this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, the American merchant marine has not been a success in the general understanding of that term for many decades. To be candid, it has been a very lame duck—unable to take care of itself financially except in war or national emergency—unable to strongly attract passengers at times because of a reputation for inefficient or impolite service—unable even to propagate itself without outside aid. Yet the United States must have an adequate merchant marine, both to protect its industrial position in time of peace and to bolster its national defense in time of war. To get this merchant marine, we have spent countless millions of the taxpayers money during recent wars. In World War II alone we spent more than $15,000,000,000 for ship construction. Now this great fleet of ships is being rapidly disintegrated by the influx of new foreign ships into the overseas commerce. New foreign ships are coming out almost daily. New American ships are not coming out. We are too short of steel to be able to build ships at any price reasonable even according to American standards. Yet there is a ray of sunshine for the merchant marine in the attitude of the Eightieth Congress which one of our great national publications declares "has restored faith in Government by discussion at a time when that has seemed by many to be a losing proposition," and further that "the Congress, like the people who elected it, has acted in the last 2 years with great good sense."

This speech, Mr. Chairman, is an appeal for fair and just treatment of the American seaman on the part of this Eightieth Congress which, with sound wisdom, stopped sales and charters of American ships to foreign nations and directed that at least 50 percent of American goods bought in this country with ERP funds for shipment abroad be shipped in American bottoms; which only a few days ago granted funds to the Maritime Commission to commence the construction of urgently needed vessels; and which only yesterday passed two bills amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to encourage ship construction in the United States and ship operation under the American flag. It is an appeal for that same sort of justice which the House demonstrated so forcefully a few days ago when it accepted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] to the displaced persons bill so as to admit some 2,000 deserving Czech patriots who had fought for liberty.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why we do not have a better merchant marine, a more reliable merchant marine, a more efficient merchant marine, is that we have treated the men who go to sea in merchant vessels with utter contempt; we have refused to give them even the most basic recognition of their accomplishments in time of war; we have turned them out to be beggars on the streets or recipients of public charity even when sick or disabled—because their disabilities could not be connected directly to a war-risk casualty. I know of no class of workingmen in the entire Nation who have been treated more shabbily by a supposedly grateful Nation than have the merchant seamen who were absolutely indispensable to victory in World War II.

I believe that most of this ingratitude and indecent treatment has been due to a misunderstanding of facts. I wish I had time to spread these facts before you. Unfortunately, I do not, so shall confine myself to only one or two outstanding examples.

The very first thing one hears when he discusses wartime merchant seamen is the big wages they got in comparison to the armed services. We hear that they made fortunes through high pay, bonuses, overtime, and so forth. At one time I almost believed this myth. Fortunately, however, I learned the truth during extensive hearings the Subcommittee on Ship Operation, Construction, and Maritime Labor had last session. Now, Mr. Chairman, this testimony regarding earnings is conclusive insofar as anything human can be. It represents the facts as given by ship operators, by the Maritime Commission, and by the men themselves. If you will examine the tables which I am inserting here—tables furnished by the United States Maritime Commission—you will find that, all things considered, the earnings of naval personnel and of merchant seamen of comparable positions were approximately equal.

Annual earnings of seamen in selected occupations whose employment in the maritime industry ranged from 8 to 11 months, Oct. 1, 1943, through Sept. 30, 1944

Occupation	Number of men		Average days worked [1]	Average net income [2]	Average gross income [1]	Voyage earnings					
	In 8–11 months' range	Percentage of total in occupational subgroup				Average earnings [3]	Average basic wages		Average overtime		Average war-risk bonus	
							Amount	Percent of earnings	Amount	Percent of earnings	Amount	Percent of earnings
Able-bodied seaman:												
A	88	54.7	286	$2,185	$2,596	$2,555	$934	36.6	$378	14.8	$1,230	48.1
B	57	63.3	288	2,236	2,624	2,574	973	37.8	400	15.5	1,187	46.1
C	53	75.7	285	2,115	2,530	2,492	891	35.8	396	15.9	1,199	48.1
Ordinary seaman:												
A	11	29.7	299	2,131	2,553	2,528	816	32.3	328	13.0	1,366	54.0
B	49	64.5	284	2,014	2,386	2,356	816	34.6	353	15.0	1,178	50.0
Oiler:												
A	69	61.1	287	2,263	2,648	2,606	1,021	39.2	283	10.9	1,291	49.5
B	22	75.9	278	2,300	2,755	2,702	1,087	40.2	327	12.1	1,286	47.6
C	10	45.5	280	2,155	2,568	2,549	950	37.3	328	12.9	1,265	49.6
Messman:												
A	56	44.8	281	1,991	2,335	2,292	799	34.9	289	12.6	1,195	52.1
B	9	42.9	300	2,200	2,491	2,431	916	37.7	314	12.9	1,199	49.3

A Worked in rating during entire part of year employed.
B Worked in rating during major part of year employed, and on higher paid job(s) rest of work year.
C Worked in rating during major part of year employed, and on lower paid job(s) rest of work year.

[1] Includes port work as well as voyage.
[2] Average net income is average gross income minus income-tax deductions and social-security tax withheld at source. Cost of room and subsistence not included.
[3] Includes explosives and penalty cargo bonuses and other minor earnings.

Monthly pay and average allotment of complement of Navy-operated Liberty cargo vessel

Branch and rating [1]	Duties	Number in rating [2]	Base pay [3]	Base pay plus sea-duty pay [4]	Average allotment [5]	Total	
						Each man	Each rating
OFFICERS							
Commander	Commanding	1	$292	$321		$321	$321
Lieutenant commander	Executive officer	1	250	275		275	275
Lieutenant	First lieutenant	1	200	220		220	220
Do	Navigator	1	200	220		220	220
Do	Engineer officer	1	200	220		220	220
Lieutenant (jg)	Gunnery officer	1	167	183		183	183
Do	Communications officer	1	167	183		183	183
Do	Watch and division officer	1	167	183		183	183
Lieutenant	Medical officer	1	200	220		220	220
Do	Supply officer	1	200	220		220	220
Boatswain	Assistant to first lieutenant	1	150	180	$51	231	231
Machinist	Assistant to engineer officer	1	150	180	51	231	231
Pay clerk	Assistant for disbursing	1	150	180	51	231	231
ENLISTED PERSONNEL							
SEAMAN BRANCH							
Chief boatswain's mate		1	138	166	51	217	217
Boatswain's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Boatswain's mate, second class		2	96	115	51	166	332
Coxswain		7	78	94	51	145	1,015
Gunner's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Gunner's mate, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Gunner's mate, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Quartermaster, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Quartermaster, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Signalman, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Signalman, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Seaman, first class		30	66	79	51	130	3,900
Seaman, second class		32	54	65	51	116	3,712
ARTIFICER BRANCH							
Radioman, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Radioman, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Radioman, third class		2	78	94	51	145	290
Radio technician, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Radarman, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Radarman, third class		2	78	94	51	145	290
Carpenter's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Ship fitter, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Ship fitter, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
ENGINE ROOM							
Chief machinist's mate		3	138	166	51	217	651
Machinist's mate, first class		3	114	137	51	188	564
Machinist's mate, second class		3	96	115	51	166	498
Machinist's mate, third class		4	78	94	51	145	580
Motor machinist's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Motor machinist's mate, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Electrician's mate, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Electrician's mate, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Electrician's mate, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Chief water tender		1	138	166	51	217	217
Water tender, first class		2	114	137	51	188	376
Water tender, second class		2	96	115	51	166	332
Water tender, third class		2	78	94	51	145	290
Fireman, first class		7	78	94	51	145	1,015
Fireman, second class		8	66	79	51	130	1,040
SPECIAL BRANCH							
Yeoman, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Yeoman, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Yeoman, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Chief storekeeper		1	138	166	51	217	217
Storekeeper, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Storekeeper, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Storekeeper, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Chief pharmacist's mate		1	138	166	51	217	217
Pharmacist's mate, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
COMMISSARY							
Chief commissary steward		1	138	166	51	217	217
Ship's cook, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Ship's cook, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Ship's cook, third class		1	78	94	51	145	145
Baker, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
STEWARD'S BRANCH							
Steward, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Steward, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Cook, first class		1	114	137	51	188	188
Cook, second class		1	96	115	51	166	166
Steward's mate, first class		2	78	94	51	145	290
Steward's mate, second class		3	66	79	51	130	390
Total		167					25,516
Weighted average each man				105			

[1] Complement of AK type vessels, as revised Feb. 28, 1944.
[2] Number in certain ratings may vary slightly, although total number in complement remains the same.
[3] Under 3 years' service.
[4] Sea-duty pay is 10 percent of base pay for officers; 20 percent for enlisted men.
[5] Average payment received by dependents of Navy enlisted personnel from Federal funds, as of Nov. 30, 1944; servicemen's contribution not included.

Source: Navy Department, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Average monthly earnings of crew of commercially operated Liberty cargo vessel, Southwest Pacific area

[Rounded to nearest dollars]

Department and rating	Number in rating	Wages	Bonus [1]				Overtime [2]	Total	
			Total	Voyage	Area	Attack		Each man	Each rating
DECK DEPARTMENT									
Master	1	$396	$406	$357	$43	$6		$804	$801
First officer	1	231	252	203	43	6	$113	596	596
Second officer	1	202	224	175	43	6	95	521	521
Third officer	1	184	209	160	43	6	83	476	476
First radio operator	1	175	201	152	43	6	14	390	390
Second radio operator	1	165	193	144	43	6	10	368	368
Purser-pharmacist mate	1	152	181	132	43	6		333	333
Boatswain	1	113	147	98	43	6	59	319	319
Carpenter	1	113	147	98	43	6	53	313	313
Able seaman	6	100	137	88	43	6	51	288	1,728
Ordinary seaman	3	82	137	88	43	6	52	271	813
Cadet	1	82	137	88	43	6		219	219
ENGINE DEPARTMENT									
Chief engineer	1	363	363	314	43	6		726	726
First assistant engineer	1	231	252	203	43	6	85	568	568
Second assistant engineer	1	202	224	175	43	6	80	506	506
Third assistant engineer	1	184	209	160	43	6	75	468	468
Deck engineer	1	120	151	102	43	6	25	296	296
Oiler	3	110	145	96	43	6	46	301	903
Fireman-watertender	3	110	145	96	43	6	44	299	897
Wiper	2	88	137	88	43	6	12	237	474
Cadet	1	82	137	88	43	6		219	219
STEWARD'S DEPARTMENT									
Chief steward	1	155	184	135	43	6	63	402	402
Chief cook	1	138	167	118	43	6	42	347	347
Second cook and baker	1	122	156	107	43	6	42	320	320
Night cook (third cook) [1]	1	138	167	118	43	6	20	325	325
Messman	4	88	137	88	43	6	33	258	1,032
Utilityman	2	88	137	88	43	6	30	255	510
Total	43								14,873
Weighted average, each man		134							

Navy gun crews [3]	Number carried	Monthly pay [3]	Average allotment [4]	Total	
				Each man	Each rating
Lieutenant, junior grade	1	$183		$183	$183
Chief petty officer	1	166	$51	217	217
Petty officer, first class	2	137	51	188	376
Petty officer, second class	2	115	51	166	332
Petty officer, third class	2	94	51	145	290
Seaman, first class	19	79	51	130	2,470
Total	27				3,868

[1] When rated as third cook total earnings average $326 divided as follows: Wages, $113; voyage bonus, $98; area bonus, $43; attack bonus, $6; overtime, $66.

[2] Gun crew data are from the Navy Department.

[3] Includes sea duty pay (10 percent additional for officers; 20 percent for enlisted man).

[4] Average payment received by dependents of Navy enlisted personnel from Federal funds, as of Nov. 30, 1944; serviceman's contribution not included.

Source: Based upon data from 26 round voyages of commercially operated Liberty ships from United States ports beginning after Mar. 1, 1943, ending before July 28, 1944, except as noted. (See note 2 above.)

Let us take comparisons between the Navy and the merchant marine. Exact comparisons are not possible as there are no exactly equivalent ratings.

Navy: Chief petty officers, $217 per month, petty officer, first class $188 per month.

Merchant marine: Able-bodied seaman, $182 per month.

Navy: Petty officer, third class, $145 per month. Seaman, first class, $130 per month.

Merchant marine: Ordinary seaman, $177 per month.

NOTE.—The wages of naval personnel include family allowances. The wages of merchant-marine personnel are after income taxes. Naval personnel in these brackets paid no income taxes during the war. Retirement benefits for naval personnel have not been taken into account in these wages.

It is to be noted that the earnings of merchant-marine personnel given above include bonuses and overtime, this latter being a very minor item during the war in comparison with present practices.

Now just as a matter of interest let us see what the comparative personnel costs of operating a Liberty ship under the Navy and under the merchant marine were during the war.

Navy: For AK with complement as of February 28, 1944, $25,516 per month.

Merchant Marine: Same vessel, merchant complement, $14,873. Navy gun crew, armed guard, $3,868. Total for ship plus armed guard, $18,741 per month.

A difference in favor of the merchant marine of $6,775 per month.

I appreciate fully that a ship under naval jurisdiction usually did a different job from that of the merchant marine and I have no criticism of the higher costs for personnel. My sole intent in the comparison is to show that the Government got its money's worth from merchant marine crews.

It appears to me that this data should thoroughly dispel the illusion of extraordinarily high pay for the merchant seaman during the war.

Another field in which the merchant marine is supposed to have had an advantage is in free life insurance. This also is largely a myth. What they did have was a war-risk insurance good only for casualties due strictly to war as distinguished from usual occupational hazards. This insurance did not cover a man who died of heart trouble or who was killed by a falling boom. Even in the event of death through combat casualty, it furnished no continuing protection to the dependents of the deceased. In fact, the war-risk insurance is just about the same as the Government furnished free to every member of the armed forces for 3 months after entry into the service, and continuously for every holder of a Government service life-insurance policy. Only a few seem to understand that Government policies make no charge for war risks but, rather, have their premiums based upon the actuarial tables of peacetime deaths and disabilities. Merchant seamen would have paid for Government insurance policies with joy if such had been made available to them. As it is, the soldier or sailor had all the best of the insurance situation any way one wants to look at it.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we find that the men who went to sea during the war in merchant ships are entirely forgotten in this selective-service bill. They are treated as though they had not existed—had performed no war service for the Nation. It is an amazing picture to me—a direct reversal of the policy in effect toward the close of the war when these men were exempted from induction if they held certificates from the Maritime Commission of substantially continuous

service for as much as 12 months. Apparently, we hold here that we should cast aside all feelings of gratitude; that we should waste all of our financial investment in the training of these men; that we should say to them, in effect: "You are in the same catagory as if you had remained ashore in safe, remunerative, civilian occupations." We say this, Mr. Chairman, to a body of men whose loss of life was at a higher percentage than that of the armed services for the first year or more of hostilities, and which ended the war with a percentage loss of life equal to that of the armed services. We say this, Mr. Chairman, to men who sailed through the ice cold seas off northern Europe in the long winter nights when the expected loss of ships was just 50 percent of those which cleared for Russian Arctic ports. It seems fantastic that we should regard these men in such a cold-blooded way just because they do not wear the uniform of one of the armed services.

How can we expect to build up a satisfactory body of merchant seamen while we regard them as outcasts, and as undeserving of even the simplest recognition by a people for whom they died to the extent of more than 7,500, for whom they starved on rafts, were cremated in the burning oil of torpedoed tankers, or were blown to bits by falling bombs. Some say the veterans object to recognition of the wartime merchant seaman in any way whatsoever. I do not believe this. Brave men do not object to decent recognition of other brave men. The American fighting man is not built on a narrow, biased pattern. He can share a little of his glory and shine yet more brilliantly from the added appreciation which will then become his lot.

Please take recognition of these comments from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission:

> Unlike those employed in shore-side war industries, they signed employment contracts which obligated them to serve for 12 months, if the voyage, as many do, should need to be that long; they were subjected to military court martial; their employment was not continuous and they were not compensated between voyages; they could not live at home nor could they take their leisure daily at liberty; and shore leave in foreign ports was rigidly curtailed. Like the military, however, they served in active theaters of war; and, as part of active task forces, they carried troops, ammunition, and supplies to such theaters of war as the Pacific islands, Anzio and Normandy beachheads—

And so forth. Mr. Chairman, there are relatively only a few of these men who would fall into the age limits of this selective-service act for peacetime service. No one wishes to exempt them from service in time of national emergency or of war. We do want to preserve their skills and their readiness for those very emergencies.

Mr. Chairman, to me, looking back over two wars; looking back over the years of training it takes to make a good seaman; looking back particularly at the fine new ships I have seen largely useless due to lack of adequate trained personnel to operate them; this drafting of the merchant seaman for Army services does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, to me, considering the outstanding achievements of the merchant marine during the long years of World War II—the fact that we could not have conducted our overseas campaigns without merchant ships in the thick of combat activities—this complete lack of recognition of the heroism and steadfastness of the men of the wartime merchant marine does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, to me, the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars each year to build up and maintain a merchant marine under the American flag, while at the same time we completely destroy every vestige of pride in service on American merchant ships—every vestige of desire to serve again in such vessels in the event of war—simply does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, an amendment will be introduced at the proper time to give some sign of recognition to the wartime seaman. I hope this House will give it most careful consideration.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

CONSCRIPTION

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, the district I represent—Twenty-fourth Congressional District, Bronx—is in many respects a cross section of America. It is populated by many peoples—most of whom came to the New World to escape the tyranny of the Old World. To escape the very system of Prussian peacetime conscription which we are considering here. They could tell you that conscription fails to prevent war. They could tell you that conscription corrupts our freedom and liberty.

I rise to speak out against the peacetime draft of our young men between the ages of 19 and 26.

I rise to speak out against this bipartisan design to commandeer these young men, in time of peace, away from their homes, their jobs, their schools, their careers—for precious years which can never be returned to them.

I rise to speak out against this plot to conscript the sons and kid brothers of America, the teen-agers of today and tomorrow; the lad courting his first sweetheart—starting out to college—or bringing home his first pay check; to teach and indoctrinate these youths of 19 years in the fine art of killing other boys 19 years of age.

I rise to speak against this bill which seeks to conscript the youth of America, while my bill, H. R. 6780, which would conscript industry by nationalizing the manufacturers of munitions, is bypassed. Why not draft the profits of the wealthy before we draft the lives of our youth?

I charge that President Truman and his coterie of military schemers and profit-hungry monopolists have deliberately and openly created a spurious war hysteria and have scorned all efforts to bring about a century of peace.

I charge that the Republican leaders in both Houses of Congress have joined with the Truman administration, its Wall Street brass, and the business-controlled press and radio of the Nation to wage a psychological war of fear against the American people in order to whip them into line behind this unconscionable grab for profit and world power.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT PEACE—NOT WAR

The people of America do not want another war.

The people of America want peace.

They want a permanent peace, a dignified peace, a peace with honor achieved through world cooperation in the United Nations.

The people of America want a strong and prosperous country.

They want homes; and health and the promise that educational advantages will be available to every boy or girl, in the calling he or she may choose; with no exclusions, no discrimination, no deprivation because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

They want new, modern schools; and broad, free public parks and playgrounds. They want improved social security for all; old age pensions; full employment so that men may no longer be driven to strife against one another for the right to earn a living.

They want a future of promise; a future guaranteed and safeguarded against the ominous, terrible threats of the kind of war which might befall if the heads of nations are men unfit to lead; if the moneyed interests and the military cliques win the control of our Nation as they have sought to do with unparalleled vehemence in the last 3 years following the victorious end of the war against fascism, nazism, and Japanese militarism.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL PREPARE FOR WAR IF THEY ARE THREATENED

Yet, beyond all these things which our people want and hope for, they are deeply and sincerely stirred by a love of country first. They stand ready and willing to offer great self-sacrifice and, yes, sacrifice of the very lives and futures of their children, if the security of our great land of promise be in true peril.

For love of country, for preservation of the sacred heritage of America, all Americans whether of ancient American lineage or newly come to our shores, would sacrifice all these things and more.

This is the deep-rooted faith of the people of America in the hope and promise of democracy as inscribed in our Declaration of Independence, in our Constitution, in our Bill of Rights, and the other epoch-making resolutions which compose the greatest fabric of freedom ever designed in the history of the world.

OUR COUNTRY IS NOT THREATENED

But our country is not in danger.

Its security is not threatened.

Therefore it is most scurrilous, Mr. Chairman, it is an unthinkable breach of trust to the great, self-sacrificing people of our country that our Nation's power-mad, profit-hungry leaders dare to exploit this great spirit of America in order to assure profits for the overpowering corporations of the free-enterprise system. Step by step they are taking us down the road to war.

The administration wants us to believe that a world crisis has arisen which threatens our security. But it has presented no facts to substantiate this. I charge that an artificial crisis was deliberately manufactured to stampede

Congress and the people into accepting universal military training and conscription which they have always strongly opposed.

It was General Ludendorff, Hitler's military mentor, who first advanced the totalitarian theory that the imminent danger of war must be drilled into people's minds in order to prepare a nation for an aggressive, militaristic course.

The danger of attack and the need to prepare to fight for existence must be stressed. Then the Nation will go obediently through the steps and sacrifices and human costs of building a war machine. Then on command, the people will go willingly to war—an aggressive war and not a war of defense.

This was the Ludendorff theory; this was the trick Adolf Hitler played on the German people.

This is the trick now being played on the American people.

THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE WANT PEACE—NOT WAR

Are we threatened by the Soviet Union? That nation lost 10,000,000 lives in the war. The most productive sectors of its economy were destroyed. After 2½ years of reconstruction its production has just regained the prewar level. It will take the Soviet Union many years to attain an industrial output equal to one-half our current production. Meanwhile, if we do not squander our resources in preparations for war, the United States can increase its output by 50 percent in the next decade, raise itself to an undreamed-of prosperity, and help promote the prosperity of the rest of the world.

The Soviet Union has just adopted its sixth demobilization measure since the end of the war and has been steadily reducing the percentage of its national budget for munitions expenditures.

Does anyone seriously believe that the Soviet Union wants another war? The most ardent advocates of the get-tough-with-and-hate Russia policy admit that the Soviet Union does not want war. They even concede that the Soviet Union fears war. The fact is that the Soviet Union cannot attack the United States. As the hard-headed Wall Street Journal cynically said, if the Russians wanted to attack us, they would have to swim to get here.

There is no military threat to our national security. The administration has merely concocted a nonexistent threat to force through unpopular legislation and to guarantee great corporation profits.

To insure corporation profits, to halt the march of real democratic progress in our Nation and in other countries of the world, the administration has conjured up a great, dynamic lie—as evil in its own way as Hitler's great lie which took the lives of millions of people including 6,000,000 in Europe solely because they were Jews.

Behind the propaganda front of this great lie—behind the campaign of fear against the mind of America—these men conspire to conscript the youth of America—to take America's sons and plunge them into regimentation of mind and body of the very sort over which we have fought the totalitarian world. They would indeed perpetuate Jim Crow and racial discrimination by refusing to eradicate this un-American principle from our military branches and from the production of military material.

They seek to destroy civil liberties and to train the mind of young America the way Hitler trained the Hitler youth—to the necessity of a holy war to protect profit and greed.

Mr. Chairman, the leaders of our Nation have deceived the American people and withheld vital information from them in order to traduce the Nation into accepting the totalitarian regimentation demanded by American monopoly capital.

Here are the facts, unchallenged and undisputed although our Administration has sought desperately to draw a curtain of iron and steel and cotton and tobacco and oil over this vital information upon which our people must base their decisions between war and peace.

WE HAVE NOT REALLY SOUGHT PEACE

On March 17, 1948, the President of the United States stood before the joined bodies of the Congress and, with apparent concern and desperation, called upon the legislative branches of the Government to take immediate steps to mobilize and militarize America. He declared that peace was threatened and that our power to maintain peace was nearing an end.

Yet the fact now stands indisputably revealed that last January, a full 2 months before the President made his appearance before Congress his own administration had flatly turned down an overture from the Soviet Union for peace.

The facts now stand revealed that on a certain evening in January of this year, an emissary of the Soviet Government in Berlin called upon Mr. Robert Murphy, the adviser and consultant assigned by our Department of State to Gen. Lucius Clay, who heads our military government in Germany.

This emissary came to the house of Mr. Murphy at 8 o'clock on that January evening.

The two men talked until 2 o'clock the next morning. They discussed in detail the problems and differences existing between the Soviet Union and the United States which had led the existence of the cold war and the threat of open conflict.

This was last January—let us not forget—two full months before President Truman wrung his hands before Congress and pleaded for the mobilization of America for war.

What was the result of that Berlin discussion last January, by an accredited representative of the Soviet Union and participated in by our top policy-maker in the area of immediate conflict between Soviet and American interests?

Did our Nation pause in its waging of the cold war?

Did we ask for more details?

Did we send General Marshall to meet Mr. Molotov to air further these problems and differences?

We did not.

Rather, our White House and State Department not only refused to discuss the matter, but even went so far as to deny that the original exchange of views had ever taken place.

Clearly, even last January, our administration was determined to conjure up a Frankenstein monster of war.

No peace overture could be permitted to upset the creation of the specter of war.

For unless that Frankenstein, that specter, were created, the American people could not be regimented into docile battalions for the profit of the monopolists.

Then, significantly, two whole months later, President Truman appeared before Congress to ask for a peacetime draft to build our Army to wartime strength.

This act—undertaken 2 months after the Soviet Union had sought to initiate conferences to iron out our differences—was a clear and indisputable indication that certain forces in our Nation were determined on a war program, even though the peoples of the world wanted peace.

Can we, as an intelligent, democratic, progressive Nation, condone acts like these?

Are we to be so taken in by those who make huge and unconscionable profits out of war and war programs that we can close our eyes and ears to facts such as these?

The answer should be obvious, but there is still another chapter to this story of greed, deception, and bipartisan flouting of our people's will for peace.

On May 9, our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, held a conversation with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov and later submitted to him a confirming note. Our Ambassador said that the United States considered the door always open to negotiations for peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

Perhaps General Smith thought that this conversation, like the one in Berlin 4 months earlier, could be blotted out by our expensive tapestry of iron and steel and cotton and tobacco and oil.

At any rate, he went fishing.

But this time the Russians decided to tell the story to the world.

Perhaps, it is true that as our President and State Department cried later, the Russians sought to put them on a spot.

Whether or not that was the Soviet's intention, our leaders were put on a spot. But the spot was the spot of peace. Did they want peace or not, yes or no?

The whole world waited breathlessly for the answer.

Again our President and our Secretary of State made it indubitably clear that even on this point they were determined to disagree with the Soviet Union.

In plain, simple diplomatic mumbo-jumbo they said General Smith's conversation was misinterpreted, its meaning distorted.

Did they mean that General Smith did not mean to propose peace?

Do our leaders mean that the American Nation wants war?

CONSCRIPTION BRINGS WAR

We, the people of America, want peace. We have never wanted anything else. Peace is a basic ethic of America. We are a peace-loving people. We do not raise our sons to die in wars—we raise

them to be useful citizens in a democracy at peace.

Our leaders, in their desperation to sell their war-profits regimentation to the American people, tell us that the way to peace is through military strength, a swollen armaments program, and conscription of America's young manhood to train for war.

What nonsense this is.

If you train men for war, will you have peace?

If you teach our youth to fight and kill, how can we ever, ever expect our future generations to want peace?

Mr. Chairman, all the great institutions of our democracy cry out against militarization, against the peacetime conscription of American youth. The churches, the colleges, the trade unions, our social agencies, the fathers and mothers of America and even youth itself—all these oppose conscription and war.

Only business and the military and the press and politicians representing them are behind this back-to-war movement.

Let us call a halt now, in this final crucial moment in the drive to war, before greed and political blindness steer us all into the total destruction of atomic war.

Let us turn our course toward peace—peace and understanding and a sincere helping hand to the oppressed and suffering peoples of the rest of the world.

Let us turn the mind of America away from war and toward achieving full democracy in our own land for all our people.

And above all, let us cherish and preserve our youth for this great American mission.

CONSCRIPTION BRINGS FASCISM

Let us not conscript a whole American generation to sacrifice themselves on the battlefields of greed and hate.

For conscription of our youth means conscription of their minds as well as their bodies.

Sir Norman Angell has said:

> Conscription to be effective must be a conscription of minds as well as bodies * * * the state must take charge not only of the expression of opinion, but of the dissemination of facts which lead to the formation of opinion.

Major Hinman of the Morale Division told a writer:

> It is not our job to teach the men in the Army what is right. It is simply our job to teach them to fight for what is right—as laid down by the Government.

Let us consider the impact of thinking like this, in the teaching of all our young people. In the current war psychosis, what is "right" as laid down by the Government? Current-events teachers may be permitted to say that our Government's betrayal on Palestine was unfortunate, but they will be compelled to add that it is right because it adds to the profits of the oil monopolists. They will have to teach that it is right to feed the power of Fascist Franco, Salazar, Peron, Chiang, the Grand Mufti, and the puppets of Greece and Turkey.

Civic teachers will be compelled to teach that only Reds are in favor of racial equality, for segregation is as fixed a part of UMT as it is in a Memphis railroad station. It will be their job to explain how right it is for the President of the United States to trail along behind the denunciations by the British Foreign Minister of disloyal New York Jews.

It is this aggressive military doctrine which constitutes the real threat to American security.

Yes; we must keep our Nation strong.

America is strong.

But we must keep America free.

A compulsory peacetime draft will reduce us to slavery.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the debate thus far on the floor reminds one of the tragic days before Munich. It takes one back in memory to the sad trail taken by Neville Chamberlain, umbrella under his arm, and hope in his heart, as he walked unhesitatingly down the path of appeasement, that unhappy path followed by so many who were blind to the fact that when you are dealing with brute, fanatical force, sometimes controlled and directed force is the only weapon at your command. Reason would be far more desirable, but reasoning with a blueprint for world conquest is less than futile.

So long as we are in the business of subsidizing almost every group, bloc, and faction in this great land of ours, people who raise everything from potatoes to peanuts, it might be well for us to subsidize some of the firms who make umbrellas, because certainly we are going to be in need of them if this trend continues.

After the rain of death that fell upon Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, it is indeed astounding that so many minds remain so relatively dry. In my district I have several hospitals full of the maimed, broken, and crippled who paid, in that attack and in the attacks that came later, for the criminal negligence that preceded that fateful day. These men are watching this House today and watching the action that we take toward preserving those things for which they fought.

It must have been a debate of this kind that caused Patrick Henry to rise angrily from his seat in the Virginia Assembly and give impassioned voice to those immortal words known today to every American schoolboy. You will remember them, too:

> Gentlemen may cry "Peace, peace," but there is no peace. The war has actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the north may bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brothers are already in the field. Why stand we here idle?

Our brethren are in the field, Mr. Chairman, in France and in Italy, in the low countries, in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Greece, and Turkey. Men and women who believe in liberty, willing to fight for it, are taking up their stand against the specter of militaristic communism, that ever-enveloping shadow that creeps across the face of the earth and threatens the things that free men hold sacred. They are determined that their lands will not be added to the tragic roll call of nations who fell victims to aggression. Others have found out too late the high price of attempting to shield liberty with a veil of hope and a wishful dream.

This body would do well to heed the words of warning and of sound judgment spoken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] who paid a high price in his distinguished service. Brute force prowls undisguised across the world today. Apologists and fellow travelers here at home cannot make it look like anything but terror on the march. I suggest, if you have not read the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, that you read it. It is 100 years old this year. If you want to know what fate holds in store for you in a Communist world read it and read it well, for it affects not only you, but millions and millions of other American citizens whom the drafters of the manifesto and their beneficiaries call the bourgeois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the gentleman when Czechoslovakia went Communist, if the brute force of the Russian Army marched into Czechoslovakia to take it over?

Mr. JACKSON of California. There I take issue with the gentleman. Czechoslovakia did not go Communist. Czechoslovakia had communism forced upon it by a minority. That is the very real danger that faces every nation which tries to stand in constitutional dignity and human decency. We are dealing with force, and if we are wise we will show any aggressor that we can and will use force to defend ourselves if necessary.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thought the gentleman was dealing with ideologies.

Mr. JACKSON of California. That is where the gentleman and myself have a serious difference of opinion.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the fifth column of Russia, that operated in Czechoslovakia, was backed up by an army?

Mr. JACKSON of California. The threat of the Red Army was an ever-present factor in the Czechoslovak coup.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear at the outset of my remarks that I deeply regret to have to differ with my distinguished chairman and other distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee with respect to the merits of this bill.

Let me also make it clear that I do not intend anything expressed in my remarks to be construed as indicating animosity or ill-will toward high-ranking members of the armed forces or toward those who have sponsored the viewpoints of the armed services before our committee.

I have admiration and highest regard for most of the men who are leaders of our armed forces because on the whole in war and in peace they have demonstrated not only great ability but great personal valor and loyalty to our country. My differences of opinion with them concerning this issue are honest, deep-rooted, and fundamental. I do not believe that the military should control the American Nation or the American economy. I believe that under our Constitution the military was definitely intended to be subordinate to the civilian authority and I stand here supporting the continuance of that time-honored tradition of our democratic Nation.

This present draft measure is the most far-reaching and the most revolutionary peacetime proposal ever advanced to place shackles upon American freedom. Unless the Nation is facing a genuine emergency, unless the national security is at stake or in jeopardy, there can be no logical rational justification for the imposition upon American youth and the American economy of the burdens contemplated by this bill. I cannot concede that such an emergency exists.

This bill demonstrates that the country is confronted as never before with the evil of supermilitarism. The only barrier to a completely militarized and regimented American society is this Congress.

Warmongering, war scares, and war hysteria have been feverishly generated and flagrantly promoted by those high in official civil and military authority.

Misleading reports have been spread throughout the country that foreign submarines have been seen off our coasts, though it is a common and perfectly legal practice in time of peace—one which we follow ourselves—for naval craft of foreign nations to ply the high seas.

Reports are circulated that Russian planes have been observed in Alaskan waters, though it is a known fact that in these waters Russian territory is only 47 miles away from the Alaskan coast and one of our own islands in that area is only 3 miles away from a Russian-owned island.

The Army has recently released to the press, from the Surgeon General's Department no less, a news article which was widely disseminated containing full instructions to the American people on how to conduct themselves in the event of an atomic-bomb attack on American cities, though it is known to the Army and every other informed source that no nation, apart from our own, is presently able to make atomic bombs for military use.

Another war-scare report declares that the United States Army in occupied Germany has been put on guard against "flying discs."

In countless other ways of late since this bill has been pending a campaign to develop a war spirit in this country has been carried on and a war fear has thus been artificially produced and spread in the Nation which has unwarrantedly but gravely upset our people, and has had disturbing repercussions on the public sentiment of other friendly and peace-loving nations.

All these propaganda devices have been utilized lately in the intensive drive for full compulsory military regimentation of the Nation.

This bill will ruin and wreck the United States which we have traditionally known. It will enslave our youth, undermine our educational, religious, social, and industrial standards, regiment our economic system and business, reinstate wartime controls over industry and commodities, and completely militarize the Nation. This permanent militarization—for that is what it will be—means excessive tax burdens—about twenty-two billions for military purposes for fiscal year 1949 and steadily growing thereafter to even higher figures—and threatens the country with stagnation and bankruptcy.

There is absolutely no necessity in peacetime to militarize our cherished American institutions of freedom of the individual and freedom of initiative in order to secure the Nation against danger from foreign attack or to prepare it to meet other types of aggression or dangerous infiltration. I favor and support a strong and impregnable national defense, a modernized, streamlined, fast-thinking, and fast-moving Army, the mightiest fleet in the world to protect our bases, our commerce, and lines of communication—which we already have—and an overwhelming air force comprised of the latest type of aircraft and invention. These powerful forces in peacetime under our American system should and can be manned entirely by volunteers. The evidence conclusively shows that the Navy can get all the men it needs without the draft, that the Air Corps is now turning volunteers away, and it is neither wise or necessary to institute the draft, or any other compulsory system in order to get the relatively limited number of men allegedly required by the Army at a time when there is no national emergency. The voluntary system has not been given a fair chance. The Army high command is prejudiced against it.

Immature boys cannot handle the intricate devices of modern war. Experienced, professional career men, organized voluntarily, well-paid, well-housed, well-treated, and scientifically trained are required for this task. Organized Reserves and the National Guard—an organization which has rendered such conspicuous service to the country in the past—should be encouraged and built up to adequate strength though the Army has done virtually nothing along these lines, in fact by the provisions of this bill, the National Guard will be absorbed into the Federal military bureaucracy of highly paid, high-ranking officers at an early date.

If the Army would put half the effort into getting the men it claims it now needs, which it has put into hysteria-producing, war-scare measures, which it has put into its campaign for UMT and the peacetime draft, it would have no trouble getting an adequate force.

Our armed services must be streamlined and modernized, ancient, outmoded concepts of organization, strategy, tactics, techniques, and personnel relations, modeled after the Prussianized army of continental Europe—the same kind of reactionary outlook which was responsible for drumming the late and great Gen. Billy Mitchell out of the Army because he dared to assert the growing importance of air power—must not be permitted to dominate the thinking of our military leadership. Under our Constitution the military authority is subordinate to the civilian authority and that is the way it should remain. It should not be permitted to dominate, as it is now seeking to do, the policy-making functions of the Congress. This country exists for the people and not for the military. Supermilitarism as provided for in this bill is no answer to the problems of democracy any more than it is an answer to the problems of national defense in this advanced atomic age.

Americans have amply demonstrated that they can outwork, outproduce, and outfight nations and that they do these things best when they are free and unfettered by the techniques of autocratic militaristic government. Only war or the danger of imminent war could justify compulsory military services by our youth. We are not now facing that danger.

In my opinion, Russia has no intention of attacking this country and Red Russian leaders know better than anyone that their nation does not have the strength or the industrial potential to stand up for long against this country in war. Moreover, the problems of dealing with Russia and establishing an enduring peace cannot be solved by warmongering militarism, bluff, threats, bluster, and swashbuckling. Military men cannot alone settle these problems. They are problems that will have to be dealt with by trained, seasoned, experienced diplomats and statesmen and will have to be approached in a spirit of moderation and fairness. Be adequately prepared as we must be, and we intend to be, but also let us work and seek permanent enduring peace with all nations and thus try to avoid the horrible bloodshed, slaughter that will inevitably attend the next great war.

Militaristic fascism is just as much of an outrage to America, just as obnoxious to our people, just as alien to our institutions as is Marxist communism. Both systems are the enemies of democracy. Both are alien to the spirit of freedom. Let us recognize these dangers before the hour is too late or we will lose our birthright of freedom to the organized might and intrigue of totalitarianism, Red or black it matters not. This bill gravely imperils the institutions of America and I hope the American Congress will rise up and fight it and defeat it and thus repudiate militarism just as we are prepared to repudiate communism.

The draft is merely a stopgap arrangement to build up the manpower of the armed forces until universal military training can be adopted. It is just the first step in the program for complete militarization of the Nation by those who believe, among other things that the Army can train our young men; yes, and our young women, better than they can be trained in the homes, the churches, and the schools and col-

leges of the Nation. It was freely admitted by Army officials testifying before the committee that the draft was a temporary measure to tide the Army over until UMT could be enacted.

The Army has made no real effort to enlist volunteers, or to build up the Organized Reserves or the National Guard. The classification test rating which was fixed at 59 during the war has been raised to 80 thus barring many capable young men able and anxious to serve. If this rating were reduced to 59 large numbers of able-bodied young men would join the Army.

The failure of the Army high command to build up the National Guard is shocking. Congress made generous provision for the development of the National Guard and provided nearly $150,000,000 of which up to a recent date only $30,000,000 had actually been spent. The National Guard has been in the past a most effective instrument for implementing the national defense. This bill will relegate it to be a mere adjunct of the vast military machine contemplated by the draft and UMT.

The Organized Reserves, according to the clear testimony presented to the committee, stands in virtually the same position. No real attempt has been made to build it up to the levels intended by Congress. Under the 1940 Selective Service Act, it was specifically provided that all Army personnel should be discharged into the Reserve, but this provision was disregarded by Army officials, and according to testimony presented to the committee, instead of discharging the very large numbers of personnel taken into the Reserve under that act, the Army availed itself of the plenary war powers of the President in order to give unconditional discharges to millions of trained men who would have made excellent material for Reserve components.

The present bill is being enacted on the theory that it is necessary in order to meet conditions of tension and crisis and emergency that exist throughout the world and gravely threaten the security of the United States. If this bill is adopted it will be very difficult to convince the American people that we are confronting a state of crisis and emergency when the Congress passes this measure and then adjourns. The American people will not be much impressed by the argument that an emergency exists. When the Army starts taking young men under this bill, a vast public protest will arise.

There is no question of preparedness involved in this measure because most every Member of this House is agreed that the Nation should have and must have in these uncertain days an adequate and formidable national defense. Military preparedness must keep pace with scientific advancement. It cannot be based exclusively or even in large part upon massed armies as the recent war has so well demonstrated. The atomic bomb and other equally destructive weapons and agents have revolutionized modern warfare. Our armed services must be implemented along scientific lines, and must be manned in very large measure by experienced and trained technicians. Six months' training or even 1 or 2 years' training is not sufficient properly to indoctrinate and train modern, scientific, armed-forces personnel.

New weapons and agents are developing with bewildering speed and assuming amazing character. Jet-propelled planes, radio-directed aircraft, rockets and guided missiles will have great and most important effect upon the shape, composition, and technique of modern armies. The colleges and technical schools of the Nation as well as certain of our industries will have to train and furnish the high skills required by this new type of warfare. As constituted at present and based upon the draft and UMT as proposed, our armed services cannot do this great job. I repeat—the armed forces must be modernized and streamlined to conform to the requirements and fast-moving developments of scientific warfare.

Our armed forces to be sure, have made some very commendable efforts to adapt themselves to these new needs but much remains to be done in this direction. In my opinion, the armed forces will have to be fundamentally changed before they can be welded into a smooth-functioning, instantaneously-responding, effective fighting force.

Another objection to this bill—and this relates to our whole military set-up—is the present high cost involved in maintaining our national defense establishments, including the draft. It was testified for example that the cost of the military program for fiscal year 1949 would be more than $22,000,000,000, a staggering sum, a crushing burden to place upon the American people in peacetime. Clearly as we proceed with the draft program and with UMT and other programs being projected, this huge cost will rise still higher and we will move into a situation where military establishments will be consuming a disproportionate share of the product of our industry and labor and the substance of our people to the exclusion, or at least the very marked detriment, of other essential activities and functions of our Government such as proper care and provision for our veterans, social security and pensions, salaries of Government employees, payments on the national debt and proper provision for agriculture and labor. But this is not all.

The gigantic military machine provided by this and other bills will have to reach out for the resumption of controls over our economy, for the return of priorities, allocations, rationing, price fixing, and all those other onerous and irritating social and economic controls which were hard enough to stand during wartime, accompanied as they were by gross bureaucratic abuses, but which in peacetime can never be tolerated by the American people except in periods of genuine emergency.

Let us not blind ourselves to these realities because the militarization proposed by this bill and ancillary measures will inevitably entail crushing burdens on the taxpayers, misadjustment and maladjustment of industry and the economy and will definitely move in the direction of that which most Americans have been striving so anxiously and so aggressively to avoid—the regimented totalitarian state.

The lessons of history plainly show, and the demonstrated experience of nations clearly prove, that unbridled militarism in any nation, let alone a democracy, has led to war, absolutism, ravaged economies, and loss of that cherished thing called human freedom.

Because I believe that this measure is not necessary at this time, because I believe in a national defense based on scientifically devised and trained units and not on massed armies, because I believe it is a dangerous departure from traditional American practice of raising armed forces in peacetime, because I believe that it is a forerunnner of additional measures to militarize the United States which leads in the direction of a military dictatorship, because I believe that it unsettles our educational and family relationships, provides for permanent conscription which has been so disastrous in European countries and which has been responsible for so many wars in the past, because I believe it is an indefensible encroachment upon the American free way of life, because it involves staggering financial burdens and controls, I propose to vote against this bill if I have to stand alone. But I will not have to stand alone. There will be many here moved by the same considerations which move me, who will also vote against this bill. In another forum, the greatest forum in the Nation, the forum of the American people working their will through the ballot, this matter will be finally determined. I am convinced that when that time comes an overwhelming verdict will be rendered against this monstrous, coercive, un-American measure which so greatly threatens American family life, American education, the welfare of the American youth, and the shape of our free political, social, and economic institutions.

War is not imminent. Peace is not impossible. International order is not beyond our reach if we but strive for it. In order to set up an adequate national defense there is absolutely no need to militarize the Nation, no need for drafting our young men and taking them away from their parents, homes, and schools and forming them into what may well become a vast military dictatorship that will ultimately overpower freedom in this country.

Let us exercise prudence and levelheadedness in meeting present difficulties and moving to solve present problems, great as they are. I hope this un-American bill will be defeated.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, obviously in the brief time allowed each of us, it is utterly impossible for one to discuss fully and satisfactorily a measure such as that before us of such vital importance, and that is fraught with such momentous consequences to all the American people.

Regardless of the opinion which any individual in this Chamber might have of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the able chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, I can state, I think, the true feelings of every member of that committee that we all regret very much he is leaving as a Member of this House and the committee. For several years I have sat at his side, and much as we have differed on various occasions, I have learned to respect his ability, to admire his courage, and to appreciate the very valuable and useful service he has rendered in committee.

I am just a little regretful that at the beginning of his remarks today he rather insinuated that those who opposed this particular measure are either ignorant or are unpatriotic. It may be true that every subversive element in this country is opposed to this pending measure, but I can hasten to assure other Members of the House that not every opponent of this measure is a member of any subversive organization. And some of us we like to feel are not too ignorant but know a little about this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. In view of the fact that my good friend is obliged to take time from his main discussion to refer to this latter matter, I am going to yield him an additional 5 minutes. But may I say that it was the least thought in my mind that anyone who opposed this measure is of the kind the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure the gentleman has properly stated his position. I did not want anyone to gather the inference that he meant otherwise. That is the reason I take this time, and again I want to thank the gentleman for being eminently fair in granting me 5 additional minutes. He has always been kind and considerate with me.

Mr. Chairman, should the United States become engaged in a major war tomorrow, we would find ourselves in a very precarious situation, due chiefly to the lack of strategic and critical materials and minerals to make the weapons with which to wage war. Modern mechanized warfare consumes enormous quantities of raw materials. In winning two World Wars in our generation, we have depleted and exhausted many of our national resources. We pumped many of our oil wells dry; greatly reduced the deposits of copper in Montana and Arizona; depleted much of the lead and zinc in our mines all over America; slashed the best timber from our forests; and devoured much of the iron ore on our Mesabi Range.

I regret very much that on yesterday, after spending over an hour before the Committee on Rules on this particular bill, they saw fit to table the Russell bill by a vote of 5 to 4 which would have continued premium payments on the production of lead, copper, zinc and manganese to build up a sufficient and adequate stock pile so that the present members of our armed forces would have something to shoot. Then immediately after tabling that meritorious measure that would provide the sinews of war, because the minerals produced under it would have gone into our stock pile, they reported out this bill by a vote of 6 to 4.

I want to reiterate what I said on that occasion that to me it is utterly foolish to spend billions upon billions of dollars in appropriations on our armed services, or to build up and increase the numbers of men in the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, unless we first furnish them the weapons of war with which to wage a conflict. You know and I know that in this troubled world, war torn and bleeding, in this time of stress and strain, until the United Nations becomes more firmly established and we have an international police force to carry out its decisions, the United States of America, which has been left militarily supreme among the sovereign nations of this earth must, of necessity, and in self-defense, remain strong on land, on sea, and in the air.

Let us make it clear that there is no difference whatever between the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure so far as maintaining a strong national defense. Those of us who are opposed to peacetime military conscription are not against adequate preparedness. We want to see this Nation strong, able to defend itself against any possible emergency. But I submit to you that with our Navy greater than all the other combined navies of the world, with a splendid Air Force, and with a reservoir of men who know how to fly the latest ships, with more than half a million men in our ground forces, our Army, almost 500,000 in the Navy and Marine Corps, with 370,000 in our Air Force—a total of 1,400,000 in our armed services, and after appropriating $11,000,000,000 in January of this year for national preparedness, this Nation is not weak. We are carrying on scientific research, technological development, and building up a strong intelligence. When the Secretary of State says after such vast expenditures, and with the equipment that we now have, in spite of certain shortages in our stock pile, that our defense is "a hollow shell," then I say something is rotten in Denmark and we need some new managers somewhere.

This Nation is not weak or impotent. We have control of the atomic bomb, the latest bacteriological methods of modern warfare; we have the greatest reservoir of highly trained, skilled, technical men in this country; with the greatest industrial output—superior to any likely combination of nations on the face of the earth. And it was America's industrial output, our productive capacity, the men in the mines, on the farms, in the forests, and in the factories of America who helped win this war as much as the men on the front battle lines. That is something that we must keep constantly in mind. Russia has not forgotten that it was American equipment that saved the day at Stalingrad.

Now, that we we are living in uncertain times, no one will deny, but every single witness, from the Secretary of State and from the Chiefs of Staff, General Eisenhower, General Bradley, and the Secretaries of the defense forces, frankly admitted to us that we are not in a crisis at this moment. None of them believed we are in grave danger of imminent war. They did say that we were in the midst of great international tension, but we have had so many crises during the past 16 years in this country, in both time of peace and war, that some of us cannot keep from feeling that some of these crises, perhaps, are artificially manufactured for political gain.

Now, what are the facts? We all know that the whole world, especially Europe and Asia, is a heap of rats, rubble, and ruin today. The world is in a state of economic collapse. General Clay, in Germany, is absolutely right when he says that the struggle in Europe is not a military one but a political one.

Many of you have seen the devastated cities, the razed factories, the underfed and underclothed helpless peoples wandering like nomads not only in Japan but in all the countries of Europe. While we must be alert and on our guard, and never go to sleep at the switch, we must not grow panicky and become unduly alarmed or show great fear of any other world power. I know that Germany, Japan, and Italy are not going to jump on anybody for a long, long time.

I do not view with great consternation that Boston, New York, Washington, or Philadelphia will be bombarded by the Greek Navy. I do not think the Bulgarian hordes will soon be running over the plains of Texas. I do not think that even Russia, with all her potential possibilities, her vast territory, her virgin forests, her rich mineral deposits, her diversified agriculture, is capable of waging a global conflict today against the United States.

The truth of the matter is the economy of Russia is very bad. Her standard of living is low. The misery of her people is great. There is much discontent. One of the greatest things we could do would be to use psychological warfare to penetrate the iron curtain and get over our ideas of freedom to those people, because I believe that any totalitarian state, whether it is Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, is doomed to utter failure. It is a government of force, of terror, of murder, of the gestapo, of the ogpu, of the concentration camp, and of the firing squad.

The present world crisis is fundamentally a moral and spiritual one. Bread and bayonets alone will not establish world peace. Ideas and ideals are just as necessary. The chief trouble with every nation is that men have lost faith in themselves and in their fellowmen. In an age of might, money, and materialism, we must not overlook faith, hope, and charity. We shall continue to trust God and keep our powder dry, but we will not place our whole redemption upon sheer physical force.

There must be no weakening of America's position—no evidence of fear. But likewise there must be no provocative act that will convince the world that war is inevitable. The United States must not now begin an armament race but rather accept the opportunity to give real leadership for peace. We do not want the rest of the world to think by

our action here that we are going to march down once more the road to war. We must, however, maintain the strength to end all appeasement with wrongdoing but at the same time give evidence of a policy that is both firm and patient. In order to accomplish this sane balance it is not necessary to adopt peacetime military conscription which is a radical departure from our American tradition, and the acceptance of a discredited European philosophy.

It seems incredible to me that after fighting two world wars in our generation and winning both as freemen we should now reach the point where we are going to adopt the techniques, the methods, and the plans of the very nations we fought to destroy. Germany had peacetime military conscription, Italy had universal military training, Japan put her faith solely "in horses that run upon the rocks." I submit that history is replete with instances where every major nation that has had peacetime military conscription has inevitably been led down the road to war and eventually to utter ruin.

After the expenditure of so much of this Nation's wealth in both men and money, in blood and treasure, are we now to admit that freemen are not as strong as conscripts or as slaves? If the last war taught us one lesson it was that freemen can outwork, outproduce, and outfight slaves anywhere. The Axis Powers looked upon Great Britain and the United States as the two western, "unprepared, weak, and soft democracies." It did not require long, however, for us to rise in our might and go forth as freemen to conquer and all but destroy those countries where men were compelled to live in a regimented society, cast in a military mold, and forced to goose-step to the commands of the Fuehrer and Il Duce.

The Air Force can get all the volunteers it needs. There are 80,000 applications down there for 6,000 jobs. I have had men come to my office recently and I have talked to them, as dozens of Members of this House have, who are not only willing but eager to get back into the service, but they are rejected. The Navy admits it could get all the men it needs through the volunteer system. It is only the ground forces that are short.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Would the gentleman like to call back into active service the reservists who fought in the last war and make them fill up the Army this time?

Mr. SHORT. If they want to. If you give them the inducements, they are not only willing but eager to do so, and I would take them. I would not deny any man. I think they would make much better soldiers to protect and defend this country than the men you take into the service against their will. A volunteer army, every militarist will admit, is the best army on the face of the earth. Now since the Air Force and the Navy can get the men they need by the volunteer method, why must the Army resort to peacetime conscription?

Here are a few of the reasons:

First. The Army has opposed any change in its courts-martial system that would correct many injustices and abuses and treat officers and enlisted men impartially and alike.

Second. The Army has been slow to abolish its caste system and to carry out the constructive suggestions of the Doolittle board which would improve relations between officers and enlisted men.

Third. The Army has failed to provide anything like adequate and decent housing for enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers. If this is due to a lack of funds the Congress is partly if not mainly responsible.

Fourth. Whether deliberately or not, the Army has unmistakably circumvented the clear intent of Congress in its shameful treatment of our Organized Reserves. Gen. E. A. Evans, Director of the Reserve Officers Association told our Armed Services Committee that the Army had done "very little" to help the Reserves, had done nothing to furnish equipment, and did not contact or put in units the members of the Reserve. He agreed that "there would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere and earnest effort to build them up."

Only today General Evans, according to the AP, stated in Denver, Colo., that—

> Our military leaders have been sitting for 3 years watching a highly trained, combat, hardened Reserve force disintegrate. The Navy has done something, but not enough. They all have lost the cream of the enlisted men of World War II who joined the Reserves for a 3-year hitch. The average Reserve officer is disgusted, his morale is way down. We have no real Reserve force which could be rallied for national defense in an emergency.

It is also interesting to note that in the same article our former colleague from Minnesota, Hon. Melvin Maas, who is a colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve, declared:

> In the last war, 98 percent of the fighting was done by civilians. Yet in peacetime today less than 2 percent of the armed forces budget is devoted to civilian defense activities.

Fifth. The Army has neglected our National Guard in such a way they would make one blush. Maj. Gen. E. A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, advised us in a telegram dated May 3, 1948:

> The enactment of H. R. 6401 as now drafted will mean the complete dissolution of the National Guard of the United States by June 1950. The security of the Nation cannot be assured by destroying its reserves. If there is a possibility of war the measures proposed are utterly inadequate. If there is no possibility of war then the measures proposed are excessive.

Mr. Chairman, these are just five—but very good—reasons that the Army wants peacetime conscription. It would seem that in peacetime at least some officers are interested chiefly in pay and promotion and would like to govern large bodies of men. The only reason one can think that the National Guard and the Organized Reserves have been ignored or sadly neglected is to force UMT or selective service upon this Nation. The Congress and not the Army is the policy-making body of this Nation, and we should never become a rubber stamp of certain officers who want to prussianize the Nation.

It is also interesting to note that in our demobilization after World War I 1 officer was discharged for every 8 enlisted men discharged while following World War II, the military discharged only 1 officer for every 16 enlisted men discharged. In other words there was twice the ratio of officers retained with respect to enlisted personnel after World War II as after World War I. This meant that thousands of highly paid individuals were retained as officers with little or nothing to do since 1945 unless to plug for the enactment of UMT or peacetime military conscription.

Now when a man gets a big salary plus an authority over his subordinates in rank, far greater than that possible under a civilian system such as America enjoyed in the past, it is to be expected that he will take steps to insure that his pay and position are not abolished through a return to a peacetime economy.

What are we doing? We appropriated $11,000,000,000 in January for national defense. Then we appropriated $3,400,000,000 in supplemental appropriations following the President's frightening speech of March 17. We also voted $882,000,000 for the 70-group air force. If we enact this measure, we will require $2,000,000,000, or more than two billion, to set up the machinery of the Government for training, equipment, and to get the program under way. Then if we reequip the 25 divisions, we will require four billion additional dollars, and you will have a budget for $21,000,000,000 alone for national defense. Add to that, if you please, $7,000,000,000 that the Veterans' Administration is paying, and you have $28,000,000,000. Add to that $5,500,000,000 in interest on our national debt at the present rate, which is a very low rate of interest, and then you will have an annual budget of $33,000,000,000 for national defense, Veterans' Administration, and interest on the national debt without a single dime for any of the ordinary functions and operations of the Federal Government.

How much longer can we continue down this road? I believe in a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. If we are ever attacked, it will be from the air and from the sea. With our superior Air Force and with the best Navy on earth, who is going to attack us or can attack us in the immediate future? The only reason anyone would attempt it is if we bleed ourselves white. Take all the money that we are spending on the preparedness program, plus the $17,000,000,000 we are going to send to Europe under the ERP plus the proposed aid under new legislation to rearm western European countries—figure that up and then you will know that we are in great danger of becoming a bankrupt Nation.

A bankrupt nation has never been able to lick anybody. I think the Army and Navy and Air Force constitute only one arm of our national defense. The first line of any nation's defense is its financial solvency, a sound economy, and a thriving, going industry.

If we enact this bill, I want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], whose arguments impressed me greatly, we are going to control the lives of the youth of America, we will invade homes, and disrupt family life by taking men against their will. You can talk about universal training or service, but this peacetime conscription is compulsion—it is coercion. The Army will go out as the strong arm of the Government and will take these 18- and 19-year-old boys at the most formative and impressionable years of their lives and will segregate them into a body by themselves. I have never thought that it was a wholesome thing for any body of men to be segregated regardless of their age, and certainly not boys in the adolescent stage, such as they are talking about. They will imbue them with a militaristic spirit. Mere boys will be taught to kill. A few will become leaders—most blind followers. In the meantime, you are building up a great military hierarchy in this country with militarists sitting in high places and positions of the Government who will control, who may impose upon us a type of military control which most of the citizens of America do not want and which their ancestors left the Old World in order to escape.

We must keep ourselves strong as a nation in time of peace as well as in time of war. The front line is never stronger than the home line. If you enact this draft bill now in time of peace, you will control not only the lives of the youth of America, but industry as well. You will be causing increased demands for weapons and materials of war which will be required. You will be forcing control of the productive processes of this country. Military orders will take priority over many of the other civilian orders that we have for durable and consumers goods today. We all know that we need all of the materials and manpower that we can get. Many factories are holding back in production because we have allocated steel. If we pass this legislation, with the great demands not only for military expenditures, but for our exports to Europe under the ERP, and particularly under the contemplated lend-lease to rearm western Europe, we will have to resort to the rationing of many commodities. I do not like priorities, allocations, rationing, but we will perhaps have to return to the rationing of gasoline and the allocation of steel. There will be a shortage of the supply of food. Groceries will be even higher in price. There will be less lumber to build homes. Because of the lack of steel we will not have as many automobiles and less farm machinery.

Because of the lack of copper, you are holding back REA and crippling the electrical industry. You cannot create scarcity at home without further adding to this vicious spiral of inflation that is now threatening to destroy us. I am not so much fearful of Russia today as I am fearful of the things she is hoping and praying will happen—economic collapse in America, with vast unemployment, a discredited currency, and a prolonged depression. Russia has won every diplomatic battle not with her army; she has won every diplomatic battle since VJ-day without firing a shot. Psychological penetration, infiltration; divide and conquer. Here we are. Seven or eight years ago we had about $7,000,000,000 in currency in circulation. Today we have $28,500,000,000—four times as much money—greenbacks—in the pockets of the American people. But it is not worth 50 cents on the dollar. If we continue to bleed ourselves white, if we continue to put our faith only in material things, I say the time is not far distant when many of us will be cashing in our Government bonds and life-insurance policies that we purchased with good sound money at 10 cents on the dollar. That is the thing that threatens this country with disruption and defeat. God help us men to stand firm and to exercise reason, and not give completely away to emotion in this jittery age when many people have grown panicky, due to the everlasting, tireless propaganda waged by some of the brass, who frankly admitted, before a subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], spending thousands of dollars in order to put over the UMT and to cram this bill down our throats against our will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri is always eloquent and entertaining. He was in good form today—as good form as I have seen him except on one prior occasion, to which I will refer a little later. I also appreciate the fact that there are many here who intend, under no circumstances, to vote for this bill or anything similar to it, and who got a great deal of comfort out of the eloquence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

I have been somewhat amused, too, at the satisfaction which has come to some in talking about stock piles, small arms and ammunition and everything else in the world except facing the realities which we have here. No one in opposition to this bill has come forward with anything concrete with reference to our ability to secure, by voluntary enlistments, the minimum number regarded by all as being necessary for our protection.

Talk about Russia winning all of her battles politically. Let it be thoroughly understood that she has never taken over any country that her army did not occupy or surround. In each instance that she has taken over the government of a country, her army has either occupied it or surrounded it. She has never taken over any country when her army did not occupy it or surround it. She did not get Greece or Italy because she neither occupied nor surrounded those countries. She did not get Italy through election because the United States came forward with the European recovery plan. Many of those who speak so eloquently here against this proposal at that time opposed just as eloquently that effort.

We are facing here a practical situation: A great nation at this time wants to arm by 1950 to the extent of only 2,000,000 men when the only other major ideology existing in the world now has at its disposal 235 divisions. Oh, yes; the gentleman from Missouri is eloquent. I remember another time when the gentleman was eloquent, a little before December 1941, when the attack came on Pearl Harbor. The speech that he made here that day was just as eloquent and just as persuasive and made every point that he made here today, saying how secure we were and how there was no danger of anyone attacking this Nation, and that we ought not then to extend the Selective Service Act. I shall never forget that night. I sat in this Chamber and watched extension of the Selective Service Act carry by one single vote. Had one other Member voted the opposite way, instead of carrying by 1 vote it would have lost by 1 vote. That was in August 1941. The same people who tell us today that we do not need this, that we are totally secure, told us exactly the same thing in August 1941, and I think they are just as good prophets today as they were then. I believe it is up to those Members of this House who have always carried the burden of protecting this Nation in national defense to protect it again and vote down this effort to protect us with eloquence and nothing else.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, what I want to leave with the membership in closing is simple fact.

The amount required to be added to the national defense program through passage of this bill is $1,700,000,000. The total budget on that basis will be $17,500,000,000.

Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that when the House almost unanimously adopted the 70-group air-force program, that meant an expenditure of $3,200,000,000. I should like to point out to you that of those 70 groups, 10 groups alone consist of many squadrons and each squadron has many planes, and there are from 45 to 50 men specifically set aside for each plane, airborne troops, engineers, and infantry. The number of planes placed end to end and wing to wing would fill the Mall completely from the Capitol to the river and the men to man them the Army has not got today. That is something for those who voted for it to think about.

One-third of the Army overhead goes for the upkeep of the Air Force. Thousands of men in the Army must be utilized to supply the Air Force.

I should like to say something about enlistments. Statistics definitely show that with the increase required for the Navy in this bill alone the Navy will re-

quire a very large enlistment, far more than they have ever received during peacetime except when selective service was in being. Selective service automatically makes enlistments easy for the Navy.

So far as the Army itself is concerned, it today has 540,000 men, approximately 300,000 of whom are serving overseas in Japan, Germany, and other places, leaving the balance in this country. There are only 2½ active, well-trained combat divisions in the entire American Army of that large number of 540,000. The rest are all police in foreign countries.

The Army will require within the next year some 800,000 men. That does not necessarily mean that large an increase. That is the increase needed to bring it up to strength for the Air Corps and to take care of the natural attrition that will result during this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that in every war we ever fought, including the Revolutionary War, we never were able to obtain the necessary number of men to fight the war, no matter what inducement was offered, and this is no exception to any past experience we ever had?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes, the gentleman is quite correct. The actual inference as a result of this bill will not be so much. I cannot see that it is going to mean rationing this or rationing that simply because we increase the armed forces by two or three or three hundred thousand people. That is not going to do it. Why, a most remarkable report has been prepared, one of the most remarkable in the history of this Congress for a long while, by a subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], even before we had passed the 70-group air force bill, pointing out that in their opinion the rationing of gasoline was imminent now.

Mr. SHORT. Which proves my point.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I think it does.

Mr. SHORT. We have an acute shortage of petroleum and steel at this time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. And we have the 70-group air force. As I stated, I cannot see how increasing the Army by two or three hundred thousand means all the other controls are going to be thrown in, too.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman said a moment ago that we have a 70-group air force.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We have not today; we will have in 1951.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman's report says that the cost of selective service will be $40,000,000 and the cost under this bill will be $1,700,000,000. Is not the difference for troops, which opponents of this bill say are needed, anyhow; therefore there is no additional cost because of the draft?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Each man who is brought into the Army is an added expense, and he is just as expensive if he volunteers as if selective service is put into effect.

Mr. Chairman, it comes down to the question, Do you want an army or not?

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to say something about the members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring out that should this legislation be enacted into law, there will be 25,000 additional people placed on the Federal pay roll in order to carry out the act.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There will be quite a few people in the Office of Selective Service Records. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is, I know, unnecessary for me to make any effort to convince the membership of this House of the importance of national defense, nor is it necessary for me to preface my remarks with an explanation that our very existence as a nation depends upon an adequate national defense. You ladies and gentlemen of the House are well aware of that fact.

Before we go more thoroughly into the preparedness program and what is being done about it, let us review briefly the structure of our national defense. The system is based upon two fundamental principles which are set forth in the Constitution of the United States. First, defense is a national function; it is the responsibility of the Federal Government and is not to be left to the States alone. The States are allowed to maintain militia to enforce their own proper authority, but they may not maintain troops or ships of war in peacetime without the permission of Congress. Neither may they engage in war unless they are actually invaded or are in imminent danger which will not permit delay. The efforts of the States are part of an overall effort, but let me emphasize the fact that full responsibility rest with the Federal Government. The second principle is that in our system civil authority is supreme over military authority. We have always relied upon a civilian army, hurriedly recruited in time of crisis, rather than upon a large standing army. We have resisted and shall continue to resist all attempts of the military authorities to extend their powers beyond the rigid limits prescribed.

The responsibility for the national defense rests primarily upon the Congress and upon the President. Congress has the sole power to raise and support armies and to provide a navy. Congress alone can raise and appropriate money for the maintenance of the Military, Naval, or Air Establishment. Congress determines the broad policies which are to be followed by the armed forces. War can be declared only by Congress although hostilities may, of course, begin without an actual declaration of war. There is also the possibility that the President in his conduct of foreign relations may bring the country to a point where there is no honorable alternative to war. Congress also endows the Chief Executive with much of the broad power required for the mobilization of a successful national war effort.

The President is the central figure in national defense by reason of the powers he derives from two sources—the Constitution and the Congress. In addition to being the Chief Executive of the Nation, he is also Commander in Chief of the armed forces, and as such has broad powers if he cares to exercise them. Beside these powers, he has those granted to him by the Congress in order to facilitate the mobilization of the national strength in time of war.

To assist Congress and the President in discharge of their responsibilities relative to the national defense, there are a number of Government establishments. Chief among them, of course, is the National Military Establishment, but several of the executive departments and independent offices, agencies, and establishments of the Federal Government have some concern with national defense. Then, too, there are the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps, both of which play an essential part in our organization for national defense.

In addition to these obvious components there are others which we sometimes overlook. Where would we be without industrial production to supply the innumerable items, including weapons, munitions, clothing, vehicles, and so forth, which would be needed in case of war? National defense cannot be effective unless industry produces a sufficient quantity of good quality materials. A weapon which will not fire affords little protection against an attacker armed with the most modern and most efficiently functioning weapons. The influence of industry is also making itself increasingly felt in the field of policy formation. There are agencies within the National Military Establishment which deal with the mobilization of our economic resources in case of a national emergency. The Munitions Board and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces are examples. Operating outside the National Military Establishment, but working very closely with it, is the National Security Resources Board, which is charged with the function of advising the President relative to the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization.

Another important factor in the national defense is scientific research and development. Between 1940 and 1944 the Federal Government spent more than $2,000,000,000 for research and development. The first session of the Eightieth Congress passed the National Science Foundation bill, which constitute a recognition of scientific research as of vital importance to the United

States. Although the President vetoed that bill, it was because of objections to the particular administrative set-up provided, rather than because of any objection to the purposes of the bill. The place of scientific research in national defense is most effectively illustrated by the development of the atomic bomb during World War II. I shall speak of this in more detail in a few minutes.

Often forgotten in any recital of the various elements which go to make up the national defense is that United States' membership in international organizations represents implementation of United States foreign policy. It is axiomatic that our foreign policy is directed primarily at preserving our national sovereignty. Thus international organizations which contribute to world peace and stability and of which the United States is an active member are in a very real sense a part of our national defense. The outstanding example of such an organization is, of course, the United Nations.

In spite of all claims that in modern warfare machines are of maximum importance, the basis of national defense is still an adequate supply of manpower. We need men to serve in the armed forces in case of need. We need men to work in industry to produce the weapons and materials of war. We need men in the scientific laboratories. We need men in the National Guard and in the various Reserve components of the armed forces. We need men to serve in the Government departments and agencies which are concerned with the national defense. There can be no adequate defense of the United States if we do not have a large body of men who are physically and mentally qualified to perform the functions which will be required of them. We learned during World War I, and it was confirmed in even more shocking fashion in World War II, that millions of our young men are not fit for such service. Of the 22,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 32 years who were registered for military duty in World War II, 5,000,000 were deferred on essential occupational grounds; 5,000,000 of the remaining 17,000,000 were found unfit to join the armed services. In North Carolina, 227,600, or nearly 43 percent of the 530,800 men between the ages of 18 through 37 examined by August 1, 1945, were rejected. This percentage was far higher than the national average; in fact, only one State had a worse record. The defects most commonly found in North Carolina were musculoskeletal—affecting the muscles attached to bones as distinguished from the heart, intestines, and so forth—feet, mental deficiency, eyes, and certain heart disorders.

Mental deficiency was one of the most important causes for rejection and included educational deficiency, mental deficiency, and the specific diagnosis of morons, imbeciles, and idiots. What do these statistics mean? They mean that our present health program is inadequate. When I say our health program I mean the program not only in North Carolina but in the rest of the United States as well. The figures also indicate that we have failed to accomplish the ideal of spreading the benefits of education to all the people. This situation must not be allowed to continue. We cannot permit our reservoir of manpower for national defense to be so reduced by lack of adequate health and education programs. Neither is it fair for a man in Iowa, for example, to be drafted to serve in the armed forces, at considerable cost to himself, because a man in North Carolina has been deferred for illiteracy. Furthermore the existence within the population of such a large group of physically and mentally disqualified persons can result only in the reduced social efficiency of the Nation.

What is to be done about it? Some of you have undoubtedly heard me call for a national public health program. North Carolina could spend a greater portion of her revenue on health measures. She could take advantage of legislation already passed by the Congress and support all Federal legislation proposed for that purpose. The over-all solution to the education problem calls for the passage of a sound Federal aid for education bill by the Congress. In the meantime the States must do all that it is in their power to do to improve the status of education. North Carolina should not wait for the Federal Government to take action but should do what she can herself. I am delighted to hear that at the end of March of this year nearly 75,000 veterans in North Carolina were taking advantage of the provisions of Public Laws 16 and 346. Five and a half thousand disabled veterans were receiving aid in colleges, schools, on the farm, or on the job. Nearly 19,000 veterans were attending college under the GI bill; 13,000 were in other schools below the college level; more than 18,000 were in training on farms; and more than 19,000 were participating in on-the-job training. I sincerely hope that these men will realize the value of the training they are receiving and will see to it that their children have equal or better opportunities.

Let us now turn to a brief consideration of the defense issues other than a national health program and Federal aid to education which have been up for consideration during this session of the Congress. The most significant of these are the proposals outlined in the legislation we now consider, and the 70-group air force which this Congress set in motion some weeks ago.

The Selective Service Act of 1948 is one way by which our Nation would provide a sufficient supply of manpower for the armed services in order to insure an adequate national defense.

President Truman in his St. Patrick's Day message to the Congress explained the state of international affairs which makes preparedness necessary for the United States at this time. Secretary of State Marshall, appearing as a witness before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on the same day, declared:

> We desire a state of affairs which would make repetitions of the fate of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, the intimidation of Finland, the subversive operations in Italy and France, and the cold-blooded efforts to destroy the Greek Government unlikely, because they would definitely be fraught with real danger to those who would attempt such action.

General Marshall and witnesses who followed him went on to point out that the present strength of the armed forces is inadequate for the national security due to the failure of the voluntary enlistment system, and that UMT, or in my opinion selective service, would fill the long-range need for adequate military strength at the lowest cost. Selective service would make the National Guard and the Organized Reserves fully effective by providing them with the necessary number of trained men.

There are those who believe that there is no need for building a new reserve of men, that we can simply call again upon the 15,000,000 veterans now in this country. Not only is this decidedly unfair to the veteran who has already given some of his best years to the service of his country, but it completely ignores the fact that this veteran reserve is being rapidly depleted as the men grow older, marry and gain dependents. Within a few years this reserve will have been thoroughly depleted and what shall we do then unless we make preparation now? In the meantime, diplomatic action to be effective must be backed by force. The bully is not impressed when his victim declares: "If you do not stop that right now I will hit you smack in the face with this cream puff."

There are several other good arguments for selective service but I should like to mention just one more—one which is connected with the problem of health which I have already mentioned. Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, wartime director of the Selective Service System, recommends a year of training essentially for national preservation but including such secondary objectives as physical conditioning, physical rehabilitation, practice in healthful living, and training in democracy by having one place and 1 year when and where young Americans will meet in training.

By an overwhelming vote in both the House and the Senate, a 70-group air force has been authorized. It was over this issue that Secretary of Defense Forrestal and Secretary of the Air Force Symington differed. This difference between the two has been seized upon by the newspapers as indicating a total lack of cooperation within the National Military Establishment. This view is exaggerated. It is, on the contrary, an example of democracy at work, an example of a subordinate voicing his views even though he is well aware that they are not in accord with the beliefs of his superior. Secretary Forrestal is not opposed to the 70-group air force as such, but fears that "building up any one service without commensurate augmentation of its supporting sister services can be as dangerous as the neglect of such a service." Secretary Symington believes that balancing the Army, Navy, and Air Force should be subordinate to providing a sufficient number of the only adequate defense weapons now available to us.

The 70-group air force will require nearly 6,900 planes of various types. A group is composed of as many as 30 bombers, requiring 9,000 men, or 75 fighters with a complement of 6,500 men. In addition to the bombers and fighters there will have to be a large number of troop carriers, trainers, reconnaissance planes and so forth. Those who believe that the establishment of the 70-group air force will eliminate the need for the draft or other means of supplying manpower may find themselves much mistaken. Life magazine for May 17 carried an estimate of the number of men it would take to operate and maintain a typical large overseas air base. Six groups of bombers would require 55,000 men; 8 groups of fighters would require 48,000 men; 6 groups of miscellaneous planes would require 22,000 men. In addition, there would have to be an inner security force of 59,000 men, and a flank security force of 115,000 men. An Army supply base, including 100 harbor craft, would take 176,000 men. A Navy force of 15,000 men would be necessary to man the 300 ships required for transportation and supply. The total number of men required for such a base would be over 500,000. On this basis the 70-group air force would necessitate the services of more than 1,750,000 men. Support of such a program would also mean the development of a reserve of several thousand planes and adequate numbers of aircraft for the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve.

The monetary cost of such a program will eventually run into more than $7,000,000,000 a year. The effect on our economy will probably not be felt until about 1950 when the program gets into full stride. Then there may be fewer automobiles due to a shortage of steel for that purpose, fewer vacuum cleaners, fewer refrigerators, fewer houses and kitchen utensils which require aluminum. There may well be higher prices as the result of higher wages paid to lure workers into remobilization factories and the consequent reduction in the amount of civilian goods produced. In spite of this fact, we cannot say that the 70-group air force is either unwise or unnecessary. The price of freedom is never low, but neither can it be too high.

No survey of national defense would be complete without mention of atomic energy. On January 1, 1948, a report was released by the President's Air Policy Commission entitled "Survival in the Air Age"—otherwise known as the Fineletter Report. This report recommended a strong Military Establishment—particularly a strong air force to protect the United States against new forms of aggression, chief among them being atomic attack. The authors of the report stated frankly that they could not forecast definitely when such an attack might occur, but the conclusion they reached, after consulting a large number of estimates, was that other powers would have atomic weapons some time between 1951 and 1957. The new strategy of defense formulated by the Commission called for the building of an air arm capable of dealing with a possible atomic attack on this country by January 1, 1953. The minimum force needed was estimated to be 12,400 modern planes organized into 70 combat groups, and 22 special squadrons supplemented by 27 National Guard groups and 34 groups of Air Reserves. The findings of this Commission were borne out later by the Senate Congressional Aviation Policy Board in its report released March 1, 1948. The recommendations of these two Boards provided a basis for Public Law 547, enacted May 21, 1948, which provides for appropriations for a 70-group air force and otherwise strengthens the Military Establishment.

The hope of averting an atomic war has recently been greatly dimmed by the collapse of the United Nations' efforts to reach an international working agreement. After more than 2 years of negotiations for world control of atomic energy, 7 countries in the 11-member Atomic Energy Commission decided there was no use talking about atomic control any longer until the U. S. S. R. changed its mind and was willing to accept the essential provisions of the majority plan. On May 7 the Commission made a report to the Security Council declaring that it had reached an impasse and recommending that the report be referred to the General Assembly at its next regular meeting, which is scheduled to take place in Paris this summer. The report and its recommendations were accepted, and the Commission was authorized to discontinue all further meetings for the present.

The need for a change in our defensive as well as our offensive strategy has recently been highlighted by an announcement of the United States Atomic Energy Commission that three "improved" atomic bombs have been successfully fired at Eniwetok. In this connection, we learn from an article in the New York Times of May 23, that Secretary Forrestal has "borrowed" Mr. Russell J. Hopley, president of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., to draw up a country-wide plan for civil defense. Mr. Hopley and his assistants hope to evolve a plan by the end of July under which the civil, or passive defense of the United States could be conducted in case of an atomic attack. The ideal pattern for civil defense is said to start with the principle of self-help. We are then told that an estimated 555,000 persons would be killed and a like number wounded if a single bomb were dropped on each of 37 cities of the United States having populations greater than 250,000. It is difficult to conceive of any plan which would be effective in the event of such atomic slaughter.

But let us turn from these frightening figures and suppose, for the sake of improving our spirits, that men and nations are able and willing to base their hopes for survival on the constructive rather than the destructive uses of atomic energy. Here are some of the heartening facts. A few weeks ago David Lilienthal, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, announced that cobalt, a cheap and plentiful mineral, could, after irradiation in an atomic oven, be used just as effectively in the treatment of cancer as radium, an extremely rare and costly material. Besides this and other medical uses of products of atomic energy, there is indication that the lot of the farmer will be improved. For instance, tracer atoms of phosphate allow plant chemists to learn what happens to phosphate in the soil, how it is taken up by the plant, where it goes in the plant, what happens as as a result of its presence there. It may be some years before atomic energy is available as a source of industrial power but researchers have listed more than 1,000 potential industrial uses for atomic radiation. There are, then, phases of atomic energy which promise us a future of health, welfare, and human betterment. Let us pray that atomic energy is used in this fashion rather than for mass destruction.

In conclusion, let me leave with you these thoughts: The health and education of all our people are the basis of any sound system of national defense; enactment of a national health program and legislation for Federal aid to education is therefore necessary in the interests of national defense. Industrial production and scientific research and development are essential to an adequate defense and must be maintained at a high level. Let me state with emphasis, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion the passage of H. R. 6401 is necessary to provide the necessary and minimum adequate manpower for the armed forces and their Reserve components, all of which must be kept strong while world conditions remain so sensitive and unsettled which today is undeniable.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to this draft bill, H. R. 6401, which is now under consideration. The adoption of this proposal to subject to conscription some two-thirds of our single, nonveteran men in the 19- to 26-year age group will mean the establishment of the first genuine peacetime draft in American history, and I am convinced that such unprecedented action represents a serious departure from American tradition and a violation of the principles of our democracy. I am thoroughly convinced that this measure is neither practical nor necessary, and I am going to vote against it.

I am opposed to this measure on several counts. One reason is that military conscription in time of peace is contrary to our American traditions, and the establishment of such a set-up poses a serious threat to our democratic way of life. Over 150 years ago Thomas Jefferson—the great apostle of democracy and author of the Declaration of Independence—warned our Nation that military conscription, large peacetime armies, and militarism are extremely dangerous to democratic governments—that militarism leads to war and loss of freedom. Dr. Arnold J. Toynbee, one of the most popular historians of our times, in his monumental study of the rise and fall of past civilizations, states: "Militarism has been by far the commonest cause of the breakdown of civilization." The leading American historian and political scientist, Charles A. Beard, has expressed the same sentiments.

In my opinion, it would be a serious mistake for the United States to adopt

the peacetime draft. We cannot adopt ways that have corrupted and destroyed other civilizations and expect to escape the same fate. I might say that we have already witnessed trends to militarism in this country during the last 2 years. Today the military is extending its control over our democratic institutions, and the result has been the gradual weakening of one of the most important safeguards of democracy—civilian control of government.

Let us examine the record. One index of the influence of the military in government is the amount of money appropriated for military purposes. The record shows that 54 percent of the 1947 Federal budget was appropriated for the military and agencies relating to the military. An even greater amount was appropriated for 1948, when some $18,000,000,000—66.3 percent of the total budget—was granted to the various war agencies. Over $31,000,000,000—79 percent of the total 1949 budget—is for war or the effects of war. About $14,000,000,000 of this goes for direct military expenditures, or more than $85 a piece per person in the United States, and 12 times more than was spent for military purposes in 1940.

The increasing size of our military budget, however, is only one measure of the growing influence of the military in our national life. Another index of this trend is the growing number of admirals and generals finding their way into key governmental positions. For example, Admiral Leahy is President Truman's chief adviser, General Marshall is Secretary of State, and Marshall's chief advisers are Brigadier General Carter, West Point's John Peurifoy, and General Hilldring. Gen. Lucius Clay controls Germany and General MacArthur runs Japan. Ten of the 20 ranking executives in the State Department are military men. Many of our top diplomatic posts are held by military men—Gen. Bedell Smith is Ambassador to Russia, Admiral Kirk is in Belgium, General Holcomb represents us in South Africa, just to mention a few.

In other words, the recent trend has been toward more and more generals and admirals in Government, and their increasing influence in political affairs. This pattern becomes doubly disturbing when you couple it with the Wall Street infiltration into Government. For example, Defense Secretary Forrestal, ECA Ambassador at Large Harriman, former Secretary of Commerce, and the Treasury Secretary Snyder all belong to the Wall Street banking circle. This combination of military and Wall Street influence makes for reactionary politics—at home and abroad—as their logical consequences.

I maintain that the adoption of peacetime draft legislation would present a serious threat to our democratic government and our precious American liberties. Militarism is gaining a strong foothold in America—the military is exercising ever growing influence in Government, politics, in our schools and universities, and in control of atomic and other scientific research. The military is also exercising tremendous influence over American foreign affairs to the detriment of peaceful international relations and world peace. Now the militarists and their Wall Street allies are attempting to extend their influence by seeking the adoption of the peacetime draft.

I am opposed to surrendering any more power to the military crowd. I believe that draft legislation in times of peace is a denial of the spirit of the United Nations in that it rejects international cooperation in favor of unilateral action as the basis of international security.

Those who are supporting this measure base their whole case on the claim that this conscription program is necessary to our national defense. An examination of the facts, however, show that the United States is today the strongest military power in the world. The authorized strength of the Regular armed forces is 1,703,000 men, and the actual strength of the Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force units plus the Organized Reserves adds up to nearly 3,000,000 men. In addition, we have the strongest Navy in the world, and a monopoly on the atomic bomb.

It is true that our Regular forces are not at full strength because enlistment quotas fall below monthly quotas. The proponents of this bill are using this as a justification for a return to the draft; but they ignore the fact that the War Department has raised the enlistment standards far above prewar levels, and is rejecting 50 percent of all volunteers at the present time. I fail to see the logic of drafting boys when the Army is turning down volunteers by the thousands every month.

Furthermore, there are more practical methods of obtaining the manpower needed for our military needs. Enlistments in the Regular armed forces can be stimulated by offering additional inducements for volunteers, such as better pay, and more opportunities for promotion and education. The suggestion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] some months ago to pay a $1,000 bonus to all those who complete a 2-year enlistment, and $1,500 for 3 years, would encourage many young men to enter the armed forces. In addition, the Army would become more attractive to our youth if some of its undemocratic features were eliminated—we should abolish the special privileges now enjoyed by commissioned officers, and the caste system which it creates. We should also eliminate Jim Crowism, and all other forms of racial discrimination in the Army and Navy. In other words, the military crowd in America have ample means of securing a sufficient number of volunteers to fill their monthly quotas, but they prefer conscription because it enhances their prestige and power at the expense of democratic government.

Just to make the record clear, I have always supported adequate appropriations for national defense, and I intend to continue to do so. During this session, I have voted for military appropriations totaling nearly $14,000,000,000—the largest peacetime military budget in American history. I have supported the building of a 70-group air force, and I have always advocated the expansion of the National Guard and the Organized Reserves. I have repeatedly urged that additional inductments be offered for enlistments, and that the caste system and racial discrimination be eliminated in the Army and Navy, as a means of attracting more volunteers.

We have been told here today that voluntary enlistments and Reserve training cannot do the job of providing the trained men necessary to man our country's defenses. I wonder if we have given these voluntary programs a real chance to prove their worth. This Congress has been most generous with appropriations for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, appropriating the $14,000,000,000 I have mentioned, but there has been no time to demonstrate whether the additional facilities this money can provide will do the job.

There is no question but that the various Reserve units have had a hard time during the past year in holding their members because of poor facilities.

Recently I paid a visit to the headquarters of the Fifth Infantry Battalion of the United States Marine Corps Reserve here in Washington. This battalion is located a few blocks away from the Capitol, in the old Boys Club building. There is a tiny room for inside drill which is too crowded and cramped for any real exercise. It isn't even large enough for a basketball court. No wonder that many former marines who enlisted in the Organized Reserves are dropping out.

The Fifth Infantry Battalion is one of the famous Marine outfits. The Marines have always preferred volunteers, and in the early part of the war the men who fought at Guadalcanal and Tarawa were 100 percent volunteers, and a large proportion from the Organized Reserve. A great many of the Fifth Infantry men, who were called up in April, 1940, were among the gallant defenders of Guadalcanal.

I am convinced that the provision of better facilities for volunteer groups like this Marine battalion, and for the Army, Navy, and Air Force Organized Reserve, will pay real dividends and prove a workable substitute for the proposed draft.

But this military-conscription bill now under consideration, Mr. Chairman, is a measure to militarize America rather than to promote national defense. It is a proposal designed to regiment our Nation rather than protect it. It is not a desirable means of obtaining military manpower, and it is contrary to America's democratic heritage. For these reasons, I have no honest course but to oppose it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, the Army has asked for a draft of our young men. It is the job of this Congress to determine whether or not the draft is essential to obtain the authorized strength of the Army. A draft in peacetime is a very serious matter. To enter upon a peacetime-conscription program is to depart from the tradition that has been the foundation and bulwark of our freedom.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot take this step in good conscience unless it has been ir-

refutably proved that there is no alternative.

Secretary of the Air Force Symington and General Spaatz both told the House Armed Services Committee on April 13 that they did not feel selective service was necessary to bring the Air Force up to requirements. Secretary of the Navy Sullivan and Admiral Denfeld testified that the Navy could get its authorized strength without a draft.

I have seen a Navy chart which shows that in June 1947 they were accepting volunteers at the rate of 5,500 men a month. In July volunteers were being accepted at the rate of 12,500 a month. Volunteer recruitment fell back to 11,500 a month in August, but rose to 15,000 a month in September. In January 1948 it rose to over 19,000 per month. The volunteers exceeded the appropriation the Congress had authorized for recruitment.

The Air Force has had little trouble in obtaining volunteers for numerous reasons:

(a) Its recruiting drive has never slackened.

(b) It has something specific to offer in training young men for highly skilled trades.

(c) It gives better pay and better living conditions than the Army.

Until the Army reforms itself it will never be able to compete with the other services. I can see no reason otherwise among the services which would make it more difficult for the Army to recruit.

I cannot help but feel that, after serious study of the hearings, the Army has failed not in its efforts, but through its lack of effort to obtain volunteers.

General Bradley told the House Armed Services Committee on April 14 that if our Reserve units were filled up with men with proper training we believe we could reduce the size of our Regular Army.

General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, told the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 1:

> We talk of doing things, we talk of spending money and the possibility of legislation, but nowhere do we hear of the possibility of doing something to maintain, revitalize, keep intact our Reserve which we have at the present time. A 2,400,000 Reserve is no small-sized Army and Navy.

The Army has neglected the volunteer Reserves and the National Guard in order to get a compulsory program. It is all very well and proper for the Army to ask for a draft, but it is the duty of the Members, Mr. Chairman, as custodians of the people's liberty to evaluate this request calmly and objectively in the light of the needs of the Republic.

I am convinced that the Army could get more volunteers if it really wanted to do so.

The hearings show that of the 240,000 men the Army says it needs and can only get through the draft a very small percentage will be sent overseas. General Bradley on March 25 told the Senate committee that only 13,000 additional combat troops and 1,000 service troops would be sent overseas if the Army increased its strength by 240,000 men and got a peacetime draft.

If this is true, I ask why do we not enlarge the WAC? The last war proved how efficient women could be in military jobs, taking over all the clerical work, radar plotting, ack-ack batteries, the supply services, the many jobs which the Army itself calls housekeeping—not kitchen work. Women have shown eagerness to get into uniform. Why not let them, since we need them? Every Wac enlisted gives the Army a man for another job.

If there was a sincere desire on the part of the Army to obtain volunteers without the aid of the draft many ideas suggest themselves to me which the Army could initiate. It could try to make army life as normal as possible, that is, like civilian life. It could provide decent housing near posts so men could live with their families. It could permit men to live off post and come to work every morning as they would on any other job—b and c would help get enough mechanics for the air force. Mechanics do not have to be as young as pilots or infantrymen.

The Army could keep promises when enlistees are allowed to choose branch of service and type of duty. It could abolish "chicken" regulations which make post life unbearable. Reveille could be at a useful hour instead of a traditional one. Furloughs, passes, parade regulations could be liberalized. Martinets could be prevented from ruining the Army.

These smaller reasons for opposing the draft are based on the belief that the Army by reforming itself could attract enough young, intelligent men to fill its present needs. The Army has not yet been able to prove otherwise. Let the Army make the reforms and see if it is not true. Then, if it is not, let us think about compulsory military service.

If men are to be drafted, why not women, too? And above all, why not industry, too—at least to the extent of providing all goods to the armed services at absolute cost. Not one cent of profit. No cost-plus. If young men must give their youth and their lives, then the least the older men can give is their profits.

If we pass this peacetime draft we might as well recognize the fact that it is not a temporary measure. It is one with which we will be saddled for many years to come, with the danger of our country becoming a hugh military state dominated by military ideas and military people.

How can we take this step unless we have honestly tried every voluntary means of obtaining manpower needed to bring our Army up to authorized strength?

At this point it is well to remember history. In every nation where compulsory peacetime conscription has been adopted freedom of speech and action has been jeopardized or lost altogether.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

LEST WE FORGET

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the fall of 1941 during the Seventy-seventh Congress, legislation came before the House to extend the draft to 18- and 19-year-old boys. During the course of the debate, quite an effort was made to amend the bill so as to guarantee these boys at least a year's training before going into combat. The War Department and the Chief of Staff objected to this amendment, asking that the determination of the period of training be left to their good judgment and assuring the Congress that sufficient training would be given, as nearly a year as possible, and that the units in which the boys would be incorporated would have thorough training before combat. On the strength of that assurance many Members voted for the extension to include these young men.

My own disillusionment came a short time later when a young man from my district was killed in France just 5 months after he was inducted. No Chief of Staff or Secretary of War could tell me that he had been sufficiently trained or that the loss of his life might not be traceable to that fact. There were many other examples of men killed shortly after their induction, so apparently the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War talked to the Congress with tongue in cheek. I wrote to the Secretary of War of the circumstances in this particular case, and after some delay I had a long letter, saying practically nothing, but from which I learned that by their assurances when the legislation was being considered they meant that the units would have a year's training, not the individual soldier.

I am just recounting this now to show that one should accept with a grain of salt a lot of the promises of the War Department. Another thing I remember is that during the war many young men came to me and told me that their officers had forbidden them to write to their Congressman. This may not have been on instruction from headquarters, but it was done. What these officers did was to deny these citizens in the Army the right to petition the Congress. Why should these men be denied the right of any other citizen just because they were in the Army? Will this sort of thing be done again? Some measures should be taken to instruct the officers that the soldier has every right to talk to his Congressman or write to him if he pleases.

I expect to support this legislation, but I do it with a great deal of reluctance because I am not convinced, as many others are not, that the War Department has done everything it could do to build up its strength through voluntary enlistments. Certainly the Congress has granted its every request and made voluntary recruitment as easy as possible, in the hope that our strength could be built in that way. But that method has failed, and we have arrived at the point where the Congress now has to pass legislation to permit the Army to go into the homes and seize the young men again. I know there are many Americans who feel that the War Department has fallen down on its efforts to build up the forces by voluntary enlistment, and now with the draft the people must pay for the War Department's shortcomings.

Under selective service in this last war many injustices were worked when young men were taken from homes where they were needed and their induction created a hardship. When once they were taken, there was scarcely any recourse. The appeal boards almost never reversed the orders of the local boards. In several deserving cases, it was necessary for me to go to the director in the State in order to have the local-board action countermanded. Appealing to Washington was of no use. There was one instance of a local board persecuting a family for personal reasons. Other injustices were committed, but they were upheld by the appeal board. I wonder if we will have this sort of thing again. If we are, the public will know about it. More consideration should be given to the people in this, for it is a terrible thing to give authority to the War Department, or any other department to draft young men out of their homes for Army service. It is about the most ruthless thing that I know of, and the possession of such authority should not be misused, but exercised with wisdom and discretion.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support this bill. In doing so, I realize that traditionally we are departing from a long established policy of depending upon a peacetime military establishment composed of volunteers.

As a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services, full information as to world conditions and the threat to universal peace was laid before us by responsible spokesman of our Government. I want to emphasize that it was not the military alone but spokesmen for nonmilitary agencies that stressed the need for the immediate strengthening of our national defenses.

As a veteran of two wars, I learned to appreciate the value of an adequate national defense. My memory takes me back to 1917, when we were pushed into World War I totally unprepared. Likewise, I think of December 7, 1941, when in the matter of a few moments we found ourselves involved in World War II.

On both of these occasions we soon realized the inadequacy of our national defense and the value of preparedness. No one can deny the fact that we depended upon our allies to hold the front lines while we moved into high speed in perfecting a program of national defense. At this point, let me add that as a result of our unpreparedness many American lives were sacrificed.

When World II concluded we had the greatest fighting machine ever assembled. But overnight demands for demobilization caused that war machine to crumble until today it is a mere skeleton.

While we were demobilizing and preaching peace on earth, good will toward men, Russia, our ally of World War II, continued to maintain, modernize, and expand her military defenses. Without going into detail, today Russian military forces are strategically distributed on the continents of Europe and Asia in a manner that threatens the peace of the world.

It is not my intention to become involved in our problem of foreign relations with other nations or the delaying tactics of Russia at the peace table. But I do want to point out that it is the blunders and mistakes in the world of diplomacy that often overnight can plunge a nation into war. At that moment the need of an adequate national defense is imperative.

This bill is designed to provide our armed forces with the necessary manpower that will permit building our armed forces to the point where they can be expanded within a reasonable time to meet any national emergency.

While we are living in a period of peace, it is common knowledge that dark clouds have gathered on the world horizon. With such a situation demanding that this Nation be equipped with an adequate national defense and the fact manpower is needed to reach such an objective, in my opinion this bill is necessary.

By this legislation, the responsibility of serving in the armed forces is not placed upon a few but becomes the duty of all young men between the ages of 19 and 25, who are physically qualified. The provisions of this bill are a guaranty that the rich and the poor will be treated alike.

For months we have heard the statement that voluntary enlistments can provide the reservoir of manpower needed for our national defense. While this question has been discussed quite freely, as a Member of Congress, I feel I cannot discharge my obligation to the American people by taking the world of armchair strategists, regardless of how sincere they may be.

To the contrary, I prefer to follow a great soldier—Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, who, in testifying before the House Committee on the Armed Services, cited the urgent need for this legislation. The statement of General Bradley emphasized the inability of the Army to recruit foot soldiers for the Ground Forces. His statement alone on this point is sufficient evidence to warrant the enactment of this bill.

Like many Members of Congress, this bill does not entirely satisfy me. For that reason, when the opportunity presents itself, it is my intention to offer a series of perfecting amendments, which I hope will have your favorable consideration.

Three of my amendments concern the National Guard, which we all recognize as a strong arm of our national defense.

My first amendment concerns section 5, paragraph D, page 12, lines 1 to 5, inclusive. This amendment provides that a young man who enlists in the National Guard either before or after this legislation becomes a law, shall be permitted to serve in the National Guard. Under the present language of the bill, after it becomes law, a young man cannot enlist in the National Guard.

The second amendment concerns section 19, paragraph G, page 48, lines 8 to 11 inclusive, and deals with the definition of "organized unit." My amendment provides a definition so that exemption from the draft will not be on the basis of the amount of pay received by the individual, but rather on the amount of training the man actually receives.

The third amendment concerns section 22, paragraph G, page 49, lines 3 to 16 inclusive. My amendment will rewrite this statement of policy to conform to the provisions made in the Selective Service Act of 1940, which guarantees that the National Guard will be trained and equipped, ready to be used in case of emergency, and not left standing on the sidelines as could be the case if the present language of the bill remains unaltered.

These three amendments have the endorsement of the National Guard Association of the United States, who join me in the hope they will be adopted as an aid in maintaining the National Guard at its proper strength and protecting its functions as a reserve component.

As I said in my opening remarks, I am in favor of this bill. I think it would be a mistake for us to pull our punches at this time when a two-fisted national defense is our best guaranty for world peace and our own national security.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss this very important matter, the drafting of our boys during peacetime. This is a move that has never been necessary in the history of our country and we have engaged in quite a few wars, with what I believe could be called a perfect record; we have never been defeated.

I would like to ask the question, "Why is it necessary to draft our young men, now that World War II is over?" I ask that question advisedly for it seems to me that even the heads of our present Administration have different ideas on the subject. President Truman on Sunday night said:

> There is no danger of war, ERP is having a wonderful effect on the peoples of Europe and peace is certain.

But only yesterday General Bradley appeared before the Appropriations Committee and said:

> The world situation which dictated the necessity for this expanded military program has not changed. We must still measure the capabilities of our nations without trying to guess what they will do.

General Bradley is merely pointing out that the military must look at the darkest picture that can be painted, but for him to say that the picture has not changed does not make sense. We all know that things are not as bad as they have been painted.

I would like to discuss the possibility of Russia starting an armed conflict with the United States. That would be the last thing in the world she would want to do. Could Russia supply her armies in case of another war? We all know that she could not last a year without the factories of the United States resupplying her with equipment. Germany would have completed the campaign in

Russia with ease if we had not been successful in getting our equipment to Russia in time, and sometimes I think that might have been a good solution, let Hitler clean up the Communist Government in Russia and save our equipment to wipe out Hitler and Mussolini. Then we would not have had the trouble of trying to complete our moves for peace in the world with all of the dictators wiped out.

We ended the war winners but we started the appeasing of Stalin and permitted him to move into Poland and other Balkan countries, and what did we do? Sent him a note of protest on the one day and recognized his Communist Government on the next. Now that he keeps on his political moves and gets into Czechslovakia, we finally feel that we had better arm to the hilt, and stop the robber. It is like locking the stable door after the horse was stolen. There is still no more danger of war today than there was when Stalin moved into Poland. What this administration needed was the backbone to stand up and tell Stalin where to stop.

I remember when I was overseas and was finally told that I had enough points to go home, I told my boss, General Englehart, that he should not be sending me home but we should keep our armies intact and tell Stalin right then what he was going to do toward peace and we should have kept that big stick over his head to see that he complied with our requests.

Mr. Chairman, the people back home did not see it that way and our armies were broken up. The National Security Act required that when the men were discharged they were to be assigned to Reserve units and kept in the Reserve until the emergency was declared over and peace treaties completed. Was this done by our armed services? No, the men were permitted to volunteer for the Reserves and they were informed that they would be assigned to organized units. Some 1,500,000 men signed up for the Reserve and even to this date only a very small number were ever contacted and assigned to any units. Most of the men are unassigned or members of conglomerate groups of the Reserves. It has been a peculiar thing to me that the Regular Army has been so negligent in the forming of Reserve groups to make up a strong national defense. Here we have about 15,000,000 men, all war trained and ready and able to don a uniform at any time, if necessary, and the Army decides that the only thing they are interested in is UMT and the draft. I have been told by men in high places that they were not interested in the old Reserves, what they wanted were the 18-year-old boys for their Reserves.

The Regular Army has spent your money and the taxpayers' money for all manner of propaganda for the purpose of selling UMT and to me it is the most ridiculous idea of a way to secure an adequate national defense. The UMT program even specifies that the 18-year-old boys would be trained in all lines even up to the division commander. I know that some of you men who have served in the armed forces will appreciate that. I personally believe that it was nothing but a plan to try and keep some of the stars on the shoulders of some of the Regular Army officers.

Mr. Chairman, here we are today spending $11,000,000,000 for our national security and the top brass admits that we have no security. Someone should be required to answer for that, if we do not have any defense, where has the $11,000,000,000 gone? What rat hole are they using? I think I can answer for part of it. When the end of a fiscal year comes near orders are issued to spend all of the money in your budget, whether you need anything or not. Get rid of the money or Congress will cut our appropriation next year. I think it is high time that some method is devised to put a stop to such waste, when so much of their supplies are in the hands of the WAA and still they buy. This information was given to me by a Government employee very recently, and he stated that it disgusted him. I think that our committees in Congress should start some investigations of our own to bring out some of these facts.

Mr. Chairman, I was discussing the Reserves and I want to emphasize the importance of the Reserve and National Guard units as a real national defense. If we had not had our National Guard divisions and our about 160,000 Reserve officers at the start of the last war our Regular Army would have been lost. I served overseas for a period of 41 months and I served in several headquarters, the last one being the Pacific Ocean Area Headquarters, under General Richardson, and at no time were there more than 3 percent Regular Army officers assigned to it. The other 97 percent were Reserve, National Guard, and AUS officers. In the other headquarters there were only 1 percent Regular Army. Now does that show that there are some Reserve officers, National Guard and AUS officers, who are available with proper training under war conditions to be assigned to organized units and be ready for any eventuality? I believe that the Army has taken the wrong position toward the Reserve.

I am pleased to read the minority report on H. R. 6401 and I wish to state that I agree with it 100 percent. I am glad to see that General Evans, the head of the Reserve Officers Association has expressed the same sentiments as I have outlined above. I do not believe that any draft of any kind would be necessary if they had complied with the law and built up the Reserves and National Guard. In fact if they had only encouraged instead of discouraged the Reserves who are patriotic enough to want to remain in training and be ready if they are needed in the future. I am a colonel in the Ordnance Reserve and I feel that I could still go out and do my job in the Ordnance if necessary.

Mr. Chairman, once a man becomes a member of the Reserve he will be so interested in the work he will continue to be a Reserve and will remain in it as long as there are training courses and they are kept interesting. I have been a member of the ROA since 1925, and we were very much interested in the work. I started as a second lieutenant and when the emergency came in 1940 I had worked up to the grade of major, and when called we were all glad that we had kept up to date on our work because we felt we were capable of handling anything that might come up. I am sure the Reserves of today will be the same type of enlisted men and officers and will make you the strongest national security that any nation could organize at this time, including Russia.

I am opposed to breaking up the period of education of our boys and if you do not think we are already doing that you should have been with me last Sunday when seven college boys were in my home and if you could have heard the questions that were asked of me, you would have realized that the youth of our Nation are so confused and disturbed that they are not able to study. They all feel that they might just as well quit and join up and get it over with, so why study. Some of the boys had very poor marks for the first time in their lives. I blame the Regular Army and the propagandists who are trying to paint the ugliest picture that can be painted.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the eyes of every mother in the Nation are on us today and there will be many heartbreaks when this day is over if this bill is passed, as I expect it will be, if the vote in the other body is any criterion. We all know that all mothers will gladly lend their sons to their country in time of emergency and many will bravely withstand the many sacrifices that must come out of the ravages of war, but when their is no apparent emergency, no war in sight, it is most difficult for them to believe that this is a real emergency, and not just a trumped up emergency to save the New Deal in an election year. Everyone is aware that the New Deal thrives on emergencies and the western nonpolitical trip of the President's show how far they will go, at the taxpayers expense, to try to win their point.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the proper solution to the problem of personnel could be solved by the proper action on the part of the Army. They have increased the I. Q. rating of enlisted personnel from 55 to 80 and this to me is ridiculous. There are many jobs in the Army that can be done by boys without an I. Q. of 80. I realize that some jobs must be held by scientists but they are few and far between, there are still many others that can be performed by the lower I. Q. men. I believe that the Army could reduce their requirements to 60 and get many good men. In fact they are refusing to take the men every day. I also believe that the Army could be made more inviting by having better food facilities for their troops overseas. Refrigeration is very important to the stomach of the fighting man. During the last war in the Pacific, the Navy always had room for reefers for the Navy units but not for the Army. We had to eat the canned foods and they on their ships would have steaks and ice cream. Even the Navy units who were landed on an island base carried their reefers. These sound like small items but they are the main point when you talk of the morale of the men and I believe that it is part of the solution in getting men to join the Army rather than the Navy.

I feel that the Army should go to work on the solution of this problem, at least as hard as they have worked to try and sell the country UMT, and maybe they could have had a solution by this time. The money would be spent for a better purpose.

In conclusion, I believe that the draft should be adopted as the last resort, and, to my way of thinking, we have not given the matter of enlistments a fair trial or enough energy to say that we have reached the end of our string and the draft is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) this act may be cited as the "Selective Service Act of 1948."

(b) The Congress declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

(c) The Congress further declares that such armed strength, to be adequate, requires an increase at the earliest practicable date in the number of persons on active service in the armed forces to not to exceed the manpower strengths authorized in section 2 of this act.

(d) The Congress further declares that if at any time such requisite manpower strengths are not attained and maintained by voluntary means, the national security requires that they be provided through a system of compulsory selective service.

(e) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selecton as hereinafter provided.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I discussed this matter with the Speaker and the floor leaders. It is our intention to let the amendments run just as freely as possible, but there is a great desire to finish the bill as soon as possible. So I must say to my good friend and former colleague on the Committee on Military Affairs that I must object to the request for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I will quote also from the Detroit meeting of the Ordnance Association some remarks of General McNarney, Commanding General of the Air Matériel Command.

Several years would be required to tool up for proper production because of the weakened state of the aviation industry.

If war occurred today, the Air Force combat groups would be composed primarily of planes that were on the drawing boards prior to Pearl Harbor.

In the forty-eighth annual edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica I found an article just off the press by Brig. Gen. Edwin L. Sibert, Assistant Director of our Central Intelligence Group. I was interested in seeing what he had to say about Russia on equipment. I quote:

The Soviet Union spent more than $1,225,000,000 in 1947 on military strength. An additional $9,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 was spent on new equipment. A considerable proportion of the allotment to research was spent on atom-bomb development. More than 500 German scientists worked on the development of new and improved weapons, particularly guided missiles, tanks, and aircraft. A new tank, probably the largest in the world, was developed.

In going over General Eisenhower's final report of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, to Secretary of the Army, dated February 7, 1948, I will quote certain parts that I thought were very important. The first is found on page 8:

Many lessons of the last war are available for the design of a defense pattern: The necessity for unified direction of all combat forces in war; the strategic role of the air arm; the need for accurate military, economic, and political intelligence; the necessity of eliminating the costly industrial time lag between mobilization and the application of significant military effort; the necessity for ready Reserve units and a reservoir of trained men; the dependence of the United States for many raw materials on external sources and the consequent need for stock piling adequate reserves of critical items essential to a defense program.

Again, over on page 19:

Widespread dispersion of factories or the establishment of underground facilities is an obvious remedy. However, the economic, social and political obstacles in the way of mass dispersion are so numerous and stupendous as to make an accomplishment practically impossible.

Then I was interested in an article in Factory Management for May 1948, by Robert Magidoff, McGraw-Hill World News correspondent who was expelled from Russia on April 15 of this year. I will not take the time to quote those extracts, but I do wish that the Members of the House would read them. I insert them as part of my remarks so that you will have some idea of what Russia has done to disperse and spread out back of the Ural Mountains their industrial development:

Russia is producing several times the volume of war weapons that the United States is turning out. For example, the Soviets, according to United States Army testimony, are producing 12 times as many combat aircraft as we are building.

And, more important, they are sacrificing their civilian economy to a large extent to multiply munitions-producing capacity.

* * * * *

It would be a fatal error to accept Russia's low standard of living as indicating a comparably low war potential. Russia's war potential is very much greater than her low standard of living might lead Americans to believe.

* * * * *

The building up of huge new industrial centers in Russia's interior—beyond reach, the Russians hope, of American planes carrying atomic bombs. More than half of her current industrial investment is now going into these new centers, many beyond the Urals.

Much of this vast decentralization movement is already complete. Some 1,300 plants and 15,000,000 workers and their families were shifted eastward during the war. Most of them have remained there. By 1950, half of all Russia's steel and coal will come from the East—where only one-third did before the war. Shifts in other industries are comparable.

Yet our own Chief of Staff said that was too vast a project for us to undertake.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Since the gentleman has referred to this report, in that report it is also stated that Russia has 3,800,000 men in her army and the United States has 670,000. Is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DURHAM. That is a vast difference.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. There is quite a difference. I must say they are certainly carrying out a balanced program on some points we are completely overlooking.

What is the condition in our own country? I am leading up here to a situation that has developed in the Eightieth Congress, something you are going to have to carry home and explain to your people. As I have stated above, General Bradley and General McNarney have told us we do not have adequate and balanced arms and ammunition for the armed forces to be raised through the draft as presently planned. In the Committee on Appropriations Secretary Krug, on April 29, regarding stock piles, said:

Frankly, I will let the committee know that military strategic stock piles don't exist.

He is talking about America.

We have a few items that are not important, but on the extremely important, critical materials, we have virtually nothing in the stock pile.

In commercial use we are pinched in practically every way, and we will even be more pinched with the increase in productivity activity that must come to meet this heavy production program for foreign aid and the defense program.

The foregoing situation makes the action of the Rules Committee extremely illogical in bringing before the House the bill, H. R. 6401, which proposes to draft men into military service in peacetime, and on the same day disapproving and refusing to bring before Congress the Russell bill, H. R. 6623, for national mineral development and conservation, which has for its purpose the building of a healthy mining industry and the building of our stockpile of strategic and critical materials pursuant to Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. As I stated in my speech which appears on page A3864, we must face the present situation in international affairs with sounder logic as to our own preparedness. If war is upon us, the responsible leaders in our Government should be severely punished for America's failure to preserve and produce an adequate supply of weapons for our defense and an adequate stockpile of strategic and critical materials for the making of new and superior weapons. Their total failure to do these things and their total failure to disperse our own postwar industrial development in this atomic age completely discredit the claim of the proponents of compulsory military service that the enactment of H. R. 6401 is necessary or logical at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 2, line 11, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "and without discrimination in selection or service, or segregation on account of race, creed, color, or national origin."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, and therefore should not be considered at this point.

Mr. JAVITS. May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was offered at that point in the bill which declares the policy of Congress, and the bill itself provides that service should be shared in accordance with a fair and just system of selection. I respectfully submit that the amendment I have offered states in more specific terms what is a fair and just system of selection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's argument simply sustains what I have said. This amendment is absolutely not germane to this section of the bill and has no place in it. Therefore, I submit that my point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment is directed to subparagraph (e), which reads:

The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selection as hereinafter provided.

The amendment inserts a semicolon and adds the following language:

and without discrimination in selection or service or segregation on account of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Chair is of the opinion that the language proposed by the amendment clearly follows the suggestion of a fair and just system in the declaration of policy. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, there is bound to be a considerable amount of discussion about the issue just raised by my amendment to the declaration of policy in this bill. I can think of no more appropriate place to have that discussion than right in the declaration of policy.

I served in the Army of the United States, as did so many other Members of the Congress, as an officer in the operations branch. We were taught that it was proper to order what, where, and when, but never how. Therefore when I read this bill to try to decide where this issue of discrimination and segregation ought to be raised—because I am firmly convinced that if we are to have a citizens' army, which is the basic rationale of this bill, it must be a citizens' army with discrimination or segregation excised—I felt it ought to be in the declaration of policy. When the Congress has declared the policy of the United States, for both military and civil officers to follow, then we can of right expect compliance in the administration of selective service.

I might say now that I shall offer at a later point in the bill an amendment to set up a committee composed of representatives from the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, and Education and Labor, which will be empowered to watch that the civil, rather than the military, remains dominant in the military policy of the United States. The text of this amendment follows:

Page 48, line 24, insert the following new section and remember the succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 21. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Military Policy (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of 18 members, as follows: (1) Three members who are members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, two from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (2) two members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (3) two members from the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman; (4) two members from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (5) three members who are members of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, two from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (6) two members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (7) two members from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (8) two members from the Education and Labor Committee of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee.

"A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the military policy of the United States with respect to (1) its capability to enable the United States to discharge its international responsibilities; (2) the dominance of civilian control in the military policy; (3) the training and orientation in citizenship of the personnel of the armed forces; and (4) the participation of personnel of the armed forces in the foreign and domestic affairs of the United States, and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of the military policy of the United States.

"Upon request the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over the military policy of the United States and shall make reports to the Senate and House of Representatives from time to time concerning the results of its studies together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Director, at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to the actions of the committee.

"(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman."

I served as Government appeal agent of a draft board in the course of the first months of the draft before I went into Army service myself. In that capacity I interviewed hundreds of Negro inductees, as my board was right in the heart of a district largely composed of Negro families. Man after man said to me, "I want to serve my country. I love the United States for everything it has given to me, and for the opportunities which it gives me, but I have this gnawing feeling that in some parts of the country, and for some reasons which I cannot understand, I am put down as a second-class citizen. That is something that worries me and bothers me very much." I said to those men from my own experience that much had been and would be accomplished to make this not so, and that in addition they had the constitutional right, a God-given right of every American, to seek and to fight for change.

We are here in Congress to see that inductees who are of a minority race, creed, or color should not have this gnawing feeling when they are called upon to serve the country equally with other citizens. I believe we can do that, and do it effectively by stating the policy, by setting forth clearly and precisely in the declaration of policy which precedes everything else in the bill, that there will be no discrimination in selection or service, or segregation on grounds of race, creed, color or national origin. This is where I think we ought to have this question considered and decided.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Is the gentleman in sympathy with the over-all objectives of this legislation? Does he expect to support it?

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, I think I will make that very clear.

Mr. COLMER. I wanted to ask that question as preliminary to another question.

Mr. JAVITS. I will make that clear, and if I had more time, I would be glad

to yield further, under the circumstances I hope the gentleman will forgive me for not yielding further.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has yielded to me.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield no further if the gentleman will forgive me. I would like to make this point: As I see this particular piece of legislation, it has to fit in, if it fits in at all, with the over-all foreign policy of the United States. As I see it, that policy is premised on three bases: Assistance by us toward European economic recovery and economic recovery in other parts of the world; but based on the self-help and mutual cooperation of those assisted; a strong and effective United States adequate to preserve the peace; and the ability by the United States to perform its international responsibilities wherever it has to perform them to stand by our obligations under the Atlantic charter and war and postwar agreements to give self-determination and democracy to all peoples. The intent of this bill should be and what this bill should be directed toward, is implementing our capability to perform our international responsibilities.

That, in my opinion, can be its only justification if there is to be a peacetime draft. I believe those who are observing us to see whether we intend to perform our international responsibilities will judge us not by what we say or even by how many dollars we are willing to grant or lend alone, but by whether the United States is also willing if necessary to implement our foreign policy with the service of citizens, whether we mean what we say, when we say that the United States intends to perform its international responsibilities and to back that up with every resource at its command, financial and material.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman state if this is the segregation amendment? Is it not stated in the bill exactly who is going to be inducted into the service of the United States? Is there anything about segregation?

Mr. JAVITS. My amendment deals with policy, and so requires both the policy of antidiscrimination and the policy of antisegregation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to put the House on notice that, at the proper time, I shall offer an amendment to section 23.

This amendment, I believe, will give the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] his concrete proposal to do something about building an army by voluntary methods.

The amendment will read:

Strike out section 23 and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 23. No person shall be registered or inducted under this act until January 31, 1949, and then only after the President, with the concurrence of the Congress, shall find that sufficient voluntary enlistments have not been provided by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. This intensified campaign shall be instituted by the armed forces promptly upon the enactment of this act and shall include the following provisions:

"(a) base pay of enlisted men shall be increased by 25 percent for all grades.

"(b) passing mark on the Army general classification test shall be reduced to not more than 70 points.

"(c) two-year new enlistments shall be accepted for all age groups suitable for military service, with enlistment privileges at least similar to those now provided for longer term enlistments.

"(d) one-year and two-year reenlistments shall be accepted, with proportionate payment of any reenlistment incentives, and other privileges similar to those now provided for longer term reenlistments.

"(e) regular monthly reports and consultation on the methods and results of the intensified campaign shall be furnished by the armed forces to a special joint committee of the Senate and House Armed Services Committee established for that purpose."

That will be my amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] strikes at the very heart of what I said a few minutes ago in the course of general debate.

In response to a question asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] by one of his colleagues, "Does this amendment strike at discrimination and segregation?" we say, unqualifiedly, "Yes."

"Does it also include selection and service?" Yes.

During the wartime certain efforts were made by outstanding people of America, of both races, to see that the army fighting for world democracy from the United States was a democratic army. We were engaged in a people's war, and we wanted to attain a people's victory, and we knew it could not be attained except through a people's army. We were told during that period by our leadership, from our great Commander in Chief, Mr. Roosevelt, on down, that during wartime was not the time to make any significant changes. Nevertheless, under our late President certain experimental groups were set up in Europe, and certain units of our armed services in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Coast Guard, served without any discrimination or segregation. So well did this policy work out that the Coast Guard adopted it as its policy. In response to a letter from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Coast Guard said that they were in favor of the Powell bill—my bill—to eliminate discrimination in the armed services. The Navy did likewise.

I would like to remind the gentleman again of what I said a few moments ago, that it was the specific pledge of the Republican Party of 1940 and 1944 to "eliminate segregation in the armed services."

I should like to remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the President's Commission on Universal Military Training also unqualifiedly recommend that we have an armed service without any segregation.

There is no war on now. No excuse can be given. This is peacetime. We are getting together a citizens' Army to show the world we are strong. The world, however, is not going to believe that we are anything but hypocrites. A lot of us have traveled throughout the world since World War I, and we know with what skepticism our actions here are being viewed in various sections of the earth; and logically, because they do not believe that we practice in America the democracy that we are trying to sell Europe and other places specifically.

Let us have a people's Army or let us have a Fascist Army, one or the other, because that is the choice here before us.

We make no apology for the way the Negro has served this Nation. You cannot find any minority group in America that has served our Nation more loyally than my people have served; no minority from the earliest days of the birth of this Republic. On that day on Boston Common, the first man to die for this Nation in 1773, that first person to fall was a Negro. We have done enough for this country not to be treated as second-class citizens but as first-class citizens. We have proven ourselves.

When George Washington's ragged irregulars of the Continental Army swept over the snows at Valley Forge there were 10,000 black men marching with him.

When Commodore Perry fought his battles on Lake Erie 70 percent of his men were Negro sailors.

In the war with Spain, when Teddy Roosevelt swept up San Juan Hill, Negro cavalrymen rode with him.

When Black Jack Pershing went into Mexico the black troops of the Tenth Cavalry were by his side. In World Wars I and II we were there.

This is the bill, this is the time to tell the world by our actions that we believe in this democracy that we preach and teach or shut up and confess our hypocrisy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot bring debate on this first amendment to a close. This is merely the preamble of the bill.

I move that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the gentleman will not press his motion.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, this is not an easy task that we are called upon to perform today. I am sure every Member has not only thought over this measure, but has prayed over it.

There has been quite a bit of talk to the effect that this bill will break up the families to take these youngsters into the service. I left my home and family when I was 19. It did not break up our

family and the 2 years of service I put in in the service and two more in hospitals following the First World War did not demoralize me. I have an 18-year-old daughter who left last fall to attend a school hundreds of miles away. She went out from under our control but it did not break up our family. The fact that many young men may leave home under this bill will not break up their families. They do it every year to obtain employment and for many other reasons.

I too am a Christian. To serve your country in time of need is not un-Christian. I can remember very well reading that when Christ went before Pilate He told Pilate:

My kingdom is not of this world, but if My kingdom were of this world, then would My people fight.

In other words, as head of an earthly kingdom—a nation—He would have an army.

I recall that when He was in the garden of Gethsemane in those darkest of dark hours, He told His followers who were without swords to sell their coats and buy themselves one. This is what this preparedness program means to us today.

Furthermore, that Christ said to His disciples that in days of old it was said "thou shalt not kill," but Christ said that he who is angry with his brother without just cause is in danger of condemnation. Certainly ruthless forces are abroad in the world today and we have every right to rise in righteous anger and not fear that condemnation will be heaped upon us.

I feel, however, that there should be safeguards placed in this legislation and at the proper time I will offer an amendment on page 4 to section (b) which might be called an amendment to regulate the regulators. We can recall when Selective Service Director Hershey ignored the express and direct language and edicts of Congress and that we as Members of Congress had to pass a law to repeal a regulation issued by the Director of Selective Service relating to farm exemptions.

The amendment I shall offer is as follows:

(a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by any governmental agency exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than intra-agency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or interagency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.

(b) The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate and to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, intent, letter and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. If sooner approved by either committee, it may go into effect immediately upon such approval. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance; *Provided*, that in the event of conflicting committee actions, the earlier action shall govern.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a time when legislation like this should be under the direct control of Congress it is now. May I say to my friends who fear that militarism or a military clique will rule this Nation that as long as we have a House of Representatives which is alert to its duty and does it, we need have no fear of a military control. The Congress, the House and the Senate, can control the military by controlling the purse strings which furnishes the dollars which pays the troops and buys the supplies. When you control the money you certainly have controlled every activity of the armed forces. The American Congress will not shirk its duty nor forsake those they represent. No military coup need be feared as long as we have constitutional government.

Mr. Chairman, some mention has been made of the Organized Reserves and the National Guard. Those two units did get off to a bad start because the President curtailed and stopped the spending of over half of their funds in the first year, fiscal 1947, their formative year. Congress has remedied that and I am sure you will see in the coming months that both the National Guard and the Organized Reserves will make rapid strides and with a well-rounded, well-thought-out program of training, we will again have civilian components that will be ready to answer the call of the country in time of need.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my sincere conviction that if we had been prepared—if we had been militarily strong we would not have been involved in either World War I or World War II. Twice we have been lucky in having strong allies who were able to fight while we armed and trained. Dare we take a chance on unpreparedness a third time, especially when we stand almost alone?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on one occasion when England was emerging from one war and threatened with another, Shakespeare described the condition of the British people in these words:

So shaken as we are, so wan with care,
Find we a time for frighted peace to pant,
And breathe short-winded accents of new broils
To be commenc'd in strands afar remote.

It seems to me that we only emerge from one war when certain elements begin to pull the scare of another conflict in strands far remote.

Mr. Chairman, I look in the faces of men I served with in the Sixty-seventh Congress, and I am reminded that in 1921, right after the First World War, the same efforts were made to induce Congress to adopt militarism. Now, what is militarism? There can be but one answer. It is universal, compulsory military service in times of peace with all the armaments that go with it.

If we will build the strongest air force on earth, and keep an ample supply of atomic bombs on hand, it will not be necessary to transform America into a military camp or to transform our Government into a military dictatorship, which I fear will follow the passage of legislation of this kind.

For that reason I am opposed to the passage of this bill.

I want to say a word in opposition to the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr JAVITS].

This is an attempt to stir up the race question by representatives of certain minorities, or misrepresentatives of certain minorities.

They attempt to frighten the Congress into passing legislation that is unreasonable, unnecessary, unjustifiable, and which will do more harm to all people than it will do good.

You cannot reverse the laws of nature by an act of Congress. You cannot please anybody who wants to stir up the racial question for personal or political gains. You cannot afford to ignore the vast majority of the white Americans who will serve under this law, if it passes, and bring upon them a condition that will do infinitely more harm than good.

For that reason I say that this amendment should be voted down. And those Members who are always whining about racial minorities had better remember that there are some majorities in America that are going to be heard from.

Now, I am speaking for the majority—the white Americans who fight the Nation's battles in time of war and sustain its institutions in time of peace. I am tired of these misrepresentatives of racial minorities getting up here, whining about race discriminations, and trying to pass legislation or adopt amendments that would injure the great majority of the men in the service and would not do the minorities any good.

I hope the amendment is voted down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, listening to the gentleman from Kansas I was almost persuaded that war was a good thing. I heard him tell what Christ said, and I heard him quote the Scripture. If one had not listened closely, he might have thought that war was a glorious pastime. We all know it is a curse to mankind and to nations.

I remember from my early days' training when the children of Israel decided that they could no longer make brick without straw that they even walked across the Red Sea and the Lord let them out by rolling the water back for a dry

path across. Then I remember when they got a little uppity from time to time, they had some trouble with their neighbors, and the Lord sent them back to the wilderness to dig a few roots, after they got hungry, to get something to eat, until they behaved themselves and became God-fearing again.

I remember the gentleman from Kansas saying that he went to war at 19. His home was not broken up, so he said. Somebody from his family went somewhere, but still the home was all right. He did not say anything about those young men who were married and went across the sea to fight a war for the four freedoms and did not come back; he did not say a word about them. They died and were buried and their homes knew them no more. Oh, I know it is wonderfully fine when the boys march down the street with the flags awaving, drums abeating, fifes athrilling, the bands aplaying, the crowds cheering. That is a wonderful sight, but I never heard of many of the cheering throngs going down to meet the ships when the boys came back in boxes. Just a few old rags, a few musty bones. Yes, there were some homes broken up. What about these measures we have up now to build houses? Had the boys stayed at home, maybe they would have built their own homes. What about the two or three million young women of America, the would-be mothers of the future soldiers? If you are going to have wars, just who are they going to marry? Who are going to be the fathers of their children? There are two or three million of these young girls who have no opportunity to marry a fine young American. Maybe they can marry those brought in in these foreign labor battalions. Perhaps they can marry some of the Jamaicans, some of the Mexicans, or even some of the refugees from concentration camps, 200,000 of whom are to be rushed to America. I do not know. But, those are the things that we ought to think about.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] talks about liberty so often. He is a very eloquent man, a good American. I wonder if he really believes in the America we have known and which has given us all so much. I wonder if he does.

What is this amendment, and what will it do? Why, the boys that enlist under it, if I interpret it rightly, will be forced into a regiment where they must associate with and fight with others of various races whether they will or no. Do we not fight better, more courageously, more tenaciously, when we fight with those we like? The gentleman may not like me. Should we have a law which will force him to sleep in my bed, in my room with me, to eat with me, if he does not like me nor my ways?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield now, but I will ask the gentleman sometime to answer this question, which is fundamental: When does preference begin and when does it end? When does preference cease and discrimination begin? The gentleman married the lady of his choice. I am sure, without knowing his younger days, or being acquainted with him in those days, that there were many, many young ladies who would have been happy and honored to have been asked into wedlock by him. And what did he do? He discriminated—yes, he did—against all the other women he knew. You may laugh if you want to but that is true. My question is, Where does the right to choose your associates, business and social and in marriage, end, and where, for what and when are you to be accused of discrimination?

Would the gentleman have felt that he was free had he been compelled to marry, I will say, the first good-looking, intelligent young woman, true American, who stepped up and said that she would like to be his wife? Oh, no; no, no. He would have fought to the bitter end, even if she had had millions of dollars; I am sure he would.

There is something wrong with American statesmanship, with those who guide the destinies of this Nation of ours. Here we are at the end of the war, according to Churchill and in our own estimation the greatest, the richest, the most powerful Nation in all the world, and yet what? We want to adopt the methods of Hitler and Stalin and force our men into the Army, as they did. What for? We have the most of everything good in this country, have we not, of any people in all the world? The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] nods "Yes." Sure we have. Then are we so lacking in patriotism that our young people would not volunteer if they believed their services were needed? No, indeed. If the Army would make the proper regulations they would come in if there was need but they are not fooled by the internationalists nor those who, too old to serve, are willing that American blood be shed everywhere any time some "thinker" thinks it is our duty to save the world.

Mr. POWELL. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In everything I said?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, first I should like very briefly to state my feelings on this bill. I despise isolationism. I have never been an isolationist. Way back as far as 1935, when President Roosevelt made his now historic speech, I backed him strongly. I did not believe then and I do not believe today that we can shut ourselves off from what is happening in the rest of the world.

My first reaction to the present draft bill was, of course, if the Army needs the draft to meet our commitments around the world, we must give it to them, even at the risk of departing from our democratic tradition with all the serious implications of that departure.

When the last draft was passed on the eve of war, the gentleman from Texas reminded us that it passed with one vote. I was one of those who sat at the phone in California and called California Congressmen and every other Representative I knew in this House, begging them to vote for that draft.

The draft in 1940 was needed to protect our Nation. There is no imminent danger of war today. There is no testimony in the hearings on this bill to the contrary. There is world-wide tension. On that we are all agreed and it should be the business of this Nation to try to relieve that tension.

Presumably, it is because we would prevent another and more terrible war that the Army has asked the Congress to pass this compulsory peacetime draft. The draft is asked today so that we may preserve the peace, and I am all for that; but I do not want to destroy our democratic way of life in the process.

I approached this bill with the attitude that I would of course vote for the draft if the Army needed it. However, because compulsory military training has such far-reaching implications, I could not come to a sudden decision in this matter. I locked myself in with the Senate and House committee hearings and every bit of evidence I could get on the subject.

I approached the subject in one frame of mind. At the end of my studies I was convinced that the need for the draft had not been proved.

I do not think a sincere effort has been made to obtain young men through the voluntary system. You ask me, will I vote for this bill? I will, if the amendment read by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is attached at the end of the bill. If I were convinced that men could not be gotten by voluntary methods, if I were convinced that every sincere effort had been made to obtain men by voluntary efforts, then I would vote for the bill before us. For some reason, and I impugn the motives of no one, certain of the armed forces want this draft. Let us put it on the highest plane. They want it because of the psychological impact that it might have on Russia, of course, hoping then that that would be another deterrent that would keep them from war. Well, in Heaven's name, if the atomic bomb will not stop them, if the biggest Navy in the world will not stop them—I voted for the 70-group Air Force, and I will vote for the aircraft carrier bill when it comes up—if these will not stop them, do you mean to say that the draft will?

Let us boil it down to a very few words—I see ourselves in this draft bill erecting a mental Maginot line built out of the young men of this country.

Where is the integrated program that is needed to truly defend this country by permitting us to win the peace? Where is the price control that we need? Where is the allocation program? Where is the program to expand our steel capacity? Why did we cut the steam plant out of the TVA program? This cut down our power capacity.

Why has the Congress wantonly tried to destroy the reciprocal trade program without which world-wide economic recovery is impossible?

There is a great hue and cry against controls from those who would now draft the young men of America without having first made the simple corrections in Army life that might make drafting unnecessary.

I shall insert in the RECORD the testimony given by Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, CIO, before the Senate Committee on Armed Services which I think is one of the most intelligent and comprehensive statements made on the subject of total preparedness for peace.

Winning the war was not an easy job. Winning the peace is not easy either. We had better make up our minds to that fact. Drafting the young men of America will not make up for our failures to grapple with the problems that confront us at home and abroad realistically.

I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Of course I support it. The man whom I have revered most in political life was Franklin D. Roosevelt. The reason why I entered politics was to support Franklin D. Roosevelt and his program for the people. I believe President Roosevelt would support this amendment today.

I resent very much the suggestion that Members who stand on the floor of this House in support of antidiscriminatory measures represent minority groups, and that that is their only interest in such amendments. I think I express the feeling of the majority of Americans in this country when I support a democratic army free from discrimination. I ask the gentleman from New York: Under President Roosevelt during the war did we not have an Executive order which in effect laid down exactly the principles that you are proposing today?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentlewoman is better acquainted with the terms of that order than I am. The intent I have is very clearly expressed in this amendment. It is to that ultimate effect. I am not aware of the specific details of the order.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I believe that was the case. Mr. Chairman, it is my simple belief that we should work for greater unity. Surely, a democratic country should have a democratic army. That was the policy laid down in the last war. It is the policy which we should follow today. Discrimination and segregation in the armed forces and traditional Jim Crow policies have the serious result of emphasizing irrelevant differences and in effect create a white army and a black army, instead of an American Army.

Just as I despise isolationism, so I despise any kind of isolationism in the community which sets one group apart, and I beg you in thinking of this bill to think of all the people in their proper perspective in relation to Almighty God.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a great congressional district in the South, and I believe that in rising in opposition to this amendment, I am representing the people of my district of all colors, all races, and all creeds. I frankly do not believe that the Negroes in my district want to break down the segregation laws. I rather believe that they prefer to keep their separate churches, their separate schools, and their separate recreational centers. I do not believe that they would want their Congressman to vote for this amendment, and even if they did want me to vote for it, I would not vote for it, because I know enough about the relationship between the races in the South to know what this thing just would not work.

As the advocates of this amendment have pointed out, we never have lost a war, and yet through every war we have had segregation of the races. Why it is that some Members of Congress seem to believe that Negroes want to camp and sleep with the white people and that the white people want to sleep with the Negroes, I just do not understand.

I will wager there is not a Member of Congress from a southern district, where Negroes are greatly in the majority in some places, who has had a single petition or a single letter or a single telegram from a single Negro asking him to break down the segregation laws. All of this originates north of the Mason-Dixon line. I cannot help but believe that those who are trying to put this amendment on this bill want to make it so obnoxious and so objectionable that many people who would like to vote for the bill would be forced to vote against it.

I do not see any good that could be accomplished. Even during the war, when Negroes went side by side with white men away from my district, I never received a single complaint from a single Negro anywhere in Europe, Asia, or anywhere. Yet the proposition is now put up to me to support an amendment to force white folks and Negroes to associate together.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Does not the majority of the people have any rights in this country? We are told about the rights of minorities. What about the rights of the majority to do as they please?

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. I think we are making a mountain out of a molehill. I do not want to impugn the motives of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who introduced this amendment, or any man who supports it, but, frankly, it is a ridiculous proposition, and every right-thinking man in this House knows it.

It seems to me that some of the good Negroes in my district, and I know many of them are my friends, and I am their friend, and they feel free to discuss all of their problems with me when I go home—it seems to me that some of them, from the pulpits or the platforms or some place, would have communicated with me saying, "I want you to break down the segregation laws in the armed forces."

Why should a Negro feel that he is a second-class citizen because he is in company with other Negroes? There is no more reason for his feeling that way than there is for a white man to feel he is inferior because he is in a separate barracks and marches with a separate group. They are all fighting for the same cause. They all have the same interest at stake. It seems to me we should come to an end of this proposition once and for all. It will never be done. There is no way you can pass Federal laws to make the white people of the South accept the Negro on social equality.

A Negro schoolteacher asked me to make his commencement speech. I would have readily agreed to do so except for the fact I was not going to be home. I asked him why he did not get one of the Negro Congressmen to come down and make a speech for him.

He said, "No, sir, lawyer. I wouldn't think of it." He said, "They would come down here and start talking about social equality and break up my school and cause more trouble than I would ever be able to get over."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS), there were—ayes 23, noes 135.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 1? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the number of persons on active service in the Army of the United States is hereby authorized to be 837,000; in the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present statutory authorized strength of 666,882; and in the Air Force of the United States, 502,000: *Provided*, That the number of persons provided for in this section shall be construed to mean the daily average number of persons in the armed forces during the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the number of persons who are serving on active duty for training purposes only and the number of officer candidates shall be excluded in computing the number of persons within these authorized strengths or on active service.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 3, line 2, after the period strike out: "*Provided further*, That there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in each and every branch of the armed services."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to say a word to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The gentleman from Michigan and I are very good friends. We do not agree on anything but we are good friends. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] said that I married the person of my choice. He is right; but this bill does not allow you to do what you want to do; you are drafted under this bill. However, Mr. HOFFMAN, if I had been drafted into marriage, I would have done my best. Just as I expect

white and Negro men to do their best in a nonsegregated army.

I wish to say to my colleague from Texas who spoke last that I appreciate his point of view, I understand it, I understand the problems that he faces and that sort of thing. I don't agree with him. But there are certain things that I should like to enlighten him about that are happening in this world and have already happened.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, some very radical changes have taken place all over America, in Texas as well. I have been in Texas repeatedly, I have been to his city. Lots of things are taking place down there that I am sure he is aware of, but maybe he forgot when he said there has been no desire for a change in segregation. Because changes have and are taking place.

He undoubtedly forgets that a very militant effort was made by outstanding white people and Negroes of Texas, not we damned Yankees from the North, to get Negroes admitted to the law school of the University of Texas. The Supreme Court of the United States has handed down a decision in that case and supported them.

The gentleman from Texas also probably does not know—or forgot, rather—that Negroes are voting in such vast quantities in Texas now that in the city of Houston, for instance, one of the Congressmen running there in July will be defeated or elected according to the Negro vote. There are between 30,000 and 40,000 registered Negro voters in Houston, Tex., where just 2 years ago there were not 1,000. Changes are taking place.

When the gentleman from Texas says that Negroes and whites will not serve together in the armed forces, then may I enlighten him and you: They have served and are serving on a nonsegregated basis right now in the Coast Guard and in the United States Navy. And our Navy is not any weaker. Our Navy is the greatest navy in the world, not only by virtue of its tonnage, but by virtue of the fact that men, irrespective of race, creed, or color, are serving together side by side. This they always did until the 1920's when the rules were changed, but now under liberal leadership the rules have again been changed and Negroes and whites are serving together.

May I say to him also that you may not have received many letters from Negroes in the South about this, but I will be happy to show you letters from Negro people in the South to me from your district saying that they would like to see a genuine people's democracy established in these United States, rather than a segregated one.

May I say, finally, that, yes; the majority do have rights, but the first right of a majority in a democracy is to see that all people, irrespective of whether they belong to the majority or the minority, are treated equal. That is what democracy is. Of course, if you do not believe in a democratic form of government you should not be here.

This amendment I have offered says that Negroes shall serve in all branches of the services of our Government without discrimination. I say that because during World War II the vast majority of the Negroes who were drafted were forced to serve in the Quartermaster Corps. There are Negro men today products of the schools of Texas and the other 47 States. They have been especially trained, they are equipped to serve in every branch of the armed services. If you will go back into the Army records, you will read there, according to the Army psychological tests, that where a Negro has been given the same opportunity that a white man has been given, his psychological test is the same and his efficiency rating is the same. In fact, Negro Alpha Beta tests showed a higher I. Q. of New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Ohio than whites of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana and Georgia.

This is only going to make America stronger, not weaker: if we give the Negro man an opportunity to serve in all branches of our services without discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments to the section close in 8 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO), there were—ayes 110, noes 14.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman offers a rather peculiar amendment. Let me read it to you:

> On page 3, line 2, after the period, strike out *"Provided further"*—

and so forth.

There is no such language in the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Insert.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says now he means "insert" instead of "strike out." That is all right, if that is what he meant. But I was just wondering if he is just as mistaken in his theory of life and as to how we should do things as he was in drawing that amendment.

He is correct when he says this measure is different than some things to which he made reference previously. He states, and he is correct, that under this legislation Uncle Sam goes out and grabs the young men. That is true.

And he grabs them with just as arbitrary a grip, just as securely and just as finally, as ever did a Hitler or a Stalin. When Uncle Sam grabs them, they go, and they fight when and where—and they will be fighting for what reason or for no reason—they will be fighting on the order of that superworld organization known as the United Nations, controlled by individuals who have no interest whatever in America, her people, or her future.

That is why this amendment should not be in there, or any amendment of this kind, because after Uncle Sam grabs them he would under the gentlemen's agreement mix them all up together, according to the gentleman's theory, and put them all in one place according to chance.

That gets back to my original argument. We fight better when we are doing the things we want to do and are fighting for the things in which we believe.

Now, I still believe, in my own ignorant way, that the Lord did create the heaven and the earth. I do not know of any other way to account for our existence. If God wanted us to be all of one kind, I think he would have made us all black or yellow or brown or white, any one of these four colors. Maybe there are a lot more, I do not know. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] shakes his head. I accept his statement. But, the ultimate objective of most of these people that advocate this sort of legislation is amalgamation of the races, and in that I do not believe, because I think the Lord tried to do a fairly good job, and I do not believe that these modern agitators—I will not call them rabblerousers, and I am not referring to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for I think he is sincere, but those who sincerely believe as does my good friend from New York—I do not believe they know any more about how the people should be colored or live than did the Lord. Maybe I am wrong about that, and maybe the Lord was wrong about that, but that is the way he left it. Some black, some brown, some yellow, some white, some tall, some short, some fat, some thin. My experience tells me, whether it is with plants or animals or flowers or human beings, when you begin to cross them indiscriminately and mix them up, the ultimate result, while it may be an improvement in some strains, the strains that are better will go down. I think an examination of the history of those countries where we have had that sort of thing will show that while perhaps the brown or the yellow or the colored race has been advanced in some way by association and intermarriage and interbreeding with the whites, the over-all result and the average on the whole has been lower and downward. That is why I do not believe in this kind of an amendment, for while it says nothing about intermarriage that is usually where the thing ends.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman does not understand my amendment. My amendment does not advocate social equality. We are dealing with a draft bill, and it is going to be of importance. It would be very interesting if that did occur, though.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. The gentleman said "interesting," did he? It might be. But, there are many things that are interesting that are not for the good of the human race; many, many things, and I do not want to try some experiment which I honestly believe will lower the standard of our people just because it is interesting.

I know that none of these amendments on its face deals either with social equality or with intermarriage, but I do remember many, many previous discus-

sions and arguments which began with the proposition that there should be no denial of opportunity because of race, creed, color or state of origin, and to that proposition I wholeheartedly subscribe.

But that was never the end of the argument. Well do I recall that when, some years ago, a special committee of this House had before it Mr. Ross, who was then the head of President Roosevelt's FEPC, witness after witness appeared and, while, in the beginning, the controversy was all over the question of equality of opportunity in employment, almost always, either directly or openly or subtly and by implication, the advocates of the FEPC were insisting upon social equality and intermarriage of the races.

There should be not only equality of opportunity as to employment and education, there should be opportunity for equality of social intercourse. But never should there be an attempt made by law to force upon either the individual or any group the society, social intercourse, with those with whom they do not choose to associate.

The Constitution does guarantee equality of opportunity, but it also guarantees the right of every man to seek his own happiness through the choice of his own associates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 19, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and thirty-one, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to me that serious consideration can be given to a peacetime draft proposal at this time in view of the information that we have. If our information is incorrect, then we should be properly advised. No such enlightenment has been forthcoming from the proponents of this measure. Aside from the fact that we generally understand that conditions throughout the world are unsettled, we are called upon to act in hysteria and further disrupt our own economy. We are told that a peacetime draft is necessary in order to bring our armed services up to the necessary strength. We are asked to accept this in spite of the fact that we know that such a statement is not true. There are many present here today who heard me personally ask Major General Vandenberg of the Army Air Force whether or not they were able to obtain all of the men they need by voluntary enlistment. Those who were present heard the General reply that they had a backlog of applications and that they had stopped recruiting. You know that the Navy and the Marine Corps do not want and do not need this peacetime conscription. You are all aware of the fact that the physical standards of the Army have been raised as well as the mental requirements. You are aware of the fact that the Army, for which this peacetime conscription is primarily intended, clings to the old-fashioned recruiting methods.

The armed forces need men trained for various duties. We have learned that these men can be better trained in civilian life and in private industry than they can be trained in the armed forces. Carpenters, electricians, machinists, mechanics of all kinds, are needed in modern warfare. By leaving these men in their civilian occupations they can perform useful service in providing the things we need, and at the same time they are being trained better than they could be if they were inducted into the Army. We are going into a period of uncertainty for the young men of this country and their families and upset homes and lives in a manner unprecedented. We are losing sight of the fact that employers will be very reluctant to hire and train men within the draft ages, because of the uncertainty which will exist due to the possibility of these men being inducted into the armed services after they are brought up to the point of productivity. We have all kinds of shortages, including an acute housing shortage, and yet we are considering taking men out of industry when there already exists a shortage of building mechanics. The whole thing just does not make sense.

As many of you know, I am thoroughly in accord with the view that we should maintain our Military Establishment. I have voted for all the appropriations which would provide for an adequate Army, Air Force, and Navy. I served voluntarily in two World Wars in the Navy and have never been obliged to register for the draft. I have a son who is a corporal in the Army Air Forces, having enlisted voluntarily 2 years ago. My ancestors came to this country hundreds of years ago to get away from Old World regimentation. The principles on which this country were founded, which have made it great and strong, will be violated by the enactment of this type of legislation. I am thoroughly opposed to it, and it is my belief that the American people are opposed to it. I hope that this peacetime conscription proposal will be defeated.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLGER: On page 3, line 7, after the words "between the ages of" strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty-one."

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, while I subscribe entirely to the magnificent statement made by the gentleman who preceded me, I am not offering this amendment as a dilatory tactic. I am offering it because I believe it is just. If we are going to have conscription, we are not morally in a position to reach down and get the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old boys who ought to be in school, and whose education has not been finished. They cannot vote. They cannot say a word. When we pass this law, we take that 18-year-old boy who ought to be in school of all places in the world and for 2 years at least we command him to surrender his liberty in the name of conscription and learn to carry on war in peacetime.

Let me read you the section which refers to this. It sounds like a condemnation, something like a sentence pronounced by a judge for cause—and this is not for cause, and when applied to a person under 21 years of age, it is taking advantage of one who is helpless in his own right.

The bill reads as follows:

Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States—

Oh, that 18-year-old boy. Oh, that 19-year-old boy. If you would let me draw up another amendment, I suspect I would make the age from 40 to 68, and then then let us see how it would feel to be conscripted for 2 years and taken out of our pursuits in order to make a useless gesture, when we have all the implements of war, if they would apply them, that a nation can have in times of peace.

The bill reads further:

who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 31.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a period in my opinion in the life of any young man that is so important that he remain at home. They say he will go to college. Yes; but he can come back home on weekends when he wants to, and his mother and his daddy can see him and ask him every day that they please, how he is. There is no valid force in putting forth such an argument as that. I say to you that between the ages of 18 and 21 we have no right to reach below that age of 21, especially, and demand that they give 2 years of their lives to this conscription in time of peace.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. How many men would be available under this amendment or under this bill?

Mr. FOLGER. I am not able to tell the gentleman that. I am not figuring on the total number of cogs in the machine. I am talking about humanity and human rights and fairness toward the people who are helpless and who are in our hands.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. Is it not a fact that in World War I no one was drafted under 20 years of age?

Mr. FOLGER. I do not remember about that. But I do remember a bill was offered which I am sorry that I did not vote for, and that was to require that they must be 21 years of age before they are drafted.

I am going to offer an amendment to section 4, which reads:

> Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, except those aliens who have not declared their intention to become citizens thereof, who is between the ages of 19 and 26 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this act, shall be liable for service in the armed forces of the United States.

Do you believe that is fair? Do you believe that is the part of the exposition of manhood, to go down and say to the 18-year-old boy, "You must register, and when you shall have registered, when you reach the age of 19 years, by proclamation of the President, under the authority granted in this act of Congress, you shall be taken by the nape of the neck out of your school, away from your home, at a crucial time in your life, and put in 2 years of military service"? It is not right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered seeks to strike out the figure "18" and insert the figure "21" in that provision of the bill which provides for registration. The argument that was made in support of the amendment had to do almost entirely with the question of the service of 18-year-olds. There is no proposal that the 18-year-olds shall be called for service. There is no point in not registering them at 18, because, of course, it is an expensive proposition to carry on the registration. It permits the orderly registration, and a sufficient period of time for the records to be prepared. So that as to the 18-year-olds and 19-year-olds on registration, the arguments made do not apply to the amendment offered.

Of course, we have to be a little practical. We continued to induct men until October 1946. At that time we were inducting them at 19, having gone up from 18. During the war we inducted a great many 18-year-olds. So that when you come to the group above 21 years of age, unless you want to get into the veterans who have already fought a war, put in a long period of active service, unless you want to take married men and do away with your deferments, you will not be able to get any men under this bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Why did the committee put in the bill that they would draft men who were over 21 years of age, then?

Mr. KILDAY. Because there are in that group some men, as the gentleman knows, having been in the service of the country, who were released from duty with less than 12 months of service, and who will, under this bill, be channeled into the Reserve organization.

Mr. SMATHERS. But the great reservoir who have not had service, are in the group under 21?

Mr. KILDAY. They are in the group under 21, because up until October 1946, those men were inducted. I have available the figures for each age bracket.

The 19-year-old group has 692,400; 20-year-old, 528,200. Then, when you come to 21, you drop down to 307,800. So that you immediately lose out of your pool 1,100,000 men 19 years and over. Of course, there is no convenient age at which to do this service, but it is far more convenient if it could be made in that period immediately after high school, when the time can be taken out before entering college. The average boy comes out at 18. Then he is in a position to arrange his affairs so that between his high-school training and his college training he can put in this service and get it behind him.

The bill has been worked out with careful thought and intention as to what is available in the pool. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Would this not include a great many of the boys who are in college?

Mr. KILDAY. If he is in college he can complete the year for which he is enrolled.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. But only the 1 year.

Mr. KILDAY. He gets only the year in which he is enrolled. As I said, there is no convenient time. I fully appreciate the disruptions which will come here and that there would be no time when it could be done with perfect convenience; but I think it is the best that we can do in working on a personnel problem as complicated as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 6401, which will provide us with the necessary manpower to adequately care for the needs of our national defense program and which makes provisions for industrial mobilization.

After every war we resolve that there shall be no new war, but we also resolve that if war does come in the future as it has in the past, we shall be prepared. The changed conditions of modern war—bacterial warfare, speed of movement by air, and the atom bomb—make it a certainty that mistaken calculations in regard to being prepared for national defense will be fatal to America and possibly to the world. The Eightieth Congress must make this calculation.

One of the most important cogs in this great wheel of national defense is manpower. Some people say we have the atom bomb, the best planes in the world, the best guns, and need not worry about manpower. I say that the strength of this country will be determined more by the strength of the men handling the weapons of war than by the guns, bombs, and planes. I am not happy and it will not be with pleasure that I vote for the selective-service bill. The idea of a peacetime draft or conscription law is obnoxious to me, and I believe it is to most Americans. However, I shall vote for the bill because under the circumstances it appears to be the wise course to follow for the protection and security of our country.

Mr. Chairman, our country was caught unprepared in two great world wars. We can only guess as to what might have happened if we had been prepared. It is my personal belief and the belief of many other people that had we been militarily strong, both wars would have been avoided. Every sensible God-loving and God-fearing person in this world knows that this country has led the world in the battle for peace. We continue to assume the responsibilities of this leadership.

Our preparedness at this time can very easily result in a great saving of American lives, resources and money in the future. Near the end of World War II we were spending $90,000,000,000 a year to carry on the war effort. If preparedness shortened a future war by 6 months as no doubt it would, the saving for this period alone would be tens of thousands of lives and $45,000,000,000. If preparedness should prevent war—as we hope it will—the savings would be incalculable.

I am supporting the selective-service bill in the interest of peace and not to prepare us for war. I would rather have training without fighting than fighting without training. General Eisenhower has stated:

> In terms of the larger issue of victory or defeat comparison is not possible, because in modern war it is not possible to win without training. But in the more personal matter of the individual's chances for survival, I should say that the trained combat soldier has at least three times the chances of the untrained to live to become a veteran.

Some have said that the Selective Service Act will not frighten Russia. As far as I am concerned, it is not intended to frighten Russia or any other country. However, we do want to demonstrate to the world that we are prepared and our national defenses are strong. Surely everyone will admit that those who speak with authority and possess the power to back up what they say wield more force and influence than do those who talk, boast, or threaten without the power to back up their statements.

I believe the passage of this bill will assure the world that we are going to play our part in the world, that we are going to win the battle for peace. The people of the world who want peace and freedom will be pleased and will welcome the passage of this selective service bill. The aggressor nations of the world will stop, look, and listen for a long time before making further aggressive moves.

Mr. Chairman, again quoting from General Eisenhower, this great leader said:

> I am intimately familiar with the attitude of the leaders of the other nations to the armed forces of the United States. It is my personal opinion that the greatest single motivation force for world peace is the organized military potential of the United States.

Former Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Joseph G. Grew, said recently:

Without preparedness, diplomacy (our first line of defense) is bankrupt. The extension of the selective service draft is plain common sense.

The armed services have an authorized strength at the present time of 1,736,882, but they have been able to secure only 1,380,888 volunteers for military and naval duty. We have been unable to provide the necessary manpower through volunteer methods.

The Armed Services Committee has decided after extensive hearings that the combined strength of our armed forces should be 2,005,882. This figure was agreed upon after considering the advice of the best authorities we have in the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the report of civilian commissions which studied this question. Adequate strength of the armed forces is determined by considering these three important factors: First, the international situation; second, capabilities of any possible enemies; and, third, evident intent of governments of other nations.

The proposed law requires that those between the ages of 18 through 30 must register with local draft boards and those 19 through 25, unless deferred or exempted, are liable for induction for 2 years of service. Members of the medical profession are liable for service until age 45 with those deferred during the war and those educated at Government expense to be called first.

After 2 years of service the inductee must, first, take another year of active duty, or, second, stay in an organized reserve unit for 3 years, or, third, stay in unorganized reserves for 5 years or until age 35. A person liable for induction may volunteer for 2 years' service to permit his beginning the required period of service when it is most convenient.

Exemptions will be given Purple Heart holders, veterans with combat or 12 months' service, members of organized reserve units, and ministers and ministerial students. Deferments will be given ROTC students until graduation, essential workers, persons with dependents, high-school and college students. An inducted sole surviving son cannot be sent outside the United States and must be assigned noncombatant duty.

Two years of service is required for those inducted and this law will also require that those ROTC students who are deferred until graduation must serve 2 years active duty upon completion of college. However, the present selective-service bill provides that those entering the senior division of ROTC after enactment of this law must serve 3 years on active duty upon graduation. I am offering an amendment to reduce this period of active duty to 2 years as it will then provide for the same amount of service as we require of inductees and other ROTC graduates. I urge the Members to favorably consider this amendment.

My hope and prayer is that my sons, ages 11 and 12, and other young men of America will not have to face an enemy in combat like so many of us had to do. I am convinced that we must have selective-service legislation now which will provide us with the strength to make possible aggressors reconsider their plans to wage a war. In the event of another conflict, our sons will be much better trained and prepared to carry out their responsibilities as defenders of their country.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on this section close in 5 minutes, at which time it is the purpose of the Committee to rise.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. What was the gentleman's request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York requested that all debate on this amendment and this section close in 5 minutes, following which the gentleman stated that he would move that the Committee rise.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition; I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid this Congress will go down in history, a Congress of which I am a Member—as a Congress of hysteria.

Back in 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938 I was one of the strongest supporters of an all-out armament, all-out military training program. I was called a militarist and a warmonger back home, but I knew that America had to be prepared, for at that time we did not even have rifles to give to our boys. Today the situation is different; we not only have rifles but we have tanks, we have guns, we have boats, we have planes, we have even got the atomic bomb. It is a different situation.

They come in here and say, "Vote for a peacetime draft" and they throw it right at you.

I am not going to vote for any peacetime draft because we do not need a peacetime draft. If you really want to make America strong and keep her powerful then you can go right back to World War I when I was a student at high school and when I was taking the ROTC program at that time, and we students were obliged to take 1 hour of ROTC training every day. Then we had a little program during the recess period in which they trained us some more. It was a fine program. That program can be put into effect today. Start in your high schools. Give your high-school students an ROTC program. Have them out there 3 months in the vacation period and give them an intensive program of training. Have them out the following vacation period for 3 months and give them a further intensive training program, but do not disrupt, do not disrupt the educational program of our States. It is not necessary.

Who wants this draft? Who is asking for it? Why is it necessary? Why am I compelled to vote one way or another on this question when we are not at war and there is no reason for it? I will tell you who is asking for it. There are two men you can get rid of and you will not have to have a draft. Get rid of Mr. Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense, and get rid of General Draper, the Assistant Secretary of Defense. You get rid of the former president of the international bankers, Dillon, Read & Co., Mr. Forrestal, get rid of the vice president of the international bank of Dillon, Read & Co., General Draper, and you will not have anybody asking for a draft or wanting a draft.

Why do they want a draft? Because there is a big gold rush on. There is the gold rush of 1948, the gold rush for the Ruhr. It is greater than the gold rush of 1849 in California. There will not be as many people going in 1948 to the Ruhr as there were to California in 1849, but the amount of gold and the amount of money involved is far greater in 1948 than it was in 1849.

They are going over there to take over the Ruhr. Your big boys, your big international boys, are moving into the Ruhr, and the Ruhr is going to be owned by American bankers, not by Germans. Now, I have no love for the Nazis, everybody knows that. I have no particular love for the Germans, as such, but I do not believe that it is right for me to go in there or for American big business to join with the cartelists and monopolists, to go in there and do this dastardly thing. We will bring upon us another war in order to make these investments secure in the Rhur. They will tell you there are other reasons for this call for the draft, but I tell you there is no other reason except to have an army to protest those American investments in Germany.

Your boys will have to be drafted to go into Germany. To do what? To protect American investments in the Ruhr. Whose investments? The investments of my industrialists in Detroit? Oh, no. It is not going to be the investments of the industrialists of my city. It will be the investments of the big bankers, the international banking crowd.

Do you know what is happening in the automobile business today? The Fiat car of Italy is being sold all over Europe. Markets are being created all over the world for that car.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADOWSKI) there were—ayes 32, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, except those aliens who have not declared their intention to become citizens thereof, who is between the ages of 19 and 26 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this act, shall be liable for service in the armed forces of the United States. The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the armed forces of the United States for service in the manner provided in this act such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain manpower strengths of the respective armed forces not to exceed those authorized by section 2 of this act.

No person shall be inducted for service under this act unless and until he is acceptable to the armed forces for such service and his physical and mental fitness for such service has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States: persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the Air Forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.

No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for service under this act, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.

(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of this section shall serve for a period of 24 months, unless sooner discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, except sections 19 (b) and 22, the President is authorized, pursuant to requisitions submitted by the armed forces, to require special registration of and to make special calls for members of the medical, dental, osteopathic, veterinary, pharmacy, and optometric professions, who have not yet reached the age of forty-five at time of such call, in such professional categories as he shall determine, and persons called hereunder shall be liable for induction for not to exceed 24 months of service in the armed forces: *Provided*, That during the life of this act there shall be, in the Army, including the Air Force, and in the Navy, including the Marine Corps, a ratio to total active strength of not to exceed 5 doctors of medicine and 2 dentists per 1,000 men, 1 osteopath per 5,000 men, 1 veterinarian per 2,000 men, and 1 pharmacist and 1 optometrist per 3,000 men.

(2) In inducting persons pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President shall induct, in the following order of priority:

First. Those who participated as medical or dental students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the above professions, and have had no active duty as commissioned officers.

Second. Those who participated in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy and who have served on active duty as commissioned officers for less than 24 months (exclusive of time spent as intern).

Third. Those who are less than 35 years of age and have had less than 90 day's prior active honorable military or naval duty.

Fourth. Those who are over 35 years of age and have had less than 90 days' prior active honorable military or naval duty.

Fifth. Those whose total active honorable military or naval duty is less than 24 months.

Sixth. Others as prescribed by the President.

(d) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of 19 and 26 shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

(e) Each person who hereafter is inducted, enlisted, or appointed and serves for a period of less than 3 years in one of the armed services and meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, shall be transferred to a reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component until he attains the age of 35, or until the expiration of a period of 5 years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, and shall be subject to such additional service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law for such component: *Provided*, That any person who completes at least 24 months of service in the armed forces under subsection (b), and who thereafter serves satisfactorily on active duty in the armed forces under a voluntary extension for a period of at least 1 year, which extension is hereby authorized, or in an organized unit of any reserve component of any of the services for which he is entitled to receive pay for attendance at drill or equivalent duty for a period of at least 36 consecutive months, shall, in time of peace, be relieved from any liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such persons, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces in accordance with other applicable laws.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York (interrupting the reading of section 4). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of this section be considered as read and open to amendment tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of section 4.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 427 correcting the act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas a clerical or printer's error by omission of words appears in section 1 of Public Law No. 6200 amending the act of April 25, 1947, establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That section 1 of the act of April 25, 1947, establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park as amended by Public Law No. 6200 be further amended by striking out the period at the end of section 1 and inserting the following: ", are hereby dedicated and set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, and shall be known as the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to construct and maintain a road or highway through the park connecting with a State or Federal highway".

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "6200" and insert "620"

Page 1, line 5, strike out "6200" and insert "620"

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT HALL INDIAN RESERVATION PROJECT OF IDAHO

Mr. D'EWART submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interest of the Fort Hall Indian irigation project of Idaho, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture—exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration—for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur in Senate amendment No. 1, the only amendment in disagreement. This has the unanimous concurrence of the subcommittee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 3, strike out all after line 24 down to and including line 6 on page 4.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 679, Rept. No. 2361) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 680, Rept. No. 2362), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6263) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 681, Rept. No. 2363), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment, and no amendment shall be in order to said bill. At the conclusion of general debate, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 682, Rept. No. 2364), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6917) to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment, and no amendment shall be in order to the said bill. At the conclusion of general debate, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AIR PARCEL-POST SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 683, Rept. No. 2365), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6773, to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 595, Rept. No. 2366), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas it appears that current and anticipated shortages of petroleum products threaten the present and future economy and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such shortages must be considered in the light of the availability of other fuels and energy resources; and

Whereas, in order to deal effectively with the problem of making petroleum and other fuels available in quantities adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, it is necessary to formulate sound national policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy adequate to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, including recommendations for a national petroleum policy and the integration of such policy with policies relating to other fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; and for such purposes the committee shall study the current and future fuel supply and demand of the United States and shall study methods of encouraging needed developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report not later than the close of the present Congress. Such report may be made to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) Is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member;

(2) May utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies;

(3) May seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a full and correct ascertainment of the facts.

JOSEPH P. KAMP

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 495, Rept. No. 2367), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the citation heretofore voted by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1944, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., be, and the same hereby is, rescinded for the following reasons:

1. Said citation was not the legal act of the said committee for the reason that information necessary to said committee and to each member thereof for their consideration was withheld from them.

Certain of said withheld and necessary information was improperly deleted from the official printed record of the hearings without the knowledge of any member of said committee and, therefore, was not available to the members of said committee at the time they considered the matter and took action resulting in voting a citation for contempt.

Certain of other withheld and necessary information was denied to some members of said committee who were refused answers to specific questions about information available to other members of the committee. Some of this same withheld and necessary information was deliberately kept from the knowledge and consideration of a majority of the members of the said committee.

2. Said citation was not the legal act of the said committee for the reason that exhibits in evidence before the committee and necessary to said committee and to each member thereof for their consideration was withheld from them.

The said withheld necessary exhibits were illegally removed from the committee's files prior to the consideration of the matter by the committee and were not available to the members of the committee at the time they took final action resulting in voting a citation for contempt.

3. The said citation resulted in the indictment of the said Joseph P. Kamp, who was tried for criminal contempt of the Congress in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in December 1946.

On behalf of the defense, the court issued a subpena for one of the said withheld exhibits. Because the said withheld exhibit was not available in the files of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, where it legally belonged, having been removed without the knowledge of the committee or by the authority of the House, the defendant, the said Joseph P. Kamp, was prevented from presenting a full defense and therefore was denied a fair trial.

4. The said Joseph P. Kamp is again to be tried under the said indictment which resulted from the said illegal act of the said committee. The said withheld exhibit, together with the other committee exhibits, were delivered to a representative of the American branch of an international propaganda movement, and the former chairman of the said committee has unsuccessfully attempted to have the said withheld exhibits returned to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and has written to the said Joseph P. Kamp, * * * "We have made another effort to secure the memorandum you desire. We have not been able to get it." Therefore, the said withheld exhibit will again be unavailable and the said Joseph P. Kamp will again be unable to subpena this evidence in his behalf and will therefore again be denied his constitutional right to a fair trial.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a few moments?

Mr. POWELL. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. There was a gag placed on discussion this afternoon on one of my amendments. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to state that there is a veto message from the President of the United States which should be read to the House today, and also several enrolled bills which are of vital importance to many departments of the Government.

Mr. POWELL. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 714)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 6355, "Making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

This bill would provide funds for the next fiscal year for the Social Security Administration, the United States Employment Service, and some functions of the Public Health Service. A measure of this kind clearly should not be disapproved by the President except under unusual circumstances and for the most compelling reasons. Such circumstances are presented by the provisions of this bill which would transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

I believe that this transfer would be a serious error from the standpoint of the proper location of this important function of government. I believe also that this transfer is clearly substantive legislation which should not be included in an appropriation bill.

Over the past 3 years considerable study has been directed to the proper location of the Employment Service in the Government. It is apparent that a system of public employment offices to secure jobs for the workers of this country is directly related to the major purpose of the Department of Labor, which is "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States." It is equally apparent that it would be far less appropriate to place the Employment Service, together with its auxiliary Farm Placement Service and Veterans' Employment Service, in the Federal Security Agency, which is primarily concerned with matters of health, welfare, and education.

I am, therefore, firmly convinced that because of its intimate relationship to the functions of the Department of Labor the Employment Service should remain permanently in that Department.

To achieve this end, I transmitted to the Congress on January 19, 1948, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, placing the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor and transferring to that Department the Bureau of Employment Security, now in the Federal Security Agency. This reorganization plan was not accepted by the Congress, principally on the ground that no basic changes should be made in the structure of the executive branch until the Commission on Organization of the executive branch of the government has completed its studies and submitted its recommendations. This seems to me a reasonable viewpoint.

But in this bill the Congress has acted contrary to its own declared position, and has attempted to effect a far-reaching change in the organization of the executive branch without waiting for the Commission on Organization to report.

In fact this legislation, which is of such paramount importance to the interests of millions of wage earners and employers, and which is plainly substantive in nature, was passed by the Congress entirely without reference to or hearings by the legislative committees concerned with such matters. Neither the House Committee on Education and Labor nor the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was given an opportunity to consider the measure. Instead it was conceived by a subcommittee on appropriations and tacked onto an appropriations bill.

I do not believe that it is in the interest of good government that legislation of such importance should be enacted in such a manner. As I stated in December 1945, in withholding my approval from an appropriation bill which contained substantive legislation, "a matter of such grave importance as our public employment system deserves not only permanent legislation, but legislation carefully and separately considered. Issues of such a difficult and vital nature should not be dealt with as riders to appropriation bills." I note also that on March 4, 1946, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress recommended "That the practice of attaching legislation to appropriation bills be discontinued."

What makes this matter even more disturbing is that the present bill is another in a series of legislative actions stripping the Department of Labor of essential funds and functions. Last year the Congress removed the United States Conciliation Service from the Department and drastically slashed the Department's appropriations. To remove the United States employment Service from the Department would further weaken and demoralize it and reduce the entire Department to such a minor status as to raise seriously the question of the validity of its continuance as a separate Department.

I am convinced, therefore, that the provisions of this bill which would transfer the United States Employment Service represent unwise legislative action, enacted in an unsound manner.

For these compelling reasons I am returning the bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 14, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

By unanimous consent, the bill and message were ordered to be printed as a House document.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the veto message of the President on the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, be postponed until tomorrow and that it may be in order at any time tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief statement on social security.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain tables prepared by the Maritime Commission as part of the remarks he made this afternoon in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the bill H. R. 6401 under the 5-minute rule, I made some remarks under pro forma amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they be incorporated with my remarks made in general debate on the bill, and also to include therein certain extracts from Factory Management magazne.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. O'KONSKI) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles and extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a sermon by Rev. John Curry Walker, of Waterbury.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a speech by Hon. Harold E. Stassen.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the speech made by the President of the United States at Los Angeles yesterday.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS SPECIAL AND SECOND SESSION RECORD AND FORECAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, many of the problems which we faced on January 3, 1947, when the Eightieth Congress convened have been dealt with during the past 18 months, but other serious problems will remain unsolved as we adjourn to prepare for the coming Presidential election. A review of the work of this Congress and its record and an assessment of what is likely to face the 81st ieth Congress should prove useful information to all interested citizens.

I campaigned on a platform of international peace through cooperation within the United Nations, and domestic prosperity and stability based on an ever rising standard of living for all of the people of the United States.

FIRST SESSION RECAPITULATED

By the time the President summoned the Members of Congress back to Washington on November 17, 1947, the Eightieth Congress had written a good deal of legislation on the statute books. It had extended Federal rent control, and acted on labor, and relief for European countries like Greece, Austria, and Italy, tax reduction, unification of the armed services, Presidential succession, and had passed the important appropriation measures affecting literally hundreds of thousands of governmental activities. It had laid the groundwork for much of the action that has been taken during the second session of the Eightieth Congress. When the first session recessed on June 26, 1947, the Members dispersed to go home to their own districts to find out how their constituents felt about the momentous national problems confronting us. Other Members, including myself, took up committee assignments either in the United States or abroad. Everyone hoped that it would be unnecessary to return to Washington until the beginning of the new year.

THE SUMMER RECESS

As a member of the Subcommittee on the International Refugee Organization and the International Trade Organization of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I spent 8 weeks in Europe last summer visiting hundreds of DP camps, speaking to thousands of DP's and also to the men and women in the governmental and private agencies responsible for the care and resettlement of these people who had lived through terror and death sustained only by the hope that they would find a new life in a new land as soon as the shooting was over.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND THE SPECIAL SESSION

While I was visiting DP camps and studying the ITO, others of my colleagues were making other investigations in Europe, South America, Asia, and other foreign territories, too. More Congressmen went abroad last summer than at any other time in American history. I think this fact is of extreme importance because it highlights the paramount role that foreign affairs plays in our domestic and personal lives. Even before all of the Congressmen had returned to the United States and had analyzed their experiences and reported them to the country, the foreign situation had become so serious in terms of American policy that the President of the United States asked the Members of Congress to reconvene in November of 1947, in a special interim session to take action on a foreign-aid bill. This bill was designed to help the countries of western Europe avoid disaster and reject the grim alternative of the "police state" by providing them with enough food and other basic commodities to see them through until they could rehabilitate themselves economically, socially, and politically, fortify their democracy, and rebuild their resources and trade.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Preliminary work had already been started by what are now known as the 16 Marshall plan countries of Europe (Denmark, Austria, Belgium, France, Greece, Eire, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey). As we all know, they are called the Marshall plan countries because they developed a plan of cooperative economic action as a result of a suggestion made by Secretary of State Marshall at the Harvard commencement in June 1947. Secretary Marshall said at that time if the countries of Europe would cooperate and draw up plans to help themselves in a free and democratic manner, the United States would back them up with money, men, and materials.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, started hearings on the program for the Marshall plan early in November and carried on these hearings continuously for approximately 5 months.

For 6 weeks the Congress studied, debated, and finally passed an interim foreign aid program preliminary to Marshall plan aid, to meet the immediate needs of foreign countries faced with starvation and the prospect of fuel shortages during the winter months. The vote was overwhelmingly in favor of such a program. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, responsible for carrying this legislation through the Congress, I played an active part in writing this legislation which was so largely responsible for giving life and hope to the peoples of Europe in time to prevent them from plunging themselves and the United States into a new political and economic upheaval which could have led inevitably to war.

Today the European recovery program which was a blueprint for action only a few months ago, is a reality. The United States is appointing heads of mission to all of the ERP countries and the Economic Cooperation Administration is being built up in the United States, but 3 months ago it faced a hard fight. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I was one of the active participants in the mighty effort to legislatively implement Secretary Marshall's pregnant suggestion of June 4, 1947, and the monumental work of the 16 European nations who joined together to work for their mutual economic recovery. The final vote in favor of the European recovery program was gratifyingly large. I believe it will prove to be one of the really great achievements of American foreign policy as significant as the Monroe Doctrine in expressing our determination to have world peace.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PALESTINE

The European recovery program is but one example of the action that the United States has taken in the international sphere. The United States is actively working within the framework of the UN to achieve world peace, security, and prosperity. For example, as a result of action recently taken by the Congress, the United States is now a member of the World Health Organization, a proposal which we in the Committee on Foreign Affairs worked for and supported for months.

The UN has had to deal with many difficult issues, a very important one of which is Palestine. Last year during the

interim session we had good cause for gratification when the United States through the UN adopted the partition plan of the UN General Assembly on Palestine on November 29, 1947. It seemed possible then that bloodshed would be averted through this timely and decisive action by the nations of the world. Unfortunately, however, the action of the UN on this issue never was implemented. Almost as soon as the decision was made it was repudiated by the very countries which should have breathed life into it. Both as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as one who had made a tremendous effort to get justice in Palestine so as to establish the true Jewish national home there, I tried to make a constructive contribution toward the education of the other Members of the House who I knew would inevitably have to become concerned with this situation since it affected the peace and security of the United States as well as of the other members of the UN.

With 30 of my colleagues, who acted together on this issue, I kept in constant communication with the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States representative to the UN, on the Palestine issue urging that the United States actively work for the realization of the partition plan, the protection of the shrines of Christians, Moslems, and Jews, and peace in the Holy Land. When it became apparent that the UN could not and would not act swiftly enough to prevent the outbreak of war in Palestine, I united with my 30 colleagues in urging the lifting of the United States arms embargo in the Middle East which had been invoked by the President and which in effect was preventing only the Jewish people of Palestine from receiving arms to defend themselves, and not the Arabs, since it was an open secret that the Arabs were receiving arms and money from Britain to carry on a war of aggression for many months. I protested in speech after speech on the floor of Congress against this British double dealing and demanded that it be ended or that the whole United States policy of helping Britain be reconsidered decisively.

When the new state of Israel was proclaimed on May 15, 1948, I introduced legislation authorizing the appropriation of $100,000,000 so that the people of Israel could purchase military and other supplies to help them end the aggression against their territory, rebuild their shattered economy and realize the hopes and dreams that had been nurtured by the Jewish people for centuries. Recognition of the state of Israel by the United States which came almost immediately was the first real break in resolving the problem.

Now that there is a truce in Palestine I have continued to expose Britain's support of Transjordan's Arab Legion in its attack on Jerusalem in the effort to get Britain to atone for her actions by calling off the Arabs; and, second, I have pointed out that the truce cannot be used to appease the Arabs, but that Israel's independence, won by much sacrifice, and the boundaries established by the United Nations partition decision must be respected.

The Palestine situation demonstrated better than any other the present weaknesses of the UN as well as its potential power and effectiveness. Ever since its inception the UN has been plagued by excessive use of the veto and by vacillation instead of determined action of its member nations. The great tension that exists in the world today, especially between the two great powers of Soviet Russia and the United States (which is considered later in these remarks) had dwarfed and almost paralyzed the functioning of the UN. But on the Palestine issue both the United States and Soviet Russia were on the same side and still the new world organization was helpless to cope with the very threatening problem involving the peace of the middle eastern region but perhaps of the whole world.

REORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The enemies of the UN and the skeptics of international cooperation used the Palestine situation as the occasion for condemning the whole organization and for seeking a reorganization so drastic in character as to have destroyed it in the attempt to rebuild it. They based this demand also on UN failure in resolving the problem of control of atom bombs, or in settling the contentions between the United States and the U. S. S. R. As a result of the extensive hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the testimony presented by members of the State Department, especially Secretary Marshall and other well-informed witnesses, any precipitous action has been forestalled and serious and well-thought-out action will be taken by the Congress. I contributed to the discussion and resolution of the issue through participation in the Town Hall of the Air program on the Reorganization of the UN and countless other radio and platform forums, as well as during the open hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. One of the most effective steps taken by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has been the reporting of a bill on the UN, providing in addition to other things, a $65,000,000 loan to the UN so that it can build a permanent home on the site selected in New York City. I introduced the legislation for the loan in the House of Representatives.

THE PLIGHT OF THE DISPLACED PERSONS

These are fine people, skillful, productive, and anxious to work. About two-thirds of them from eastern Europe, of Catholic faith, about 10 percent from northern Europe, Protestant, and about 20 percent, from many parts of Europe, of Jewish faith. But all equally homeless and unhappy. They were faced with the prospect of spending years in almost the same concentration camps that had claimed their friends and families and imprisoned their souls and bodies; labeled DP camps, they were no less deadly to the morale and spirit of already martyred peoples than when they were known as concentration camps. Armed with the knowledge that this could prove to be one of the worst reflections on the record of our own and the other United Nations, I came back to the United States from our investigation determined to do everything I possibly could to eliminate the problem of the DP's. Swift legislative action by the Congress was indicated to open the gates of the United States to our fair share of the DP's, so that instead of displaced persons they could become productive new citizens in the United States and in other peace-loving, democratic countries.

So far the legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress is not nearly as complete as I had hoped for and worked for and effects a discrimination against one group in the DP camps which I consider fatal to its original purposes. The bill only provides for the admission of 220,000 DP's in 2 years instead of 400,000 DP's in 4 years, as did the Stratton bill. Also, it picks a date at which eligible DP's should be determined which discriminates most unfairly against the existing population of the DP camps, for it admits not the actual percentage of 23 percent but only about 3 percent of the DP's from Poland and eastern Europe of Jewish faith who escaped from the religious persecution of the months immediately following the war which had been left as a heritage by the Nazis. The only comfort we have left is the United States participation in and contribution to the International Refugee Organization, for which I worked so hard, and the inclusion in the DP bill of the substance of the legislation introduced by Senator IVES and myself early in 1947 to allow DP children who became orphans as a result of the war to enter the United States without regard to immigration quotas. The fight to eliminate discrimination in the DP bill must be continued.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

While in Europe last year I had the opportunity to review at Geneva the beginnings of the International Trade Organization. This organization contains the basis for future world economic cooperation which is the necessary foundation for international peace. Representatives of the United States and 19 other nations sat together at Geneva to catalog the problems that plague international trade and weaken the economic structure of individual peoples. They sought to create machinery capable of dealing with these troublesome problems and promoting international trade through the elimination of artificially created trade barriers.

Three months later as one of the United States delegates to the International Trade Organization conference in Havana, I again met with the draftsmen of the new ITO in Havana—representing 60 countries—and brought back to the Congress a report of the contribution that the United States delegates were making to the creation of this new organization. Although the United States has not yet formally ratified the new ITO charter, the way has been paved for doing so in the next Congress.

When the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act came up recently I supported and voted for the passage of a straight 3-year extension with no crippling restrictions and testified before the House Ways and Means Committee and

the Senate Finance Committee to that effect, I also spoke in the House on the debate to warn my colleagues of the dangers to American business if the program were emasculated in favor of protectionism over reciprocity. I am gratified that the Congress has seen fit to continue the RTA program for another year without the congressional veto, although I preferred a straight 3-year extension.

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

I have described at some length the action taken by the Congress in the field of foreign policy because the problems of world peace have lately overshadowed what are too, the pressing needs that our people face in the United States.

RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING

Our people have been vitally concerned with the problems of housing and rent control as a result of lack of construction during the war and the increase of families and marriages. The housing shortage became critical during the years when millions of American boys were living in foxholes and jungle huts dreaming of the day when they could return to the United States and live civilian lives in comfortable homes. Instead, when they returned they were confronted with the problem of finding any kind of shelter, decent or otherwise, at a price they could afford. The long-dreamed-of privacy that so many veterans had lived for during the war years turned into a cruel joke. Instead of living with his buddies, the veteran found himself living with his in-laws under difficult and overcrowded conditions, or spending much of his income and savings earmarked for other essential commodities and services on providing living accommodations, generally of an inadequate character, for his family.

As a veteran myself I have been very conscious of the problems faced by millions of veterans and their families throughout the country and I have worked diligently and ceaselessly for adequate rent control and housing legislation.

Congress passed a rent control bill again early this year. It was not as tightly drawn as I should have liked to see it, but we did manage to keep Federal rent control. I fought for better controls to get tenants the painting, decorating, and building maintenance they were entitled to, to prevent unfair evictions of tenants by landlords, and against across-the-board rent increases. I also warned all the people of my district not to be pressured into making the so-called voluntary 15 percent rent increases.

When it comes to housing, however, the story is not encouraging. Millions of Americans cannot afford to buy or rent houses built by private industry under existing costs unless they do so at the price of their standard of living. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Act, which I introduced in the House, was the legislation veterans and citizens looked to as a means to end the drastic housing shortage. It was the only comprehensive long-range housing bill up for consideration. It had been before the Congress for more than 4 years, in one form or another, extensive hearings had been held on it by both the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees, the Joint Committee on Housing which was created by the Eightieth Congress to make an exhaustive study of the housing situation, had supported its main provisions, including federally assisted low-rent housing, Government-supported research to reduce housing costs, slum clearance, and farm housing and it had twice been passed by the Senate.

Together with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman KENNEDY, and several other veterans representing all of the major veteran organizations, I sponsored a veterans housing conference which was held in Washington on February 29 and March 1 for the purpose of marshalling support and getting action on the T-E-W bill for the Eightieth Congress. More than 1,350 veterans from all parts of the country representing all national veterans organizations attended this conference. The response was immediate and encouraging. Many Congressmen who had recognized the need for action in housing and who had not understood the overwhelming interest that the people of the United States have in the T-E-W bill had their eyes opened, and it got many signatures on the discharge petition by which the bill could be brought up on the floor of the House.

Desipte the drive to bring the T-E-W bill up for action by discharge petition and the ceaseless efforts of those like myself in the Congress in behalf of the T-E-W bill, and although the bill was finally reported out by a majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee, it could not get action on the floor of the House. I pledged the House, however, that the fight for the T-E-W bill would continue and refused to compromise my position in support of this bill in any way.

OTHER DOMESTIC ISSUES—NATIONAL HEART DISEASE INSTITUTE

Housing is the country's No. 1 domestic issue, but the questions of health, education, social security, minimum wages, civil rights, have also demanded action by the Eightieth Congress. Few of these issues have been acted upon, yet it is very gratifying to me that after a year's work the Congress passed the bill H. R. 3792, which I introduced in June 1947 to create a National Heart Disease Institute within the Federal Public Health Service. There is no doubt in my mind but that heart disease, which is the Nation's foremost disease killer, will be dealt a body blow as a result of the research and clinical work that will be initiated as a result of this legislation.

FEDERAL YOUTH ASSISTANCE ACT

During the special session I introduced a bill to provide Federal financial assistance to State and local youth projects. In my own district of Washington Heights and Inwood in New York City, the problems of youth demand immediate attention if they are to be dealt with in time to prevent broken lives. An outstanding citizens' organization, Youth Aid, Inc., has been working there and doing a great job on youth problems, under President Wright, of the College of the City of New York, Anne Lee Jacobs, Professor Shulman, of City College, and other leaders. But it needs financial help. This bill has met with a tremendous amount of enthusiasm among those engaged in the fight against juvenile delinquency because it provides what has been lacking for so long, the funds to carry out the many excellent preventative youth programs which never get beyond the blueprint stage, because of the lack of funds to carry them out. The very crowded schedule of the Committee on Education and Labor has prevented the consideration of this bill during the Eightieth Congress. From the ever-mounting support that this bill is getting, however, I feel confident that the Eighty-first Congress will pass this or similar legislation.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Ever aware of the burden that the high cost of living has placed upon the people of this country and my constituents, I have been engaged in the effort to stabilize and bring down the cost of living. I have already mentioned the fight to maintain rent control. This was a principal effort in behalf of stabilizing the cost of living since rents normally constitute 20 to 30 percent of the family budget. But the high cost of clothing, food, and taxes as well as shelter demanded attention and I have tried in every way possible to meet these adversaries of a high standard of living head on. I voted against giving special treatment and a subsidy to the wool growers. I campaigned for food-conservation measures and succeeded in getting the House of Representatives to write such a provision in the interim-aid bill passed by the Congress in December 1947. I joined in the fight to eliminate taxes on oleomargarine. Together with Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, I sponsored a meat-rationing bill. Although the bill never got out of committee I believe that Senator FLANDERS and I accomplished a great deal by warning the meat industry against the same squeeze on the public of which they had been guilty in the spring of 1946. This action aroused a great deal of discussion and although the bill did not pass I believe the public opinion created was an important element in preventing a complete run-away of meat prices during the ensuing months.

When the controversial matter of tax reduction came up, I was guided primarily by the needs of the people of middle and low income in my district and all over the country to meet the high cost of living. As I said during the debate, "I voted for the reduction because the need of my constituents for some kind of help to meet the high living costs is so great that I feel as their Representative that I must vote for this bill with its imperfections rather than to accord them no help at all at this time." It is my conviction that the people of our district will be willing to increase taxes again if necessary, but they want the reduction now while we can afford it in view of the high living costs.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The problem of safeguarding the cherished American tradition of civil

liberties has loomed large on the congressional horizon during the second session of the Eightieth Congress. The report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights touched off a tremendous amount of discussion in this field. Legislation has been introduced to create a Federal FEPC, to abolish the poll tax, to make lynching a Federal offense, and to eliminate segregation in its many forms.

Together with other Members I introduced legislation to create an FEPC during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, but unfortunately no action has been taken on this measure on the House side and from all appearances nothing will be done on it during the rush to adjourn. But this is must legislation and I intend to work for its passage early in the next Congress.

The dilemma of how to cope with the threat of communism in the United States was crystallized during the debate on the Mundt-Nixon Subversive Control Act of 1948. This measure became one of the most thoroughly discussed pieces of legislation to come before the Eightieth Congress and even was the subject of a great radio debate by two Presidential candidates. I am in accord with those who believe that no stone should be left unturned in dealing decisively with any threat by subversive elements to American political and economic institutions. I had to vote, finally, against this measure because I believed with Governor Dewey and Senator Taft that the Mundt-Nixon bill did not accomplish the purpose we sought, but outlawed the Communist Party and I did not believe that forcing the Communist Party underground is a way of dealing with the Communist threat, but rather of increasing it. There is sufficient legislation on the books, if vigorously prosecuted, to deal effectively with those dominated by a foreign government who seek to undermine American institutions. The Senate has shown that it agrees, for the Mundt-Nixon bill is not even coming out of committee there. To strike a blow at totalitarianism with totalitarian weapons is to put a time bomb under the great American fortress of civil rights.

I have stood against efforts to overthrow the guaranties of our Constitution, realizing that these guaranties must protect all if they are to protect any. I showed my evenhandedness in this by voting to punish those guilty of acts against our laws regardless of their politics, hence I voted to cite for contempt Messrs. Eisler and Josephson who had refused to answer the questions of a congressional committee. Disturbed by the manner in which the Committee on Un-American Activities was handling witnesses where their reputation and character was at stake, I introduced by resolutions a plan to substitute for the House Un-American Activities Committee a new joint committee of the House and Senate to investigate all Communist, Fascist, or other extremist movements in the United States with the understanding that the committee would have rules of procedure which would give people whose character was on trial a fair opportunity to clear themselves.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

The whole question of veterans' rights and benefits has also been a major consideration of the 80th Congress. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs successfully sponsored through the Congress a bill increasing subsistence benefits from $65 to $75 for single veterans, $90 to $105 for married veterans, and $90 to $120 for veterans with more than one dependent.

This Congress took action to authorize the cashing of veterans' terminal-leave bonds.

Legislation has been enacted in connection with the disposal of war housing and to arrange for putting up barracks and other temporary structures for housing students attending schools and colleges under the GI bill of rights. I supported all this legislation and worked for it. I also was able to get some Government buildings put up at 187th Street and Amsterdam Avenue in my own district to help expand the facilities of Yeshiva University.

There was also passed by the House a bill to increase the allowances for dependents of disabled veterans and to help war widows and orphans. Also legislation was enacted to help with homes for paraplegics with Government assistance.

I believe that the Eightieth Congress has dealt with the most pressing of the veterans matters before it but there is still a tremendous backlog that will have to be taken up in the Eighty-first Congress.

FEDERAL AND POST OFFICE PAY RAISES

Another subject which deserves special attention is that of a pay raise for Federal and post office employees. The high cost of living has been especially hard on those who have been receiving incomes fixed by law despite the fact that the cost of living has skyrocketed during the last 2 years. The postal employees have been particularly handicapped because their basic salaries are lower than most other Federal employee pay schedules to begin with. I have consistently worked for and supported a $1,000 Federal and postal employee pay increase which would be realistic in terms of the present cost of living. A bill has now passed granting the postal employees a $450 annual pay raise, and other Federal employees an average $330 per annum increase. That is not enough, but it will help.

Some action has been taken, also, to help those Federal employees who have already retired through the enactment of the Stevenson retirement bill which increased the annuities of retired Federal employees by 25 percent or $300 a year, whichever was the smaller, made provisions for refunding retirement contributions of employees who worked at least 5 years and less than 10 years, and generally made more flexible the retirement age of Federal employees.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Every citizen will be giving the most serious consideration to the peacetime draft. It can only be justified if absolutely necessary in the interests of the Nation and on no other basis. People in my district will want to feel that the enactment of the draft at this time is not a measure in contemplation of war, but a measure to keep the peace. It must be tested, therefore, on the basis of its being an essential element in our foreign policy, which is a policy for peace. This policy consists of three parts: First, assisting in the economic reconstruction of the European democracies and other democratic nations provided that they do their best to help themselves and each other; second, strengthening the UN to make it what we want—a true world organization for preserving the peace; and third, full performance of our international responsibilities.

It is the implementation of this last point which would require selective service if we could not get otherwise adequate occupation forces in Germany, Austria, Trieste, Korea, and Japan. I voted against the bill because I did not believe that a sufficient case was made out that we could not get the necessary volunteer forces, so that we had to have a peacetime draft to fulfill our occupation obligations or to back up our foreign policy. If I thought we needed a draft right now I would have voted for it, but the Navy and Air Force appear to be able to do adequate recruiting, and only the Army is not getting enough men at this time. I believed additional measures should have been taken to recruit men for the Army before enacting a peacetime draft in the present international conditions.

It is estimated that the draft will call up about 200,000 men between 19 and 26 each year for 21 months' duty. There are restrictions in the law regarding the exemptions of veterans who have already served a year or more, those with dependents, and the deferment of young men attending schools or colleges until the end of the school year, those taking professional training, and others. It will be up to us as legislators to guard carefully against any dominance of the country by the military and to insure that civilians at all times shall dominate the military forces and the Federal Government, in accordance with American tradition. We showed our ability to do this even in war, and we should be able to do it just as well in peace.

The prize of peace, prosperity, and stability which the American people fought for at great sacrifice and which they thought they had won in 1945 still lies just beyond our reach, but with wisdom, responsibility, and generosity, we can go far during the next years toward really accomplishing the goals for which the recent disastrous war was fought. The 80th Congress made some good beginnings, and there are also failures and frustrations to point to. I believe that in the 81st Congress, as in the 80th, the nettling problems of foreign policy will again be in the forefront of our consideration, and that the people of the United States will also want action on the social issues which were passed over by the 80th Congress. Together, we, the people of the United States, will be building tomorrow as we

are today a country capable of greatness and of leading toward a united and peaceful world organized democratically for its own salvation.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE MAKING OF A CONGRESSMAN

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, yielding to the insistence and suggestion of many Members, I had prepared a revision of the 1947 revision of the making of a Congressman. It will be postponed until a later date and either be made by me or somebody else.

FEDERAL PAY BILL SHOULD CARRY FLEXIBILITY FORMULA

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, if permitted by the rule under which the Rees bills for a cost-of-living pay increase are to be considered, I shall offer an amendment to provide for a flexible formula based upon the cost-of-living index. This will not only achieve justice for Federal workers but will avoid maintaining inordinate salary levels if the need for a cost-of-living bonus should cease to exist.

My proposed amendment to H. R. 6917 is as follows:

On page 2, line 19, of H. R. 6917, amend by striking all of paragraph (b) and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) The additional compensation provided in section 1 shall be increased by $90 for each increase of nine points in the Consumers Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as of April 1948; and the additional compensation shall be decreased by $90 for each decrease of nine points in the Consumers Price Index as of April 1948. Such increase or decrease shall become effective on the first day of the month following the publication by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of such nine-point change in the Consumers Price Index."

The figure $90 is 25 percent of the temporary increase of $360, bearing the same relation to the total as 9 points bear to 36. The April 1948 index is 36 points above the July 1946 index and if the cost of living should decline to the 1946 level then a reduction to the salary level of that date when previous adjustments were made would be achieved in four steps. Further increases in the cost of living would be reflected in gradual advances in salary. It would be sound from the Government's standpoint because it would avoid heavy expenditures if not justified by the economic situation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. REGAN (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN) for today and tomorrow, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in our earnest desire to solve the housing shortage let us not lose sight of the preferential order of the importance of our housing problems. The veterans' problem is still the most acute, and its treatment must command our first attention until it is completely solved.

I would like to call your attention to the all-important fact that the preference in occupancy provided in the Housing and Rent Act, and the preference in occupancy provided under title VI of the National Housing Act is a mere sham and delusion unless the veteran is also provided with an effective preference in his attempt to finance his purchase. Today, only the GI bill stands to offer the veteran any such financial preference. It obviously means nothing to tell our veterans that they may have first call on new homes if they do not have at least equal financing resources to compete with non-veterans. But we all recognize that our young veterans who were called away from their jobs and their education during the war cannot be expected to compete on equal terms with those who stayed home and accumulated savings during the war years.

In a nutshell, if we hope to tackle our most important housing problem first, we must provide preferential home financing aids to veterans.

The so-called T-E-W bill fails completely to solve this all-important, first problem. The net practical effect of the combined provisions of that bill is to nullify and destroy the last vestiges of financial preference to veterans of World War II that still remain in the housing picture. To do so in the face of facts published by the Bureau of the Census, that as late as April 1947 there were 14 veteran families overcrowded for every 4 nonveteran families overcrowded, would be an unpardonable repudiation by the Congress of the obligation of their Government to those veterans. This is accomplished through devious twistings of statutes, the meaning of which is already so obscure as to preclude the Members of this Congress from taking time to appreciate adequately their significance. When hearings were held in the Senate on a bill containing similar provisions to title VI of the T-E-W bill, Gen. Omar Bradley, then the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, wrote in part as follows:

It is believed that the enactment of those sections into law would accomplish results immediately and positively prejudicial to veterans in that—

(1) The substantially increased advantages to lenders embodied in the proposed changes will channelize lending under title I and title II of the National Housing Act, and thus divert or stem the flow of credit now participating generally in lending under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, with the result that the veteran will be compelled to accept loans on terms substantially less advantageous to him than of the terms which govern the GI loan.

(2) They will stimulate the ability of nonveterans to compete with the veteran for the purchase of housing in the lower-to-medium-cost brackets. This will further inflate the price of new housing to the prejudice of each prospective veteran purchaser.

It might be further pointed out that those of the proposals which are designed to inject further credit into the single-family housing field seek to attack the housing problem from almost the sole angle at which it is at least deficient. There is general agreement that the supply of financing under present legislation is more than adequate. The real need is to supply more materials and more labor and to translate those factors into more building at lower cost. To approach the problem by providing additional stimulants to credit expansion may result in further price inflation.

The consequences that General Bradley correctly foresaw and feared are even more real and fearsome in view of the elaborated layering of credit support on credit support which is sandwiched into the various titles of the T-E-W bill.

The attention of the Members of this House is drawn to the fact that despite the lapse of the insuring authorization of title VI of the National Housing Act, builders are proceeding with new home construction on an unprecedented scale. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that in April of this year 90,000 new dwelling units were started, with prospects that in May the number may possibly reach the 100,000 level. In the face of such performance and on the record of prior months, it appears that the combination of conventional loans plus the GI bill and FHA's title II will attract and provide ample production credit to keep the home-building industry at full steam. The Federal Housing Administration has liberalized their valuation standards for homes built under title II so that for practical purposes builders have about the same benefits as under the old title VI.

Rather than a rejuvenation of title VI, which is available to veterans and to nonveterans as well, the critical need of our home-hungry veterans is for a distinct plan whereby they may help themselves and under which we may be assured that a fair proportion of our none-too-large supply of construction materials and labor will be available to them. Precisely such a plan, clear and simple of operation, has been provided in the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, H. R. 4488. This bill was reported out by the Veterans' Affairs Committee unanimously. I would emphasize this unanimous endorsement of the veterans' homestead bill after very extensive hearings, because it is in focal contrast to other recent developments in this field.

Accordingly, in justice to our debt to the veterans of World War II, I urge you again to give the most careful consideration to the provisions of the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, H. R. 4488. The bill has the wholehearted support of the American Legion.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the

following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 5524. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California;

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 5524. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; and

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 16, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1645. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for transfer by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1646. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of channels to Lake Ogleton and Walnut Lake, Anne Arundel County, Md., and Walnut Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., lying between Bay Ridge and Arundel-on-the-Bay, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 712); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1647. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a project designed by the Commodity Credit Corporation to stimulate and increase the production and procurement of copra and palm oil in the Netherland Indies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1648. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1649. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1650. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting volume 8 of the report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 713); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1651. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the conversion of two cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts between the United States Maritime Commission and the Permanente Metals Corp. to a fixed-price basis, and the subsequent settlement of the fixed-price contract; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6935. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on Voice of America broadcasts; without amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on investigation of the public housing authority at San Diego and Los Angeles; without amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3871. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6917. A bill to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia Municipal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 2353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State; with amendments (Rept. No. 2355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4928. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6916. A bill to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 2358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MICHENER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 56. Concurrent resolution welcoming the Inter-American Bar Association to the United States for its conference in Detroit, Mich., in May 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 2359). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 679. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6402, a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 2361). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 680. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6263, a bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2362). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 681. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6916, a bill to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 2363). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 682. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6917, a bill to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government; without amendment (Rept. No. 2364). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 683. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 6773, a bill to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2365). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 595. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2366). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 495. Resolution to rescind the citation for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2367). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth; without amendment (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 6923. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans to provide housing accommodations for families in the Vancouver-Portland area deprived of their homes as a result of the flood disaster; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6924. A bill to aid in the production of permanent housing in the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ARNOLD:

H. R. 6925. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Kahoka, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6926. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Milan, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6927. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Princeton, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6928. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Lancaster, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6929. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Memphis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6930. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Shelbina, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6931. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Kirksville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6932. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Edina, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6933. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Gallatin, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 6934. A bill to provide, in certain cases, that internal-revenue stamps may be affixed in foreign countries to tobacco products manufactured in such countries before importation into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 6935. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6936. A bill to provide for a temporary extension of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain limited-dividend corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6937. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to authorize the renewal for an additional 8 years of 5-year level-premium term policies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code for the purpose of providing a tax incentive for the production of additional rental housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6939. A bill to provide that certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, shall be pursued for vocational or occupational purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 673. Resolution to investigate the feasibility of making insured loans to students; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. Res. 674. Resolution providing for the further expenses of the studies and investigations conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 404, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Res. 675. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the Joint Committee on Housing for the purpose of concluding its business; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 676. Resolution to provide further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 298, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. Res. 677. Resolution for the relief of Evelyn Richardson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 678. Resolution authorizing the printing of the volume entitled "The Democratic Way and the Totalitarian Way" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6940. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Estella Wolfe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6941. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mark Wolfe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 6942. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Juana Mercado Valle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6943. A bill for the relief of Hector Luis Melendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6944. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Colon Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6945. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Ovidio Vazquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6946. A bill for the relief of Winston A. Brownie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6947. A bill for the relief of Daniel Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 6948. A bill for the relief of George Craciun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6949. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 6950. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Governali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 6951. A bill for the relief of George Nicholas Lyras and Angeliki George Lyras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2100. Mr. FOOTE presented a petition of 18,805 residents of Greater New Haven, Conn., urging the President and the Congress to call immediately for amendments to the United Nations Charter under article 109 to enable the United Nations to enact, interpret, and enforce world laws to prevent war, formally presented to Congressman FOOTE by the Greater New Haven Committee To Strengthen the United Nations, at the city hall in New Haven on June 14, 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we are again approaching Thy throne of grace through the old and familiar way of prayer which is always open to those who come with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Grant that this day may be glorious in the realization of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power, and in the assurance that we are serving our generation according to Thy divine will. May we carry on bravely in the high adventure of building a finer civilization.

Make us eager to have a large part in ministering to the needs of all who are finding the struggle of life so difficult and who are discouraged because of hardships and handicaps.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 15, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2223) to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta; and

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DONDERO, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. MCGREGOR, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. BLATNIK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.

The message further announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. HALE, Mr. MILLER of Connecticut, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. PRIEST were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PLOESER, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. MAHON, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. GORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. PLOESER, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. HENDRICKS, and Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of Freda Wahler;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Robert A. Atlas;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 5145. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor;

H. R. 5336. An act for the relief of Leon Moore;

H. R. 5339. An act for the relief of John Keith;

H. R. 5423. An act for the relief of E. Neill Raymond;

H. R. 6570. An act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki;

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation;

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations;

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer;

H. R. 5883. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6628. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and doc-

uments on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram just received from Allan B. Kline, president, American Farm Bureau Federation Board of Directors, urging early and favorable action on S. 2318, the long-range farm program measure.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 15, 1948.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation Board of Directors in session today in Chicago heartily commends the Senate on their apparent progress toward the passage of long-range farm program legislation. We earnestly solicit your support for prompt and favorable action on S. 2318, including Aiken amendments.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President.

RESOLUTIONS OF CUSTER COUNTY, NEBR., POWER DISTRICT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Custer County, Nebr., power district, at Broken Bow, Nebr., relating to power supply by the Bureau of Reclamation.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUSTER PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT, BROKEN BOW, NEBR.—REA PROJECT NO. NEBR. 83, CUSTER

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
County of Custer, ss.

I, Ivan D. Evans, secretary of the Custer Public Power District, do hereby certify that the resolution stated below is a full, true, and correct transcript and literal copy of a resolution passed by the board of directors at a meeting held May 26, 1948, as the same appears in the original minutes book, which is now in my possession and custody.

"Resolved, That this district request the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, and our Senators and Representative in Congress, to take all steps necessary to protect the interests of this district in any proposed allocations of Bureau of Reclamation power that would affect any distribution of power in the State of Nebraska and particularly in the territory this district serves or will serve as an REA project.

"Further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator BUTLER, Senator WHERRY, and Congressman MILLER, and also the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, Washington, D. C., and Denver, Colo."

Dated this 14th day of June 1948.

[SEAL] IVAN D. EVANS,
Secretary.

CUSTER PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT, BROKEN BOW, NEBR.—REA PROJECT NO. NEBR. 83, CUSTER

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
County of Custer, ss.

I, Ivan D. Evans, secretary of the Custer Public Power District, do hereby certify that the resolution stated below is a full, true, and correct transcript and literal copy of a resolution passed by the board of directors at a meeting held June 12, 1948, as the same appears in the original minutes book, which is now in my possession and custody:

"REQUEST FOR POWER SUPPLY BY THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Custer Public Power District hereby request that the Bureau of Reclamation include in its plans to construct a 115-kilovolt transmission line to North Platte, Nebr., sufficient energy and substation capacity to supply the initial and ultimate wholesale power requirements of this district.

"Further resolved, That inasmuch as the Bureau of Reclamation has plans for hydroelectric and irrigation development in the Middle Loup River Basin within the project area of this district, that we urgently request the Bureau to make a full study of the desirability of extending their proposed North Platte transmission line on to the load center of this district, which load center would be immediately adjacent to the transmission lines that the Bureau would construct to interconnect their proposed hydroelectric plants in this area.

"Further resolved, That the Bureau of Reclamation be requested to furnish this district copies of their standard 'if and when' wholesale power contract containing the applicable terms, conditions, and rate schedules for customers such as this district.

"Further resolved, That if such contract is found satisfactory by the board of directors, that favorable action in regard to same be taken. The foregoing action being subject to the approval of the Rural Electrification Administration."

Dated this 14th day of June 1948.

[SEAL] IVAN D. EVANS,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2524. A bill for the relief of Carl Plowaty and W. J. Plowaty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1712).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2849. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1734);

H. R. 6162. A bill to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1709);

H. R. 6507. A bill to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level-premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1710);

H. R. 6808. A bill to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1711); and

H. R. 6818. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting; without amendment (Rept. No. 1727).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old); without amendment (Rept. No. 1716);

S. 1691. A bill for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1717);

S. 1982. A bill for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1718);

S. 2382. A bill for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1719);

S. 2662. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1720);

S. 2709. A bill for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1721);

H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Chester O. Glenn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1729);

H. R. 1733. A bill for the relief of G. C. Hedrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 1730);

H. R. 2193. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Graham; without amendment (Rept. No. 1722);

H. R. 2696. A bill for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1731);

H. R. 4199. A bill for the relief of George Haniotis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1723);

H. R. 4516. A bill for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1732);

H. R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Dimitri Petrou; without amendment (Rept. No. 1724);

H. R. 5040. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1733); and

H. R. 6184. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1725).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2096. A bill to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1705); and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1706).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2339. A bill to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 1707); and

S. 2677. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air mail field railway post offices; without amendment (Rept. No. 1708).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 6634. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea; without amendment (Rept. No. 1735).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2810. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1713).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 6633. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1714).

By Mr. MALONE, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 2667. A bill to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey; with amendments (Rept. No. 1726); and

S. 2831. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas and to provide emergency aid, including aid for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities in such areas, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1728).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2705. A bill to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1736);

S. 2726. A bill for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1737);

H. R. 1734. A bill for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1738); and

H. R. 6428. A bill to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1739).

By Mr. MALONE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2756. A bill to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1741).

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3999. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders; with amendments (Rept. No. 1740); and

H. R. 4044. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1742).

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 262), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress $5,000 in addition to the amount and for the same purpose specified in Senate Resolution 120, agreed to July 26, 1947.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2872. A bill for the relief of Julio Lafitte; and

S. 2873. A bill recording the lawful entry for permanent residence into the United States and authorizing the naturalization of Ellen Rodriguez Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2874. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain real property at Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., to the custody and control of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

S. 2875. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2876. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, part III; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2878. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 18, between lines 14 and 15, to insert the following:

"BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Education of Indians: For an additional amount for education of Indian pupils in the Winnebago Public Schools, District No. 17, Winnebago, Nebr., fiscal year 1948, $9,055.90."

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF ALASKA RAILROAD—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. ECTON) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2326) to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5710) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill S. 2318, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 18, after line 14, insert: "For payment to the following named contractors in the following designated amounts in full settlement of their claims, legal or equitable, of any nature whatsoever arising out of or connected with the notice by the United States Reclamation Service of the exhaustion of funds for payment of contractors earnings in connection with the construction of the Friant-Kern Canal, Calif., Peter Kiewit Son's Co., $186,195.93; Arizona-Nevada Constructors, $348,867.62; Morrison-Knudsen, Inc., and M. H. Hassler, $217,618.47; Bechtel Bros.-McCone Co., $32,018.[illegible] in all, $794,699.93."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6935 making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of Freda Wahler;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Robert A. Atlas;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 5145. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor;

H. R. 5336. An act for the relief of Leon Moore;

H. R. 5339. An act for the relief of John Keith; and

H. R. 5423. An act for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6570. An act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2239, to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 2 of said Senate engrossed amendment, after the word "certified" insert "by the Governor of the State in which the property is situated and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HOMER FERGUSON,
EDWARD J. THYE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

REVERCOMB-WEST VIRGINIA PLAN FOR VETERANS

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain letters, statements, and supporting material pertaining to the Revercomb-West Virginia plan for veterans, which appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSING PROGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE JOURNAL

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Housing Progress," published in the Providence (R. I.) Journal of June 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN H. BANKHEAD

[Mr. SPARKMAN, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of John H. Bankhead, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE POLISH PEOPLE BY SENATOR BROOKS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech in tribute to the Polish people delivered by him June 6, 1948, in Humboldt Park, Chicago, Ill., under the auspices of the Polish National Alliance, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SILENT CURTAIN SEPARATING AUSTRIA FROM GERMANY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Compassion Inn," as told to Margaret Pearson by Ulrich Haussman, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHILDREN'S FUND

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate for a moment. Last night, or perhaps it was this morning, the question was before the Senate on the European recovery appropriation bill relative to the Children's Fund, and the reduction of the provision contained in the House bill, from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000. Last night I voiced, most inadequately, my disapproval of the Senate amendment. I had not had time to think about it fully, but I thought then that a grave mistake was being made by the Senate. I was disturbed about it, Mr. President, and even after the long hours we had been in session, I did not rest too well last night, because I could not help but think of the circumstances and conditions of the people in the eastern countries of Europe, the people behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, they are not Communists in large part. The people themselves are liberty loving. Their desire for liberty today is greater than ever, because they are living under the tyrant's heel. They want the kind of life we have. They look to America. We are spending millions upon millions of dollars in carrying our way of life to the people behind the iron curtain, and their governments, and the government of the Soviet Union, are combating our efforts with every kind of propaganda. When the word goes out that the Senate of the United States has reduced the sum which was allowed by the House from $60,000,000 to the pitiful sum of $20,000,000 for the care of little children in those countries, children who themselves are our hope for the future of democratic life in the very countries behind the iron curtain, I know it will be seized upon and used against us in all our efforts in those countries.

It was said last night that it makes no difference; that propaganda will be used against us anyway. That is quite true. But every bit of true ammunition we give to be used against us makes that propaganda more effective and more deadly.

So I rose again this morning only to express my even stronger and firmer conviction on the subject, and my hope that the conferees on the part of the Senate will see the situation as it really is and will recede from the position taken by the Senate, and permit the appropriation for the Children's Fund to remain at $60,000,000.

TIDELANDS LEGISLATION — TELEGRAM FROM GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent to several Senators by a number of governors relative to the tidelands legislation.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT,
Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senator GUY CORDON,
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senator HOMER FERGUSON,
Senator ALBERT W. HAWKES,
Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN:

The Governors' conference being on record as favoring the submerged lands and tidelands legislation now pending in the Congress, and this being a matter of vital concern to the States as it affects the fundamental rights of the States, and the Supreme Court having in its opinion clearly indicated that the Congress has the right and power to determine the national policy involved, and it being generally considered that the Congress at this session would pass upon this legislation before irreparable damage is done, and the House of Representatives having some time ago overwhelmingly passed this legislation, we respectfully urge that it be given priority on the agenda of remaining legislation to insure that action be taken upon it by the Senate before adjournment.

Horace A. Hildreth, Maine; Dwight H. Green, Illinois; C. A. Robins, Idaho; Frank Carlson, Kansas; Earl Warren, California; Alfred E. Driscoll, New Jersey; Robert D. Blue, Iowa; Walter W. Bacon, Delaware; Luther W. Youngdahl, Minnesota; Kim Sigler, Michigan; John H. Hall, Oregon; Thomas E. Dewey, New York; James H. Duff, Pennsylvania.

"THE LITTLE MAN" ALSO HAS SOME TARGETS—ARTICLE BY JOHN W. OWENS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled " 'The Little Man' Also Has Some Targets," written by John W. Owens, and published in the Baltimore Sun of June 16, 1948. It is an article of challenging pith and moment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE LITTLE MAN" ALSO HAS SOME TARGETS

(By John W. Owens)

Whether or not Mr. Truman has made lasting gains on this tour of the country nobody can say, but there is not much doubt left that he has done rather well by himself. The reason is not far to seek. Mr. Truman turned the tables.

Everybody had got into the habit of speaking of the President as an average man and many had come to speak of him habitually as a little man. In Congress, condescension often was unconcealed. What nearly everybody forgot was that this Republican Congress, which has been bedeviling Mr. Truman, is not overstocked with intellectual giants. For that matter, the Republican Presidential race is not overstocked with intellectual giants. There is no lack of targets on the Republican side. The "little man in the White House" put on his hat, went into the country and began to shoot. From time to time he placed his shot on a target. This, of course, does not overnight project Mr. Truman as a great statesman. But it does bring things into better proportion for Mr. Truman's benefit. It does direct attention to the fact that under the Dome of the Capitol is a considerable number of important figures who certainly need not be accepted as great statesmen.

Moreover, the fight itself makes an appeal. Mr. Truman has been politically flat on his back. Flat on his back, he found the stamina which is a prime quality in his make-up. In politics, few things are more appealing—for the moment anyway—than the sight of a mild, good-tempered man who comes up fighting in circumstances which would break the hearts of most of the tough guys.

If one stands off at a little distance and looks at the scene, one may sometimes marvel that the Republicans can be topiofty with Mr. Truman and his mistakes.

Take this question of aid to Europe under the Marshall plan. As a concept it is comparable to the lend-lease plan evolved by Mr. Roosevelt. Each was the work of bold imagination in dealing with international conditions beyond precedent. Lend-lease served mightily in war to keep this Nation's friends on their feet. Thus it served a cause which this Nation believed to be the cause of humanity. At the same time, it helped to guard our welfare while we were trying to find our way and our policy. Aid to Europe under the Marshall plan is designed in the postwar period to keep this Nation's friends on their feet. In keeping this Nation's friends in Europe on their feet, it is designed—according to our kind of democratic faith—to serve the cause of humanity. At the same time it is designed to preserve our national defenses by holding outposts during the months or years in which we move toward some sort of settlement with Russia.

This Marshall plan of aid to Europe—on a scheduled, sustained basis—won the instant support of the large majority of men and women in this country who are concerned in the promotion of law and order in the world. It won their support in its first outlines and it won their support in its patiently detailed structure. It came to Europe as a beacon of salvation. Almost from the hour that it was announced some checking of the process of disintegration could be seen. Winter relief for some nations in the west of Europe became necessary last autumn, and winter relief may have saved the instant situation. But it was the prospect of scheduled, sustained aid in rehabilitation as well as in relief that steadied Europe in the touch-and-go months of the winter and early spring. So clear was the case for the Marshall plan that Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dewey supported it outright and Mr. VANDENBERG led the fight for it in Congress.

And who produced this massive plan for the preservation in Europe of our kind of democracy and our kind of freedom? Secretary of State George C. Marshall. Who appointed George C. Marshall to be Secretary of State? "The little man in the White House." Who has supported Secretary Marshall full and fair, through thick and thin? "The little man in the White House." And who sniped at the plan, who dawdled over the plan? Old-line Republicans in both branches of Congress. There was so much sniping, so much dawdling that but for the fidelity of ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG—aided by the scare in the Italian elections—old-line Republicans might have fatally damaged authorization of the plan. And who in late days has been trying to meat-ax the appropriation to carry out the plan—endorsed as it is by three of the four leading Republican candidates for President? Who, indeed? You know the answer. Old-line Republicans in Congress.

Let "the little man in the White House" make it a fight. The mistakes are not all at his end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

OMINOUS IMPLICATIONS OF THE TARIFF COMPROMISE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. TYDINGS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Ominous Implications of the Tariff Compromise," published in the Baltimore Sun of today. The article deals with the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMINOUS IMPLICATIONS OF THE TARIFF COMPROMISE

The vote in the Senate on the renewal of the reciprocal trade-agreements program was 70 to 18. But the size of the majority in favor of it gives a false impression—23 of those 70 favorable votes were cast reluctantly by Democrats compelled to make a choice between renewal of the trade-agreements program on a weakened basis and no renewal at all.

The attack on the program started in the House of Representatives, which passed a renewal bill in a form calculated to cripple the whole program. The net effect of the House bill, if it had become the law, would have been to throw the whole business of tariff making back into Congress, and thus to revive all that log-rolling and back-scratching which were notoriously characteristic of tariff making for so many years. This evidence of Republican hostility to the program, this outburst of old-fashioned protectionism, was reflected in the Senate. But under the leadership of Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN a compromise was finally worked out which got the approval of the Senate.

The compromise eliminated the worst feature of the House bill—that which would have restored the power of Congress to veto any changes in tariff rates under the program. But the compromise renews the program for 1 year only instead of 3; and it contains certain provisions which will clearly handicap the President in tariff negotiations.

The Senate compromise, therefore, is not one which can be greeted with enthusiasm by those who look upon the reciprocal trade-agreements program as an important element in our foreign policy. The best that can be said of it is that it is the lesser evil.

Yesterday, moving swiftly, the House accepted the Senate compromise, and the bill has been sent to the President. The trade-agreements program has been saved, thanks largely to the efforts of Senator VANDENBERG and Senator MILLIKIN, but those who are hostile to it have shown their strength, and we may be sure that they will come back to the fight a year from now more determined than ever to kill it.

REPORTING AND PRINTING THE PROCEEDINGS FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished President pro tempore lay down the business that is privileged at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before doing that, the President pro tempore would like to take advantage of this opportunity to express a word of appreciation to some of the Senate servants whose efficiency is so total and constant that it is scarcely ever recognized.

The Chair reminds Senators that the Senate adjourned at 12:50 o'clock this morning. When we arrived at our offices we found the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the day, consisting of 248 pages, a complete and accurate transcription of the entire proceedings, which is, the Chair must say, as one who knows something about the publishing business, little short of a miracle in efficient production.

The Chair wishes to express our debt not only for this performance in itself, but as a symbol of the constancy with which we are served so efficiently not only by our reporting staff but by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the eloquent words expressed by the President of the Senate in expressing my deep appreciation of the services to which he has referred.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2318, to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, and the pending question is on the first amendment to the committee substitute. Meanwhile, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is recognized.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 169)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay down the veto message on Senate bill 110.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 110, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, because it would permit an important segment of the economy to obtain immunity from the antitrust laws, and would do so without providing adequate safeguards to protect the public interest.

This bill would authorize exemption from the antitrust laws for any carrier acting in concert with one or more competing carriers in the establishment of rates and related matters, if the Interstate Commerce Commission approves

the procedural agreements under which such action would be taken. The Commission would be required to approve these agreements if it should find that exemption from the antitrust laws would be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy."

Under this bill private carrier associations and rate bureaus, free from the restraints of the antitrust laws, could exercise broad powers over most forms of domestic transportation, including railroads, trucks and busses, water carriers, pipe lines, and freight forwarders. Carriers could agree privately among themselves upon the rates to be filed with, or withheld from, the Interstate Commerce Commission. Acting through these bureaus, groups of carriers could exercise a powerful deterrent influence upon the filing by an individual carrier of proposed rates which might benefit the public.

The exercise by private groups of this substantial control over the transportation industry involves serious potential harm to the public. Transportation rates affect the cost of goods as they move through each phase of production—from raw materials, through finished products, to the consumer. Power to control transportation rates is power to influence the competitive success or failure of other businesses. Legislation furthering the exercise of this power by private groups would clearly be contrary to the public interest.

My disapproval of this bill does not signify opposition to carrier associations as such, or to all of their present functions. Many of their activities are useful and desirable. However, this legislation is not necessary for the continuation of such activities.

No legislation giving a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws should be enacted unless adequate alternative safeguards are provided for the public interest. This measure fails to provide such safeguards. Even the limited safeguards incorporated in the bill as originally passed by the Senate are omitted from the bill in its present form. It would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve any agreement which it finds to be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy." This is a vague and general standard and is manifestly neither adequate nor appropriate as a criterion for waiving the protection afforded the public by the antitrust laws.

Furthermore, the Commission would be placed in the position of applying this general criterion to the basic procedural agreements without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint actions which would be taken thereunder. Nevertheless, the exemption from the antitrust laws would extend to these subsequent actions without the necessity of further Commission approval. It would extend, moreover, even beyond the parties to the basic agreement to any "other persons" who participate in such actions.

Even though transportation rates are subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the public interest nevertheless demands that the general national policy of maintaining competition continue to be applied to this industry. Our present transportation policy contemplates a pattern of partial regulation, within the framework of which the pressures of competition will remain substantially effective. Regulation cannot entirely replace these competitive pressures. It can guard against some of the potential abuses of monopoly power, but it cannot be an effective substitute for the affirmative stimulus toward improved service and lower rates which competition provides. By sanctioning rate control by groups of carriers, this legislation would represent a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition. This, I believe, would be a serious mistake, with far-reaching effects on our economy.

Antitrust cases are now before the courts challenging some of the very activities which would be covered by this bill. Pending judicial clarification of the issues raised in these proceedings, it would be inappropriate to provide the immunity proposed by this bill.

I have repeatedly urged upon the Congress the necessity for a vigorous anti-monopoly program. This bill would be inconsistent with such a program.

For these compelling reasons, I find it necessary to withhold my approval from the measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1948.*

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask whether this privileged matter displaces all other business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is entirely privileged, and displaces nothing.

Mr. AIKEN. It does displace the pending business, does it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only long enough for the Senate to act on the veto message, then the unfinished business will be automatically resumed.

Mr. AIKEN. The discussion and vote will not displace the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will not.

The question before the Senate is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. REED. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Dworshak
Baldwin	Cain	Eastland
Ball	Capehart	Ecton
Barkley	Capper	Ellender
Brewster	Chavez	Feazel
Bricker	Connally	Ferguson
Bridges	Cooper	Flanders
Brooks	Cordon	Fulbright
Buck	Donnell	Green
Butler	Downey	Gurney
Hatch	McKellar	Smith
Hawkes	McMahon	Sparkman
Hayden	Magnuson	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Malone	Stewart
Hill	Martin	Taft
Hoey	Maybank	Taylor
Holland	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Ives	Moore	Thye
Jenner	Morse	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	Umstead
Kem	O'Conor	Vandenberg
Kilgore	O'Daniel	Watkins
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Langer	Pepper	White
Lodge	Reed	Wiley
Lucas	Revercomb	Williams
McCarthy	Robertson, Va.	Wilson
McClellan	Robertson, Wyo.	Young
McFarland	Russell	
McGrath	Saltonstall	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have just had a quorum call. I should like to propose a unanimous-consent request for a limitation of debate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request until the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] returns to the Chamber?

Mr. WHERRY. I can make the request, and we can discuss it. The Senator from Georgia will be in the Chamber shortly.

Mr. RUSSELL entered the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if he will not confer with the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], with whom I usually consult before proposing such an agreement, although I did not have an opportunity to talk with him this time.

I think it would expedite matters if we could agree on a time to vote. I am not one to set the hour. The time for voting should be agreeable to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If the Senator from Georgia could suggest a time which would be acceptable to him, and the time between now and the time for voting could be properly divided, I think the work of the Senate today would be very much expedited.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that he withhold his request for a few moments until I can make a few inquiries

and confer with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is now on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. If he is on his way to the Chamber, let me make a suggestion so that we can begin thinking about it. It is now nearly 12:30. I am wondering if 2 o'clock would be a satisfactory hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that that time would not be satisfactory. I am anxious to arrive at a reasonable time, but 2 o'clock would allow entirely too little time to devote to a subject of this magnitude.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator consider any other hour, depending upon the approval of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to consider the hour of 3 o'clock, but I do not wish to be committed to that hour at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] wishes to get ahead with the farm program bill, and proceed to a vote. This is a privileged matter. I am quite sure that if we could get unanimous consent we could expedite reconsideration of Senate bill 110 and get back to the farm program bill. I hope to have the full approval of the Senator from Vermont in arriving at a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at some appropriate hour.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understood the ruling of the Chair a few moments ago, the laying down of the veto message is a privileged matter, but reconsideration of the bill is not a privileged matter. However, I would not object to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that consideration of the veto message is a privileged matter, as well as the matter of laying it before the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we had a different occupant of the chair a few minutes ago——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Chair is absolutely correct. There would be no point in making the laying down of the message a privileged matter, if its consideration were not privileged. I have always understood that consideration of a veto message is a privileged matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator in charge of the proposed legislation. My only hope is that Senators in a position to do so can see their way clear to agree upon an hour for voting. I am not undertaking to fix the hour. I should like to have an hour fixed for the vote, for the reason that many Senators are busy in committees, and it would be a great help to them to know when the vote will be had. I appeal to my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is working with me on a very important conference, to agree to fix a time for the vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the persuasive qualities of my friend from Nebraska. This bill is one of the most important measures that this Congress will have to consider. In the terrific rush which the able and distinguished driver of the majority is managing with his bull whip, we have no time to devote to the important problems of the people. Probably I shall not object eventually to a settlement; but until there has been some opportunity to explain what was done with respect to this bill in the conference, and until those of us who are opposed to changing the traditional American system of free competitive enterprise have an opportunity to debate this question so that at least some Members of this body who are not in various subcommittees or conferences which are now meeting all over the Capitol in the insensate rush to close the Congress by the 19th of June may have an opportunity to know what this is all about, I shall not agree to a limitation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of that statement, I suppose it is hopeless to go further. We are now taking up valuable time that might be used for debate. However, I am hopeful that after the debate has proceeded for a time the distinguished Senator from Wyoming can suggest an hour which he feels will be acceptable. Later, in the event that the debate promises to continue for some time, we may obtain unanimous consent.

I do not wish to deprive the able Senator from Wyoming of the opportunity to make an argument. However, I wish to observe that the bill has been debated, and the only question before the Senate now is consideration of the veto message. I think it would be a very fine thing if the Senator from Wyoming would consider the fact that Senators working on committees would like to know at what hour the vote will be had.

Mr. President, later I shall make another suggestion, but I shall wait until the Senator from Wyoming feels that the debate has progressed sufficiently far so that we may obtain an agreement to vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Members of the Senate who have been working day and night during the past week probably are more or less physically exhausted, and they may not be able to prolong the debate. They may not be able to develop all the issues which ought to be developed. Speaking for myself, I have no intention of addressing the Senate at any undue length. However, I wish to have the opportunity clearly to lay before Members of this body the significance and effect of the passage of this bill, if I am capable of doing it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there gathered in Washington yesterday about 60 or 75 representatives of traffic organizations, covering the entire Nation. At the close of their deliberations yesterday afternoon they issued a statement which is so clearly an exposition of everything that is included in the veto message that I shall read it to the Senate as my statement. Those who issued this statement are the top-flight traffic experts of the country. Among them are representatives of agricultural, industrial, and commercial organizations. At the close of my comments on this matter and the reading of the statement, I shall place in the RECORD a list of the organizations participating in the conference.

Here is the statement of fact the conference made:

President Truman on June 12 vetoed S. 110, the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, to extend the regulatory power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to cover procedures among regulated carriers—rail, motor, and water—through which carriers and shippers may give consideration to rate changes preliminary to their publication and filing with the Interstate Commerce Commission. In his message, the President says his disapproval of the bill "does not signify opposition to carrier associations," many of whose activities he described as "useful and desirable." The shippers of the country go further than the President and say that carrier rate committees are not only useful and desirable but are absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, these are the top-flight executive traffic men in the country, representing shippers, and only shippers.

I read further from their statement:

The system of regulated transportation under the Interstate Commerce Act could not function successfully if there were no such committees.

In transportation circles, either among shippers, carriers, or governmental regulatory bodies there has been no doubt that such committees, as they have been organized and have operated for half a century, were lawful. It is only within the past few years that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has made such an issue of their legality under the antitrust laws that it has become necessary to appeal to Congress to say what is its intent in the area of conflict asserted to exist between two of its own acts.

Both Houses of Congress, at the insistent and urgent demand of thousands of shippers in every section of the Nation, and after most exhaustive hearings and careful consideration, passed S. 110, the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. The bill does not do the things alleged in the veto message of the President. It does not enable private groups to control rates. It does not remove the rate-making process from the full and final control of the Commission. It does not substitute private rate making for government supervision and regulation of transportation rates under the Interstate Commerce Act.

It does not, as implied in the President's veto, remove the carriers from the general provisions of the antitrust laws. It does not render moot or defeat the pending antitrust suit of the State of Georgia or the one at Lincoln, Nebr.

It does not remove or weaken the safeguards thrown around commerce by present laws. On the contrary it continues all the safeguards we now have and throws new safeguards around such regulation and procedures by giving the Interstate Commerce Commission, for the first time, jurisdiction over and power to control rate-committee practices.

The bill resolves the conflict alleged to exist between the antitrust laws and the Interstate Commerce Act. It reaffirms the intent of Congress that regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act shall continue to be the responsibility and function of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It recognizes that this is the only way in which transportation rates can be successfully regulated and that the present system of rate making must be preserved in the interest of the shippers.

Large shippers might be able, after a fashion, to cope with the situation that would result from the elimination of the present method of rate making. The hundreds of thousands of small shippers, whose business does not justify the maintenance of large traffic departments, however, would be next to helpless if the present rate-making meth-

od is discontinued. No shipper should be subjected to the confusion that would result from such action.

Without present rate-making methods, the small shipper particularly, would not be informed of proposed changes in his rates or those of his competitors, or of existing services. He would be put to the impossible task of trying to confer separately and individually with numerous rail carriers and still more numerous carriers by motor. It would also lead to costly and endless litigation to all parties.

That is why, with virtual unanimity, shippers and shippers' organizations from every section of the country, representing agriculture and industry, urged that Congress pass S.110, the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. That is why today, after the bill has been vetoed by President Truman under an apparent misconception of its meaning and effect, these shippers now urge upon Congress that the bill be enacted into law over the President's veto.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 15, 1948.*

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a list of the shippers' organizations that participated in the conference yesterday.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among the national and regional shippers' organizations represented at the meeting on the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, S. 110, on June 15, 1948, were the following: The National Industrial Traffic League, National Association of Shipper Advisory Boards, Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, National Council of Farm Cooperatives, National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, National League of Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, American Paper and Pulp Association, Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Automobile Manufacturer's Association, Mississippi Valley Association, New England Industrial Traffic League, the Southern Traffic League, the Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, the Illinois Territory Industrial Traffic League, the Central Territory Rate Conference, the New England Shipper's Advisory Board, the Atlantic States Shipper's Advisory Board, the Midwest Shipper's Advisory Board, the Southern Shipper's Advisory Board, the Northwest Shipper's Advisory Board, the Growers and Shipper's League, New England Paper and Pulp Traffic Association, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, Northwest Horticultural Council, Apple Grower's Association, West Coast Lumberman's Association, Georgia-Alabama Textile Traffic Association, Wisconsin Paper & Pulp Manufacturers Traffic Association, Texas Industrial Traffic League, Southern Hardwood Traffic Association.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me say to my southern friends that in the conference held yesterday not only was all the shipping world covered by the conference represented, but there were also in attendance representatives of the National Association of Shipper Advisory Boards, the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, the National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, the Mississippi Valley Association, the Southern Traffic League, the Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, the Southern Shippers' Advisory Board, the Georgia-Alabama Textile Traffic Association, the Texas Industrial Traffic League, and the Southern Hardwood Traffic Association.

In all my experience in the Senate, I have never seen a piece of legislation which has commanded such widespread support from shippers the United States over. The Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the various other agricultural associations, with one exception, have endorsed this bill.

Mr. President, during the hearings we filed in the record approximately 950 expressions of approval of the bill. Its enactment is absolutely necessary.

I do not wish to prolong this debate. What I am saying has been said over and over again. But here is the fact: In the beginning of railroad rate making, every railroad published its own rates. As the commerce of the country grew in volume it also grew in complexity, and the rate-making process became so complex that to enable shippers intelligently to determine what rates would be applied there had to be rate bureaus and rate conferences that included more than one railroad. About thirty-odd bureaus and conferences of that kind have operated in the last 40 or 50 years. For 40 years, up to 1942, no question was ever raised as to their lawfulness or legality.

There is no way to make freight rates except through the conference method. The Interstate Commerce Act requires that the railroads form through routes and then establish joint rates. The through-route requirement was included in the Interstate Commerce Act, section 1, so that a shipper would not have to unload his car when it got to the end of any particular railroad. As I recall, it is section 18 of the Interstate Commerce Act that requires—not permits, but requires—the railroads to establish through rates on which to operate the joint routes.

Now, Mr. President, in the name of high heaven, how can two or more railroads establish joint rates and through routes without conferring with each other? The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, under what was in my opinion a wholly strained construction of the antitrust law, filed a criminal proceeding in Chicago against one of these rate bureaus in 1942. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Agriculture, virtually all State authorities of the country, and every shipper's organization of which I have any knowledge have filed their approval of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was interested in the Senator's statement that all the departments of the Government ask that the veto be overridden. I should like to know the basis of the Senator's statement.

Mr. REED. They have supported the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator have any statement here from any department that is now urging the Senate to override the veto?

Mr. REED. There are the most complete hearings on the bill of any bill of which I have any knowledge. There was special authority given under the War Powers Act to waive the antitrust law where certain things were necessary during the emergency, and after the case was filed in 1942 in Chicago, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Production Board joined in an action through the War Production Board to continue the conference system of establishing rates.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me there is quite a difference between the situation the Senator outlines, and having the departments request the Congress to override a veto of the President of the United States.

Mr. REED. I do not think I said that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. REED. Of course, they have always supported the bill, and if they were going to be consistent they would have to continue their support. Be that as it may, I want to say to my friend from Georgia and my friend from Alabama, there is nothing in the bill that in any way allows or permits discrimination against the South in the freight-rate structure; there is nothing in the bill that would affect the validity of the Georgia suit in the Supreme Court, and there is nothing in the bill that would affect the antitrust proceedings pending in the court at Lincoln, Nebr. This bill has been trimmed down to where the only thing it does is to give exemption in the making of rates, fares, and charges and the actual handling of equipment and costs of handling equipment as between the different railroads.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the course of the trimming down to which the Senator refers it is quite unusual that the amendment which specifically retained all the rights of action to the State of Georgia was among the first of the casualties. It was the first to be eliminated in the trimming. I hope the statement of the distinguished Senator as to the effect the bill will have upon the right of action in the State of Georgia in the Supreme Court is correct, but I apprehend that if the Congress shall override the veto of the President and enact the bill into law despite the veto, there will immediately be filed a supplemental brief or pleadings in the Supreme Court pointing out that the cause of action of the State of Georgia can only be applied to past conduct on the part of the rate-making agency and can have no possible effect upon what may take place in the future.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Let me answer the Senator from Georgia. I intend to deal with what has been included in the agreements or the definition of agreements in the different phases of what was originally called the Bulwinkle bill, as I shall identify it here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Senator is entirely too modest. Without the earnest, diligent, continuous and ardent support of the Senator from Kansas the bill would not now be before the Senate after a veto; it would never have been passed. If there is to be any justice in applying names to legislation, and if the Senate is willing to share whatever criticism or ignominy may be heaped upon him in the future

as a result of the enactment of the bill, I think the name of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, like that of Abou Ben Adhem should lead all the rest in connection with the amendment, because he has certainly been more responsible than any other individual for having carried it thus far in the legislative process.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I correctly understood the Senator, he stated the bill would not affect the Georgia case.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. The attorneys who are handling the Georgia case will not agree with the Senator, will they?

Mr. REED. I think they will.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is not the information the Senator from Arizona has received. Would the Senator say the bill would not affect the western case so far as rates are concerned?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kansas so contends.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Department of Justice informed the Senator from Arizona that so far as the rate part of that case is concerned it will do away with it. Where does the Senator get his information? Is it the result of his own analysis, or is it from the attorneys for the defendants in those cases?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the case of the State of Georgia rests upon the allegation of a conspiracy between the railroads to establish rates which were illegal because discriminatory. The bill has no relation at all to any case that rests upon conspiracy. The bill, if enacted into law as I firmly believe it will be today, will not affect the Georgia case or the Lincoln case in the slightest degree.

Mr. McFARLAND. Where does the Senator get his information? Is it from his analysis, or is it from the opinion of the attorneys from the defendants in the cases?

Mr. REED. It is from my own analysis plus the information I have had from attorneys in the case.

Mr. McFARLAND. Attorneys for the defendants?

Mr. REED. Yes; for the defendants.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes—because the attorneys who are handling the case, who are prosecuting the case, say emphatically it will do away with the case so far as rates are concerned.

The bill cuts the very heart out of the case. Who shall we believe—the attorneys who are prosecuting the case, or the attorneys who are defending the case?

Mr. REED. I do not know what particular attorneys the Senator has in mind, but if they were not any nearer to the truth than the group of "screwballs" from the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice who appeared continuously and at length in the hearings, their statement is not worth much.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not like to hear the Senator from Kansas say that the representatives of the Department of Justice are "screwballs." I would not say that in regard to the attorneys who are defending the legislation. I think they are able attorneys, on both sides. I give them both credit for having their own views and expressing them; but on the floor of the United States Senate I do not like to hear able attorneys called "screwballs."

Mr. REED. I had no reference to any particular attorney engaged in the case. I do not know who the attorneys are.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator does not know who they are, to whom was he referring when he called them "screwballs"?

Mr. REED. I was referring to attorneys from the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. If those gentlemen are not "screwballs," I cannot recognize "screwballs," after listening to them day after day for a long time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says that this bill will not affect the Georgia case. As the Senator well knows, when the bill was before the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] offered an amendment, which was adopted by the Senate, expressly stating that this bill should not affect the Georgia case, and yet, when the bill went to conference, his amendment was eliminated. If the bill will not affect the Georgia case, why was not the language of that amendment permitted to remain in the bill?

Mr. REED. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] made a more careful analysis of the effect of the so-called Russell amendment than did the Senator from Kansas, and he expressed himself during the debate upon the report of the conference committee.

Mr. HILL. But it is not a question of what the Senator from New Jersey thinks about it. The Senate of the United States adopted that amendment, and the Senate conferees went to conference as the agents of the Senate to fight for the amendments which the Senate had made to the bill. I am now asking one of those agents of the Senate why that amendment was taken out of the bill, particularly since the Senator from Kansas says that the bill does not affect the Georgia case in any way.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia have sat in many conferences. I suggest they furnish a list of conferences over controverted questions——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Let me finish.

Mr. HILL. The Senate conferees may have come back with everything they individually wanted, but they certainly did not come back with everything the Senate wanted, when they surrendered and permitted the amendment to be stricken from the bill.

Mr. REED. We discussed specifically every amendment which the Senate wrote into the bill. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] offered four amendments which were adopted by the Senate. The conference committee saved one. The other three went out. The Senator from Georgia put in one amendment, but the House conferees were determined not to touch it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the House conferees take the position that the amendment did not in any way affect the case pending in the Supreme Court?

Mr. REED. I do not know that the matter was discussed in that detail, but I think that was the impression of the House conferees.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, we all know that in conferences there must be a spirit of compromise if legislation is to be obtained, but it is rather remarkable in this case that an amendment, which the Senator says was of no effect, but which the majority of the Senate thought was necessary to protect the State of Georgia, was stricken from the bill. The mere fact that the House conferees were adamant in their stand against the amendment, as the Senator relates they were, is clear evidence to me that the elimination of this amendment strikes a death blow at a cause of action which has cost the State of Georgia a great deal of money and a great deal of time, and as to which the Supreme Court has said there was a real cause of action. That leaves the State of Georgia, a sovereign State, absolutely helpless in the matter as against the machinations of a group of freight bureaus, after the Senate had put its arm around the sovereign State of Georgia to protect it from such a situation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It not only affects the State of Georgia, but, indirectly, affects the whole South. The entire South will be hurt. The Senate of the United States adopted the amendment, and I do not see how the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] could consent to the elimination of an amendment which affects all the Southern States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Western States are just as much involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Wyoming will content himself for a few minutes, I shall try to come to the end of the initial discussion of the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My request of the Senator was designed to illuminate the point which he has made. He said, if I heard him correctly, that the conference report and the bill, as it is now proposed to pass it over the President's veto, does not impair the power of the Supreme Court to rule against conspiracies.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator says that, then may I ask him to interpret to the Senate the reason for the elimination by the conferees of two specific amendments? We have been discussing the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] which was adopted by the Senate. Let me read that amendment so that it may be clear in the RECORD:

> The enactment of this section shall not—
> (a) deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear and determine the case of

Georgia versus Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al., Docket No. 11—

And so forth—

or any proceeding for the enforcement of the provisions of any decree entered in such suit;

(b)—

I interpolate—"shall not"—

change any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable in the determination of such suit or proceeding, or deprive any party to such suit of any relief to which such party would be entitled but for the enactment of this section; or

(c) render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the Supreme Court in such suit or proceeding as it relates to the parties to such suit to be unlawful or which shall be prohibited by the terms of any decree entered therein or any supplement thereto or any modification thereof.

That amendment has been completely eliminated. So it seems to us that the attempt which was made by the Senate of the United States to preserve this action already initiated by a sovereign State should not have been affected by the conference report.

Just another quotation, with the Senator's indulgence. This was an amendment which was inserted by the Senate in order to make sure that no conspiracies would be permitted under the Bulwinkle-Reed bill. I read from paragraph (6):

Nothing in this section and no approval of any agreement by the Commission under this section shall be so construed as in any manner to remove from the purview of the antitrust laws any restraint upon the right of independent action by any carrier by means of boycott, duress, or intimidation.

In other words, the Senate said there should be no approval of any device by which boycott, duress, or intimidation should be applied to any carrier. The conference eliminated that amendment. Is that the way to prevent conspiracy?

Mr. REED. When some useless language is inserted in a bill for political purposes, and accepted by the Senator in charge of the bill at the end of 5 days' debate in order to get the bill through the Senate, and the conferees on the part of the House say, "If you expect us to consider that kind of bunk seriously you are mistaken."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator say it is useless to prevent boycott, coercion, or intimidation, and can it be prohibited when exemption is being granted from the law which enforces it?

Mr. REED. Of course we are not granting any exemption. The constant misstatements of the Senator from Wyoming—I wish he would make them in his own time——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no limitation on debate.

Mr. REED. No; and certainly the Senator from Wyoming exercises his privilege very freely in that respect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator object to being catechised on this subject?

Mr. REED. It would not do any good to object to the Senator from Wyoming utilizing his privilege as a Senator and taking a lot of time in debate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator can substitute personalities for argument, and I have no objection to that, because I know the RECORD will show that personalities cannot outweigh the facts. The facts are that the Senate put in the bill a prohibition against boycott, intimidation, and coercion, and the conferees took it out.

Mr. REED. It is in the law, anyway.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Where?

Mr. REED. I shall call attention to it later. I ask the Senator from Wyoming to permit me to complete my statement, and then make his speech and make his statements, including his misstatements, in his own time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to point out my misstatements?

Mr. REED. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas declines to yield.

Mr. REED. Now let me deal briefly with the history of the so-called Bulwinkle bill. It came up about 4 years ago, and in its original form, as it passed the House, it granted exemption to agreements made between two or more carriers. It did not say what kind of agreements. It did grant exemption from antitrust laws when agreements were submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission and approved by the Commission.

When the bill came to the Senate and went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we rewrote the bill. I had an active part in doing so. In our version, when we rewrote it, we defined the subjects which might be the basis of agreement. We named rates, fares, charges, schedules, damages, and various other things. That was the form in which the bill was passed by the Senate. It was presented in the Senate first in the Seventy-ninth Congress, in the year 1946, and did not pass. That was the form, virtually, in which it came up last year, and the Senate passed it.

The House was too restricted in its first version. Here in the Senate—and I accept a share of the responsibility—we perhaps were too liberal in trying to designate too many subjects. So an attempt was made in the form of the bill which is before the Senate today, and was before the conference, to limit the bill purely to rates, fares, charges, and the adjustment of the costs or payments by railroads for using each other's transportation facilities.

Mr. President, that is a part of the reason why the Russell amendment was deleted, and why some of the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming were eliminated. It was in order to bring the bill down to its strictest fundamentals, to limit it to them, and that is its form today. It does not touch anything except rates, fares, and charges. It is not retroactive. It affects only those actions for the future. It provides for independent action on the part of any participant in an agreement, regardless of the action of the conference.

I think that with this statement, Mr. President, I shall yield the floor at this time.

BOYCOTT, DURESS, OR INTIMIDATION PERMITTED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has yielded the floor without in the slightest degree giving the Senate any explanation at all as to why in his opinion the bill in the form in which it was reported by the conference prevents intimidation, boycott, or duress. He has contented himself with a mere all-inclusive statement that such practices are prohibited by law, but the purpose of the proposed law which the Senator from Kansas is urging upon the Senate is to eliminate from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws the type of agreement which the transportation industry is permitted under this bill to make.

The language is perfectly clear. These organizations may make agreements—and I am quoting from the language of the conference bill—

Relating to transportation under joint rates or over through routes; and for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipe-line companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are carriers of one class.

So under the bill which we are now asked to pass over the veto of the President of the United States there is authority granted by Congress, not to the railroads to fix rates, not at all, but to an organization of the transportation industry to fix rates, and to deal with matters relating to transportation over every type of carrier that operates in the commerce of the United States. It includes not only railroads, but also express companies, sleeping-car companies, pipe-line companies, motor-vehicle companies, carriers by water, and freight forwarders. So that here the authority is granted by Congress for a combination of all competing systems of transportation in the United States into one single organization, which will then in effect govern the transportation industry of America regardless of the wishes of the individual carriers.

Let us not deceive ourselves. We are not doing what even the shippers believe is being done. We are establishing a private collectivism. We are taking away from the States in their sovereign capacity the right to protect their own citizens, and we are giving to a private organization, privately created, without any semblance of a standard in the law, the power to govern the transportation industry of America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

GIVES TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY ITS OWN SUPERGOVERNMENT

Mr. HILL. Might it not be well said that by the bill we would be giving them the power to set up a supergovernment of their own?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The truth of the matter, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, is that we are doing precisely that with respect to the transportation industry.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Wyoming if he has ever heard of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, the Senator from Vermont knows very well that I have heard of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would not have thought so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I challenge the Senator to read the bill. If he does, he will see that the bill provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission is given a mandate to approve the type of agreement authorized here.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that is not the fact. That is not correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. There was no evidence, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming, from his remarks that he was aware of the existence of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is a creature of Congress, which can set rules for its operations and standards for its approval, and that is the safeguard of the shippers of the country and of the interests involved with the railroads. I merely wanted to call the Senator's attention to the existence of that body.

DEPRIVES INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION OF POWER TO PROTECT SHIPPERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont is apparently unaware of the effect of the language of the bill, which takes away from the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to protect the shippers of the State of Vermont as well as shippers of the State of Georgia, because the mandate is here given that, unless these agreements fall within certain very narrow categories, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall approve them.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether those categories are protective categories to shippers, or whether they are categories hostile to shippers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These are categories which serve the shippers; categories of transportation companies which serve the shippers; and we are now giving them the right to govern themselves with relation to transportation under joint rates over all through routes, and for the purpose of this paragraph all carriers are grouped together.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Wyoming that it is not clear to me from what he has just said in what way the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission in defending the rights of shippers are decreased by this legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall show that to the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is important.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to do that. When the bill was before the Senate—

Mr. FLANDERS. I have the bill before me, I may say to the Senator, and shall be glad to be referred to the specific point in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have now before me the bill as it passed the Senate. I am reading from page 2:

Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers—

This Senate language appears—does the Senator from Vermont follow me?

Mr. FLANDERS. I have found the place.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator may now have before him the bill as reported by the conference. Does he?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the bill which is under consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. That is what the Senator has before him?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is what I have before me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very good. I now read:

Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers—

The Senate version had this language.

Mr. FLANDERS. But the Senate version is not before us.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to answer him, he will receive his answer. These words were inserted by the Senate and were stricken out by the conference:

concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of—

Those words have been deleted. So the sentence reads:

Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers relating to rates, fares, charges (including the charges as between carriers).

Now I want the Senator to see that the substitution of the words "relating to" for the provision of the Senate bill "concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of" is very much broader.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator if the words which he read from the Senate bill were ever in the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They were in the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS. The question we have before us is as to whether the bill presently before us diminishes the ability of the Interstate Commerce Commission to protect the interests of shippers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to lay before the Senate this entire section, I think he will see the point. I proceed:

Relating to rates, fares, charges (including charges as between carriers), classifications, divisions, allowances, time schedules, routes, the interchange of facilities——

Mr. FLANDERS. Excuse me a minute. The words are not exactly the words that I get from the bill which the President vetoed. I do not know the reasons for the differences.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That language of the Senate bill was changed. I have been reading from paragraph 2:

Rules pertaining thereto or procedures for the joint consideration—

Let me go back to the sentence as it is in the conference report:

Any carrier party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions, allowances, or charges (including charges between carriers and compensation paid or received for the use of facilities and equipment)—

This is much broader than the Senate language—

or rules or regulations pertaining thereto, or procedures for the joint consideration, initiation or establishment thereof, may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (6), if it finds that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act)—

That means the policy of the existing law.

The relief provided in paragraph (9) should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement; otherwise the application shall be denied.

LANGUAGE IS DECEPTIVE

As I pointed out upon the floor in the original debate, this language is very carefully drawn to appear to be a restraint upon those who make the agreement, whereas in fact it is a restraint upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission "shall" approve these agreements. These agreements may be made by all carriers, not only railroads, but also by pipe lines, and motor vehicles, and freight forwarders, and the like. So here we have a clear purpose to transfer from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the new organization to be set up, the power to make these rates.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that he read one section with emphasis, and a second section sotto voce.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will raise my voice for the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would like to read that particular sentence with emphasis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. FLANDERS. I read:

If it finds that by reason of furtherance——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say before the Senator proceeds——

Mr. FLANDERS (continuing):

of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the relief provided in paragraph (9)—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I decline to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. FLANDERS (continuing):

The relief provided in paragraph (9) should apply—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming declines to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont has accused me of attempting to suppress a portion of this language; and that is an accusation which I shall not permit to be made.

I seek to analyze this bill as it is before us. The Commission may prescribe rules and regulations, as I read this bill, only for the manner in which application is

made for the approval of an agreement. This is the language of paragraph 2:

> Any carrier, party to an agreement * * * may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply for approval of the agreements * * *.

Obviously these rules and regulations have no effect on the making of the agreement or its contents, but only to the manner in which it is to be presented to the Commission.

THIS IS PRIVATE COLLECTIVISM

Mr. President, as I said a little while ago, we are dealing with the establishment of what amounts to private collectivism. This legislation has been proposed because the operating officials of railroads do not wish to compete in rates and services. Railroad managements have repeatedly undertaken to use their traffic associations to suppress competitive effort, and the Attorney General has vigorously attacked such restrictive policies in suits to enforce the antitrust laws.

If the bill as reported by the conferees becomes law, the ground will be cut from under the Department of Justice. Traffic and rate associations will be organized, and the Interstate Commerce Commission will have to approve them. As a practical matter, it will never thereafter be possible for the Attorney General to attack the renewed use of the associations to suppress the competitive impulses of operating officials.

The way in which the bill would operate would be to prevent individual lines and carriers from fixing any competitive rate upon their own lines, for local, State, or either regional or interregional transportation. Under the provisions of the bill a single railroad company would be deprived of the power of establishing competitive rates within its own territory. The books are full of cases in which the trade associations here sought to be confirmed by law have applied duress and intimidation to the individual carriers to compel such carriers to obey the mandates of the collective managers.

In the past it has been frequently stated by the Interstate Commerce Commission that its powers to regulate the railroads and the transportation systems of the country are slight enough at best. Now it is proposed to whittle this away and transfer to the transportation industry itself the power to regulate transportation. But to me this is probably the least significant aspect of the whole bill.

The real meaning of this measure is that if it is enacted it will be a long step toward the abandonment of the competitive system in the American economy. The United States alone of all the great countries in the world has had an antitrust law. The United States alone of all the great countries in the world has declared as a national policy that the door of opportunity shall always be open, and that every enterprise shall be protected from restraints of trade. That is not the European ideology. The European theory has always been that combinations and cartels should be permitted to operate. The result of the cartel system has been the establishment of the totalitarian form of government.

MONOPOLY VERSUS FREE ENTERPRISE

A rather extraordinary development has taken place this year in Great Britain. In Britain the advance of socialism has been the result of the prior policy of Great Britain to allow trusts and cartel associations. Even the Conservative Party in Great Britain has undertaken to indicate some approval of antitrust policy. What amounts almost to an agreement between the Conservative Party in Great Britain and the Labor Party has resulted in the enactment by the British Parliament of the monopoly—inquiry and control—bill. This measure was presented to the House of Commons on March 25, 1948, by the president of the British Board of Trade. Its purpose was to establish an inquiry in order to see what could be done to prevent monopolistic restraints of trade.

BRITAIN AWAKENING TO DANGERS OF MONOPOLY

A distinguished member of the Conservative Party, the Right Honorable Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, published a pamphlet early this year which he entitled "Monopoly." In 10 chapters of this pamphlet Sir David discusses monopoly, including unit integrations of economic power and agreements among smaller companies to maintain prices and share markets. He gives a history of business agreements in England since the Middle Ages, all of which leads up to some specific conclusion. In this pamphlet, in chapter 5, which he calls Dangers of Monopoly, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe outlines six great dangers as he sees them.

The first is that monopoly promotes industrial inefficiency. When all the transportation systems of the United States are privately governed by a private trade association, so that all the different types of carriers are required to obey the provisions of these agreements relating to transportation, then we may be sure that inefficiency will be promoted.

The second great danger that this author recites is that monopoly uses economic power without any standard of responsibility. There is no standard of responsibility in this measure by which the new monopolistic trade associations may operate. We are neglecting completely the public interest.

MONOPOLY'S GROWING POLITICAL POWER AND PROFITS

The third danger recited by the leader of the British Conservative Party is that monopolies have economic power to wield political influence. Can anyone study the history of the progress of this bill without realizing how monopoly exercises political influence? So great is this power that we are striking down the authority of the sovereign States to protect their own citizens and their own industries.

The fourth danger recited by Sir David Maxwell Fyfe is that monopolies make extortionate profits. Who does not know it? In the Eightieth Congress of the United States there has been exhibited over and over and over again the desire of the majority party to protect the right of big business to make extortionate profits and to levy upon the masses of the people a steadily increasing level of prices for the necessities of life.

I know it was said, back at the beginning of this Congress, that if we would only let these industrial giants have their own way prices would go down. In January 1947 I remember well the announcement of Henry Ford II of a reduction in the price of Ford cars. There was a statement by Fowler McCormick, of the International Harvester Co., announcing a reduction of prices. As a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the joint committee which was created to study inflation and what the Congress could do to prevent depression, I sent Mr. Ford a telegram congratulating him on his action in reducing prices, and a similar telegram was sent to Mr. McCormick. But the Congress of the United States took no action. Prices rose. Only a week ago last Sunday Mr. Ford for the second time in the last 12 months announced another increase in the prices of Ford automobiles. His company was forced to abandon the plan to cut prices and join the inflation parade.

While prices have been going up because the Congress of the United States has determined not only not to take action to prevent inflation, but to also allow concentrated organized business to have its own way, as provided in this bill, profits have been rising by leaps and bounds. The National City Bank of New York, one of the greatest and most powerful banks in the United States, as well as in the world, in its letter for June 1947 on economic conditions and Government finance, recites this very interesting and important fact on page 70 of its report:

> The net income, after taxes, of the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in the United States in 1940 was $1,875,000,000.

Mr. President, those were the profits after taxes.

PEOPLE SUFFER WHILE CONGRESS FAWNS UPON BIG BUSINESS

From that monthly letter we also learn that in 1945 those profits, after taxes, had increased to $1,943,000,000; but that in 1947, last year, net income, after taxes, had increased to $3,730,000,000. In other words, between 1940 and 1947, net income, after taxes, had practically doubled. Dividends, which in 1940 amounted to $1,197,000,000, in 1947 had increased to $1,668,000,000. This is the story of what happens to concentrated industry when the Congress of the United States pursues a hands-off policy, when the Congress of the United States declines to act in the way it is constitutionally empowered to act to protect the economic interests of the masses of the people.

On the preceding page of its monthly letter—on page 69—the National City Bank lists the 100 largest manufacturing corporations. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the important thing which I wish to point out is that this list, which gives the total assets of each one of these 100 corporations, as reported by them at the end of 1947, produces the staggering total of $41,600,000,000. In 1947, the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in the United States, out of a total of some 100,000 or more, owned assets aggregating $41,600,000,000. Their total number of employees was about 4,000,000, according to the National City Bank, which said that the assets of those 100 corporations "represented an average investment in assets of $10,000 per employee."

Mr. President, when we consider that stupendous evidence of the concentration of economic power, along with the report which was made by the House Committee on the Judiciary when it asked the House of Representatives to pass the bill amending sections 7 and 11 of the Clayton Act in order to prohibit monopolistic mergers, we see to what degree the concentration of economic power has proceeded in the United States.

Incidentally, let me say that that bill, approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary, has been buried in the House Rules Committee. A similar bill was here in the Senate. It was assigned to a subcommittee for study. The subcommittee filed a favorable report, and then the whole Judiciary Committee tossed the bill back again into the lap of a subcommittee for additional investigation in connection with the bill, introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], respecting monopoly.

In other words, in the House and in the Senate our policy has been not to act with respect to prohibiting monopolistic mergers; and now the Senate of the United States is asked to pass, over the veto of the President, a bill which conveys away a power which ought to reside in the representatives of the people—a power over the transportation systems of the United States.

I was making a comparison of what has resulted from the concentration of economic power, as proven by the National City Bank's figures, when one takes into consideration what the House Committee on the Judiciary said with respect to concentration in other lines. I shall read now from page 3 of the report submitted to the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Iowa, Representative GWYNNE, on June 17, 1947, approximately 1 year ago.

The body has been laid aside in the Rules Committee, and the Congress is now proceeding by an adjournment to draw the curtain of respect over the laid-out corpse of an antimonopoly procedure because the Congress has dedicated itself apparently to permitting concentrated economic power to take over the control of industry. This is what the gentleman from Iowa, Representative GWYNNE, said in his report:

> In copper mining, three companies controlled 78 percent of the United States production in 1937. In lead mining, four companies controlled 87 percent in 1941. In farm implements, six companies controlled 80 percent in 1940. In dry ice, two companies controlled 70 percent in 1941. In rubber tires and tubes, four companies sold nearly 93 percent of all tires sold by the 17 most important tire companies in 1943. In fluid milk and cream, one company, in 1937, sold 56 percent of the total consumed in the District of Columbia, 55 percent in Baltimore, 42½ percent in Pittsburgh, and 32 percent in Philadelphia. In the icecream business, the same dairy company, in 1937, sold 52 percent of the total in Connecticut, 51 percent in Vermont, 49 percent in New Jersey, and 47 percent in both North Carolina and the District of Columbia.

I could stand upon this floor for hours reciting the record, the cold record, of the concentration of economic power by which a managerial system has been erected in this country because Congress has not paid attention and has failed to exercise the power which the Constitution gives it to regulate commerce among the States. We have permitted this drift to go to such an extent that now the transportation companies of the country ask the Congress to override a veto of the President in order that they may in a private collectivism regulate the whole transportation industry.

One after another I have recited the great dangers of monopoly as pointed out by a conservative Britisher. Let me now recite the fifth danger on his list: The maintenance of prices and profits has the effect of frustrating full employment. Here is a measure which is designed to enable the transportation industry to maintain prices and profits. Here is a measure which puts it within the power of the transportation industry, not the railroads alone but all kinds of carriers, to lay a mandate upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve their private government of this industry.

We are the successors of the great statesmen of the past who said they were establishing here a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Instead of that, we have a government of big business, by big business, and for big business. The result is that the resources of the States and cities of the United States are drying up. States and cities no longer are able to support their own school systems because under our economic structure we permit a few concentrated industrial companies to drain the resources of the States and cities into their central power.

DRIFTING AWAY FROM FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY TOWARD RISING TOTALITARIANISM

I point this out because I say it is my solemn conviction that if the Congress of the United States overrides this veto it will be turning the corner away from free competitive enterprise and democratic popular government down the road to socialism and totalitarian power. There can be no doubt in the mind of anybody who has taken even a few hours to study what has been going on in the world that the rise of totalitarianism, the rise of concentrated political power, has been the direct result of the appearance of concentrated economic power. If we have any thought of stopping this trend we had better act now—act now, or it may be too late.

The State of Georgia brought a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States to protect its citizens and its industries. Under the bill, that suit will be thrown out of court. The Congress of the United States is saying to a sovereign State, "You may not further prosecute this case." When that is done to Georgia, it is done to every other State of the Union, including the States of Kansas, Nebraska, and Vermont. There will be nothing left except a basis for the cry which will then arise to expand the power of the Central Government.

The sixth great danger of monopoly described by Sir David Maxwell Fyfe is that prices fixed by agreement allow the survival of firms with financial resources rather than firms which are efficient producers.

Here, Mr. President, is a comprehensive, intelligent, and able analysis of the result of monopolistic practices. I requested the Library of Congress to prepare a brief statement upon the British monopoly—inquiry and control—bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

I make this request, Mr. President, because it seems to me it is of the greatest importance that Members of the Senate should realize that while we here in the United States are taking over the European ideology of cartel arrangements and monopolistic control of industry, the Government of Great Britain is trying to adopt the American system of free competitive enterprise. At the moment we are abandoning free enterprise and competition, the people of Great Britain are attempting to take it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRITISH MONOPOLY (INQUIRY AND CONTROL) BILL (AS OF JUNE 1, 1948)

STAGE OF THE BILL

The British Monopoly (Inquiry and Control) Bill was presented to the House of Commons, March 25, 1948, by Mr. Harold Wilson, who is also president of the Board of Trade. Upon the second reading, April 22, 1948, there was lengthy Parliamentary debate; it was referred to committee, considered, amended, and the resolution reported agreed to.

SUBSTANCE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the investigation of monopolies and restrictive arrangements in industry and trade, and to give the Government special powers for dealing with those which may "operate against the public interest" (clause 6).

An independent commission, to be called the Monopoly Commission, with a staff to be provided by the Board of Trade, will be set up to investigate and report on particular industries referred to them by the Board of Trade. If the commission upon investigation establishes the fact that particular industries are engaged in monopolistic practices not previously authorized, the relevant Government department (one of nine) will have new powers to make orders prohibiting the making or carrying out of the agreements in question, boycotts, conditional sales, and preferential terms. These orders would be subject to the approval of both Houses of Parliament.

Conditions to which the act would apply are held to prevail if a third or more of the goods in question is supplied, bought or processed either by one person or by two or more persons who have an arrangement, tacit or expressed, to limit competition in any way in

any particular trade. Agreements dealing with wages and employment are exempted.

No criminal proceedings can be brought for breach of an order made under the proposed act, but civil proceedings can be brought, either by the Crown or by any person affected, for an injunction or any other appropriate relief (clause 11).

Subject to security safeguards, cases referred to the commission must be published. Also when the commission has been required to report on the effect on the public interest, its report must be published. In other cases publication is optional. Disclosure of information is restricted to disclosure for purposes connected with the act; and penalties are provided for failure to give evidence or to produce documents.

When the commission has not decided whether the arrangements investigated are against the public interest, the House of Commons may do so by resolution. In such a case the remedies provided may be applied.

Penalties under the proposed act consist of imprisonment for a term of not more than 3 months or a fine not exceeding 100 pounds, or both. In cases of guilt by corporations every officer thereof is to be deemed guilty unless he can prove his lack of consent to and effort to prevent the offense.

Supplemental provisions deal with the payment by Parliament of expenses incurred in putting the act into effect.

Amendment to the bill providing for salaries and other expenses was agreed to after brief discussion.

RECEPTION OF THE BILL

It was expected that the bill would receive approval from all parties. The assumption that it was noncontroversial was based upon the fact that, prior to its introduction, there had been issued a pamphlet written by Sir David Maxwell Fyfe on behalf of the Conservativy Party which advocated measures against monopolies similar to those embodied in the bill.

The expectation was partially fulfilled in that there was general agreement as to the end to be attained. There was, however, opposition expressed as to the means to that end. Both in the lengthy debate in the House of Commons upon the second reading and in the press from time to time since the first reading, the opposition dwelt chiefly upon two principal points, the exclusion of trade unions and the exclusion of nationalized industries from the scope of the bill and the possibility of an attitude of arbitrary prosecution rather than of inquiry in the operations of the commission have been adversely criticized repeatedly.

The effort at a return to the competitive system in trade and industry was welcomed on every hand.

The criticism may be partially summarized in an excerpt from a long account in the London Economist (April 10, 1948, p. 575):

"The bill, in short does at once too much and too little. The main public service that can be rendered at present is in establishing and broadcasting the facts about monopoly and restriction and their effects. * * * The commission should neither be limited to the instructions it receives from the board of trade nor debarred from entering any field. Nor should there be any restrictions upon its findings. * * *

"But when it comes to a matter of action to be taken on the facts * * * there should be an aroused and articulate public opinion * * * (and) principles of economic justice should be drawn up, so that the enforcing authorities may have something other than their own prejudices to guide them."

In a subsequent comment the Economist (May 1, 1948, p. 705) offers an argument also to the opposition:

"Sir David's speech * * * and his view that any definition of prohibited practices would involve administrative chaos deserves, at least, respectful consideration. It is arguable, however, that this would be avoided if the prohibitions were few enough and the definitions right enough. Certainly it should be possible to profit by hard American experience and avoid the type of legal drafting which benefits no one except that particularly close corporation, the legal profession."

(Sources: Great Britain. Monopoly (Inquiry and Control) Bill, 1948, No. 67. Great Britain. Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons, March 25, April 22, 29, May 3, 1948. The Economist (London), April 10, 1948, p. 574 ff. May 1, 1948, p. 705. The Financial Times (London), April 2, 1948, p. 1; May 4, 1948, p. 4. Manchester Guardian Weekly, April 8, 1948, p. 14; April 29, 1948, p. 4. The Times (London), April 23, May 1–June 4, 1948.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, observe the contradictory things which are happening around us here. The distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], is chairman of the Small Business Committee. That committee has been maintained ever since it was established upon the motion, as I recall, of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. It has been maintained throughout the Eightieth Congress, because the Eightieth Congress believed that it desired to support and encourage small business. It does little good to support small business, Mr. President, to hold hearings and investigations and to read papers, if, at the same time, we undermine the law which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, conspiracies to establish monopoly, or attempts to establish monopoly. How can we hope to maintain small business while our legislative policy destroys it?

I understand the Small Business Committee, the Small Business Committee of the House, at least, has been authorized to undertake some sort of an investigation during the recess of Congress in order to go among the small-business men of the country and find out how the antitrust law is injuring them. In other words, here is an invitation, apparently, to those who want monopolistic combinations to say that the antitrust law of the United States should be abandoned.

UNDERMINING THE FOUNDATIONS OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Here is this bill, Mr. President. A few days ago the Senate adopted a resolution authorizing a study, which was brought about by the decision of the Supreme Court with respect to the basing-point system. There is every indication that the leadership of this Congress is now trying to go a step further than merely to let things drift, as we have done with respect to increasing prices, and, by positive action, to undermine the very foundation upon which free enterprise exists, namely, the antitrust law.

I desire to make it perfectly clear how broad paragraph 2 of the conference bill is. It not only fails to delineate the area for permissible joint rate collaboration among carriers, but it goes far beyond the field of collaboration on joint rates. The grant of power is so broad as to permit approval of the regulation of the transportation industry by private groups in the field of all rates, whether charged by an individual carrier on its own line or jointly by connecting carriers, or whether regional or interregional. Nor does its delegation stop with mere rate making.

Paragraph 2 of the bill provides for the approval of agreements "relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions, allowances, or charges—including charges between carriers and compensation paid or received for the use of facilities and equipment—or rules and regulations pertaining thereto, or procedures for the joint consideration, initiation, or establishment thereof." This goes beyond approval of agreements by joint action in considering and determining rates and fares, and includes agreements by joint action concerning not only the rates and fares to be charged, but the services to be performed, and the schedules and timetables to be effectuated, which could reasonably be construed as an agreement relating to rates and fares. As a matter of fact, a reasonable construction of paragraph 2 could include agreements which, without making specific reference to rates or fares, provide for joint action concerning the elimination or extension of services, schedules, and timetables, and other matters relating to rates and fares could come within the scope of mandatory approval by the Commission. This paragraph goes far beyond the field of rates, as is indicated by the express words in the parentheses which include "compensation paid or received for the use of facilities or equipment." Thus, as I have said, Mr. President, the bill comprehends the private control and direction of numerous activities involved in the conduct of carriers in all forms of transportation.

One of the most important omissions is that there is not a word or line in the bill to provide any rule of responsibility for the conduct of the meetings and the negotiations as a result of which an agreement is made. Let me emphasize the significance of that fact. All the agreements which affect rates, fares, equipment, facilities, and services can be made in secret meetings, without supervision, as they are in the process of being constructed. The only thing the Interstate Commerce Commission sees is the final work, the outcome, the result of these deliberations.

It is carefully provided that when the Congress passes laws its procedure shall be in the open. No bill may be passed unless it has been formally introduced upon the floor of either Chamber. It must be printed in the ordinary procedure. It must be sent to a committee for a hearing. The public is given notice. Those who are to be affected are told what it is proposed to accomplish. Before it is finally enacted it must come to the floor. But such is not the case with respect to the great power and authority which we are now extending to the transportation industry to draw up its theory, principle, and structure of self-government, without public supervision, at a time when the agreement is drafted, by anyone representing the public interest. It is true that the agreement must go to the Interstate Commerce Commission for its approval. But the language of the bill clearly states that the Interstate Commerce Commission

shall approve it, unless the agreement contains certain subjects in a narrow category set forth in paragraphs (4), (5), and (6). But these exceptions are insignificant because the exemption from the antitrust law contained in paragraph (9) is so broad that it makes the traditional American policy against restraints of trade ineffective so far as the transportation industry is concerned.

Immunity from the antitrust laws is granted not only to the carriers who participate in the agreement and carry it out but to "other persons." The heart of the Georgia case was that coercion by the individual carriers is inherent in and carried out by an integrated railroad association structure which, assisted by banking and other influences, disciplines and enforces its mandates by economic pressure upon individual carriers.

When such an agreement with this inherent power to prevent an individual carrier from acting independently is approved, as under the bill it must be approved by the Commission, all hope of independent action by any member carrier is destroyed. Paragraph 6 in no way preserves the right of a carrier to withhold any matter from joint consideration or action. The whole purpose of the bill is to provide for procedures for determinations through joint consideration.

If it should be argued that the Commission has the power to deny approval to an agreement on general grounds because of violation of the antitrust law, that contention would be rebutted by the fact that under paragraph 2 the Commission is under a mandate to approve the basic organization agreement on a finding that "by reason of the furtherance of the national transportation policy declared" in the Interstate Commerce Act, exemption from antitrust laws should be granted.

The national transportation policy of the existing Interstate Commerce Act embraces a broad range of general objectives unrelated to the antitrust laws.

Thus, the bill gives an effective exemption from the basic antimonopoly law of this country for practically everything the new organizations may do "relating to rates; fares, classifications, divisions," and so forth, set forth in paragraph 2.

The field in which these agreements may be made without limit or supervision is so broad, as I have already indicated, that it covers all sorts of rates and services with respect to every type of transportation in various types of competing carriers.

SAFEGUARD AGAINST INTIMIDATION ELIMINATED

Here we have the grave possibility that these transportation companies are being empowered to fix joint rates for pipe-line companies, railroads, and motor carriers, all of which must obey the mandate of the association which is to be set up.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention over and over again to the elimination from the bill of the safeguard which was written in by the Senate to prevent the exercise of intimidation by the association over any carrier. The language was:

> Nothing in this section and no approval of any agreement by the Commission under this section shall be so construed as in any manner to remove from the purview of the antitrust laws any restraint upon the right of independent action by any carrier by means of boycott, duress, or intimidation.

Why did the authors of the bill desire to eliminate the prohibition against the exercise of intimidation, boycott, or duress upon carriers who might desire to announce competitive rates? This semblance of a safeguard was eliminated, and the reasons for the omission of this and similar safeguards have never yet been explained. They were not explained in the conference report, and no explanation was given to the Senate, although requested by the critics of the bill in the Senate debate.

I am glad to see that my distinguished friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the acting majority leader, the chairman of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, is on the floor. During the absence of the distinguished Senator, who has been laboring in the Interior Department appropriation bill conference, I discussed the fact that while the Small Business Committee goes through the motions of expressing its sympathy with independent private enterprise, we, the Members of the Senate, here upon the floor authorized the establishment of a trade association which will eliminate all semblance of competition in the transportation industry.

If that is eliminated, Mr. President, then the shippers and the people of Nebraska and Wyoming will suffer just as those in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Vermont, and other States are suffering.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator desires to ask me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Senator could inform me whether it would be possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote at some time this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is very desirous of speaking upon this matter, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] tells me that he wishes to speak upon it, the Sentor from Alabama [Mr. HILL] wants to speak, and I think the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] desires to make some comment upon the measure. I have been talking here to empty seats, so that the Members of the Senate are not receiving the true gospel, and I want to be sure that they do receive it. I am hoping that, now that the lunch period is over, Senators may return to the floor of the Senate and listen to those who may succeed me.

Mr. WHERRY. I was going to ask the Senator if he intended to make his speech all over again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It carries an important message which every Member of the Senate should have.

Mr. WHERRY. Whenever the Senator speaks he makes an interesting address. But does the Senator feel that, if I should suggest the hour of 4 o'clock for a vote, the time between 2 and 4 to be divided, we might arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not presume to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement in the absence of the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Georgia, and some other Senators.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, but before yielding, may I say to the Senator from New Jersey that at the beginning of this debate he was given personal credit by the distinguished and able Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] for the elimination from the conference bill of the provision inserted by the Senate to preserve the virility of the suit of the State of Georgia.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I beg the pardon of the Senator from Wyoming. I did no such thing. What I said was that in the debate on the conference report the debate dealt more in detail with the reasons why the House conferees refused to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I apologize to the Senator. I misunderstood him. Let me say that the Senator from South Carolina also misunderstood him, as did some other Senators.

Mr. REED. What I was trying to say, and what I think I do say, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, was that Senators were asking me about the attitude of the House conferees on the Russell amendment, and I said that the Senator from New Jersey had dealt with that aspect of the matter in his part of the debate on the conference report.

Mr. HAWKES. I think the Senator from Kansas made a clear statement, and I accept the responsibility for that, and made a statement on the floor in connection with it.

(Mr. HAWKES thereupon asked and obtained permission to have printed in the RECORD a certain editorial, which appears at the conclusion of the remarks of Senator O'MAHONEY.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks those who are holding conferences on the floor of the Senate to recess their conferences or retire to the cloakroom. It is impossible for even the Chair to hear the speaker and understand what he says.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think we have a reasonable degree of order in the Senate now. I am quite ready to proceed.

Mr. President, I have recited what I conceived to be the dangers of the policy which permits large industrial and transportation units to combine for the purpose of governing their own industries.

I am thinking now of the evil effect of concentrated economic organization, the ideology of business which in Europe led to the establishment of the dictatorial state. This theory of business organization has been condemned uniformly by all American leaders of all parties. A distinguished former President of the United States, and former Chief Justice of the United States, William Howard Taft, was not the least effective of those who condemned monopolistic practices. I remember very well in my studies reading the message which he as President of

the United States sent to the Congress of the United States recommending that there be public legislation to provide national charters for the national corporations which carry on the business of the United States. I remember how severely in that very message he condemned the monopolistic practices which have led all over the world to the destruction of free government and to the establishment of dictatorships. We in the Senate and in the House must make the decision whether we desire this country to remain loyal to the tradition of free competitive enterprise, for if we abandon that ideal, be sure it will be lost to the world.

I have no doubt at all that the greatest issue in the campaign of 1948 will be the issue of free competitive enterprise. It is not free enterprise which marches under the disguise of this measure. This is the beginning of totalitarianism; this is the measure that turns the corner.

Almost every great industrial leader condemns the cartel system but that system is the one by which industrial leadership writes its own ticket. Here we are giving into the hands of the transportation industry of the United States the power to write its own ticket.

I have before me a little volume published by the Brookings Institution in Washington in 1947 entitled "The Aluminum Cartel." It was written by Mr. Louis Marlio, who himself was one of the principal officers of that cartel for many years. He tells in this little volume how the cartel was established and what it undertook to do. I read from it as follows:

> Unlike previous cartels, the fourth cartel, that is the Alliance Co., adopted the principle of leaving to its members the maximum commercial and industrial freedom compatible with the realization of its objects.

Freedom was permitted to the members only to the degree that it was compatible with the objects of the cartel. Here we have a measure which denies freedom to the individual transportation companies, and makes them subject to what is done and to the decisions which are made by the transportation organization which is to be created.

> Regulation was to be imposed only to the extent it proved useful.

Who was to decide what would prove useful? Of course, the managers of the cartel. Who is going to decide what will prove useful in the present case? Again the managers of the trade association which we are allowing the industry to organize in secret session. It will determine—not the representatives of the public—what is useful to do in the transportation industry.

Mr. Marlio continues:

> This principle is affirmed in the following clause of the agreement:
>
> "A" shareholders will be free to produce, transform and sell aluminum in all its forms, including raw metal, semifinished products and finished products, without any price agreement, territorial limitations, or any other regulation, except as provided in the present agreement and as may be enforced by ACC (Aluminum Alliance Co.) in accordance with this same agreement.

So here we have an organization which has the power to fix prices and to delimit territory and to control production. And did they do it? Let me read again from Mr. Marlio:

> The prices at which aluminum was sold in the Japanese market were somewhat below the prices in London and Paris, in order to discourage the creation of plants in Japan. This did not mean that under the cartel system prices in Japan were lower than they would have been under international competition. It must be remembered that a primary purpose of the cartel was to prevent serious under-cutting in world markets. The result was doubtless a level of prices in Japan somewhat above that which would have prevailed under a system of wholesale dumping by noncooperating producers.

Here was a world-wide organization which frankly undertook to regulate prices and to prevent competition, and made no bones about saying so.

This is the way they divided their business: I read from page 32 of Dr. Marlio's book:

> The division worked out as follows: Aluminum Francais, 299 shares, or 21.36 percent; Aluminum Industrie Neuhausen, 216 shares, or 15.43 percent; Aluminum, Ltd., 400 shares, or 28.57 percent; British Aluminum Co., 210 shares, or 15 percent; German group, 275 shares, or 19.64 percent.

FREE GOVERNMENT COLLAPSED IN EUROPE WHEN MONOPOLY TOOK OVER

So the cartel arrangement decided for itself what each participant would enjoy of the world market, and then enforced rules and regulations to prevent competition. That was done in industry after industry, and the result was the collapse of free government in Europe. There is no doubt at all, if past experience of humankind means anything, that if we here in the United States abandon our American tradition of a free economy we shall go the road of those countries which have adopted the cartel system.

There is no evidence before this body that anyone presented himself at the hearings on behalf of the public to endorse this measure. Of course the shippers were represented. The shipping associations were represented. Attorneys for the railroads were there. The transportation companies, the motor carriers, and the pipe lines do not like regulation in the public interest. I can understand their annoyance. But the great danger is that if we now open the door to monopoly by exempting one great industry in all its aspects from the effect of the antitrust laws, there will be no recourse except the establishment of a more powerful Central Government.

When we undertake to destroy the power of a sovereign state to go into the Supreme Court of the United States to protect traditional Americanism and the freedom of its economy, we are laying the foundation for monopolistic control of industry which will lead inevitably, as it has done everywhere, to the destruction of free government. I was never more certain of any statement I have made in all my service in the Senate than I am of this: The approval of this bill, the overriding of the President's veto, means the abandonment of competition as a rule of economic conduct in the United States.

EXHIBIT A

[From the June 1948 Monthly Letter on Economic Conditions—Government Finance, published by the National City Bank of New York]

100 largest manufacturing corporations, based on total assets reported at the end of 1947

[In millions of dollars]

Allied Chemical & Dye Corp	575
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co	202
Aluminum Co. of America	430
American Can Co	250
American Cyanamid Co	207
American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp	153
American Smelting & Refining Co	256
American Sugar Refining Co	133
American Tobacco Co	647
American Viscose Corp	201
American Woolen Co	118
Anaconda Copper Mining Co	637
Armco Steel Corp	249
Armour & Co	421
Atlantic Refining Co	330
Bendix Aviation Corp	123
Bethlehem Steel Corp	949
Borden Co	222
Borg-Warner Corp	151
Burlington Mills Corp	125
Caterpillar Tractor Co	122
Celanese Corp. of America	212
Chrysler Corp	487
Cities Service Co	900
Coca-Cola Co	192
Continental Can Co	207
Continental Oil Co	209
Corn Products Refining Co	146
Crane Co	129
Curtiss-Wright Corp	166
Deere & Co	229
Distillers Corp.-Seagrams	267
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co	1,438
Eastman Kodak Co	360
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	324
General American Transportation Corp	132
General Electric Co	1,027
General Foods Corp	207
General Motors Corp	2,473
B. F. Goodrich Co	247
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co	408
Gulf Oil Corp	929
Hearst Consolidated Publications	161
Inland Steel Co	244
International Business Machines Corp	184
International Harvester Co	620
International Paper Co	279
Johns-Manville Corp	115
Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp	341
Kennecott Copper Corp	541
Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co	366
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp	116
Monsanto Chemical Co	199
Nash-Kelvinator Corp	138
National Biscuit Co	154
National Dairy Products Corp	277
National Distiller Products Corp	210
National Lead Co	163
National Steel Corp	292
Ohio Oil Co	164
Owens-Illinois Glass Co	162
Phelps Dodge Corp	251
Phillips Petroleum Co	439
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co	207
Procter & Gamble Co	242
Pullman, Inc	197
Pure Oil Co	245
Radio Corp. of America	216
Republic Steel Corp	455
R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co	458
Reynolds Metals Co	112
St. Regis Paper Co	133
Schenley Distillers Corp	318
Shell Union Oil Corp	534
Sinclair Oil Corp	591
Skelly Oil Co	129
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co	1,262
Standard Brands, Inc	135

[In millions of dollars]

Standard Oil Co. of California	876
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	1,268
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	2,996
Standard Oil Co. of Ohio	189
Sun Oil Co	242
Swift & Co	437
Texas Co	1,115
Tide Water Associated Oil Co	263
Union Carbide & Carbon Corp	649
Union Oil Co. of California	272
United Aircraft Corp	160
United Fruit Co	419
United States Gypsum Co	132
United States Rubber Co	348
United States Steel Corp	2,163
Walker-Gooderham & Worts	134
Western Electric Co	771
Westinghouse Electric Corp	602
Weyerhaeuser Timber Co	195
Wheeling Steel Corp	158
Wilson & Co	140
Youngstown Sheet & Tube	260

The above list excludes a number of large companies whose statements are not yet available for the 1947 calendar or nearest fiscal year, or for the years going back to 1940, including American Car & Foundry Co., Crown Zellerbach Corp., Dow Chemical Co., Ford Motor Co., General Mills, Inc., Phillip Morris & Co., Ltd., Publicker Industries, Inc., Remington Rand, Inc., Singer Manufacturing Co., and J. P. Stevens & Co.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rate Making," from the Washington Post of this morning. In my opinion it is a very clear statement of the problem which will be in front of the country and the transportation systems unless the pending veto is overridden.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATE MAKING

The President's veto of the Bulwinkle-Reed bill exempting rate agreements by railroads and other common carriers from the antitrust laws should be overridden. For, if upheld by Congress, it would result in serious disruption of rate-making processes that have stood the test of time and meet with the approval of shippers as well as the Interstate Commerce Commission and State regulatory officials. A great deal depends, therefore, upon the action taken today by the Senate on the rejected measure. If it votes to override the veto the chances are that the House, which passed the bill by a very large majority, will follow suit.

In passing the Bulwinkle-Reed bill, Congress sought to remove the confusion and uncertainty that have resulted from a conflict of views regarding the applicability of the antitrust laws to certain kinds of agreements among regulated common carriers. As the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce said in its report on the bill, "a large measure of collective action by and among common carriers is necessary if the national transportation policy is to be effected and if the public is to receive the kind of transportation service to which it is entitled and if rates are to be reasonable and nondiscriminatory." If, as the Department of Justice maintains, rate agreements effectuated through rate bureaus and associations are to be regarded as illegal restraints of competition, the regulatory system under which the carriers have been operating for years will be shot to pieces.

The late Joseph B. Eastman, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who was also director of the Office of Defense Transportation, was an ardent defender of the existing system of rate conferences. He said some years ago that he did not know how the carriers could comply with the mandates of the law and the orders of the Commission unless they could consult and confer with one another. He further pointed out that such joint action was always subject to protest and review by the ICC if in violation of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. The bill vetoed last week by the President does not impair any of these existing safeguards against abuse. The carriers will have the right, as at present, to propose rates to the ICC, subject to its approval. And the Commission may suspend any proposed changes on protest or of its own initiative as at present. The bill also protects the rights of a carrier to take independent action regardless of conference decisions. Spokesmen for the Department of Justice have made much of the fact that few protests reach the Commission, citing it as an indication that rate bureaus are in a position virtually to compel individual roads to adhere to collective agreements. However, it can just as well be maintained that the small proportion of protested rate changes is proof that the conference method of rate adjustment works very satisfactorily for all interested parties, roads and shippers alike.

The President's charge that the Bulwinkle-Reed bill represents a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition simply does not fit the facts of the case. For the bill does not impair the regulatory powers over rate-making now exercised by the ICC. Nor does it render the carriers immune from the antitrust laws except as to joint rate agreements of the kind they have long been accustomed to enter into with the approval of the ICC.

In the absence of rate conferences tariff schedules would have to be filed by individual railroads and by thousands of motor carriers. The result would be not competition but regulatory chaos. The integrated rate structure would fall apart and the ICC would be overwhelmed by the burden of work thrust upon it by protesting shippers and carriers. Consequently, prompt legislative action is needed to insure preservation of a regulated system of rate-making that an overwhelming majority of transportation officials, regulatory agencies, and shippers consider indispensable and in the public interest.

The pending antitrust cases referred to by President Truman as one reason for vetoing the Bulwinkle-Reed bill may not be settled for some time. Nor is it certain that those suits will result in judicial clarification of the issues raised in the present instance. Incidentally, the pending Georgia and Lincoln, Nebr., suits to which the President was evidently referring in his veto message would not be thrown out of court by legalization of carrier rate agreements, since the roads concerned have been charged with conspiracy to fix rates of a discriminatory nature. Such practices are outlawed by the antitrust laws, whether they are engineered by rate bureaus or other agencies. And the Bulwinkle-Reed bill would not legalize such unlawful antisocial practices. In sum, the national interest appears to require that Congress override Mr. Truman's veto of this important measure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now propose a unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to vote upon the veto at the hour of 4:45 o'clock p. m., 1 hour and 35 minutes of the time to be in the control of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and 45 minutes in control of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. That would bring the vote exactly at 4:45 p. m.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 25 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the able Senator from Wyoming with reference to the growth of monopoly in this country and how it threatens our American system of democracy. He made a most startling statement; and yet there were very few Senators in the Chamber to listen to him and hear his remarks about what is happening in our country.

THE RAILROAD LOBBY

Mr. President, the support which has been mobilized in favor of this bill among transportation agencies and among shippers and industrial groups must not be permitted to override the public interest in the preservation of healthy competitive enterprise. The public interest is broader than that of any group having a selfish interest in or relationship to transportation. It is the public which pays the freight. The public is interested in the lower rates and in the improvements in service which flow from healthy competition between the carriers.

Shippers are more interested in rate relationships than in rate levels. Indeed, it is charged in the pending antitrust cases that powerful groups of shippers in a number of basic industries have joined with the carriers in private agreements to maintain high uniform rates and to prevent rate reductions which would disturb market relationships favorable to such groups of shippers or which would aid in the establishment of new competition in basic industries. It is also charged in the pending antitrust cases that the private rate bureaus which could be legalized by this bill have in the past been used by combinations of carriers to frustate the will of progressive individual carriers seeking to make rate adjustments which would permit shippers on their lines to compete in distant markets and which would attract new industries to areas where industrialization is essential to the balanced development of our national resources. Such practices, which would be freed from prosecution under the antitrust laws by this bill, are no more in the interest of shippers than of the public generally.

The manner in which support for legislation similar to this bill has been mobilized by the railroads is a matter of record. I refer to the documents and testimony presented to committees of the Congress which describe the organization and functioning of the railroad lobby.

According to the late John J. Pelley, until recently President of the Association of American Railroads, lobbying is one of the primary functions of that association. The chief lieutenant to carry out the lobby activities of the AAR has been R. V. Fletcher, who for many years had been vice president and general counsel of the association. He described the objectives of the general legislative committee of the Association of Railroad Executives, predecessor of the AAR, as being "charged with the duty of assembling and promulgating inform-

ation relative to legislation affecting railroads, and with the further duty of organizing the States for offense and defense on all matters of legislation, State, and Federal, affecting railroads"—exhibit No. 3448, hearings on Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-fourth Congress.

To accomplish the objective of organization for offense and defense on legislative matters, Mr. Fletcher, as chairman of the legislative committee of the Association of Railway Executives, created a system upon which the present legislative activities of the Association of American Railroads are based, and which was continued under the control of Mr. Fletcher as vice president and general counsel. Senate Report No. 26, paragraph 2, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, on Senate Resolution 71. That system involved the organization within the sphere of railroad organization of a virtual army operating nationally, regionally, and locally, and the maintenance of an alliance with nonrailroad associations to give the railroad lobby, where deemed necessary, a nonrailroad front. The story of the development of this organization and the various intrigues and manipulations in which it engaged is told in detail through documents and oral testimony in the railroad investigation conducted by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce under Senate Resolution 71 Seventy-fourth Congress—Hearings, part 23; Report No. 26, part 2, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

First, a plan was promulgated whereby the various States in the Union were assigned by the association to a particular railroad, as follows:

New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island.

New York Central: New York, Michigan.

Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey: New Jersey.

Pennsylvania Railroad: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Indiana.

Baltimore & Ohio: Maryland.

New York, Chicago & St. Louis: Ohio.

Chesapeake & Ohio: West Virginia.

Norfolk & Western: Virginia.

Seaboard Air Line Railway: Florida.

Atlantic Coast Line: North Carolina, South Carolina.

Louisville & Nashville: Alabama, Kentucky.

Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis: Tennessee.

Central of Georgia: Georgia.

Illinois Central: Illinois, Mississippi.

Texas & Pacific: Louisiana.

Chicago & North Western: Wisconsin.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific: South Dakota.

St. Louis-San Francisco: Missouri.

Missouri Pacific: Arkansas.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific: Iowa.

Great Northern: Minnesota, North Dakota.

Northern Pacific: Montana, Washington.

Union Pacific: Oregon, Utah, Wyoming, Idaho.

Southern Pacific: Nevada, California, Arizona, Texas.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe: Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy: Colorado, Nebraska.

In addition to carving out the 48 States and assigning each area to a railroad, the plan further provided for the creation in each State of a State railroad association or a State legislative committee to work on national as well as State legislation. The purpose of the associations was to line up the "boys" in a particular State, to line up the support of all influences—citizens, organizations, newspapers, and so forth—which could be brought into play upon Representatives in Congress or Senators; and under the guidance of the national organization, to flood Members of Congress with letters and telegrams favorable to the railroads' point of view on pending legislation. As outlined by Mr. Fletcher in letters written by him to the State organizations:

> In suggesting the organization of railroad associations in each State, I had in mind putting into effect a plan whereby we would be advised as to who are the influential men behind the several Congressmen, and the further thought that we might be able through personal contact or by the careful distribution of literature to influence in a perfectly proper way the judgment of the men upon whom the several Congressmen rely for support and advice. Indeed, I have thought that we might go so far as to get a mailing list which would show the names of the influential citizens of the United States, meaning thereby those who are influential in a political way, so that we might contact those men through our attorneys, employees, and representatives, and in order that we might provide them with such informative publications as are issued by the various railroad agencies and which discuss the railroad question in a careful and conservative manner. I should be glad, therefore, if you could send me with reference to each Member of Congress and each Senator, dealing with each separately for filing purposes, a statement as to who he is, where he lives, what profession he follows, what is his social and political background, and particularly who are his friends, advisers, and sponsors in each of the counties in his congressional district. I understand, of course, that the sentence just before this refers particularly to Members of the House of Representatives. In the same way, however, I should like to know something about the background of the Senators and the persons on whom they probably rely for advice. I appreciate the fact that this is a pretty large order and may require a good deal of inquiry in different parts of the State, but I am seeking to assemble here in Washington a very complete record of each Member of Congress with particular reference to the influences which control him and the persons on whom he relies for support.

In addition to the State associations, the technique was subsequently refined by setting up congressional district chairmen to operate in the congressional districts, and to whom local officials of the railroads would be directly responsible. At the disposal of the district chairmen were placed railroad officials, freight and passenger men, local agents, and local attorneys and surgeons, who were charged with the building up, in their respective congressional districts, of organizations to be called in for assistance, either locally or in Washington, as the need should arise. The railroad officials, employees, surgeons, and attorneys were required to respond to the call of the district chairman as and when requested and the district chairman was given the right to call upon them for any assistance he may need without the necessity of going through individual railroads. This corps of railroad men has been considered by Mr. Fletcher as the real strength of the railroad lobby.

Shortly after the Association of American Railroads was organized and took over the work of the lobby, Mr. Fletcher suggested a further refinement of the methods developed in carrying out the work of legislative offense and defense. Under directions of Mr. Fletcher, the person charged with primary responsibility in each State undertook to assign a particular Congressman to some member of the organization or of the committee, with the request that the person to whom a particular Congressman is assigned endeavor to have him interviewed at home by as many of his influential constituents as can be persuaded to undertake the task. Mr. Fletcher expressed the thought that it would be very helpful indeed if a hundred influential citizens in each district could mention the matter to the Congressman and give him to understand that the measures advocated by the railroads meet with the approval of his constituents and that those matters which the railroads disfavor are not looked upon with approval by the influential men among the Congressman's constituents.

Mr. Fletcher looked upon hearings before the congressional committee in which he or his assistant participated as largely matters of scenery to satisfy the public and that the effective work on legislation had to be done by the lobby personnel sent to operate in Washington. Mr. Fletcher, for example, wrote the general counsel of the Milwaukee Railroad regarding a pending maximum-hour bill in Congress that "he had pulled every string which is accessible to defeat the bill" and that he desired the railroads to select a list of men who would be "particularly influential with Members of Congress and with Senators to come to Washington." Mr. Fletcher desired only such men to come to Washington as are quite well acquainted with the Members, but who sustain such relations to them as would make it unnecessary that Members of Congress would rise in their places and denounce our friends as lobbyists.

"I have no purpose to interfere with sleeping dogs," Mr. Fletcher wrote, "and I shall, therefore, not send out a Macedonian cry for help unless the situation becomes desperate. However, I would like to have the preliminary work done in the way of selecting men who can come to Washington, if necessary, so that if I wire some time next week or a little later that we are driven to the necessity for canvassing the House and Senate, these men would be available for this service."

The traffic department of the Association of American Railroads, which ostensibly would be considered wholly to be concerned with traffic matters has been

engaged in lobbying activities. Under its directions, telegrams have been sent to Members of Congress by citizens and chambers of commerce on the assurance that the Association of American Railroads would make necessary reimbursement for expenses incurred in sending such telegrams.

To give the lobby, where it was deemed desirable, a nonrailroad appearance, organizations supported and maintained by the AAR posed as independent, public organizations, but presented the railroad view under guidance of the railroad lobby. So-called shippers' advisory boards were established within the organizational set-up of the AAR. The shippers' advisory boards are operated under the supervision of the car service division of the AAR, and the district managers of the car service division usually act as secretaries of the shippers' advisory boards. The incidental expenses of the boards are paid by the Association of American Railroads. The members of the shippers' advisory boards pay no dues. These shippers' boards, posing as representatives of the shippers, appear before congressional committees and otherwise support railroad legislation. In a statement made by the AAR authorizing the shippers' advisory boards to pursue legislative activities, it was said:

> The boards afford a splendid set-up for handling all questions of this kind. Each important section of the country, and every industrial and agricultural interest in each section have both adequate and localized representation in the board.
>
> Of the personnel of the membership in these boards, there is no need to say anything other than that it represents the leading and most intelligent thought on transportation matters of industry, agriculture, and banking in each territory and throughout the Nation as a whole.

The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, in making a report on the shippers' advisory boards, said: "Obviously, such a far-flung organization could wield great power and influence in promoting railroad legislation, and it quickly got into action."

Other organizations have been used in the same manner. Such front organizations include taxpayers' associations, security owners' associations, railway-employee organizations, and chambers of commerce. The extent to which the Association of American Railroads control the front organizations is revealed in a letter written by the secretary of the car service division of the AAR to the president of the Security Owners' Association concerning proceedings of a meeting of the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board at which resolutions were passed in favor of a special railroad bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Montana one more minute.

Mr. MURRAY. The letter said:

> You will find the discussions in the proceedings leading up to the passage of these resolutions very interesting. The antagonism shown was from a small minority block of barge-line advocates or enthusiasts, which we use as scenery occasionally, and they performed very nobly in this case, although they do not know it.

The purpose of obtaining the passage of resolutions by the shippers' advisory board and their dissemination in Washington was, as stated by the secretary of the car-service division, "to impress them with the fact that these gentlemen represent the largest single block of organized and intelligent public opinion in the Northwest." The chairman of the Senate committee asked the president of the AAR:

> The AAR utilized the machinery of the shippers' advisory boards to promote the railroads' legislative program, did they not?

Mr. Pelley answered:

> I think the answer to that is yes—wherever it can be done.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I said when this bill was originally under consideration, an analysis of the bill, made in the light of the facts of record and the reports of the committee, compel the conclusion that through its passage the legislative policy of competitive enterprise in public transportation would be supplanted by a Nation-wide cartel monopoly under the domination of the Association of American Railroads and the traditional railroad bankers. This is so because the bill would, first, effectively repeal the antitrust laws as applied to public transportation.

There should be no misunderstanding as to what we are now doing. We are taking the railroads, the Nation's means of transportation, out from under the antitrust laws. We are putting them into a privileged class, separate and set apart from the class in which we find all other segments and elements of American business and economy. The transportation industry is to be in this special class, entirely exempt from the antitrust laws.

In the second place, this bill legalizes the continuation and extension of control over every phase of a carrier's operations by the Association of American Railroads and the traditional railroad bankers. They are to be insulated from the courts, for, under the bill, the railroads cannot be taken into the courts under the antitrust laws, because the antitrust laws will no longer apply to the railroads. Insulated from the courts, and without fear of hindrance from other agencies of the Government, they would be free to create combinations of carriers on a Nation-wide scale, with power not only to fix rates, but also to determine what part of the rate each carrier shall receive, what time its trains shall arrive and depart, over what routes they may operate, what equipment shall be built and how it shall be used, and what should be done collectively to promote, to use the words of the Interstate Commerce Act, "adequacy, economy, and efficiency of operation or service."

In view of the vast powers thus conferred upon the transportation cartel and the extent of the pressures which it would be able to exert upon otherwise independent carriers, it is clear that no carrier could afford to remain long outside the cartel. In other words, Mr. President, we are so legalizing this railroad supergovernment, we are so confirming the machinery and the operation of the machinery of the Association of American Railroads that no independent carrier could operate. This association, which we today confirm, which brings such tremendous economic power to bear on any independent railroad, could so hold the power of life or death over any independent railroad as to force that railroad to surrender its independence and to become a part of the Association of American Railroads.

Mr. President, this bill would strike a telling blow to private enterprise. We in the United States hold today the last citadel, we constitute the last stronghold, of free enterprise on this earth. Free enterprise is the basis of our whole American life. Without free enterprise we cannot enjoy the other freedoms which we cherish and of which we so proudly boast. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion—these freedoms cannot long survive in a land where economic liberty has been destroyed. Elsewhere throughout the world we see nation after nation moving toward some form of nationalization, some form of socialization, some form of totalitarianism. Even our friends in the British Isles, who, for so long, have held fast to the great principles of individual liberty, are today rapidly moving toward socialization. We have witnessed their socialization of one industry after another.

Only last night the Senate passed a bill appropriating billions of dollars, to be given to nations and peoples across the seas in the hope of holding the frontiers of freedom, in the hope of preserving liberty to men and women. Yet right at home, within 24 hours after the appropriation of those billions of dollars we find this bill before us, a bill which would strike a terrible blow at the free-enterprise system of America.

Mr. President, the bill would undo the public benefits which have resulted or may be expected to result from antitrust suits involving the Pullman monopoly, the western agreement, the investment banking houses of J. P. Morgan & Co., and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., equipment manufacturers, safety and signal monopolies, and rate-fixing combinations dominated by the Association of American Railroads, all of which have been and are adverse to the interests of carriers in large sections of the country. In other words, the benefits which the American people have derived from the antitrust suits which have been brought in the past would now be wiped out, at one fell swoop, by the passage of this bill.

As we know, when the bill was originally before the Senate there was placed in it an amendment specifically stating that nothing in the bill would in any way impair or affect the case which the State of Georgia now has pending in the Supreme Court of the United States against the railroads in the matter of unfair and unjust discriminations in freight rates as they affect Georgia, the people of that State, and the national economy. Yet, we find that when this bill went to conference, that amendment was eliminated from the bill, and there is now no protection in the bill for the suit of the State of Georgia against certain railroads in the matter of unfair and unjust discriminations, but, on the contrary, as we well know, the very purpose of the passage of the bill is to prevent such suits as the suit of the State of Georgia, and to wipe out any other suits which may have been filed against the railroads for unfair and unjust discriminations in the matter of freight rates.

If this bill passes, Mr. President, we may know that the conditions which exist today as to unfair and unjust freight-rate discriminations will continue. Because of such unfair and unjust discriminations, the States of the West, as well as the States of the South, have largely been placed in the status of colonial provinces. They have been denied the opportunities for economic and industrial development which their natural resources and the character and genius of their people entitle them to enjoy. The States of the West and of the South have been thwarted, and, indeed, paralyzed in their economic and industrial development, because of unfair and unjust discriminations in freight rates. This bill would now confirm and freeze this paralysis.

Mr. President, if this bill passes today representatives of the Western States and representatives of the Southern States need no longer protest against unfair and unjust discriminations, because there will be no opportunity to go into court and have those discriminations removed, there will be no opportunity to translate those protests into action, there will be no opportunity to secure relief from discrimination and injustice.

Today we find the railroads organized in the Association of American Railroads, with the control, with the power, with the dictation and the domination under this association in the hands of a few great investment bankers in New York City, largely in the hands of the two great investment banking houses of Morgan & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

What this bill would do would be to approve this supergovernment set up in the form of the Association of American Railroads, this supergovernment for the transportation industry of America, this supergovernment controlled by great investment banking houses of Wall Street.

We speak of our democracy, we speak of government of the people, yet what is proposed to be done today if we pass this bill is to take the Government, so far as the transportation industry is concerned, out of the hands of the people and their chosen representatives, and out of the hands of the courts created for the protection of the people, and put it in the hands of these great investment bankers. We would sign and approve the relegation of the States of the West and of the South to a colonial status.

Mr. President, when the case of the southern governors, which was designed to remove unfair and unjust discriminations against the Southern States, and to open the door for the removal of unfair and unjust discriminations against the Western States, as well, was tried before the Interstate Commerce Commission, a witness for the eastern railroads, testifying, as shown on page 832 of the record of the Senate committee on this bill, did not hesitate to make this statement:

Official Territory—

And the Official Territory is the preferred, the privileged, territory of the East—

Official Territory lines have perhaps the most vital interest in interterritorial competitive adjustments of any single group of carriers in the country for the reason that the populous Official Territory provides the markets for a large part of the traffic produced elsewhere in the United States. That territory is hemmed in on the South, the Southwest, and the West by territories, and carriers serving them, all seeking to market their products within the territory served by Official lines.

In that Official Territory, let me say, Mr. President, live more than 70 percent of the people of the United States who constitute more than 70 percent of the purchasing power of the country. It is in that territory that we find the great markets.

The witness continued:

In many instances, such commodities, sought to be marketed within Official Territory, come into direct competition with the commodities produced in that territory. Official lines—

That is, the eastern railroad lines—

therefore, are in duty bound to protect the geographical or other natural advantages possessed by shippers or producers on their lines, and, as a matter of justice and equity, they may not be required to join in such low bases of interterritorial rates as to nullify or neutralize these natural advantages.

What the witness was saying, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 20 minutes allotted to the Senator from Alabama have expired.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Georgia yield me one more minute?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield 1 minute more to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. HILL. I wish to sum up by saying that if the bill is passed over the President's veto we shall have struck a heavy blow to the free-enterprise system which has built and made great our country. By passing the bill we shall have taken the first step leading inevitably toward Government ownership and operation of the railroads, for the people will soon come to realize that if we are to have a monopoly cartel, a supergovernment, controlling the transportation industry, then that supergovernment should be their government, and they will insist that that monopoly cartel be turned over to the Government of the United States, which will mean Government operation and control and ownership of the railroads.

If we pass the bill today, we shall have taken a step toward the socialization and the nationalization of American industry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the legislation now pending before the Senate is not anything new. We have been discussing what is commonly known as the Bulwinkle bill, or the Reed bill, for many years. I am glad to say that in the years that have passed we have been successful in keeping such a law as this off the statute books. During all the time the legislation has been pending in Congress the railroads have been crying that they could not operate properly without legislation such as is carried in the bill. But I should like to call to the attention of the people of the United States that the railroads have continued to make rates and have continued to operate under existing law.

I want to make it plain that defeat of the legislation will not prevent the railroads from continuing to operate in the future as they have been operating in the past. So long as they see fit not to violate the antitrust laws they can meet together and enter into agreements respecting rates and operation of their railroads, but such agreements must not violate the antitrust laws or be detrimental to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, in reality, what is being asked of us by the pending bill? We are asked to permit the American Association of Railroads to meet together as a group and decide upon policies, rates, the making of timetables, and everything else that goes into the operation of railroads, and submit their agreements

to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if the Commission approves them, the railroads will be protected from prosecution, even though they have in fact violated the antitrust laws of the United States. Should the railroads be permitted to hide behind the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or should they, like all other corporations in the United States, abide by the antitrust laws of the United States? That is the question before us upon the reconsideration of the bill which was vetoed by the President.

Mr. President, I commend the President of the United States for vetoing the bill and sending it back to us, thus protecting the people and the shippers of the United States.

Why do I object to the Association of Railroads getting together and entering into agreements such as provided by the bill? I can give the Senate a few reasons why I object.

Hearings were held over a long period of months and years on the pending legislation. In those hearings it will be found that time and time again a certain railroad endeavored to reduce its rates between one city and another city in the United States, but was prevented from doing so—not by any law similar to that represented by the measure which is now before us, but by intimidation. That was the only way that existed at that time by which to keep a railroad from reducing its rates. During the investigation, when the records were explored, it was found that a railroad would be told, "No, you cannot reduce your rates from the one city to the other." The railroad would contend that it thought it advisable to reduce the rates, not only for the advantage which would accrue to the railroad itself, but for the advantage which would accrue to the shippers by a reduction in rates.

Those behind the bill are afraid of what may happen to them because of such records which have been dug up respecting them. They have in the past violated the law. If the pending measure were passed over the President's veto it would result in blotting out any violations of the antitrust law committed in the past, and would, by direct provision of law, give the railroads permission in the future to violate the antitrust laws, and thus penalize the people of the United States because of the shipping rates which would be applied to them.

Do Senators for one moment believe that the Department of Justice of the United States would oppose the bill if the Department did not believe it would result in breaking down the antitrust laws of the United States?

I am warning the Senate and the people that if we pass this legislation it will be only the forerunner of similar legislation exempting one corporation after another in the future.

All during the hearings the Department of Justice kept a close watch upon this legislation. In the minority views on similar legislation in 1946, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and I had this to say:

> This bill would give the railroad, motor-carrier, water-carrier, pipe-line, and freight-forwarder industries the opportunity of obtaining complete exemption from the antitrust laws. If enacted into law, the proposed legislation would cut the antitrust laws from the heart of our economy—the transportation industry. Such legislation would be an opening wedge in entirely destroying the antitrust laws, designed to guard and preserve the American system of free enterprise.

The reason we made that statement was that we wanted free enterprise. But we did not want any combination or group telling people even within the group what they must do, telling them that they cannot reduce rates, even when a carrier may think it is to the best interests of the people to reduce rates.

Reading further from the minority views:

> The obvious purpose of the bill is to deprive the courts of jurisdiction in pending cases instituted by the Department of Justice and the State of Georgia.

In invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that those same cases are still pending in court, and thousands of dollars have been spent to carry the cases forward since this report was written in 1946.

> The Department of Justice, in a suit at Lincoln, Nebr., is seeking to enjoin powerful combinations of railroads—

And it is still seeking to do so—

> is seeking to enjoin powerful combinations of railroads, railroad associations, and bankers from violating the antitrust laws, fixing arbitrary and discriminatory freight rates limiting railroad services, suppressing improvements in railroad equipment and facilities, and preventing the development of modes of transportation competitive with the railroads. The State of Georgia's suit is now being tried in the Supreme Court of the United States—

As I stated a few moments ago, it is still in the courts; it is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States—

> and seeks to enjoin combinations in the railroad industry from fixing noncompetitive and discriminatory freight rates. These important cases, brought to enforce basic laws enacted by the Congress, could become moot if this bill is enacted.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that when this bill was being considered by the Senate an amendment was offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which was adopted, exempting from the provisions of the bill the cases then pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, and which are still pending there. But after the bill passed the Senate and went to the free conference, someone got hold of the free conferees, and that amendment was wiped out. Do Senators imagine that the railroads had anything to do with that? Do they imagine that the railroads wanted that amendment out? As a result of its being stricken out I fear that all the money spent by the State of Georgia and by the Department of Justice in an effort to uncover what the railroads had done and how they had violated the antitrust laws will have been spent in vain. After the money has been spent, the amendment placed in the bill by the Senate is stricken out.

Reading further from the minority views:

> A dangerous precedent would be set, encouraging other powerful groups to seek legislation immunizing them from established laws and the power of the courts to enforce them.
>
> Cartelization of the transportation industry cannot be isolated from the national economy.

Give me the right to regulate traffic into and out of any commodity, and I can make or break any producer of such commodity, whether it be a textile-manufacturing establishment, a coal mine, or any other kind of business. I can so arrange rates that it would be more profitable to go into that kind of business in another locality.

I have had a little experience along this line. The South has had experience when it comes to discriminatory State rates. That is the reason why I am watching this legislation so closely. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that even when the case was carried through the Interstate Commerce Commission and on through the courts of the United States—which requires years—the Supreme Court said, in a decision a few months ago, that the people living in the South below the Mason and Dixon's line have been charged 10 percent more than they ought to have been charged, and that the people living in the official territory, north of the Mason and Dixon's line, had not been charged enough. They ought to have been charged 10 percent more. That made a differential of 20 percent, which has been in existence for many years.

If we leave it to the shippers of the United States to establish rates and regulations dealing with the making of rates, then we find, as was brought out in the hearings, the big railroads of the United States dominating and controlling smaller railroads and telling them what rates to charge between one locality and another. The people themselves do not even know about it. When these associations get together, there will be no opposition. Proposals will be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval or disapproval. How easy it is to obtain approval when no one is objecting. After such an arrangement has once been approved, it is put into effect and the people of the United States pay the bill. The consumer, even though he himself may not be shipping anything, pays the bill. That is what I am speaking for at the present time. Of course, rates must be established, but in no instance should the carriers be allowed to fix them in violation of the antitrust laws which are now on the statute books of the United States. Why should they be allowed to violate a criminal statute?

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter which I received from the late Honorable Josephus Daniels. He wrote the letter to me back on June 10, 1947:

> DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing an editorial appearing in today's News and Observer headed, "OLIN JOHNSTON Right."
>
> If we exempt railroads, insurance companies, and newspaper associations—

And, Mr. President, bear in mind that he was a newspaperman—

> as asked by this Congress we might as well, not only repeal the antitrust law, but pass an act to give monopoly the right to rob the people and repeal what we call American freedom in trade.

A stronger statement of the case could scarcely be made than that, Mr. President, as it appears in a letter coming from a former Cabinet officer and a man whom most people will say fought for the rights of the people of the Nation.

The letter closes —

With high regards, sincerely yours,
JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Mr. President, he was stating the matter just as I see it.

As I recall the hearings, I remember that the then Governor of Georgia, Ellis Arnall, came before the committee and testified for several days; and in his testimony he begged and pleaded with the Congress not to legislate him out of court. His attorneys in that case came before the committee and testified to the same effect. The attorneys from the Department of Justice pleaded with the committee in the same way, and begged that the committee not legislate them out of court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Then, Mr. President, I close by saying that in my opinion this bill should not be passed; and I warn the Senate that if we let this proposed legislation be enacted, then in the future we shall have other corporations asking to be treated in the way that the railroads are treated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, 28 minutes remain to those who favor sustaining the veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven minutes remain, the Chair is advised.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. President, I have not always found myself in agreement with the President of the United States. However, I wish to say that in my judgment the veto message he has submitted in disapproving this bill contains as fine a statement of democratic principles and of true Americanism as has ever been sent to the Congress of the United States by any President. In two paragraphs of the message the President makes an argument, that it is impossible to refute, as to the dangerous consequences of overriding his veto and enacting this bill into law. I wish to read those two paragraphs. I quote now from the President's veto message:

No legislation giving a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws should be enacted unless adequate alternative safeguards are provided for the public interest. This measure fails to provide such safeguards. Even the limited safeguards incorporated in the bill as originally passed by the Senate are omitted from the bill in its present form. It would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve any agreement which it finds to be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy." This is a vague and general standard and is manifestly neither adequate nor appropriate as a criterion for waiving the protection afforded the public by the antitrust laws.

Furthermore the Commission would be placed in the position of applying this general criterion to the basic procedural agreements without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint actions which would be taken thereunder. Nevertheless the exemption from the antitrust laws would extend to these subsequent actions without the necessity of further Commission approval. It would extend, moreover, even beyond the parties to the basic agreement to any "other persons" who participate in such actions.

Mr. President, since this bill first made its appearance on Capitol Hill some 7 or 8 years ago I have consistently opposed it with every resource at my command. When we in the Congress of the United States proceed to throw around any segment of American industry the cloak of congressional immunity from prosecution for violating the antitrust laws, we are starting a process of destroying free enterprise in this Nation. That would be true, Mr. President, if it were applied to the great automobile industry and if a law were passed which enabled the automobile manufacturing companies to meet together and fix the prices of their products without any regard to competition. But, after all, automobiles are not an absolute necessity to thousands of families in this land.

Mr. President, we should not immunize those who manufacture radios in this country from the effects of violation of the antitrust laws and permit them to agree upon the prices and upon the terms of disposal and distribution of radios in the channels of commerce. But, of course, there are millions of American families who could exist without having a radio.

We are now dealing with an enterprise whose operations directly affect every citizen of the United States and every family in the United States in their every-day living costs and standards; and it is nothing short of criminal to enact this bill and exempt the great transportation industry from any fear of punishment for violation of the antitrust laws, and permit them to enter into cartels and create a monopoly that can directly affect and increase the cost of living of every family in this land by increasing the cost of transportation for the delivery of food and clothing to the consumers.

Mr. President, the legislation is strongly urged here by one of the greatest lobbies that has been assembled in all the history of parliamentary government. We are told that the bill, if passed, would simplify the work of freight and shipping bureaus and of shippers in establishing rates. I freely agree, Mr. President, that the enactment of the bill would simplify the work of freight bureaus, but to no greater degree than immunizing any other industry from the effects of the antitrust laws would simplify the operations of their business. The simplification for which they plead will result in evils which may not be felt adversely for the next 2 or 3 years, but when the conferees on the part of the Senate eliminated from the bill the provision that would have confined the negotiations solely to those directly interested in transportation and permitted any person to sit in on the fixing of rates and conditions of travel, it in the last analysis will turn this important function which should be regulated by Government over to two great banking houses in this country, J. P. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., which advance the finances enabling the carriers to exist and to operate.

I have no antipathy to great enterprise as such. I wish to keep alive in the breast of every American youth the hope that he too may accumulate a vast fortune. But I realize, Mr. President, that in the complicated world in which we live it is necessary to impose some restraints and some controls upon those who have gathered into their possession a tremendous part of the wealth that makes these United States, if small business and enterprise are to be permitted to exist, and if the hopes and aspirations of thousands of those who today have not, are to be kept alive and retain their faith that under the American system they, too, may reach the top of the heap and enjoy the distinction of possessing great wealth.

Mr. President, through the control of the shipping bureaus centralized wealth can control to a minute degree the location of future industry in this land. It may determine whether one section of the country shall prosper while another shall lie prostrate. In the past we have seen the result of the manipulations of railroad associations and freight bureaus. We have seen how the so-called Official Territory, has enjoyed great advantages that were denied other sections. It has resulted in a centralization of industry and of wealth in America, not altogether due to the unusual capacity and genius and ability of those who lived in Official Territory, but because when they entered into a business they possessed a 10- or 15-percent advantage in the cost of marketing their products, which denied the right of expansion to industry in other sections of the country. I have nothing against them because of their bigness, but I am opposed to issuing them a license to exploit and to rob one section for the benefit of another section of the country. That is no reflection upon them as being honorable men. I regard the Members of the Senate of the United States as being honorable men, but I would oppose issuing a license to steal even to Members of the Senate of the United States.

As I see it, that is what the measure does to those who might wish to oppose the powers which are granted by the act through rigging the freight structure for the benefit of one section as opposed to another.

Mr. President, representatives of the West and of the South have for years striven earnestly to secure full fellowship as American States and as American citizens by obtaining an equality of opportunity in the application of freight rates. The enactment of the bill will long defer that day when those great sections may hope to have industrial development through a diffusion of the industrial plants of the United States equally to each and every section.

I am opposed to the bill on general principles, because it immunizes the great transportation industry, not only the railroads, but the truck lines, bus lines, and pipe lines, from prosecution under the antitrust laws. That applies also to services such as buying new cars

and other equipment that will enable the stronger to stifle the weak.

I am strongly opposed to this bill because it strikes down the constitutional right of a sovereign State to bring a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States and kills the cause of action that has already been recognized by that Court. Even if I favored the general principle of the bill I would be opposed to action of the Congress taking from the jurisdiction of a co-equal branch of the Government an action at law brought in that Court in good faith and recognized by the Court, and even now in the process of determination. We should not permit this industry, because they feel blowing hot upon their neck the breath of retribution at the bar of justice, to escape the consequences of that decision by denying the Supreme Court jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia, and shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky, such time as they may desire in which to conclude their remarks.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator is very generous. Under the prodding of the Chair, who held up his finger when it was 2 minutes, and 1 minute, I undertook to compact what I was undertaking to say in that brief period of time, and I therefore shall not expand upon my remarks. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Kentucky, in order that he may avail himself of the generosity of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope I may conclude what I have to say within that time, and I thank the Senator from Kansas for his offer. If time runs rapidly, as it frequently does, I may avail myself of it.

I have discussed this proposition several times in the past. I discussed it when the bill was before the Senate, I discussed it in a previous session of Congress when a similar bill was passed. I have not changed my views with regard to it. My views have been strengthened by the President's message vetoing the bill.

I have deplored heretofore and I now deplore the constant effort on the part of Congress to whittle down the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws. Those laws were enacted under the commerce clause of the Constitution, under which we have dealt with railroads, all sorts of transportation companies and organizations, transportation labor organizations, and organizations using transportation facilities for the shipment of their products. The same provision of the Constitution authorizing Congress to regulate commerce among the States is the foundation of all our legislation dealing with that subject, whether it dealt with the railroads themselves or steamboats or other forms of transportation among the States, or whether it dealt with the companies producing commodities shipped over the transportation lines.

I have always contended, and I believe now more firmly than ever, that morally we have no more right to exempt railroads from the operation of the antitrust law because they are railroads and because we have established an Interstate Commerce Commission as an agency of the Congress to regulate rates, than we have to exempt from the operation of the antitrust law corporations which manufacture the products which are shipped over the railroads, because we have established a Federal Trade Commission to deal, in some respects, with violations of the antitrust law by corporations. The Federal Trade Commission, no less than the Interstate Commerce Commission, is an agency of Congress. We have recognized the fact that the Congress could not by law fix rates on railroads. There had to be an agency established by Congress for that purpose. We recognized that the Federal Trade Commission, which has the right to hear and determine controversies arising in business in regard to practices in which businesses indulge, should have the power to issue orders to cease and desist from certain practices. This was done in order to get away from the interminable litigation which cluttered up our Federal courts because one concern would bring a lawsuit against another, involving only a controversy between the parties to the litigation. Then, if a decision were finally rendered by a Federal court, it would be taken as an example of what might be done by other business concerns engaged in similar activities.

It has been customary in the past few years, as I have heretofore reminded the Senate, that when the Supreme Court has a case before it involving a controversy the determination of which might be unfavorable to someone's contention, to undertake to get Congress to reverse the decision of the court in advance, by cutting the ground from under the Court in connection with its jurisdiction to pass upon the question. The same thing occurred with reference to insurance companies, when they were indicted, prosecuted, or brought into court because they were violating the antitrust law. An effort was made to exempt them, because the Supreme Court had a question of that sort before it, involving their guilt as violating the antitrust law, and the Court might render a decision, which it later did render, holding the insurance companies guilty and holding them under the jurisdiction of the antitrust law. But, in order to take time for the forelock, an effort was made in the Congress of the United States to enact legislation exempting those companies from the provisions of the antitrust law.

The same thing occurred when the question of ownership of oil under the tidelands on the coasts of the United States came before the Supreme Court. A decision was imminent. Legislation was sought and, I believe, passed, and was vetoed by the President, which denied to the Federal Government ownership, jurisdiction, or control over the tidelands oil, which may be so necessary in the immediate future for national defense. That legislation, undertaking to reverse the Supreme Court's decision, is still pending in the matter of the ownership of tidelands.

There is now before the Senate legislation dealing, or endeavoring to deal, in the same way with this trio of great interests, the great insurance companies, the great oil companies, and, now, the great railroad companies, in an effort to give the railroads a charter by legislative enactment which would exempt them from the operation of the antitrust law, merely because there is an Interstate Commerce Commission which Congress established in the beginning with jurisdiction to regulate rates. In no legislation have we enacted heretofore, either in the original act to regulate commerce, which was passed in 1887, a whole century after the Constitution was adopted, or in the amendments to that act, including the Transportation Act of 1920, or any other railroad legislation enacted by the Congress, based upon our regulatory powers in regard to transportation companies, have we exempted the railroads, by implication or directly, from the operation of the antitrust law.

In certain sections of the country we have suffered, particularly in my State, because of an artificial and arbitrary division known as the Official Rate Territory, under which differential freight rates were sanctioned by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The result has been that our section of the United States has been discriminated against and, in some respects, stunted because of these differential freight rates. I have stood on the Kentucky side of the Ohio River, where are located wonderful cities dotting the southern bank of that river, and have looked across at the other side and have seen factories on the north side which had an advantage over those located on the south bank of the river, merely because of this artificial and arbitrary division.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume the Senator did not see a great many factories on the southern bank of the river.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I saw where they might have been had it not been for the discrimination under which industries on the southern bank suffered.

The factories on the north bank of the river could ship their products across the river without paying a differential in freight rates, but those which were unfortunate enough to be located on the south side of the river could not ship a pound of their products to the north side without paying a differential in freight rates. Naturally it was a severe handicap, because the Ohio River is a great artery of commerce. It is one of the large rivers of America. I have often said in connection with consideration of the question of improving our waterways, that if improvement in navigation on the Ohio River could not prove itself to be beneficial, I did not believe there was any other river in America the improvement of which would prove to be beneficial or profitable. I think that is a true statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator has referred to railroad rates. I am glad that he is now dealing with the subject of water transportation. It is true that the railroad companies have organized a powerful lobby which has generated a great deal of sentiment, real and synthetic, behind the bill. It is not only railroad transportation, but water transportation, bus and truck transportation, transportation by pipe lines, and every other means of transportation in the United States which will be affected.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator, and I thank him for amplifying my argument in regard to the railroads. We have been generous, if I may say so, to the railroads by allowing them, under the law, to form organizations through which they may control bus and truck lines, and other forms of transportation, especially as feeders. But under this bill, if it becomes law, those subsidiary organizations can enter into combinations in restraint of trade and not be subject to either civil or criminal prosecution.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I thought I might be helpful to my friend—and I underscore the word "friend"——

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a reciprocal trade agreement.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator and I agree unanimously on that feeling. I thought I might relieve the Senator's voice for a few minutes, in view of the mention by my friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] of the words "railroad lobby." I want to give a very concrete illustration, which I think I may have used heretofore; if not, I used it in the committee. It is exhibit A of the tragic situation which confronts us in America when the insidious lobbies really get to work. There are those in this Chamber and in the other body of the Congress who ridicule the term "lobbyist" and say it is like talking about the weather. They dismiss it too lightly. The railroad lobbyists themselves admitted their action in their testimony. A group of railroad lobbyists were under examination before a subcommittee of the Senate a few years ago. Before the subcommittee, under cross-examination, they said:

Legislative committees?

They snapped their fingers.

We pay no attention to them. They are only scenery. We go back into the hinterlands, the States of the country, where the men come from to Congress, we find how much money they have, we find who controls them, and who has them in their grip, and then we get our men.

Or words similar thereto.

So that is the way they function.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Kansas to yield me further time.

Mr. REED. I shall be very glad to yield the Senator 10 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, that was an illustration. I could give others ad infinitum, ad nauseam. What has come over the American people and what has come over the American Congress? Have we lost our sense of righteous indignation? Some day the people will put us on the spot, at the bar of political justice, and at that time will ask, "Where were you back in those days when the game was being played on the lower level? What did you do to purify the body politic, to save the people from evil things that were going on in high places?" And you will hang your head. You have a job to do this afternoon by voting to sustain the veto against this Bulwinkle bill, albeit it is sponsored by my friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Every clean-living and right-living man who loves justice and free government, and who believes in having things done in the open, ought to rebuke this rotten crowd of railroad lobbyists by voting to sustain the veto of the President of the United States, and so come through clean this afternoon.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Kentucky permit me to take a minute or two in my own time?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will pay me back.

Mr. REED. After the Senator from New Hampshire has made his emotional appeal——

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has not heard any emotional appeal yet. It is but just beginning.

Mr. REED. All the shipping organizations in the United States of which I have any knowledge, some 950 of them, have filed their approval of the bill with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. That indicates unanimity, and that very degree of unanimity is suspicious, and it ought to excite the common sense of Congress, and cause us to say there is reason to be suspicious of such a degree of unanimity. "There is a reason," as Mr. Post used to say in his advertisements.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that traffic organizations have been importuned to support this bill. I received a long letter this morning from the Ohio Valley Traffic Association urging me to vote for it. But I am not going to do it. I can understand that it is more convenient for traffic officers and traffic organizations to deal with railroads if there are no restrictions. It is more convenient and simpler for them and the railroads to get together and conduct their business without any interference of the antitrust laws. I am not blaming them for lobbying; they have a right to present their views to Congress. But I am amazed that any Member of the United States Senate, who from time immemorial must have had experience with lobbyists, allows himself to be influenced by them.

We hear it constantly said, "I voted against this bill a few days ago, but I have received letters, I have received telegrams, I have received calls, asking me to vote now against my convictions, which were expressed 1 week or 2 weeks ago, now that the bill has come here with a veto from the President of the United States." I would be amazed—I cannot believe it would happen—that anyone who believes this is vicious and wicked legislation, unjust and unfair to the American people, would now change his attitude because someone has called him up on the telephone or written him a sheaf or feed basket full of letters, which have no doubt been inspired by the railroads themselves.

Mr. TOBEY. That is an excuse, and not a reason.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator. That is what I am trying to urge and emphasize. I shall be surprised if it becomes effective, not only surprised, but disillusioned also.

Our forefathers in this very legislative hall thought it wise to protect the American people, after 100 years of inaction by the Congress, because no effort was made to regulate commerce among the States from 1787, when the Constitution was adopted, to 1887, when the first act to regulate commerce was adopted. In the wisdom of our forefathers who sat in the two Houses of Congress legislation was enacted not only to protect the people, but to protect small business against big business, and every amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act has been at the instigation of the victims of business, though they themselves were small business. It has not been the result of the efforts of demagogs or labor leaders or agitators, it has been the victimized business world in this country that has demanded the creation, for instance, of the Federal Trade Commission, and the enactment of the Clayton antitrust law as an amendment of the original antitrust law.

I think we are unwise and even stupid, considering the possibilities of the tendency to which I have referred, if we now sanction the exemption from the provisions of the antitrust laws of these great arteries of trade, not only those which are bound together with steel rails, but busses, steamboats, and every form of transportation, which may or may not be under the control of the railroads which have instigated this legislation.

I have nothing against the railroads. I am their friend. I tried to show that when the question came before me in the other body as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I was a member for 14 years. And during all the time I served on the Commerce Committee in the United States Senate, when matters of this sort came up, I insisted on fair treatment to railroads, to their employees, and to the shippers as well. But there is someone involved here besides railroads, and besides traffic organizations and shippers. The American people, the consumers of our country, are involved in this legislation, and one by one we will be asked to whittle down the restrictions of the antitrust laws until the people will be victims en masse of restrictions and impositions which Congress may hereafter be called upon by an outraged public to undo, retracing its steps, to undo what we are about to do here today if the veto message shall be overridden.

I certainly hope we are not going to override it. I am going to vote to sustain the veto, because I think it is a righteous veto against a vicious principle, as exemplified by a vicious piece of legislation. In saying that, I make no reflection upon anyone who supports the legislation. I concede to the Senator from Kansas and all other Senators as much honesty, integrity, and sincerity as I possess. Nevertheless, we can be very stupid sometimes when we are most sincere.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for just one observation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Although I am sitting over here to listen to the Senator from Kentucky, I point out to the Senator that over yonder is the Republican side of the aisle, my party's side.

Mr. BARKLEY. We welcome the Senator from New Hampshire over on our side any time.

Mr. TOBEY. I came over to listen to the Senator, but over there are my colleagues, in absentia 100 percent. What about the Bulwinkle bill, Mr. Republican Party? Let me talk to you a minute. You, my party, are going to Philadelphia next week to attend a national convention, to make a platform on which to elect a President.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has now gone back to the Republican side. Does he mind if I come over there, too?

Mr. TOBEY. Not at all. I say to my party, in absentia, when you get to Philadelphia, at the meeting of the committee on resolutions, headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and others of my Republican colleagues, there I pray you begin this thing aright. If you want to deserve the acclaim of the people and win the election, there are some things you can do about it. You can and should condemn the killing of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill by the Rules Committee today, striking down a far-reaching piece of legislation in the interests of the people, a bill which has had Nation-wide interest and support, and which passed the Senate twice. You can and should condemn the burying of the education bill which passed the Senate, only to be buried in committee, not privileged to be considered and voted on upon its merits by the representatives in Congress of the American people. You can demand that in the passage of legislation we place first the interests of the people of the United States. Another thing you can do in the platform is to adopt measures against the railroad lobbyists who infest the Capitol, who have tried to get the Bulwinkle bill passed, to throttle free competition and trade in this country, and to nullify the antitrust laws now on our statute books. Having done such things in all sincerity, my Republican colleagues at Philadelphia, you may then come before the American people asking their support, with high hopes of success.

I want to join with you in such appeals and principles but we cannot make such effective by closing our ears and shutting our eyes to human needs. Remember that human life is more important than things, remember that, fellow Republicans at Philadelphia.

So with those brief remarks to my many colleagues now before me, all in absentia, I take my seat with a "God bless you everyone," and the hope that you may see the light and walk in the light as you enter upon your activities next week in Philadelphia.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. REED. I yield the Senator the time he may require.

Mr. BARKLEY. I only wish that the empty benches which have been addressed by the Senator from New Hampshire could speak and vote.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has just addressed the Senate. I think this is the first time he has been in the Chamber today.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is about three times wrong; that is all.

Mr. REED. Well, the Senator did not stay very long when he was in the Chamber, I will say that.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator knows the answer to that. The Senator knows I have heard the Senator from Kansas make the same remarks he made today many times respecting the Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the seats which are now empty are usually occupied by Senators who have heard over and over again talk similar to that which has been heard in the Senate today, which has no application to the question immediately before the Senate. If the Senator from New Hampshire had been present when the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] was speaking—and as I recall he spoke for about an hour and twenty minutes—he would have observed that there were not more than two or three seats occupied on the Democratic side of the aisle. The subject we are considering today has been discussed more frequently in more different Congresses than any other question since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I came to the Senate some years ago. We have exhausted the subject. None of us can make a speech on the subject without repeating what he has said before. I opened the debate this afternoon and occupied about 30 minutes, including the interruptions which occurred. I only repeated what I had said on numerous previous occasions. The same has been true respecting the whole debate. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] have all repeated today what they have said over and over again in the course of the consideration of this legislation in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not recall any repetition of the facts I placed in the RECORD today. It seems to me the Senator from Kansas is making a misstatement when he says the subject has been hashed and rehashed over and over again. That statement is not quite accurate.

Mr. REED. I did not pay close attention to the entire speech of the Senator from Montana, but I did pay some attention. As I recall he devoted a part of his address—I was tempted to use another term, but I shall not—which I understood was prepared for the Senator from Montana by the Department of Justice, to an attack upon the advisory shippers boards, the regional shippers boards of the country.

Mr. MURRAY. I was discussing the arrangements the railroads had built up with the shippers and other organizations of the various communities to make them a front for the railroads, and also discussing the program they had with reference to contacting the people in the States who might have influence on Senators and Representatives and use that pressure on Representatives and Senators to influence them in their action on this matter.

Mr. REED. I happened to have been chairman of the shippers' board in my territory, the Trans-Missouri-Kansas Shippers' Board, for 15 consecutive years, which is the record for such service in the whole country. At no time was that board ever used, or could it be used and there was never any attempt on the part of the railroads to use that shippers' board for such a purpose. Shippers' boards—and I think there are 15 of them in the country—are regarded universally by economists, industrialists, statisticians, and commercial organizations as among the most useful agencies of the country, by anticipating at least 3 months in advance the probable movement of traffic, as to volume, so that suitable arrangements may be made by the railroads for the equipment necessary to handle the traffic. That is the principal function of shippers' boards. During the 15 years I was chairman of the Trans-Missouri-Kansas Shippers' Board I never received a dollar of salary, nor a dollar toward payment of my expenses. I paid my own expenses. That is the universal practice everywhere. All Senators have to do is to inquire about the board in their own territory and they will find how it functions. The shippers' boards which were attacked by the Senator from Montana are regarded as performing one of the most useful functions in transportation, and they pay their own expenses and receive no salary.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall plead guilty to the Senator's accusation that there has been something repetitious about the remarks which have been made here. For a number of years I have protested against what I believe to be the great injustice and wrong contained in the bill. I propose to continue to do so. If the Senator's theory were adopted, a preacher would deliver one sermon against sin, and then never preach another. This is a continuing struggle, and I do not propose to relax in my efforts nor in my remarks, even though the Senator from Kansas were to prevail here today, because if men do not cry out against evils, soon they will encompass them

and engulf them. So, Mr. President, I plead guilty to the indictment that there has been something of repetition in my remarks.

Mr. REED. I do not make any other charge against Senators, including myself, than the charge that what we have said today has been said over and over again before on previous occasions. Criticism has come from several Senators concerning repetition. The statements as to why more Senators have not been present during the debate, which have been made, but not quite so vehemently as made by the Senator from New Hampshire just now, were based on the fact that there has been so much repetition in the debate. They have listened to a discussion of the legislation before. We have placed a limitation on debate at 4:45 today, so I assume discussion will continue until then. If there is any way to advance the time 15 minutes I shall be glad to yield the remainder of my time so it may be done.

In the time that remains I wish to talk sanely about some things in the bill which have been persistently misrepresented. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] indulged in a colloquy earlier today over the fact that the Senator from Wyoming read some sentences of the bill in a loud voice, and then others in not so loud a voice. I think the Senator from Georgia was not guilty of doing such a thing, but I think he was guilty of a mistake in his interpretation and reading of the bill.

The first thing in the bill which the shippers demanded as one of the conditions of their unanimous support was that railroads, pipe lines, water carriers, and motor carriers should not be allowed to participate in agreements between them in these different classes except for the purpose of setting up and maintaining joint rates and through routes. That is the first requirement in the bill. The language is:

> The Commission shall not approve, under this section, any agreement between or among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is of the character described in paragraph (2) of this section—

Which goes back to a limitation of the agreement concerning rates, fares, classifications, and charges; and unless it is limited to matters between these different groups. It must be limited to matters of joint rates or through routes.

This is the way the bill divides the carriers into classes:

> And for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipeline companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are carriers of one class.

Those different classes of carriers cannot participate in an agreement as between different classes except for one single purpose. That is to set-up joint rates and through routes, which the Interstate Commerce Act imposes upon every class of carrier. It imposes that burden upon them. They must assume it to comply with the law.

There has been frequent reference to a monopoly of transportation—and nothing could be further from the truth—because these different classes were permitted to come together. They have been kept as far apart as possible. Agreements between carriers of different classes are prohibited if they refer to anything else than the establishment of joint rates and through routes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to have the Senator point out anything in the bill which would prevent, say, an investment banking company which owned stock in one of each type of transportation from having a representative in each of the conferences. I concede that they are divided by types, except as to through traffic; and that is the important part. But since representatives of banking houses have been eliminated from the bill, there is nothing to prevent them from having a representative in each type of conference—water transportation, bus transportation, pipe-line transportation, and railroad transportation.

Mr. REED. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that I think it is possible that those interested in the various types of carriers might have representation on the boards of directors. Banks might have such representation. Life-insurance companies which own railroad securities have representation upon boards of directors of railroads. That is also true of investment bankers. While I do not know that it is a particularly desirable practice, on the other hand, I do not see how we are going to prevent those who have heavy investments in the properties and in the financial stake of the various carriers from having some representation which watches over the management.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. REED. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina. He may have all the time, within the limit of my time, that he wishes to use.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I served with the Committee on Interstate Commerce during the years since I have been a Member of the Senate, until the Reorganization Act took effect. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee which considered the Bulwinkle bill. I have never known any other bill with respect to which there has been so much misinterpretation or misunderstanding as there has been with respect to this measure.

It is noteworthy that every single shipper who came before that committee testified in favor of the bill. Practically every single State utilities commission in the United States favors the bill. No shippers, no representatives of chambers of commerce, no representatives of those who pay the freight bills, came to oppose this measure.

It is opposed on the ground that to some extent it interferes with or nullifies the antitrust laws. It is necessary to have rate bureaus if we are to have rates efficiently fixed for shippers. I do not know how it would be practicable to have the railroads operate and conduct their business in the public interest without having the opportunity for rate bureaus to meet and discuss rates. Any man who establishes a new business or new industry on any railroad line in the United States must of necessity obtain rates for the products of his manufacture in order that he may ship goods to every part of the United States. He cannot get rates unless the railroads can confer on the subject. If he applies to the railroad on which his plant is located in order to get a rate, that road must necessarily take the question up with other railroads in the United States in order to have a rate agreed upon. It is impracticable to take up the question in any other way than through a rate bureau, where representatives of the various railroads meet and discuss rates.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina, who is a former governor of his State, that in all the rate-bureau meetings, when rates are up for discussion, shippers participate as freely in the discussions as do representatives of the railroads.

Mr. HOEY. They certainly do. In addition, anyone has an opportunity to object to a rate. Notice is given, so that anyone can appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission and show cause why the rate should not be put into effect. After all this is done, and after the rate is put into effect, it then becomes beneficial to those who wish to use it.

In this connection, let me say that as Governor of North Carolina I joined with other southern governors in instituting three different suits in order to get better freight rates for the South. We succeeded in winning what we call the Classification Rate case. We won straight out the Commodity Rate case. We secured a very substantial reduction, which was of benefit to the Southern States, as well as to people in the western area of the country. Recently, after my term of office expired, we succeeded in winning the Classified Rate case, by which most of the discrimination has been removed.

Mr. REED. All those cases were filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and tried before the Interstate Commerce Commission; and it was from the Interstate Commerce Commission that the South obtained relief.

Mr. HOEY. That is true. All the relief which the South has ever received by way of reductions of freight rates has come either through the work of the rate bureaus or through the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has been a slow process. We have not obtained relief quickly. It has required a great deal of time, and we have not yet received all that we should have.

Mr. President, I believe that this method provides the best means by which we can continue to get improvement in our rate structure and obtain some of the benefit of lower freight rates.

I would not take the time to discuss this subject except for the fact that I believe that the purpose of the bill is misapprehended. I certainly believe that in practical operation this system has been beneficial to the entire South, as it has been to the Nation. If it should be

abolished, I do not see how we could go about the practical plan of having rates fixed; and we must have rates fixed before we can use them.

Mr. REED. As the Senator from North Carolina knows, a common carrier may not perform any kind of service for a shipper and collect from the shipper, nor may the shipper pay the common carrier any money for any service rendered, unless the common carrier has a published tariff on file describing the charge which will be made for the service rendered. It is illegal, both for the carrier and the shipper, to do anything else.

Mr. HOEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a very fine editorial from the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] had the editorial printed in the RECORD earlier in the day.

Mr. HOEY. Of course I do not wish to duplicate the printing of the editorial. It gives a very clear, full, and fair statement of the functions of this rate-making body.

Mr. REED. It is as able an editorial as I have ever seen.

Mr. President, I wish to read from what was said by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who is also a former Governor of his State, as is the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. The Senator from Florida opened his remarks on May 28 with these words:

> Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in support of the conference report on Senate bill 110. I believe that no other subject has come up for consideration in the Senate since I have been a Member with respect to which there has been a greater store of misinformation.

That is what the Senator from Florida said, and that is correct. The opponents of the bill have said more things that are not true, that are not germane, and that do not affect the bill, than have been said with respect to any other piece of legislation with which I have had experience during my service in the Senate.

The Senator from Florida stated that every shipping interest in his State was for the bill. That is true of every shipping interest in every other State in the Union.

Let me amplify a little what the Senator from North Carolina said, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a quorum call.

As I stated a moment ago, no common carrier can legally accept a payment for service rendered, nor can a shipper legally pay for the service, unless there is on file a published tariff. That is the first requisite to moving the commerce of the country.

In the beginning—and I am repeating myself; I have said this many times before—each railroad issued its own tariffs. The railroad mileage was limited at that time, and commerce was not so great as it is now. In those days each railroad made its own rates.

Then came the mandatory injunction upon the railroads to establish joint rates and through routes. That was for the purpose of moving traffic without having to unload at the end of any particular railroad. The Congress of the United States in passing the Interstate Commerce Act made in mandatory upon the railroads to do that.

How in the name of heaven 2 or more railroads—and sometimes 30 or 40 railroads are interested in 1 set of rates and 1 set of through routes—could establish joint rates and through routes without having conferences between and among themselves is beyond anyone's understanding. The shippers of the country are at least 99 99/100 percent in favor of this bill, because it would preserve the only method of making freight rates to move the Nation's commerce known to any of us who have had experience with the traffic question and the transportation question. That is why the enactment of this bill is necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, some mention has been made of monopoly in this connection, but that is silly. Some mention has been made of gouging people. The Senator from New Hampshire would have us think that all the shipping organizations and all the people of the country have been misled, but that is quite a reflection upon a great mass of people in the United States. I do not hold that view. The shippers' advisory boards and other shippers' groups, which have been attacked by the Senator from Montana, have been useful.

So the whole argument against this measure represents, as the Senator from Florida has said, more misinformation on this subject than he has heard on any subject since he has been in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and the remainder of my time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the few minutes available before the appointed time for voting on this question, if Senators wish to request insertions in the RECORD, or if they desire to make some other brief request, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose. Otherwise, we shall have a quorum call.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will it be possible to bring up at this time a matter on the calendar?

Mr. WHERRY. I think not. We are under a unanimous-consent agreement as to the distribution of the time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Jenner
Baldwin	Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.
Ball	Eastland	Johnston, S. C.
Barkley	Ecton	Kem
Brewster	Ellender	Kilgore
Bricker	Feazel	Knowland
Bridges	Ferguson	Langer
Brooks	Flanders	Lodge
Buck	Fulbright	McCarthy
Butler	Green	McClellan
Byrd	Gurney	McFarland
Cain	Hatch	McGrath
Capehart	Hawkes	McKellar
Capper	Hayden	McMahon
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Connally	Hill	Malone
Cooper	Hoey	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Donnell	Ives	Millikin
Moore	Robertson, Wyo.	Tobey
Morse	Russell	Tydings
Murray	Saltonstall	Umstead
Myers	Smith	Vandenberg
O'Conor	Sparkman	Watkins
O'Daniel	Stennis	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Stewart	White
Pepper	Taft	Wiley
Reed	Taylor	Williams
Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Robertson, Va.	Thye	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, am I correct in saying that under the unanimous-consent order previously entered, the vote is to be taken at 4:45 p. m.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state that immediately following the vote on the President's message vetoing the Bulwinkle bill, another veto message will be laid before the Senate, having to do with the Federal Security appropriation bill, on which we shall get a vote as quickly as possible after the vote on the Bulwinkle bill.

POST OFFICE AT BUNKER HILL, ILL.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2759) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at Bunker Hill, Ill., and I submit report (No. 1715) thereon. I request immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should only like to say that on March 19, 1948, the town of Bunker Hill, a small community in the State of Illinois, was entirely demolished by a cyclone, as a result of which, among other structures, the post office was demolished.

There having been no opportunity in the last 3 months to acquire suitable space in which to render adequate postal service, both the Federal Works Administrator, General Fleming and the Postmaster General have indicated their very keen desire to have an authorization passed by the Senate, which would permit the rebuilding of the post office at Bunker Hill, Ill., for which the sum of $160,000 is required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in Bunker Hill, Ill., and to cause to be erected thereon, at a total cost including administrative expenses not to exceed $160,000, a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Bunker Hill, Ill. Plans and specifications for such building shall be approved by the Administrator and the Postmaster General.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $160,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I made an announcement a moment ago, since which time Senators have been coming into the Chamber, leaving their committee work in order to be present to vote on the Bulwinkle bill. I request them not to leave immediately following the vote on that bill, as there is another veto message which will be immediately laid before the Senate, having to do with the Federal Security appropriation bill.

Mr. President, if I am correct on the veto, a vote "yea" is a vote to override, and a vote "nay" is a vote to sustain the veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement the hour of 4 o'clock and 45 minutes having arrived, the vote will now be taken. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? The Constitution requiring a yea-and-nay vote, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. STEWART. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], both of whom, if present, would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay," or to sustain the veto.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Byrd	Downey
Ball	Cain	Dworshak
Brewster	Capehart	Ecton
Bricker	Capper	Ellender
Bridges	Chavez	Feazel
Brooks	Cooper	Ferguson
Buck	Cordon	Flanders
Butler	Donnell	Gurney
Hawkes	Malone	Smith
Hickenlooper	Martin	Taft
Hoey	Millikin	Thomas, Okla.
Holland	Moore	Thye
Ives	Morse	Tydings
Jenner	Myers	Vandenberg
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	Watkins
Kem	O'Daniel	Wherry
Knowland	Reed	White
Lodge	Revercomb	Wiley
McCarthy	Robertson, Va.	Williams
McMahon	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Magnuson	Saltonstall	Young

NAYS—25

Aiken	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Barkley	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Fulbright	McFarland	Taylor
Green	McGrath	Tobey
Hatch	Maybank	Umstead
Hayden	Murray	
Hill	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—8

Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
George	McKellar	Wagner
Lucas	Stewart	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas are 63, the nays 25. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

In the event the question shall hereafter arise as to the time of the passage of the bill over the veto, the Chair announces the hour to be 4:54 p. m.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 714)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have a privileged matter. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the veto message of the President of the United States with reference to House bill 6355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 6355, "making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

This bill would provide funds for the next fiscal year for the Social Security Administration, the United States Employment Service, and some functions of the Public Health Service. A measure of this kind clearly should not be disapproved by the President except under unusual circumstances and for the most compelling reasons. Such circumstances are presented by the provisions of this bill which would transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

I believe that this transfer would be a serious error from the standpoint of the proper location of this important function of government. I believe also that this transfer is clearly substantive legislation which should not be included in an appropriation bill.

Over the past 3 years considerable study has been directed to the proper location of the Employment Service in the Government. It is apparent that a system of public employment offices to secure jobs for the workers of this country is directly related to the major purpose of the Department of Labor, which is "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States." It is equally apparent that it would be far less appropriate to place the Employment Service, together with its auxiliary Farm Placement Service and Veterans' Employment Service, in the Federal Security Agency, which is primarily concerned with matters of health, welfare, and education.

I am, therefore, firmly convinced that because of its intimate relationship to the functions of the Department of Labor the Employment Service should remain permanently in that Department.

To achieve this end, I transmitted to the Congress on January 19, 1948, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, placing the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor and transferring to that Department the Bureau of Employment Security, now in the Federal Security Agency. This reorganization plan was not accepted by the Congress, principally on the ground that no basic changes should be made in the structure of the executive branch until the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has completed its studies and submitted its recommendations. This seems to me a reasonable viewpoint.

But in this bill the Congress has acted contrary to its own declared position, and has attempted to effect a far-reaching change in the organization of the executive branch without waiting for the Commission on Organization to report.

In fact this legislation, which is of such paramount importance to the interests of millions of wage earners and employers, and which is plainly substantive in nature, was passed by the Congress entirely without reference to or hearings by the legislative committees concerned with such matters. Neither the House Committee on Education and Labor nor the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was given an opportunity to consider the measure. Instead it was conceived by a subcommittee on appropriations and tacked onto an appropriation bill.

I do not believe that it is in the interest of good government that legislation of such importance should be enacted in such a manner. As I stated in December 1945, in withholding my approval from an appropriation bill which contained substantitive legislation, "a matter of such grave importance as our public employment system deserves not only permanent legislation, but legislation carefully and separately considered. Issues of such a difficult and vital nature should not be dealt with as riders to appropriation bills." I note also that on March 4, 1946, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress recommended "That the practice of attaching legislation to appropriation bills be discontinued."

What makes this matter even more disturbing is that the present bill is another in a series of legislative actions

stripping the Department of Labor of essential funds and functions. Last year the Congress removed the United States Conciliation Service from the Department and drastically slashed the Department's appropriations. To remove the United States Employment Service from the Department would further weaken and demoralize it and reduce the entire Department to such a minor status as to raise seriously the question of the validity of its continuance as a separate Department.

I am convinced, therefore, that the provisions of this bill which would transfer the United States Employment Service represent unwise legislative action, enacted in an unsound manner.

For these compelling reasons I am returning the bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 14, 1948.*

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, H. R. 6355, the Supplemental Federal Security Appropriations bill for 1949, provides total appropriations for 1949 of $975,914,700.

Practically the entire sum is for grants to States, including public assistance grants, public employment and unemployment compensation grants, maternal and child-welfare grants and mental health grants.

Millions of people are involved in the funds provided by the bill, as beneficiaries in either the funds paid out or in the service rendered to them from the grants. Federal beneficiaries amount to 2,471,200, and other beneficiaries from funds or services amount to 16,141,000. Pay to Federal employees is in the bill for 14,432, and pay to State employees is in the bill for 100,828.

Under assistance to States, general, of the Public Health Service, 228 Federal employees are involved on the dental health program.

Under mental health activities of the Public Health Service, 1,128 Federal employees and 1,200 State employees are involved, as well as 2,000 other people under the grants.

The emergency health program in Alaska involves 56 Federal employees and 92 State employees.

Under the Social Security Administration, public assistance grants involve 295 Federal employees, 47,000 State employees, and 3,773,000 beneficiaries. These beneficiaries are divided between 2,490,000 for old-age assistance, 1,216,000 for aid to dependent children and 67,000 for aid to the needy blind.

Under the Employment Service, 468 Federal employees are involved, and under the unemployment compensation program, 200 Federal employees are involved; and for the combined program in the States, 48,000 State employees are involved, as well as an estimated 4,000,000 beneficiaries from the service of placement or unemployment benefits.

Under the old-age and survivors' insurance fund, 10,870 Federal employees are involved, and insurance beneficiaries of 2,469,000.

Under the Children's Bureau, 278 Federal employees and 4,536 State employees are involved, and the services resulting are extended to 8,368,000 people.

Under the Commissioner's office, 52 Federal employees are involved, and the total for the Social Security Administration shows 12,163 employees involved.

Under the Office of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Federal employees are involved in the amount of 550 in the Administrator's office, 159 in Service Operations, and 148 in the general counsel's office.

Another incidental item of Federal beneficiaries is under the program of civilian war benefits, amounting to 200 people.

Mr. President, we are now within 2 or 3 days of the time when the session will end. I think the Members of the Senate know that with respect to some of the provisions in the bill the junior Senator from California, who is chairman of the subcommittee, and was one of the Senate conferees, did not see eye to eye with the House action. But it is my considered judgment that, should the veto be sustained, the next bill that would have to be passed would be essentially the same bill, except that, in my opinion, we would not have as much in the way of funds as we have under this bill.

For that reason, Mr. President, I respectfully urge that the veto of the President be overridden.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does this bill carry the fund for hospital construction?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; that is under the other bill, under the regular bill. This is the supplemental bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not care to take the time of the Senate, because we are now in the final days of the session; but I should like to point out that I intend to vote to override the veto, although I do not approve of some of the contents of the bill. As I stated when the bill was passed by the Senate, I do not approve of the transfer as provided in it. I think that such action should await the findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and largely for this reason I opposed the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. In this particular instance, I was opposed to this kind of action also because it entailed an amendment including substantive matter in an appropriation bill.

At the time the bill was before the Senate I further pointed out that I did not favor, and I still do not favor, the reduction in the appropriation for the Women's Bureau, which is carried in this particular bill. I think this reduction is most unfortunate, and under ordinary circumstances I would be voting against a measure of this kind.

But as I stated before, at this late day in the session, when we are faced with a great many problems still unsolved, I feel it would be entirely out of order for me to vote in opposition to overriding the veto. I agree with the Senator from California that, if the veto shall be sustained, the appropriations as they now stand in the bill would be very likely reduced, and that eventuality would be most unfortunate.

Mr. President, for all these reasons I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the veto, except to say what I stated when the bill was before the Senate, when I took a position against the merger referred to by the Senator from New York. I regret very much that it was included in the bill.

I do not wish to take any undue risk of reducing the amount of money involved in the appropriation, and not being on the Committee on Appropriations, I am not in a position to say that I confirm or reject the statement of the Senator from California and the Senator from New York that the amount would be reduced in another appropriation bill. But because the President's veto has called attention to the objections which I urged when the bill was on the floor of the Senate, I feel it to be my duty to vote to sustain the veto of the President, though I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to go any further into the matter.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I desire to take but little of the time of the Senate. I merely want to say that I intend to support the previous action of the Senate on the bill. I do so, however, with some reluctance. In the first place I do not believe the Employment Service should have been taken out of the Department of Labor. In the second place, I regret that the committee found it necessary to make such a substantial cut in the appropriation for the Women's Bureau as practically to make it inoperative. For those reasons I feel considerable reluctance in voting for the bill. However, because the time is short and because there are so many other matters contained in the bill which are of great consequence, I feel I must support the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute. I supported Reorganization Plan No. 1 because I am completely convinced that the sooner the Unemployment Compensation Bureau and the United States Employment Service are together in the same department the better the morale and efficiency in both those agencies will be. From my knowledge of these matters gained both in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handled the appropriation, I am convinced that the continual turmoil—after all the Employment Service is only in the Department of Labor temporarily—respecting where that agency is going to wind up has seriously impaired the morale and efficiency of the employees of the Employment Service.

Mr. President, I think we have worked out with the House a reasonable com-

promise which will permit better service in both agencies concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—72

Aiken	Flanders	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Fulbright	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Brewster	Hatch	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Saltonstall
Buck	Hoey	Smith
Butler	Holland	Sparkman
Byrd	Ives	Stennis
Cain	Jenner	Stewart
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Capper	Kem	Thye
Connally	Knowland	Tobey
Cooper	Lodge	Tydings
Cordon	McCarthy	Umstead
Donnell	McClellan	Vandenberg
Downey	McKellar	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Eastland	Martin	White
Ecton	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Williams
Feazel	Moore	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Conor	Young

NAYS—17

Barkley	Lucas	Murray
Green	McFarland	Myers
Hayden	McGrath	O'Mahoney
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Pepper
Kilgore	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Langer	Morse	

NOT VOTING—7

Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	Taylor	
George	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 72, the nays 17. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Chair announces the time of passage to be 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2675. An act to amend the organic act of Puerto Rico;

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements; and

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JACKSON of California, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. COURTNEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT TO FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2225) to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency, which was, on page 3, line 6, to strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

Mr. BALDWIN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CAPEHART. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. REED, Mr. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCMAHON conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION WORK ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6419, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered, 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the words "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 8, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "House Document Numbered 682, Eightieth Congress:"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the figures "568" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "668"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the words "his report dated February 19, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof the words "House Document Numbered 643, Eightieth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: change the period to a comma and add the following: "and the authorization for the

lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the words "his report dated August 22, 1947" and insert in lieu thereof the words "House Document Numbered 651, Eightieth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: on page 10, lines 10 and 11, of the amendments of the Senate, strike out the following "at prices, on terms, and with titles satisfactory to him"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the figure "65,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following figure "62,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
EDWARD MARTIN,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
EARL WILSON,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

JUDICIAL CODE AND JUDICIARY

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on page 7927 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12 of this year, there appear, among other things, in the course of remarks made by myself, the following two sentences having to do with H. R. 3214:

> Extensive hearings were held, at which various controversial matters, and particularly one controversial matter, relating to the Tax Court, were heard. As a net result of the facts so developed, it was concluded by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee that it was advisable to withdraw from House bill 3214 all provisions by which the Tax Court would be placed under the judiciary.

Mr. President, in making that statement I was in error. As a matter of fact, as a net result of the facts developed at the hearings it was concluded by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee that there should be retained in House bill 3214 the various provisions by which the Tax Court would be placed under the judiciary.

Subsequently, however, when the matter was presented by the subcommittee to the Committee on the Judiciary, it became obvious that it was impossible to secure the passage on the Consent Calendar of this very important bill if the provisions with respect to the Tax Court were to be retained in it.

Therefore, Mr. President, the members of the subcommittee, uniting with the other members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary who were present, arrived at the conclusion that it was advisable and proper that the provisions with respect to the Tax Court should be withdrawn from H. R. 3214.

Mr. President, the fact is that the subcommittee, of which I had the honor to be chairman, in its own conclusion determined that the Tax Court should be left in the bill. The Committee on the Judiciary itself, with full approval of the three members of the subcommittee, including myself, determined, for the reasons stated, that the Tax Court provisions should be withdrawn. In the interests of accuracy, Mr. President, I desire to make this statement. I may say that the provisions with relation to the Tax Court were withdrawn from the bill as passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of today and all day tomorrow.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say for the benefit of Members of the Senate that it is our intention to continue in session until at least 9 o'clock on the farm program bill, which is the unfinished business. The Senator from Vermont has been very patient while privileged matters have been considered. The afternoon has been taken away from him, but I hope that Senators will give this bill their attention so that it may be expedited.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks in support of the farm-program bill which is now before the Senate.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been at work for months on this measure. We have discussed the need for and content of a long-range program with the Secretary of Agriculture, we have held public hearings not only here in Washington but across the country, we have written and rewritten the several sections which we thought should go into a long-range bill, and we have finally agreed upon S. 2318 and respectfully present it to the Senate for consideration.

This is much more than simply another bill. It is a summary of all our experience and study in the farm program field over the last decade. Good legislation grows. This is that kind of legislation. It is the first general agricultural bill which has been before the Senate since we enacted the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It is specifically related to that and other farm legislation now in effect with a view of rounding out, as far as possible at this time, a coordinated, well-balanced agricultural program.

The bill in its present form is somewhat different from the bill which was introduced by members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on March 15, 1948. In the bill originally introduced there was a provision which would make it optional with farmers to accept the old parity formula or the new parity formula which is now based on the 10-year moving average. After much discussion the committee concluded to stick to one formula rather than two. I understand that an amendment will be submitted to the Senate in an effort to restore the option to growers to take either the present parity formula or the new one provided for in the pending bill. If and when such an amendment is presented, I expect to support it, because it was at my instance that the original bill included that language.

The bill streamlines and continues what we are now doing in the agricultural field. As I have already said, its roots go a long way back. Some of the outstanding legislative items which have concontributed to our agricultural program are worth recalling.

It started with the Agricultural Adjustment and Farm Credit Acts of 1933. It was under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 that farmers first found an opportunity to work together in order to stabilize their prices and bring supplies in line with demand. Then the Congress enacted the Soil Erosion Act of 1935, the act under which the Soil Conservation Service presently operates. There were other acts amending or supplementing these basic acts—for example, the Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934, the Kerr Tobacco Act of 1934, the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934, and the De-Rouen Rice Act of 1935.

Then the processing-tax benefit-payment provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 were invalidated by the Supreme Court in January 1936. Shortly thereafter the Congress passed the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which extended the original Soil Erosion Act by the addition of sections 7 to 17, authorizing an agricultural conservation program and shifting emphasis in the agricultural adjustment field from temporary acreage adjustment to soil conservation and improved farm-management practices.

We then started to work trying to write a new Agricultural Adjustment Act. This resulted in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which continued and amended the conservation legislation, authorized the establishment of acreage allotments and marketting quotas on cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and (later) peanuts, authorizing the making of loans by Commodity Credit Corporation on agricultural commodities, and provided for the establishment of four regional research laboratories for the purpose of finding new uses and markets for agricultural products and byproducts.

Let me say at this point, Mr. President, that I participated in the drafting as well as the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. I was fortunate at that time in being appointed a member of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee made a tour of the country, and the facts gathered by the committee formed the basis of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

This act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, was the last piece of really broad-scale agricultural legislation which the Congress has considered and enacted. Meanwhile, there have also

been other acts relating or adding to the agricultural program—the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937, the several acts authorizing further research or increased extension activities, including our most recent act for strengthening work in the research field and giving increased emphasis to marketing work, the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

Much of the legislation I have been talking about centered around our great staple or basic commodities, but the Congress has not forgotten or overlooked the nonbasic or more perishable commodities. Section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, appropriated funds for each fiscal year equal to 30 percent of the customs receipts for agricultural purposes; and, following the Supreme Court decision in January 1936, the Congress reenacted and revised all of the earlier marketing-agreement legislation in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

It was under those several acts that our agricultural program was being operated when we found ourselves faced with World War II. To further strengthen the agricultural program and to meet our wartime needs, the Congress passed, and the President approved on July 1, 1941, the so-called Steagall amendment. It was under that amendment and related legislation that the Secretary of Agriculture was directed to support prices for the producers of the basic and specified nonbasic agricultural commodities at various rates, finally at 90 percent of their parity or comparable prices for all of the basic and Steagall commodities except cotton, for which the final rate was 92½ percent of parity. Those supports were to run for 2 years following the actual end of hostilities, and all of us are aware that the termination date of this legislation has now been definitely fixed as December 31, 1948.

Senate bill 2318 streamlines and continues what we are now doing, but it is not in itself a complete farm program. Many of the things we desire in a farm program are provided for by legislation already in effect, and some of them are provided by separate proposed legislation which the Congress must finally pass before adjournment, especially the bill providing a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to say that I understand that my distinguished colleague the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will submit an amendment providing for continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation for at least another year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that is correct. It seems to me that the safe thing to do is to add to this bill an amendment continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation for another year, because although the Commodity Credit Corporation charter bill may be acted on by the House of Representatives and may go to conference, we simply cannot afford to take the risk of having the Commodity Credit Corporation go out of business on July 1.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have understood that the bill rewriting the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which the Senate passed, is now pigeonholed in the House Banking and Currency Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I would not say it is pigeonholed. They are talking of acting on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. At any rate, it is still there.

Mr. AIKEN. But they are talking of amending it to such an extent that I fear it would be difficult for the House and the Senate to get together regarding it during the time remaining in this session.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then I repeat that in order to make our program complete, as it has been in the past, it will be necessary that we revitalize, as it were, the Commodity Credit Corporation, if we are to obtain the support-price conditions which are outlined in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Actually, Mr. President, Senate bill 2318 has two general objectives. The first is that it provides for the coordination of agricultural programs, especially conservation activities, at the national, the State, and the county levels. Second, the bill provides for agricultural commodities a flexible price-support program which takes into account changes in supplies and is specifically designed to obtain fair prices for farm products and assure abundant production. We believe that Senate bill 2318 not only will benefit farmers, but also will aid in stabilizing our national economy at a satisfactory high level.

Title I of the bill is concerned primarily with the coordination and administration of agricultural programs, and especially with the general reorganization and administration of the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service.

To begin with, section 101 provides for combining into a single "Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement" the functions presently assigned to the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Conservation Programs Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, as well as other functions deemed by the Secretary to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement. This is in line with recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The assignment of the new agency would also include those aspects of the program of the Department which require direct dealing with farmers, except for, first, educational, informational, and demonstrational features, which would be exercised through the Extension Service; second, research and investigational features, which would be carried out through the State agricultural experiment stations; and third, such other functions as would be performed in the States and counties through the State agricultural councils, county and community agricultural program committees, and county agricultural program executive committees. This section specifies that the furnishing of technical service, machinery, and equipment to soil conservation districts and others would be performed directly by the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement. Regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service are required to be abolished.

In addition to consolidating the Agricultural Conservation Program and the Soil Conservation Service into a single new agency, the chief changes in the existing law or methods of operation required by section 101 are first, the shifting to the Extension Service of educational, informational, and demonstrational work relating to conservation; second, the shifting of the research and investigational work relating to conservation to the State experiment stations; and third, the abolishing of the regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service. Technical assistance, machinery, and equipment to soil and other conservation districts would be supplied directly by the new agency, and the agricultural conservation program, as well as other activities, would be administered or given general direction through the community, county, and State agricultural committees or councils.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I gladly yield.

Mr. THYE. In the consolidation and unification of the educational, informational, and demonstration work under the Extension Service, and the shifting to the State experiment stations of the research and the investigational work relating to conservation, does the Senator believe that such a program coordinates and brings together desirable units, and makes use to the best advantage of all the services available in the State?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my belief.

Mr. THYE. I honestly believe that we shall have a more effective program as a result of the consolidation which will go forward under this program. In the same way that we recognize that new machines constitute improvements in the mechanical field, so in this case we recognize that improvements can be made in an administrative field.

Mr. ELLENDER. There can be no question about that.

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to hear the Senator agree as to that; I am very happy to hear the Senator make that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, section 102 authorizes the use of funds appropriated for conservation work for educational functions which the Secretary determines should be carried out by the State extension services. The section also authorizes the use of such funds or of funds appropriated specifically for educational or demonstrational functions covered by section 101 (a) to be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in accordance with the terms of the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, except that there is no requirement for matching such funds. It is expressly provided that these sums shall be in addition to and not in substitution for other extension moneys.

Section 103 provides for the creation of a new division in the Office of Experiment Stations to be known as the "Division of Soil Conservation and Improvement." That is to carry out the plan the Senator has just discussed. Section 104 authorizes the Secretary to allot

funds, other than grants-in-aid funds, which are available for functions to be performed under section 101 (b) to the agricultural experiment stations in the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. That is, sections 103 and 104 provide the mechanics by which conservation research and investigations now carried on by the Federal conservation agencies shall be decentralized to the States and administered.

Section 105 provides for the election by the farm operators within each local administrative area of a community agricultural program committee having three members, and certain alternates. The community committee is to perform within its area functions assigned to it by the Secretary pursuant to section 101 (c), or otherwise, and the local areas now used under the Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act are to serve as the local areas under this section; but the county agricultural program committee may from time to time designate different areas. This section redefines the method of electing community committees and broadens their responsibilities.

Section 106 provides for the creation of a county agricultural program committee which consists of members of the several community agricultural program committees in the county, the agricultural extension agent for the county, and one representative designated by each of the agencies concerned with conservation or other agricultural interests as the State agricultural council may specify, except that such representatives must be at least one less than the total number of community committees. That, of course, makes the committee almost completely controlled by the farmers themselves. Again, this committee is to perform such functions as the Secretary may assign pursuant to section 101 (c), or otherwise. This section creates a county agricultural program committee for which there is no counterpart under present legislation.

Section 107 provides for the election of a county agricultural program executive committee of not less than three nor more than five members as determined by the State agricultural council, and first and second alternate members. The committee is elected by the county agricultural program committee from among its members and through personnel employed by it performs such functions as the Secretary assigns pursuant to section 101 (c). In effect, this section provides for changes in the method of the election of the county committee which now handles the agricultural conservation program.

Section 108 provides for a State agricultural council to consist of 3 ex officio members and 4 elected members plus 1 additional elected member for each full 20 counties in the State or fractional remaining number of 11 or more, except that in any event the number of additional members shall not be less than 2. The commissioner, secretary, or director, as the case may be, of agriculture, the director of the agricultural experiment station, and the Director of the Agricultural Extension Service, or their respective designees, shall be the ex officio members. The election of the regular members is by the chairmen of the county agricultural program executive committees but not more than half of the elected members are to be chosen from among their number.

This section also provides that the State agricultural council shall develop plans to effectuate the purposes of section 7—the section providing for the agricultural conservation or national payments program—of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in each State, shall perform functions assigned to it by the Secretary pursuant to section 101 (c) or otherwise, shall supervise and direct the work of the county committees, and shall with the approval of the Secretary make arrangements with the Agricultural Extension Service for the conduct of educational and demonstrational programs. Provision is made for the council to employ a State administrator and other necessary personnel. This section provides for electing members of the State council whereas presently such members are appointed. They are appointed, as all Senators know, by the Secretary of Agriculture. I understand the distinguished Senator from Vermont proposes further to amend the pending bill so as to provide that the Secretary shall have the opportunity of selecting the State councils from panels elected by the farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana is referring to a matter which was discussed in the Agricultural Committee meeting yesterday morning, as a result of which an amendment will be offered providing that the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to maintain continuity from the Secretary right down through the grass roots, shall name a State council, but that he shall name it from a list submitted by the farmers of the State through their county agricultural chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is really indirectly done by the farmers themselves, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The farmers elect the county committees.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. The Secretary may not appoint anyone not nominated and approved by the chairmen of the county committees, who are chosen by the farmers themselves. They submit three names for each one the Secretary has to choose. In this way we feel we are requiring perfect cooperation all the way from the Secretary's office down through to the community committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that plan was submitted by a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I also understand it meets with the approval of the Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Agriculture itself objected to any change in the present method of naming the State committee, but a few days ago they came to the conclusion they were willing to have the farmers of the State submit a list of nominees, from which list the Secretary is required to choose the committee. In that way it is practically farmer-controlled, because the Secretary cannot name anyone not approved and nominated by the farmers of the State.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will agree, will he not, that that is really a compromise between the views of the Secretary of Agriculture and the views of the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. That is a compromise, but it seems to me to be a very healthy compromise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department was fearful that if the State committees were not at all tied to the Secretary's office, a wide variety of programs might be set up—possibly, if we wanted to go to the extreme, 48 different programs in the 48 different States—which would probably result in wastefulness, at least in some States.

It seems to me to be a very workable and sensible compromise, because the farmers still name their committeemen, and their State councilmen. The farmers nominate them, and then the Secretary goes through the process of appointing them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I yield gladly.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator still discussing section 108?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Has that been changed in any respect?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not as yet.

Mr. AIKEN. There was a meeting of the committee, at which about eight or nine members were present yesterday morning, and it was discussed at that time. We decided upon offering several amendments. This particular amendment, which is the longest, has not yet been printed and brought to our desks, but that is what it provides, that the Secretary shall appoint the members of the State council from a panel submitted by the chairmen of the county committees of each State.

Mr. LUCAS. How many would there be in the panel?

Mr. AIKEN. There would be three farmers in the panel for each one the Secretary appoints. He would have to appoint one out of three selected by the farmers and certified to him.

Mr. LUCAS. That at least is a compromise of section 108 as written in the bill. I have always been concerned about that section, because of what the Senator from Vermont has pointed out. I think I have made my position concerning it known from time to time. I undertake to say the whole authority for the conservation program cannot be lodged in 48 different State councils or 48 different groups, if it is desired to continue to have the kind of national and regional soil-conservation program which seems to be so vital and so necessary to the welfare of all the people.

Mr. ELLENDER. We are all familiar with the views of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and of course his views are in strict accord with those of the Secretary of Agriculture. As the Senator from Vermont will recall, several meetings were held in his office. Representatives of the Secretary's office visited with us and discussed the problem. The suggestion which is incorporated in the

amendment which the distinguished Senator from Vermont expects to offer to this bill was really made by a representative of the Secretary's office.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] was a member of the committee. I know there was a representative of the Department of Agriculture present, and we got together on this compromise. I can say it is wholly acceptable to and has been declared workable by the Department of Agriculture. I know that it is acceptable to some farm organizations, although not all have been consulted as yet.

Mr. LUCAS. It would not make any difference to me whether a farm organization agreed or disagreed. I would never agree, as one individual Senator, to permit the soil-conservation program to be divided up into 48 areas and lodge the sole responsibility for its development and administration in the respective States. The responsibility for the development and the broadening of the soil-conservation program rests upon every individual in America, and collectively the citizens of America can discharge that obligation only through the Federal Government. Soil conservation is a national policy. We cannot break it down into States. In my opinion, the formulation and control of the policy must remain with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to another series of amendments which will be offered. The Secretary of Agriculture approves this or that suggestion after consultation with the State council. At the suggestion of the Department we are offering amendments which will authorize him to approve programs and other things upon recommendation of the State council. The Secretary himself said he thought that would be more workable and, in his opinion, along with the other amendment which has just been discussed, would bring the actual carrying out of the operations closer to the people of the States. There seems to be no possibility of a diffusion of effort for the establishment of many diverse programs in the various States.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator recall to what section that amendment would apply? I am referring to the last amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. On page 48, lines 10 and 11, there is an amendment in connection with incentive payments to farmers in each State for soil-conservation practices. The bill provides that they shall be made only for practices approved by the Secretary of Agriculture after consultation with the State agricultural council.

At the suggestion of the Department, we are proposing that it shall read "only for practices approved by the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council."

The Secretary thought that would be more workable.

There is a series of similar amendments to different parts of the bill which will have the same effect.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say, if I may, in the Senator's time, that throughout the hearings my contention has been that we cannot divide the responsibility. We must lodge responsibility somewhere, and that somewhere, in my judgment, is the Secretary of Agriculture. The moment we give, even by inference, any reason for a State group to obtain authority, we are courting a situation whereby the soil-conservation program will be seriously impaired, because we shall have two agencies trying to make a decision on the same question. If this amendment shall accomplish what the able Senator from Vermont intends, I am very happy that there is an agreement with the Agricultural Department upon it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt that it will accomplish what the Senator is now contending for.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Illinois raised the question of whether there could be divided authority between the Secretary of Agriculture and the State council. As the bill is now written, I do not believe there could be any question as to whether the authority was divided. The State council would make a recommendation to the Secretary as to the type of program known to be best suited to the areas of the State, and the Secretary would accept it, execute it, and carry it out. So, rather than having divided authority, we are aiding the Secretary by getting a recommendation from the State council as to type of program.

When we met with the Secretary and the Secretary's assistants, the very fear that the Senator from Illinois recognized and stated was discussed. The reason for the amendment is to clarify the question so that there shall not be any divided authority or responsibility.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is well to bring out these points in the debate to show the legislative intent of the language which is being used in the bill, so that if there be any doubt about it, the Secretary of Agriculture will know how the legislative body feels regarding it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. From my experience in serving on boards of this character, I think this amendment will bring about better coordination than did the old program. The States will have an opportunity to offer a program, and the Secretary can modify it if he so desires. In the past there were frequently long arguments. So here is a chance for the counties and States to initiate their own program and have it rejected or accepted by the Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the duties and functions of the committee or council are spelled out in more detail than is now the case and additional duties are added, such as the development of State plans under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Section 109 authorizes and directs the Secretary to make payments from available funds to the council and committees set up under the preceding section to cover their estimated administrative costs. It is further provided that these costs may be deducted pro rata from payments or grants-in-aid to farmers as is now being done in administering the current agricultural conservation program. Section 109 further provides that no person shall be a member of more than one council or executive committee established under the act.

Title II of Senate bill 2318 consists of a series of amendments to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in order to further reinforce or supplement the various changes called for under title I.

Section 201 amends section 7 (d) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide for approval of State plans by the State councils prior to approval by the Secretary. Provision is also made for the disbursement of funds available for carrying out State plans under the direction of the State councils. These changes give the State councils a voice in the approval of State plans and make the new State councils and local committees proper agencies to administer such plans.

Section 202 extends for two additional years the authority for a national conservation program under sections 7 through 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In line 7 the bill provides:

> No such plan submitted by a State of the United States shall be approved by the Secretary, except after consultation with the State agricultural council created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948.

Do the amendments take care of the situation covered in section 201?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment proposes that the Secretary shall accept the plan upon the recommendation of the State council. It was at the Department's own suggestion that that change was recommended.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the final arbiter will be the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; the Secretary must approve all these programs. I think in most States that is being done today. The committees which are established formulate the State programs, and I think the Secretary, for the most part, approves them.

Mr. ELLENDER. That has been the case in the past. The only difference is that under the old plan the Secretary of Agriculture appointed the State committees directly, and under this proposal

they are to be appointed in the manner we discussed a few moments ago.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for continuing to stress the point I raised under section 108, as I recall, was to continue to indicate that I think the final authority for these matters must rest in the Secretary of Agriculture, and in the bill it is provided as I just read. If that language is left in the bill, I can readily see how there could easily come about some turmoil and some differences of opinion as to how much consultation, for instance, the Secretary of Agriculture had with the State agricultural council.

What I hope to see accomplished, if we ever pass a long-range bill of this kind, is the prevention of as much friction and as much disturbance between the Secretary of Agriculture and the various State agencies as possible, in order that we may ultimately have the kind of smoothly running program which is necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that is the reason why the Department recommended changing the words to "upon recommendation of" instead of "after consultations with."

Mr. LUCAS. I understand the difference.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department said it would make for much smoother operation.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is an exceedingly wise substitute for the language I have just read.

Mr. AIKEN. That language we propose to ask to have substituted in about half a dozen places throughout the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the language of the bill, with the amendments which will be suggested by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, there is no question, in my mind, that the Secretary will be the final arbiter, and that the plans will originate at the grass roots, as it were—at the community level, the county level, the State level, and on to Washington.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that, in my judgment.

I now resume my statement about the bill. This authority for a national program is necessary since less than half of the States have enacted legislation providing for State operation of the agricultural conservation program under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Section 203 amends section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to eliminate the provision for community, county, and State committees and to substitute in lieu thereof the authorization and direction to the Secretary to utilize the new State council and local committees provided for in the bill.

Section 204 amends the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by striking out the provisions of section 8 (e) relating to the provision of practice payments and substituting a new section which subdivision (1) requires approval of conservation practices by the Secretary after consultation with State councils. I understand that language will be changed.

Mr. AIKEN. That will read "upon recommendation of the Secretary."

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. Subdivision (2) limits payment to those practices which the Secretary after consultation with State councils determines have long-term conservation and improvement value; and subdivision (3) provides for a division of payments among landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers based on the relative value of their contribution to, and benefits from, the practices performed on the farm. This section also eliminates the small payment increases provided for under the current law and further provides for a limit on the amount of payments for conservation practices in the amount of $1,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Louisiana object to interruptions?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not at all.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask a question or two in regard to section 18, and I think it is well that we do this for the RECORD as we go along.

Mr. ELLENDER. What page?

Mr. LUCAS. It is section 204. It says "section 18" in my draft.

Mr. THYE. It refers to section 18 on line 2, page 69.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. I refer to paragraph (c), which reads:

> Payments or grants of aid to farmers in any State, under a State plan or by the Secretary, for soil-building or soil-conserving practices shall be * * * divided among the landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers of any farm, with respect to which such payments are made, on the basis of relative value of their contributions to, and benefits received from, such practices.

Did the committee at any time have any testimony before regarding the administrative difficulty such a standard might create for the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield, I will say that upon the recommendation of the Department those words "and benefits received from" should be deleted, because the Department felt that there would be greater harmony in the operations of the act if those four words were eliminated.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is in the series of amendments which the Senator will offer.

Mr. AIKEN. I mean that they might not be in harmony with the preceding statement. It is difficult to tell what the benefits are.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, section 205 amends section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act relating to the transfer of funds to State and Federal agencies and to State and county committees to conform to the new State and county organization set up under S. 2318.

As I indicated earlier, the second major objective of S. 2318 is to provide for a flexible price-support program for agricultural commodities. Title III, which amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, provides for this flexible program. Again I want to say that these amendments or provisions are not new or untried. Rather, they are based directly upon the legislation and administrative procedures which have been gradually developed and tried out since 1938.

We all know the job which farmers did during the last war. Food production was increased by a third at a time when the fate of the world literally hung upon American food supplies. Support prices authorized under the Steagall amendment and related legislation were the most important devices used in encouraging farmers to meet our wartime goals. We need to continue the authority to use support prices to maintain or increase production of commodities under emergency conditions. S. 2318 does that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, or would he rather complete his statement before he yields?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I gladly yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator, of course, is familiar with the naval-stores industry because he has much of that industry in his own State. I should like to know from the able Senator what provision for price support of that important industry is provided under the terms of the pending measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from Florida that the products of naval stores are described under the old act as being agricultural products. They would be treated just the same as any other product of agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say that I have received several telegrams today from people engaged in that industry in my State who are concerned about those provisions of the bill which they feel would give them less substantial protection than they are given under the present law. I have been working on other legislation and am not familiar with the provisions of the bill which relate to the naval-stores industry. If the Senator would describe in brief the provisions of the bill which relate to that industry I would appreciate it.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no specific language in the bill which relates to this industry, no more than there is for nonbasic commodities. The only crops mentioned are the original five basic crops contained in the act of 1938, plus peanuts which were added later. All the other commodities are treated in the nature of nonbasic commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The definition of "naval stores" which, I suppose are turpentine and resin, was made by the Secretary; that is those products were defined as agricultural products, and under this bill they would be eligible for support up to 90 percent of parity the same as other nonbasic commodities.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the point I was discussing when the Senator from Florida asked me to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that the basic commodities are named in the bill, and then there are a great many others which are called nonbasic com-

modities. The nonbasic commodities are subject to the provisions of the bill as well as the basic commodities, but not in the same fashion.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. Let us consider wool. Is wool a basic commodity under the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. No, wool is not a basic commodity, because a basic commodity is one which is easily storable, and which is usually produced in exportable quantities. But the bill does provide mandatory support for wool from 60 to 90 percent of parity. The Secretary is directed to support the price of wool so as to encourage production of 360,000,000 pounds annually. In order to encourage such production he would have to support wool at 90 percent of parity, which would mean about a 46 cents a pound support level at the present time.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is treated separately, in a provision of the bill which deals with wool exclusively, and it provides for parity loans and so forth of not more than 90 and not less than 60 percent of parity.

Mr. CONNALLY. My State produces a great deal of mohair, which is a form of wool, as I view it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is wool it is covered.

Mr. CONNALLY. We think it is wool. I wanted to ask the Senator if mohair would be eligible for the benefits of this proposed legislation?

Mr. AIKEN. It is my opinion that mohair would be eligible for support as a nonbasic commodity up to 90 percent of parity, in the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. CONNALLY. So that if the Secretary so ruled it would be eligible up to 90 percent of parity?

Mr. AIKEN. If it were proven that it was wool it would have the same support, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think wool means the wool from sheep. I do not know that it means wool from any other animal. I do not want to mislead the Senator, but I doubt if it would mean wool from any other animal.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some people refer to what is on one's head as being wool. I do not know that that is an accurate description; but, at any rate, it would be a matter for consideration by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly mohair is eligible for support up to 90 percent of parity in the discretion of the Secretary, after he considers the several criteria, one of which is whether he has money enough to do it, of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. So it is the Senator's belief that it is covered?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely; that is my belief.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I might add by way of information for the Senator from Texas that as I understand, from the facts developed before the committee, wool, so far as its production is concerned, is at a low peak, so to speak, compared with former years. The bill definitely provides for a goal of 360,000,000 pounds.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, 360,000,000 pounds is the goal. We are producing now only about 300,000,000 pounds.

Mr. LUCAS. So as long as we produce only that amount the parity price is going to stay close to 90 percent, due to the failure to reach the goal we have attempted to achieve.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me add that if this formula does not secure the desired amount of wool necessary for national defense, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to break through the 90 percent limitation and place the support at such a level as will secure any product in quantity essential for national needs.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. The House bill as written does not cover a raise in support level for the product which has just been mentioned even should an emergency exist and stepped up production was necessary to the national interest.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand the House bill contains no provision whereby the 90 percent ceiling could be broken to encourage an increase in production of any commodity in the event of a national emergency. The Senate bill does carry that provision.

Mr. YOUNG. That is something which has been very important many times in the past. For instance 2 years ago, when flaxseed was very scarce in the United States, and selling for six to seven dollars a bushel in Argentina, our only other chief source of supply, and it was necessary to increase production, the Secretary of Agriculture increased the support level to 165 percent of parity, which brought about the production necessary in the United States and saved the American public a great deal of money. Supporting flax prices at $6 a bushel in this instance benefited both the user and producer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will agree also that the Steagall amendment was passed by Congress for that very purpose; to increase production in nonbasic commodities.

Mr. YOUNG. What I was trying to bring out is that unless this long-range farm bill is passed with such a provision in it, there will be nothing that can be done about it when the bill goes to conference, because the subject is not covered by the House bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that naval stores constitute a nonbasic crop under the bill, but are not one of the nonbasic crops that are specially covered by a special section as well?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. And therefore would come under the provision which fixes the ceiling of price support at 90 percent, but which has no figure below that at which price support begins? Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. One further question: Am I also correct in my understanding that the provisions with reference to the computation of parity for naval stores are those which apply to the nonbasic food crops?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, in the bill there is a special formula for the six basic commodities; but with respect to the nonbasic commodities there is a formula provided in the bill which is not rigid, but which is more or less spelled out, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to make a determination. We are talking now about the pending bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that under the current law the basic period on which the parity price is figured for naval stores is the period from 1910 to 1914.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Likewise, the 90 percent, which is the maximum permitted under the law, is now applicable to naval stores?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator have any figures showing how the naval stores parity price would be affected by the formula prescribed by this bill for nonbasic commodities, as compared with the way they are affected under the present law?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont has a table in his hand. I shall be glad to yield so that he may give the Senator the exact figures.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have a table furnished by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which shows that under the modernized parity formula the parity price of gum rosin, all grades, would be $5.83 a hundred, as compared with $6 under the old parity formula. However, as I understand, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] proposes to offer an amendment which would include the cost of hired labor in computing the parity formula. If the cost of labor is included, then the parity price of gum rosin under the new formula would be $6.16 a hundred, or 16 cents a hundred more than it is under the present parity formula. There is very little change.

As to gum turpentine, there is a reduction from $1.14 a gallon under the old formula, or the one we are using at present, to 78.8 cents a gallon under the new formula, without wages, or 83.3 cents with wages. But there is a provision in the bill which prevents a sudden drop in the parity price. It cannot drop more than 5 percent a year. Therefore, the drop from $1.14 would be between 5 and 6 cents a gallon under the new parity formula.

Mr. HOLLAND. For the first year.

Mr. AIKEN. For the first year.

Mr. HOLLAND. And thereafter each year until the new parity figure was entirely applicable.

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming that the drop were to continue. However, there is no assurance that it would continue. If back in 1938, 1939, and 1940, turpentine was selling at a low price in comparison with other agricultural commodities, and

we were to substitute the high price of the past 3 years, there is a possibility that the new parity formula would come back up and meet the old.

In fact, we believe that in 2 or 3 years' time most commodities would level off, so that there would be scarcely any difference between computing parity by the method we use today and by the method which is proposed in the bill.

The average parity price of all farm commodities is the same, whether figured by the old formula or the proposed new one. There would be some sharp drops. For example, avocados, which were hardly known in the period from 1910 to 1914, today have a parity value of something like $800 a ton. They have dropped to $200 a ton, because they have come out of the luxury class. I think there are a few other commodities, perhaps, grown in the State of Florida which have dropped, too. There is no use in trying to say that some would not drop. Others would rise. Here we have the case of rosin rising and turpentine dropping somewhat. Probably the Senator from Florida knows why. I do not know. We do not get anything but maple sirup out of our trees in Vermont. But that is the way the computation is made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make one observation, in view of the colloquy between the Senator from Florida and other Senators. If Senators take the position that they require a bill which will give to every commodity, basic and nonbasic, the same kind of parity price which it is receiving at the present time, we shall never get a bill through the Senate, in my judgment. I come from a Midwest section, where we raise corn, wheat, and soybeans. Corn and wheat are taking a terrific lacing in this program at the present time—much more than what the Senator from Florida discusses.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Would the Senator mind if I interrupted to point out that the drop can be only on the basis of 5 percent for a given year? We recognize that we must do that, because there is a drop, so far as the parity formula is concerned, on certain commodities. The reason for that is the extreme low prices in the years 1938 and 1939, which, figured into the flexible 10-year period, cause a drop. Then, as we drop off the year 1939 and pick up the year 1949 in the 10-year period, we immediately commence to restore the balance, and get back closer to the present parity formula. That is the reason for the protection of the 5-percent provision.

Mr. AIKEN. Precisely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out to the Senator from Illinois, since he has mentioned corn, that under the new formula the price of corn would be $1.42 a bushel. Under the old it would be $1.60. So there is a loss of 18 cents a bushel.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from North Dakota wants to discuss wheat.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from North Dakota would like to have a supported price of $5 for wheat. No doubt the Senator from Illinois would like to have a support price of $3 or $4 for corn. But that is not possible. If we go back to prewar years, before the Steagall amendments, the support levels were away down. I believe that the farm organizations are taking a constructive view. They want, as every farmer wants, a long-range program, rather than 1 year of high support followed by a great deal of trouble, and then no support at all. Some time we shall have to get back to peacetime supports at a fair level and this bill does just that. I believe every farmer would rather have long-range assurance of at least $1.82 for wheat than $2.21 for 1 year and no assurance for the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, the Steagall amendments were adopted by the Congress to increase production. If this bill is not enacted, we shall go back to the old law, which provides a formula of 52 to 75 percent.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, the parity formula in this bill is from 60 to 90 percent.

The Senator from North Dakota mentioned wheat. Under the new formula the price of wheat will be $1.82. Under the old it would be $2.21, or a loss of 29 cents a bushel.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does not the Senator think that under the 5-percent provision, it will be possible for the price gradually to decline and taper down?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; over a period of 5 or 6 years it would be possible to make that difference.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe that all the farmers much prefer to have a permanent support level which will give them some assurance of security, even at a lower level, rather than to have a high level for awhile, and then have nothing at all 2 or 3 years from now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to emphasize the point I made a moment ago, in view of the questions and answers which have occurred on this particular phase of the problem.

Of course some of the producers of basic commodities and some of the producers of nonbasic commodities will have to make a sacrifice. Others will gain by the new arrangement. But we are trying to reach a modernized formula which will enable the farmers to go along year after year without any serious change—in other words, a situation much different from that which would exist under an obsolete formula. Under the present proposal, we shall have an up-to-date formula.

A moment ago, the Senator said that in the event the cost of hired labor was included in the parity formula, the particular product about which he was inquiring would have a better price. Of course, that is what I am afraid we shall have to meet before we finish this bill: First one and then another will try to add to this program some amendment by which a particular commodity in his section of the country will receive the benefit. Sooner or later there may be cheap labor. If that does occur, then should cheap labor be figured into the parity formula, the very persons who wanted to have labor included in the parity formula will say, "Labor is cheap now, so let us take it out of the parity formula."

That is the primary reason labor was not included in the parity formula in the beginning—it was cheap. If it had been included then, there would not have been the parity prices which have existed during all these years; parity prices would have been much lower.

So, as one Senator on this floor, I shall do all I can to defeat any amendment to this parity formula; and I hope every member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will stand by the formula. Let us go through with this parity formula as it is, and not attempt to fool around by adding additional factors at this late date, because when we do that we shall be sure to get into unsurmountable trouble.

There is only one reason anyone would wish to add labor to this formula at the present time, and that is to increase the parity price. Under the method as now proposed, we realize that in our section of the country corn and wheat will be taking a considerable loss, but the farmers there are willing to have that done. We want to operate on a permanent basis, as the Senator from North Dakota so well described a moment ago. Obviously these high prices cannot continue forever. We would like to get back to a normal condition under which it will be possible to go along on a basis of sustained abundance and protection to the American farmer, so that he will know, when he puts in a crop, that he will get a decent price for it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me say that the senior Senator from Illinois is entirely correct when he speaks about the question of figuring the labor cost into the parity formula. At the present time, in the inflationary era, the high cost of labor would work to advantage in raising the parity price; but it would work to a great disadvantage in a period of depression, because then it would have a tendency to pull prices down even lower. Certainly, if there is ever a time when parity support of prices is needed, it is in a time of deflation, rather than in a period of inflation, such as we are in now.

I should like to comment in connection with the thought the able Senator from Illinois expressed in regard to the question of a farm program. Certainly no one who is engaged in agriculture would wish to subject the consumer to unreasonable prices because of the price-support program. All that the farmers want is a program giving soundness to the prices of the commodities they raise in relation to the prices of articles produced by other workers or by business. In other words, the farmers simply want an equal chance with the other groups in our economy in order that they may be able to produce the food the consumers must have at all times and in all years.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota are absolutely correct about the question of the inclusion of the cost of labor in the formula. I recall that approximately 2 years ago an amendment to include the cost of labor in the parity formula was offered on the floor of the Senate. At that time I voted for it. Naturally, it would have boosted the parity-price levels existing at that time. But I voted for it, against the advice of the farm organizations, which had made a very intensive study of the farm program.

I admit now that I made a mistake in doing that, and it would be a mistake now to raise the formula by means of such a provision, for we would only hurt the farmers later, when the cost of labor declines.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me at this point, I should like to say that in view of all the changes we are making in this bill at the present time, the Department of Agriculture will have enough to do to administer this program efficiently and effectively in the next few years to come. I undertake to say that the inclusion of hired labor in the formula would make the formula very difficult to administer. If we add another factor to the parity formula, the administration at the other end of the Avenue will find its troubles vastly increased.

I do not wish to disturb the parity formula which has worked so well all these years. The machinery for administering it is now set up, and those who are charged with its administration know exactly what to do; they know all the factors that are involved in it; and the entire operation under the present arrangement is a going and successful concern.

But the moment we add the cost of labor to the parity formula, we upset the apple cart in a way that will make it most difficult for the program to be administered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me at this point, apropos of the statement that the wheat grower is willing to accept a drop in the parity price in order to get on a stable basis, I should like to read a telegram which I received today from Spokane, Wash. The telegram, which is addressed to me, reads as follows:

Washington-Idaho Wheat Growers League extremely interested in the early consideration and passage of Senate bill 2318, and urge your support to obtain final adoption of the measure.

WALTER R. JOHNSON,
President, Washington-Idaho Wheat Growers League.

In other words, Mr. President, they know that the parity price for wheat will drop at least for the present. Yet, although they are producers of that one commodity, they are willing to accept a lower support level in order to have a permanent and sound program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to commend the vision of the farmers who are looking to the effects of this program over a long period of years, and are not looking just to the support they can receive next year on a particular product.

When we consider the support a particular product will receive for only 1 year, we are not viewing the agricultural situation with sufficient vision. The farmers are willing to accept a parity price for wheat and corn and other commodities under this formula that will cause them some losses, but they are looking at this matter realistically, and not just in terms of the moment. Some Senators and some farmers seem to wish to receive a little profit for another year under a straight 90 percent support price. I emphatically assert that this approach is totally unrealistic, and it will inure to the detriment of the American farmer over a long period of time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Louisiana for a moment further, let me say that the Senator from Illinois is entirely correct in his statement regarding the importance of this bill because of its effect on a long-range program and because it does not simply ask for a continuation of the 90-percent support price, or the so-called war legislation, for just one more year. If we continue the war legislation, so to speak, for just one more year, it can well destroy any future opportunity for a sound farm program.

That is why I wish to join the Senator from Illinois on this matter and to say that he is entirely correct in his explanation of the importance of providing for this type of program, rather than a mere continuation of some special wartime legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in that connection, let me say that I understand the House has passed a bill extending the so-called Steagall amendment for 18 months. But if prices were to fall in the meantime, and if we did not pass this bill providing for a long-range program, my guess is that we would not be able to obtain—under conditions different from those which exist at this time—the enactment of a bill as favorable as this one to the farmers as a whole. In other words, let the price of wheat go down, let the price of corn and other commodities go down, and it would be more difficult for us to get so favorable a bill approved as the one we can obtain now, because of the fact that the prices for those commodities are fairly good at present.

We also know something about what happened to farm prices and incomes following World War I and again following 1929. On the average farm prices dropped something more than 50 percent within a 12-month period following the fall of 1920. Again, following 1929 farm prices went into the long, disastrous, downward slide which carried into 1933. Farmers need protection against such disasters. S. 2318 supplies such protection. As has been pointed out on two or three occasions, under the plan in the pending bill farm prices cannot fall below their support levels, which in the case of the basic commodities would be between 60 and 90 percent of parity. In 1929, in a period of 12 months, the price of our basic commodities fell 50 percent.

Essentially S. 2318 provides for mandatory supports for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations at not less than 75 percent of the parity prevailing at the beginning of the marketing year when supplies are normal. These mandatory price supports would gradually drop to 60 percent of parity as supplies rose to 130 percent or more of normal, or go to 90 percent of parity as supplies fell to 70 percent or less of a normal supply. In addition, the mandatory support schedule would be increased by 20 percent whenever producers of the commodity voted marketing quotas, except that in no case may the support level be increased above 90 percent of the parity level. But these are minimum floor prices and the Secretary of Agriculture is given discretionary authority to support prices anywhere up to 90 percent of the parity level.

The normal supply of wheat, rice, corn, cotton and peanuts is defined as the sum of the previous year's domestic consumption, plus estimated exports for the current year plus allowances of the following percentages for carry-over: 7 percent in the case of corn, 30 percent in the case of cotton, 10 percent in the case of rice, 15 percent in the case of wheat, and 15 percent in the case of peanuts. The Secretary may also make adjustments for current trends and unusual conditions. In the case of tobacco, a normal supply is defined as a normal year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 175 percent of a normal year's domestic consumption and 65 percent of a normal year's exports as an allowance for a normal carry-over. That of course is made necessary for the reason that tobacco is usually kept and stored for a period of 3 years.

The actual supply for a given year is compared to the normal supply for that year to obtain the supply percentage. For example, let us assume that this bill had been in effect in 1947. In that year the normal supply of wheat might have been about 1,441,000,000 bushels. The actual supply was 1,449,000,000 bushels, so that the supply percentage was about 100 percent. This would call for a minimum support price level of 75 percent of parity. However, the Secretary could have supported prices at 90 percent of parity.

The normal supply of cotton in 1947 might have been about 16,283,000 bales. The actual supply was 17,007,000 bales, or about 104 percent of the normal supply. This supply percentage would indicate a minimum support price of 74 percent

of the parity price according to the schedule set forth on page 79 of S. 2318. But let us suppose the supply of cotton might have been as much as 19,500,000 bales. Then the supply percentage would have been 120 and the mandatory minimum support level would have been 66 percent of parity or in case marketing quotas had been in effect 79 percent. That of course is 20 percent of the 66 added. In either case, however, the Secretary might have gone as high as 90 percent of parity under the discretionary authority provided.

Sections 303 through 306 of the bill specifically define the conditions under which marketing quotas may be voted for corn, wheat, cotton, and rice. In the case of the grains—corn, wheat, and rice—the Secretary shall proclaim and the farmers shall vote on marketing quotas in any year when the total supply exceeds the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent, or whenever the average farm price for 3 successive months in the marketing year does not exceed 66 percent of parity, provided the total supply is not less than the normal supply. In the case of cotton, marketing quotas shall be proclaimed and voted upon whenever the total supply exceeds the normal supply by more than 8 percent, or whenever the average farm price for cotton for 3 successive months does not exceed 66 percent of parity, provided the total supply is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year. In the case of tobacco and peanuts, the provisions relating to marketing quotas remain the same as in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 except that section 309, which was reported as an amendment to S. 2318, provides that the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding year.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 no price supports are available in cases where producers vote down or disapprove marketing quotas. Senate bill 2318, provides, however, that the level of price support for any basic agricultural commodity normally marketed in any marketing year with respect to which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers shall be 50 percent of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year.

I understand that there is a little disagreement in the Department of Agriculture on that phase of the bill. As I have just pointed out, it provides that in the event marketing quotas are disapproved by the farmers, support prices will be accorded at 50 percent of parity price. That is something new.

With respect to nonbasic commodities generally, the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation or other means available to him, is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to farmers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations at not more than 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or season.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. With reference to perishable commodities, one reason why perishable commodities would have to be handled in an entirely different manner than would nonperishable commodities——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am coming to that.

Mr. THYE. I wanted to be certain that that point was explained and clarified, so that no one would in any way feel he was being discriminated against by unreasonably high support prices.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I shall indicate in a moment, there are no loans made by the Commodity Credit Corporation on perishables, but a commodity may be purchased or dealt in with funds under section 32.

Mr. THYE. Perishable commodities are geographically located in very small areas, and there is no possible way that the producer could be protected except in the way which has been provided.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think my statement will explain it fully.

With respect to these nonbasic commodities, however, there are certain standards or conditions which the Secretary should consider. These are: The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, the availability of funds, the perishability of the commodity, its importance to agriculture and the national economy, the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation, and the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

All these provisions, of course, are specifically written in the bill, as the Senator knows.

We also specifically provide that compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out at this time that there is an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] for the purpose of offsetting temporary losses in export markets. There were instances last year of a foreign nation suddenly canceling its orders in this country, thereby sharply reducing the market price, had there been no support price. I think that is a very worthy suggestion on the part of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from California, and I think we will accept it. I know of no reason why it could not be accepted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Special provision is made for wool. The price of wool shall be supported at such level, not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of its parity price, as the Secretary may consider necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds. Senate bill 2318 also amends section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 in such a way as to allow the President to take corrective action upon finding that imports are rendering or tending to render ineffective any price-support program, provided, of course, that such action shall not be in contravention of any treaty or international agreement.

Funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation itself will not be used to support prices for perishable farm products, except as such products may be processed into storable form.

That is what I was referring to a moment ago, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota.

However, the measure does recognize that funds must be available to assist producers of perishable commodities and does specifically provide that section 32 funds will remain available to the Secretary of Agriculture until expended in order to meet any future emergency, provided the total at the end of any fiscal year shall not exceed $300,000,000.

Senate bill 2318 also specifies the conditions under which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell or not sell the farm commodities owned or controlled by it. Specifically, it is provided that commodities shall not be sold at less than, first, a price reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred; second, a price halfway between the support price, if any, and the parity price of such commodity; or third, a price equivalent to 90 percent of the parity price of such commodity, whichever is lowest. Exceptions to the foregoing restrictions are allowed in the case of sales for new or byproduct uses; sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; sales for seed or feed, if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality, or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; sales for the purposes of establishing claims of certain kinds; sales for export; sales of wool; and sales for other than primary uses. A number of other technical amendments are also included to tie in with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Senate bill 2318 provides for certain revisions in the calculation of parity prices for agricultural commodities. Essentially this revised parity provides for maintaining the same over-all relationship between prices for the things the farmer buys and the prices for things he sells as was provided in the original parity formula—that is, farm prices generally should yield the same purchasing power as prevailed during the period 1909–14. However, several of the farm organizations as well as the Secretary of Agriculture have recommended that the parity prices for the several individual commodities should be revised. This is done by providing that the parity prices of the several commodities shall be so calculated as to bear the same relation to each other as existed in the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calculation.

Parity prices, according to the present definition are prices for individual commodities which have changed by the same percentage since a specified base period as the parity index. For many important commodities such as wheat,

cotton, hogs, beef, cattle, and so forth, the base period is 1910–14, and the parity index is the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities used in farm production and farm family living plus an allowance of interest on farm mortgages and taxes on farm real estate.

Senate bill 2318 retains the 1910–14 period as a basis for the relationship between the general level of prices or rates paid by farmers and the general level of prices received by farmers. However, the price relationships among the prices of agricultural products themselves are determined by the actual prices for these commodities that prevailed in the last 10 years.

Some of the Senators may be interested to know how the general level of prices received by farmers and of prices paid by farmers are determined by the Department of Agriculture. The Department selects a representative period and determines the average quantities of the various products sold during that period. They also collect information on prices received by farmers for a selected list of commodities each month. These different prices for each of the months are multiplied by the average quantities, the same average quantities. The resulting total for each month is expressed as a percentage of the value of the same average quantities at 1910–14 average prices. Since the quantities remain constant the change in the value is a measure of the change in prices. For example, in May 1948 the index of prices received by farmers was 289. In other words, prices were 289 percent of what they were in the base period.

The parity index is obtained in a similar fashion. Prices paid by farmers for a standard list of commodities purchased by farmers for use in production and family living are collected. These prices are averaged together with interest rates and taxes to obtain the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes. In May 1948, this index indicated that prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes, were 250 percent of their level in the base period 1910–14.

The starting point for calculating the revised parity price for wheat according to this bill is the average price received by farmers for wheat during the period January 1938 to December 1947. This price was $1.22 per bushel. The general level of prices received by farmers during that period was 168. The index of prices paid, including interest and taxes, as of March 15, 1948, was 247. This index determines the level of parity prices for that month. Prices during the preceding 10 years need to be increased by the ratio of 247 to 168 to indicate the March 15, 1948, parity price. Or, stated another way, the average price of wheat for the last 10 years can be divided by 168, the index of prices received by farmers for the same period, and multiplied by 247, the parity index reported for March 15.

The revised parity prices provided under S. 2318 would be considerably different than now calculated and published by the Department of Agriculture. However, in order to protect producers against abrupt or sharp changes due to the revision, S. 2318 provides for a transitional parity price where needed. That is, no parity price shall be lowered in any 1 year by more than 5 percent of the parity price as calculated prior to the effective date of S. 2318. It is further provided that the Secretary may, and upon the request of a substantial number of producers shall, hold public hearings with respect to parity prices of particular commodities to consider whether revisions in methods of calculating the particular parity are needed. If so, the Secretary is given authority to put into effect any revision so found to be required.

Parity prices are also used in connection with marketing agreements and in order to assure that the shift to the new revised method of calculating parity causes no unnecessary administrative difficulties, Section 403 provides the necessary amendments to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

The effective date of S. 2318, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948, is set as January 1, 1949, except for section 402 which shall take effect upon enactment. Section 402 is the section giving the President power to protect any support program from imports which may render ineffective, or materially interfere with, such a program.

In conclusion, let me say that S. 2318 is not a bill to extend price supports for another 6 or 12 or 18 months. S. 2318 is not an endeavor to dodge the farm price issue. It meets it direct. S. 2318 is permanent legislation. It has the full support not only of those of us who have worked upon it but also, I believe, of the American farmers and their representatives. It offers American farmers a fair basis against which to plan for the future and, in so doing, it also goes far toward assuring the American people generally of abundant food supplies over the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement prepared by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry respecting parity prices. It further explains the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—A COMPARISON OF PARITY PRICES AS DETERMINED IN S. 2318 AND UNDER THE PRESENT FORMULA

The new parity price formula in S. 2318 accepts the prices of individual farm commodities for the 10 immediately preceding years as reflecting the current relative supply of and demand for different farm products better than the price relationships between different farm commodities in 1910–14. However, the period 1910–14 is retained as the base period in showing the over-all relationship between the prices of things farmers buy and the prices of farm products. The period of 1910–14 has advantages as a base period for farm products as a group because no large segment of our economy was badly out of adjustment with other segments of our economy at that time due to the absence of war, depression, or seriously disturbed international trade conditions. On the other hand changes in population, consumption of products, trade, total production, and other factors have had a marked effect in changing the relative demand for different farm products now as compared to the period 1910–14.

Below are given the new (S. 2318) and old parity price computations for the six basic farm commodities of corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco as of May 15, 1948, plus a few examples of nonbasis commodities. In making these calculations the following data were used to tie the new parity formula to the 1910–14 base period: the 10-year average of prices received by farmers for their products (1938–47) was 168 percent of the 1910–14 base period, and the May 15, 1948, index of prices farmers paid for products purchased, including interest and taxes, was 250 percent of the 1910–14 base period. The new parity-price calculation uses the preceding 10-year average price (1938–47) of the individual commodity to determine the current relationship of the commodity to all farm products sold. The old parity-price calculation uses the 1910–14 individual commodity price (unless some other base period has been accepted as in the case of tobacco) to show the price relationships between farm products.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES

Using corn as an example, the calculation of parity under the new parity formula is as follows: The 10-year average price of corn (1938–47) was $0.953. Average prices of all farm products during the last 10 years is 168 percent of the average prices of all farm products during the 1910–14 base period. Thus, $0.953 is divided by 1.68 to show the parity price of corn in 1910–14, which would amount to $0.567. Since the prices of things farmers buy are now 250 percent or 2.50 times as high as in 1910–14, the current parity price of corn would be 2.50 times $0.567 or $1.42.

In calculating the parity price for corn under the old formula, the actual price of corn from 1910–14 is used which was $0.642. Since the prices of things the farmer buys are 2.50 times as high as in 1910–14, the 1910–14 price of corn, $0.642, is multiplied by 2.50 which gives $1.60 as the old parity price of corn.

PARITY PRICES OF BASIC COMMODITIES

Corn (per bushel): New, $0.953 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.567 times 2.50 equals $1.42; old, $0.642 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $1.60.

Wheat (per bushel): New, $1.22 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.726 times 2.50 equals $1.82; old, $0.884 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $2.21.

Cotton (per pound): New, $0.1808 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.1076 times 2.50 equals $0.2659; old, $0.124 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $0.3100.

Peanuts (per pound): New, $0.062 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.37 times 2.50 equals $0.091; old, $0.048 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $0.120.

Rice (per bushel): New, $1.44 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $0.857 times 2.50 equals $2.12; old, $0.813 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $2.03.

Tobacco (per pound): Flue-cured, new, $0.336 (10-year average price)[1] divided by 1.68 equals $0.200 times 2.50 equals $0.500; old, $0.229 (present base price)[2] times 2.12[3] equals $0.485; Burley, new $0.340 (10-year average price)[1] divided by 1.68 equals $0.202 times 2.50 equals $0.505; old, $0.222 (present price)[2] times 2.12[3] equals $0.471.

PARITY PRICES OF SELECTED NONBASIC COMMODITIES

Cottonseed (per ton): New, $44.60 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals

[1] Ten marketing years beginning during calendar years 1938–47.

[2] Based on marketing seasons 1934–38.

[3] May 15 index of prices paid August 1934–July 1939 equals 100.

$26.50 times 2.50 equals $66.20; old, $22.28 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $56.40.

Hogs (per hundredweight): New, $12.50 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $7.44 times 2.50 equals $18.60; old, $7.28 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $18.20.

Beef cattle (per hundredweight): New, $10.90 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $6.49 times 2.50 equals $16.20; old, $5.41 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $13.60.

Milk (per hundredweight): New, $2.81 (10-year average price) divided by 1.68 equals $1.67 times 2.50 equals $4.18[1]; old, $1.60 (present base price) times 2.50 equals $4.00.[1]

It should be noted that while the parity prices of some products are higher and others lower under the new formula, the average parity price of all commodities will be the same under the old and new formulas. In the change from the old to the new parity formula, the parity price of livestock, livestock products and oil seeds are higher, while parity prices for grain crops are lower. It is because the relationships between prices of individual farm commodities have changed materially since 1910–14 that there is need of revising the parity formula to use current price relationships between individual farm commodities.

A provision in the bill (S. 2318), however, provides that where there is a difference between the two parity prices for a product exceeding 5 percent of the old parity price, that the adjustment to the new parity will not take place at the rate of more than 5 percent in 1 year. The main reason for the lower parity prices for the basic commodities under the new parity formula, except for rice and tobacco, is the low prices for the other products in the years 1938, 1939, and 1940. Insofar as the prices in 1948, 1949, and 1950 may be higher than in 1938, 1939, and 1940 for these products, their parity prices under the two formulas will come closer together in the next 3 years, and the new parity for a product may exceed the old if the 10-year average price of the product becomes relatively higher than those of other commodities. The formula provides for the annual adjustment of dropping the first and adding a new year's price to the 10-year average price of farm products.

It is desirable that the new parity prices for livestock and oil seeds be somewhat higher relative to grain prices because 85 percent of the corn crop and a large part of other grains are normally fed to livestock. This change in the relationship of parity prices for livestock and grains will encourage the feeding of grain which is the most desirable means of utilizing grain when supplies become burdensome.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his very careful and accurate analysis of the bill, and, too, for his long and splendid work in behalf of the farmers of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He is very kind.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at this time I call to the attention of the Senate certain amendments approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. First there is a series of amendments which were reported and printed on May 25 last, and which I understand automatically become a part of the bill. Then there are other amendments which were approved by the committee yesterday morning, and which were offered last night, but unfortunately they were not printed as committee amendments.

[1] Not adjusted for seasonal trends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, the committee amendment will be modified by the amendments now offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is no objection, that certainly is the quickest way to take care of the amendments.

There is one other amendment which was not taken up by the committee yesterday, and which I shall offer at this time. It is an amendment which would extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for another year under the Delaware charter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this a committee amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. No. The committee did not have it prepared in time to act on it yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is offering it in his own right?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, although I am sure the entire committee agrees with the amendment. As I have said, there is some doubt whether the House will get around to acting on the Commodity Credit charter bill in time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will send the amendment to the desk the clerk will state it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 96, it is proposed to strike out beginning with line 14 down to and including line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CONTINUED AS AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 404. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1948," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 405. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that sections 402 and 404 shall take effect upon the enactment of this act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what is the effect of sections 402 and 404? Is that part of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment is to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for another year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that part of it, but I did not understand the last line, which referred to sections 402 and 404.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked the draftsman to prepare a bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for another year, as is, merely so that the country might be safeguarded in the event the House and Senate did not agree upon a permanent Commodity Credit Corporation charter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am heartily in favor of the Senator's amendment extending the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. This was prepared by the legislative draftsman, and I am sure that if it means anything else than what I have stated we shall be glad to have it corrected.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was merely curious. On reading the amendment I find it seems to relate to the entire bill taking effect January 1, the Commodity Credit Corporation part to take effect immediately. I think I understand it now.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is all right. If there is any doubt, we will wait and offer it a little later. If there is no objection, it will save a little time to offer it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I inquire as to whether amendment lettered "A," which was reported on May 25, has been agreed to?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendments reported on May 25, being committee amendments, automatically became a part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inform the Senator from Georgia that the amendment to which he addresses himself, as modified, has been agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. When was it agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was a modification of the committee amendment, and was made a part of the committee amendment, the Chair is advised.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, Mr. President, the committee has the right to modify its own amendment to the bill; the amendment was in the form of an amendment to the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 81, line 3, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Any price-support operation undertaken with respect to either turkeys or chickens shall be applicable to all chickens, including broilers, appropriate adjustments being made as provided in subsection (e) of this section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, poultry is one of the nonbasic agricultural commodities which is supported under the Steagall amendment, the act of July 1, 1941, as amended.

But in subsequent directives issued under the authority of section 4 of that act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in authorizing support prices for turkeys and chickens, specifically excluded broilers by name. There is nothing mentioned in the law passed by Congress which would authorize any discrimination against any segment of the poultry industry, and insofar as I have been able to ascertain, this is the only case on record in which the Secretary of Agriculture has seen fit specifically to exclude by name any group of farmers from participating in the program as authorized under the law as passed in 1941.

This amendment does not say that the Secretary of Agriculture must support the price of broilers. It merely states that if and when any price-support operations are undertaken with respect to

either turkeys or chickens, it shall be applicable to all chickens including broilers with appropriate adjustments being made as provided in the act itself.

The amendment is being offered by my colleagues the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR], and myself, who represent the major percentage of broiler producers in this country. We have discussed its merits with the sponsor of the agriculture bill, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has agreed with us that there is no justification for a continuation of this discrimination, since it clearly was not the intent of Congress when it passed the law in July 1941, and I understand that he is willing to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the amendment does not require the Secretary to support the price of chickens or turkeys or broilers or any other fowl at any particular level, but simply requires that if poultry is supported broilers shall be included. I personally have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, a perfecting amendment would seem to be required on page 49, line 3. At present subdivision (14) reads:

To encourage producers, processors, distributors, and consumers to enter into marketing agreements.

Consumers are not contemplated as parties under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937. So I am offering an amendment to strike out the word "consumers" and insert after "processors" the word "and", so the language would be "processors, and distributors", omitting the word "consumers."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator's point is well taken, but a similar amendment has just been approved.

Mr. DOWNEY. Was it offered as an amendment by the committee?

Mr. AIKEN. It was in certain clarifying amendments which I offered on behalf of the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will then withdraw my amendment, of course. I am very happy to do so.

There are two amendments sponsored by the Senator from Florida and myself which I offer at this time and ask to have stated. I send the first one to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 49, after lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

(16) to assist in the retention of foreign outlets in order to (a) maintain long-run export demands, (d) prevent short-run demoralization of domestic markets, and (c) maintain productive capacity sufficient to satisfy expected long-run domestic markets plus foreign demand for agricultural products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], for himself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment which I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 77, line 19, of the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out "and (7)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(7) the need for offsetting temporarly losses of export markets, and (8)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with respect to the amendments I will say that both of them would only serve to strengthen the bill. I cannot conceive of anyone having any objection to either one.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I fully concur, and did so at the time the amendment was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], with respect to turkeys and chickens. In the State of New York we have also a rather large duck industry, I do not want to say that in this case what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, but it seems to me only fair, if turkeys and chickens are to be included in the bill, for ducks and ducklings also to be included. I therefore offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 81, after the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS, it is proposed to insert the following:

That if any support-price operation is undertaken with respect to either chickens or turkeys, the same parity price-support operation shall be undertaken with respect to ducks and ducklings.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator from New York the question whether or not there would be any particular objection to including in the appropriate place in his amendment "and other poultry," because there is an "if" clause in his amendment, that "if any support price," and so forth. Why do we not do this all up at once and insert in the appropriate place in the amendment the words "and other poultry"?

Mr. IVES. That is very agreeable to the Senator from New York, and I ask that my amendment be appropriately modified in accordance with the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment offered by Mr. IVES, as modified by Mr. MORSE, to the committee amendment, was reduced to writing, as follows:

Provided, That if any price support operation is undertaken with respect to either chickens or turkeys, the same parity price support operation shall be undertaken with respect to ducks and ducklings and other poultry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had submitted an amendment to the committee amendment which has been printed and lies on the table, and has been lying on the table for several days, but after consultation with Senators in charge of the bill and members of the committee who have devoted a great deal of work and time to the subject, I have somewhat varied the amendment. It now comes down to two amendments, and I submit them both for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 49, line 7, between the words "revenues" and "for", it is proposed to insert the words "and funds."

On page 2, line 20, before the pericd, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

And provided further, That in any fiscal year, if at the end of the preceding fiscal year the sums appropriated under said section 32 and remaining unexpended do not exceed $300,000,000, Commodity Credit Corporation may, as provided in section 302 (a) of this act, carry out any operation to support the price of any such perishable, non-basic agricultural commodity to the extent that the reserve for postwar price support of agriculture established pursuant to the First Supplemental Appropriation Recission Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 8) and other funds appropriated for agricultural price support are sufficient to cover any losses which may be incurred in connection with such operation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have consulted with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on his question. He is quite familiar with the change in the original printed amendment, and I hope he will see fit to accept this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment as read referred to page 2, line 20.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a perfecting amendment, to change language in another section.

Mr. AIKEN. Is this the same amendment which has been printed, which the Senator from Washington submitted?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It provides, does it not, that the Commodity Credit Corporation may use the funds which are already available to it for the support of prices of nonbasic commodities?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I am personally concerned, I think the amendment is satisfactory.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish the RECORD to show that I have checked into this question with members of the committee. I understand that there is no

serious objections to the amendment. I join with the Senator from Washington in saying a word in its behalf at this time. The amendment is vital to the fruit industry from coast to coast and from north to south.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have another amendment which lies on the desk, the effect of which might involve some controversy. I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Vermont.

One section of the bill provides that should the President of the United States find that at some time or other certain commodities from foreign countries may be coming in and flooding the so-called American agricultural market, regardless of the commodity, he may ask the Tariff Commission to make an investigation. For example, in the State of the Senator from Oregon or in my State the situation might involve fruit from Canada, which might glut the market at a certain time. It would not necessarily be an over-all glutting of the market; but particularly in connection with perishable commodities, fruit from other countries might come in and thereby ruin the economy of the fruit industry of a certain section of the country.

The committee has devoted much time and effort in an attempt to solve this problem. It has done so in a very decent way. In effect, it has tried to solve the problem in a long-range agricultural program without violating reciprocal trade agreements. That is a somewhat difficult maneuver. I think the committee has been very successful in its provision in the bill, which does just that.

However, these things happen so quickly that the Tariff Commission often does not act so speedily as we would like. I have before me a compilation of cases involving agricultural commodities which have been placed before the Tariff Commission for study. The compilation is too long to place in the RECORD. The Tariff Commission has been asked to determine whether or not the economy of certain agricultural products was being affected.

Reading through the compilation, I find that the shortest time that the Tariff Commission has required to act with respect to any one product has been from 9 to 10 months. Some of the cases were pending for a very much longer period. I had suggested to the committee that probably the Secretary of Agriculture might be substituted for the Tariff Commission, that he could act more quickly, and therefore we might at least have information. However, I appreciate the problem of trying to tread between giving authority to the President to act upon advice of either the Tariff Commission or the Secretary of Agriculture, and violating our international agreements with respect to reciprocal trade. I wanted the RECORD to show that I hope that under the provisions of the bill, when those representing an agricultural commodity feel that such a thing is happening the Tariff Commission will show a little more speed than it has in the past.

So, Mr. President, I shall withdraw the amendment. If the problem is not solved under the Tariff Commission, I am sure that the committee will be with me in substituting the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment to the committee amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I call up the amendment to the committee amendment which I have at the desk, and ask to have it stated. I should state that I offer the amendment on behalf of myself, my colleague the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 81, line 8, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

The price of any kind of Irish potatoes harvested after December 31, 1948, shall be supported at not less than 60 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price for Irish potatoes as of the beginning of its marketing season.

On page 81, line 10, after the word "commodity", insert "(other than Irish potatoes)."

On page 84, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(c) Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-8), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the expiration of the period specified in the preceding sentence, the price of Irish potatoes harvested prior to January 1, 1949, shall be supported as provided in this section until the close of June 30, 1949."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this amendment contemplates that the 1940 crop of potatoes shall be supported at the existing parity, up to June 30, 1949, since in the Northern States much of the crop is harvested after January 1, and the only consequence of not having this provision would be that the entire crop, which would amount to at least 100,000,000 bushels, would be dumped on the Government on or before December 31, 1948, while the support price is still in effect. So I think there can be very little dispute about the wisdom of the extension.

The other provision is to take care of the potato crop thereafter at from 60 to 90 percent of parity. The potato producers of the country are quite content to accept the 60-percent provision, believing that it is not an incentive price, and that it will not result in overstimulating the production of potatoes, but will guarantee the producers against losses which might otherwise have a very disastrous effect.

I hope that the chairman of the committee may feel that he can accept this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, ordinarily I should be reluctant to designate any of the nonbasic commodities or fix the level at which they should be supported. It was the expectation of the committee that white potatoes, which will keep during transportation anywhere, would be supported by the Department of Agriculture at 60 to 90 percent of parity, and we had so advised the Department.

It was also the expectation of the committee that that part of the 1948 crop not marketed before January 1, 1949, would be supported at 90 percent of parity, as promised by the Steagall amendment.

As I say, I am somewhat reluctant to open the gates. Nevertheless, if they were to be opened to any commodity, potatoes would undoubtedly be the first to come in.

It is only the remainder of the 1948 crop that would be supported at 90 percent of parity. After the 1948 crop, future crops would be supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity. That is in accord with the belief of members of the committee.

There is some question as to whether or not 60 percent of parity is an incentive price for early potatoes. If it turns out to be, I shall be very glad to sponsor an amendment to the bill next year, or after it has had a trial, correcting any deficiency of that sort which may develop.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the last statement the Senator from Vermont has made is very helpful to the problem I have in mind. As the Senator knows, he and I have had several consultations in regard to handling of the potato problem under this bill.

I now understand that with the adoption of the Brewster amendment, those of us who have a large constituency of potato growers will be in a position to tell them that this bill will provide them with 60 to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. It is my opinion that the Senator could have so advised them without the adoption of the amendment; but certainly he can so advise them with the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Vermont has told me that several times; but I was not able to persuade the potato growers in my State that that would be the result.

I appreciate the acceptance of the amendment by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I have noticed some considerable skepticism on the part of the potato growers toward the Department of Agriculture, and they were anxious to have this provision written into the law. Although it may not be just the thing to do, I do not know that it will do any harm, if the other 159 agricultural commodity producers do not object. I believe that potatoes are our sixth most valuable field crop.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, and while the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is in the Chamber, I wonder whether the Sen-

ator from Vermont will permit me to ask a question concerning the Magnuson amendment, which has just been withdrawn by the Senator from Washington. We are moving at such a rapid rate that it is difficult to keep up with the amendments.

This morning I had another very strong representation made to me—in this instance, by Mr. Klahre, who represents one of the large fruit holdings in my State, at Hood River. He urged upon me the importance of the Magnuson amendment because of the great delays of which the Tariff Commission has been guilty in the past in handling the problems of perishable products. He was very insistent that I do what I could to help secure the adoption of the Magnuson amendment. I told him I would.

I wish to be sure that I understand the situation. I now understand that the Senator from Vermont and also the Senator from Washington are of the opinion that the bill in its present form is such that under it the producers of perishable farm products, such as fruit, will have a quick remedy for and relief in their problems if we permit the procedure to remain in the hands of the Tariff Commission, rather than to transfer it to the Secretary of Agriculture; or at least the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Washington think that under this bill that is worth a trial.

Is that an accurate statement of the Senator's position?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment—which was not offered by the Senator from Washington, but which was explained by him—has a great deal of logic behind it and has much merit. If we were not so near the conclusion of this session of Congress, but were nearer the beginning of the session, I might be tempted to try to do more with the amendment, which the Senator from Washington did not offer.

However, we have already adopted to section 22, amendments which have met with the approval of the State Department; and already we are providing in the bill, I believe, means for supporting the fruit growers, both citrus and acidulous, in such a way that we hope the fruit growers of the Northwest will not again or often find themselves in the predicament in which they found themselves last fall.

I think several pieces of legislation which have been passed by the Congress will be very helpful in keeping the fruit growers of the Northwest, as well as the citrus fruit growers, off the rocks, and keep them from becoming so despondent that they destroy their orchards. However, we know that this piece of legislation will come too late to help in connection with the 1947 crop.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the situation in which we find ourselves, and I wish to cooperate in that regard.

Let me ask whether I am correct in my understanding that both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Washington feel that with the changes already provided in the bill, and with this debate on the floor of the Senate concerning the grievances which the fruit growers of the United States have filed against the Tariff Commission as to its past handling of cases, we now have in the bill procedure by which the Tariff Commission can, if it will, in case there should be a recurrence of the problem which has arisen in the past, give the fruit farmers an expeditious handling of their cases.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct in his assumption; and I assure him that if the Tariff Commission fails to give expeditious consideration to matters of this kind, I shall be glad to join the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington in trying to secure greater speed in arriving at such conclusions.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Washington said, Mr. Klahre told me this morning that from 9 to 10 months was the minimum that was taken by the Tariff Commission in handling their cases. Of course, the disposition of perishable fruit cannot wait for any such handling.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator will recall that this body passed, either yesterday or the day before, a measure requiring the Tariff Commission to act within 120 days in certain cases.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, if the Tariff Commission wished to do so, it could act faster than the Secretary of Agriculture could. The Tariff Commission has more facilities and it knows more about the problem; and if it wished to do so, it could act faster on these matters than the Secretary of Agriculture could.

I am sure the Senator from Vermont will join with all of us in taking action if the Tariff Commission does not improve in its handling of these matters. When we come back in January, we shall either see that the Tariff Commission has changed its handling of them, or else someone should clean out the Tariff Commission with respect to these matters.

The Secretary of Agriculture does not have the facilities needed to do the job, and that is why he naturally turns to the Tariff Commission in that connection, for that is the Tariff Commission's job. But the Tariff Commission does not seem to want to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. I am willing to accept the statement of the Senator from Washington at face value; I have no doubt that he is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have not been on the floor for the last few minutes, and I have not heard the amendment fully explained. Does the amendment provide a support price for all types of potatoes, or is it confined to stored potatoes?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the word "storable" is not included. The amendment covers all Irish potatoes, whether early or late.

The Senator remembers that he thought the payment might be an incentive; but I have before me figures bearing on that matter, if they will be of interest to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Yes, they will be.

Mr. BREWSTER. I took the trouble to obtain these figures on the question of incentive payments:

On the general situation, the figures are very impressive, inasmuch as they show that during the period in which we have been paying 90 percent of parity, the total acreage has declined from 3,599,200 acres, which was the national acreage in 1934, to 3,239,000 acres, which was the acreage in 1943, when Steagall support became effective.

In 1947 the acreage is down to 2,111,900, or a decrease of 1,127,000 acres, or 35 percent in 5 years while we were supporting potatoes at 90 percent of parity.

But I believed that those figures were not adequate, and I wished to know about the early potatoes, which are the ones which have given me concern.

I have before me the figures for the acreage planted to Irish potatoes by seven early-potato States. They show an acreage in 1941, of 490,000; and in 1947, an acreage of 407,000, or a decline of almost 25 percent in the acreage during the period when we were supporting at 90 percent of parity.

Therefore, it seems to me to be clear that a 60-percent-of-parity provision certainly cannot be considered as likely to prove to be an incentive.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the Senator from Maine is familiar with the conditions existing and the wide publicity which was given to the great piles of potatoes that could not be stored or shipped, and had to be destroyed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. It was very unfortunate publicity for the entire farm program, for the growers and everybody else. What I am interested in is, under the provisions of the bill, will a similar situation be created?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly not, under a 60-percent-parity provision. That is the proposal of the potato growers themselves, who recognize exactly what the Senator from New Mexico points out, and who have no desire to have anything that would be characterized as an incentive payment. They feel confident this would mean that the production of potatoes would be in the hands of the more efficient producers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from New Mexico mentioned the piles of potatoes which were deliberately permitted to deteriorate. In order that there may be no misunderstanding so far as the consumer is concerned, that took place really in the year 1946, and it was the 1946 crop that created such a problem. It was not that the potato producer has planted a greater number of acres, but in general, throughout the Nation, there was about a 25-percent increase in total yield per acre for that particular year. The total increase throughout the Nation brought about a large surplus, and they were not prepared to cope with it. There was some deterioration and some loss. But last year, for instance, the crop year of 1947, whatever potatoes were in surplus, in areas where they were required to be bought to support the price, large quantities of those potatoes were processed

so that they could be properly stored either as potato alcohol or as dehydrated potatoes. So, in general, it was only in the year 1946 that we actually had an embarrassing problem insofar as the price-support program was concerned.

Mr. HATCH. It was an embarrassment so far as the price-support program was concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. AIKEN. I had yielded the floor to the Senator from New Mexico. I think one of the most unfortunate incidents which has happened to our Government in recent years was the piling up of potatoes in the State of Alabama 2 years ago. They were photographed, and the photographs were allowed to be sent all over the world, showing how wasteful we were.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, I was about to mention the fact that I saw pictures of those potatoes in foreign papers, scattered about as propaganda against our country.

Mr. AIKEN. As a matter of fact, the total cost of supporting potatoes in Alabama for the year 1947 crop was $1,800 for No. 1 potatoes, $82,300 for second-grade potatoes, or only $84,000 in all. It is one of the smaller States, and the matter was very widely publicized.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know everyone interested in potatoes felt most keenly, and I know all our growers were distressed beyond compare at the wastage of that food. It grew, however, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, from the use of new discoveries incident to the war in the eradication of potato pests. The use of DDT and other insecticides accounted in some substantial manner for the extraordinary production in that year.

I should like to ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the two tables which I have prepared covering the reduction in potato acreage in recent years.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acreage planted to Irish potatoes in seven early-potato States

[1,000 acres]

	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947
California	39	35	49	64	73	81	62
Oklahoma	27	32	44	27	20	21	15
North Carolina	84	92	110	86	72	83	72
Florida	30.6	28	32.6	33.9	35.4	40.8	29.9
Alabama	54	52	51	57	47	46	37
Texas	58	50	67	56	50	54	43
Louisiana	43	42	57	61	43	42	32
Total	490	498	617	552	484	516	407

In answer to statements that 60- to 90-percent-of-parity support for Irish potatoes would be an incentive to increase acreage:

In 1934, in depression, the national acreage was 3,599,200. Steagall support was effective in 1943 and the national acreage was 3,239,000.

	Acres
In 1944	2,785,600
In 1945	2,700,200
In 1946	2,598,500
In 1947	2,111,900

This indicates a decrease every year in acreage, totaling 1,127,100 acres, or 35 percent in 5 years, during the period when potatoes were supported at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. HATCH. I understand both the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Vermont, as well as the Senator from Minnesota, are convinced that the 60 percent will not prove to be an incentive which would create conditions such as existed before.

Mr. AIKEN. If I may make a statement, I had the impression that 60 percent would prove to be an incentive price for the early-potato regions of the South; it may still be so. However, upon examination of the costs of supporting the potato price for the 1947 crop, I find that three-fourths of the cost was incurred in the States of Maine, New York, and New Jersey. I was rather surprised to find that, because I thought more of the expense was incurred in the South. Virginia was in fourth place. North Carolina came in for a substantial amount. I do not think the Department should be expected to support absolutely unmerchantable potatoes which perhaps would not keep overnight, but if they are potatoes which could reasonably be shipped, but could not be because of the lack of a market or the lack of transportation, which I understand was the case in the famous Alabama potato pile, then it appears to me there might be support. However, if 60 percent proves to be an unreasonable price, I would be willing to agree to try to change it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall not delay a vote on the amendment. However, I would say some Senators have had to leave, and I have been asked to suggest the absence of a quorum after the amendment has been voted on.

Mr. AIKEN. Please do not suggest the absence of a quorum until after the amendment is voted on.

Mr. HATCH. It was my intention to suggest the absence of a quorum after that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine, for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.
Baldwin	Eastland	Kem
Ball	Ecton	Kilgore
Barkley	Ellender	Knowland
Brewster	Feazel	Langer
Bricker	Ferguson	Lodge
Bridges	Flanders	Lucas
Brooks	Fulbright	McCarthy
Buck	Green	McClellan
Butler	Gurney	McFarland
Byrd	Hatch	McGrath
Cain	Hawkes	McKellar
Capehart	Hayden	McMahon
Capper	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Chavez	Hill	Malone
Connally	Hoey	Martin
Cooper	Holland	Maybank
Cordon	Ives	Millikin
Donnell	Jenner	Moore
Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Murray	Saltonstall	Umstead
Myers	Smith	Vandenberg
O'Conor	Sparkman	Watkins
O'Daniel	Stennis	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Stewart	White
Pepper	Taft	Wiley
Reed	Taylor	Williams
Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Robertson, Va.	Thye	Young
Robertson, Wyo.	Tobey	
Russell	Tydings	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I send to the desk on behalf of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and myself, an amendment which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment which I ask to have printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is on the desk a series of amendments which I wish to offer to the pending bill. I ask that amendment lettered "L" be stated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 15, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "either" and "or."

On page 74, line 16, to strike out the word "without."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to bring the bill somewhat in line with the present requirement, and I am hopeful that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

I may say that amendment lettered "N", which I also offer, is an alternative amendment to this. If this amendment shall be accepted, then it is not my purpose to offer amendment lettered "N." If this amendment shall not be accepted, then I shall offer amendment "N" and insist upon it.

Under the regulations which are in effect at the present time, cotton, both within and without the United States, is counted in computing the amount of the carry-over, the amount on hand at any one particular time. The effect of the amendment would be to exclude from the calculation cotton outside the United States, and if that is done, then a 30-percent allowance for carry-over will just about bring it in line. If that is not done, then the 40-percent allowance is necessary to bring it in line.

As a matter of fact, the figure that was placed in the bill by the committee is not realistic. It sets the amount of the cotton carry-over, according to the estimate I have before me, at entirely too low a figure.

The purpose of these two amendments is to bring that figure somewhat in line with conditions as they actually exist.

Mr. President, that is about all I care to say about the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from

Alabama to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I find in the report, on page 6, the language "In the event of national need the Secretary of Agriculture may raise the support price of a commodity above 90 percent of parity." Can the Senator advise me as to the definition of "national need"?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall do the best I can for the Senator from Michigan. That might almost have been written "national emergency," yet national emergency was not exactly what we meant.

It is provided that in the event we as a Nation desperately need certain farm commodities the Secretary may break through the 90-percent ceiling and establish a higher support level in order to get production adequate to meet the needs of the Nation.

We have only one example of that at the present time, and that is in the case of flax. As most all Senators know, the supply of flaxseed and linseed oil has been cut off from the United States. The world supply is very short, and what we can get is totally inadequate. It was necessary for the Secretary to offer a price-support floor of approximately 150 percent of parity to get enough flax planted in order to meet the needs of the United States. It is not expected that the Secretary would exercise the power granted by this provision except in cases which virtually amounted to an emergency.

Mr. FERGUSON. One difficulty we have encountered in the past 15 or 18 years has been that we have lived practically in a state of emergency, and I am wondering, if we leave this provision as wide open as it now is, whether it would be either wise or desirable. I am generally in favor of the bill, but I have several questions like this one upon which I should like to get some information. Particularly I should like to have it in the RECORD for the purposes of construction.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to reply to the Senator for the record. The committee considered that situation very seriously because we, too, were reluctant to grant any unnecessary power, yet, with the example which we had before us, we did not see any other course to take. We felt that an emergency might arise, or almost an emergency, anyway, when Congress might not be in session. Furthermore, it seems rather cumbersome to attempt to enact special legislation for each such commodity as flax.

I feel that any Secretary of Agriculture would be very reluctant to abuse the power, and it certainly is not the intent of the committee that he should exercise such power in any event short of a national emergency, or what was almost an emergency, but an acute shortage of linseed oil is probably a real emergency.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The emergency provision does not apply wholly to the six farm crops known as basic commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. Flax itself is not a basic commodity.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand. Would it be possible to insert some kind of definition, for example, that the supply would have to go below a certain amount before the Secretary could go over the 90 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I think he might have to encourage production in anticipation of a shortage. With the growing shortage in wool throughout the world, it has occurred to me that we might eventually have to make some unusual provision for the production of wool. Of course, that would not be an overnight matter because it is not possible to raise a sheep overnight.

Mr. FERGUSON. My difficulty is that it almost appears to me, as the bill is written, that there really is not a ceiling of 90 percent; it lies solely in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture; and while we use the 90-percent provision in relation to the six basic commodities, we use the floor there, but there is a ceiling in regard to the other commodities and no floor. I am wondering about peanuts, and why there is no provision as to some of the northern crops, why there is no provision for navy beans, for instance, which are grown in Michigan.

Mr. AIKEN. If peanuts had not already been in the list of basic commodities, we probably would not have put them in. To qualify as a basic commodity, the commodity must be produced in exportable quantities, and have long-keeping characteristics. Peanuts are well down on the list of field crops; I think they are eighteenth in value of the field crops which are raised in this country.

A question entered the minds of the committee as to whether we should designate certain crops which should be supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity, as the basic commodities are to be supported under the requirements of the bill. Then we realized that there were 151 farm commodities which were not basic. We did not know where to draw the line. We expect that important commodities—and I include field peas, beans, potatoes, soybeans, barley, and oats—will be supported at the same rate as the basic commodities, which is 60 to 90 percent of parity. But there are other nonbasic commodities, such as summer squash, which we would not want to support even at 10 percent of parity. Then there are peppers and tomatoes. Producers of various commodities have come to me suggesting that the commodity they produce should be supported. There were mohair producers from Texas, honey producers from Iowa, Minnesota, and other States, and producers of hops. We felt we had to leave such products to the discretion of the Secretary, but it is the belief of the committee that commodities which correspond closely to the Steagall commodities should be supported at a rate of from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan permit a vote on the pending amendment, and then resume his discussion with the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I have no objection to a vote being taken on the pending amendment. Will the Chair state what amendment is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). The amendment before the Senate is that submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 15, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "either" and "or"; and on page 74, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the word "without."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in arriving at a formula for determining what the normal supply of any commodity should be, the committee encountered a good many problems. When we came to the question of cotton we had to consider whether we would include the cotton which is produced in America but which is stored overseas. We finally decided to do so. The amendment would exclude the cotton which is stored overseas each year from the determination of normal supply. The net effect of the exclusion would be to raise the support level of cotton possibly 4 or 5 percent, but it would also make it more difficult, in my opinion, for cotton growers to vote quotas than it would be if the amount stored overseas were included in the total supply. About 1,700,000 bales a year are stored overseas. They would be included in the estimated amount of exports which also are computed in the definition of "normal supply." I hope I am getting this correct, Mr. President. We have had a pretty strenuous 2 days' siege here, and I reserve the right to correct my explanation if it is not correct.

Let me go a little further and say in regard to the other amendment, amendment lettered "N" of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that whereas the committee first determined that 23 percent would be a normal carry-over for cotton in this country, we have already changed that to 30 percent. We would not want to accept the 40 percent which is proposed by the amendment. Personally I would not object to accepting the amendment lettered "L." I would object to the other two amendments which have been printed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I said that if my amendment "L" is accepted I would not urge acceptance of my amendment "N." They are alternative amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Under those conditions I can accept the amendment for myself, although I would have no authority to accept it on behalf of the committee, because the committee has not acted on it. I will vote for it if it is put to a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama lettered "L" to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not insist on my amendment lettered "N." But at the same time, I should like to have my amendment lettered "M" stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 87, line 8, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "70" and inserting "90."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was the first amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment lettered "L," offered by the Senator from Alabama, was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, my I ask what amendment is offered now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has offered his amendment "M"—"M" as in "Mary."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would not be willing to accept the amendment lettered "M." The amendment would give preferential treatment which is unnecessary. I think the bill, with the amendment which has just been agreed to, gives very good support to the cotton grower, particularly in view of the fact that the revised parity formula would result in increasing the parity price of cottonseed about 20 percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment really has to do with the question of voting marketing quotas.

The effect of this amendment is to provide that cotton producers may vote marketing quotas whenever supplies are "normal" or above and the average farm price of cotton for three successive months does not exceed 90 percent of parity instead of 70 percent as provided by the bill and 66 percent as provided by the committee amendment. Bearing in mind that the proposed definition of "normal supply" for cotton, as modified by committee amendment, provides an allowance of 30 percent for carry-over, cotton producers should not be forced to wait until prices fall to 66 or 70 percent of parity or until they build up a tremendous surplus before voting quotas upon themselves. That is what the effect of the amendment would be.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the desire of the Senator from Alabama to help the poor cotton farmers, but it seems to me that there would be no injustice committed by not accepting this amendment, because I cannot conceive of the price dropping to 90 percent of parity unless the supply got up to that figure, which would permit them to vote quotas on a supply basis. I do not think there would be any injury done by rejecting the amendment. I think we have helped the cotton farmers by accepting the previous amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment "M" offered by the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment——

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Senator would withhold offering his amendment for a moment. May I inquire of the Senator from Vermont if this would not be a good time to recess until tomorrow? I do not want to interfere with the Senator from Kentucky, however.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be glad to have a recess taken now.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that the Senator offer his amendment, and have it printed, and that we then recess for today. I am satisfied we will make good headway if we recess now so we may go home and have a good night's sleep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senator from Nebraska, the Chair will state that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has already been printed and lies on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that my colleague offer the amendment as it is now proposed, and have it printed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for my colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 80, between lines 22 and 23, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas are in effect shall be 90 percent of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky for himself and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion. The proposal which the junior Senator from Kentucky makes is rather extensive in many respects. I suggest that the Senator from Kentucky make the explanation for the RECORD and thus convey the message to all Members of the Senate, so that tomorrow we may act upon the amendment more intelligently. I hope that I can fully concur with the junior Senator from Kentucky in the proposed amendment, but I know that many Senators will not understand it unless it is explained.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Minnesota suggests that the junior Senator from Kentucky make the explanation of his amendment now for the RECORD.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky how long he feels it would take him to make the explanation?

Mr. COOPER. Ten minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky might want a hand in the explanation, too.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if both Senators from Kentucky and the Senator from Minnesota feel that we should have an explanation of the amendment in the RECORD tonight I shall be glad to withhold the invitation to recess until tomorrow until the explanation has been completed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it has been suggested to me that several Senators have left the Chamber, believing that the Senate was about to take a recess. So I shall wait until tomorrow to present my argument on the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed and lie on the table an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I shall propose for the pending measure when it shall have been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this substitute is identical with the so-called Hope bill for the extension of the present agricultural program. That bill has already passed the House. It also includes an amendment continuing the soil-conservation law and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

FLOOD RELIEF IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to report an original bill, and I submit a report (No. 1743) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, be further amended by striking therefrom the following words and figures: "Section 4 (a) (1), (2), and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 4 (a) (1) and (2)"; and that section 4 (c) thereof be amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on the 30th day of May of this year, Memorial Day, there was visited upon the Pacific Northwest the greatest catastrophe and tragedy in the history of that section. I believe that every Senator has been conscious of that tragedy, which has brought so much harm and suffering to those residing in the area which is commonly referred to—or since the flood has been referred to—as the Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash., area.

I have every right to take for granted what I know to be a fact, that there has been exceedingly great sympathy on the part of Senators for the people of the

Northwest country. Almost every Senator has said, either to me, to my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], or to the senior or junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE] that he was hopeful that somehow an answer could be found to help in restoring normalcy to that stricken land. In connection with that subject I have the very happy privilege of introducing the bill which has just been read for the information of the Senate.

In a couple of sentences I should like to give my interpretation, which is concurred in by all Senators from the Northwest and the Pacific coast, as to what the bill actually proposes.

In the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act there is provision for a disaster loan fund. The act provides that $25,000,000 may be expended for disaster relief loans, with a 10-year period of repayment.

Included in the devastated land of the Columbia River area was a Federal city, entirely owned by the Federal Government, consisting of more than 5,000 units of housing, all of which have been totally destroyed and swept away. Therefore, if that city is to be rebuilt, either in its original location—which is not desirable—or at another location within the Columbia River area, it will be necessary to extend credits in excess of $25,000,000.

This morning and this afternoon, officials representing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting in concert and close cooperation with the Senators from Oregon and a subcommittee of three from the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I was one member, came to an agreement that it would be proper and practicable to take the disaster provision now within the limits of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act and extend its limit to 25 years, rather than 10, and increase the amount of loan money from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000. By that means we can offer an opportunity for financing the reconstruction of every home destroyed by the flood which so recently swept our Northwest country.

Mr. President, this suggestion does not ask for another single dollar of appropriations. It merely means that there will be a reallocation within the moneys presently at the disposal of the RFC, so that the RFC may use for disaster-relief purposes $40,000,000 instead of $25,000,000, and may make extended loans for 25 years rather than 10 years, which would permit of proper amortization and repayment of loans which have been requested for the sole purpose of rebuilding homes which were totally destroyed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be permitted to make loans to those in Coatesville, Ind., and Danville, Ind., whose homes were completely destroyed by a tornado—as completely destroyed as were the homes in the Columbia River Valley?

Mr. CAIN. The bill makes no reference to the Pacific Northwest as a single area of the country. The bill provides for an amendment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act which would make available disaster credits and/or loans to the people of Indiana were they in distress, or to the people of Kentucky, the people on the east coast, or the people on the west coast.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is proposing to increase the amount which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may loan from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. What proportion of that will go to Washington, and what proportion will go to the two towns in Indiana which were completely destroyed?

Mr. CAIN. No one could say what proportion of the $40,000,000 will go either to Indiana or Washington, or Oregon, or any other State, for the simple reason that the loans will go to those who legitimately request them, irrespective of the area from which the loan is requested.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator say that the people of Coatsville, Ind., whose homes were completely destroyed by a tornado would be justified in going to the RFC and asking for loans under the terms of the bill, just as the people in the Columbia Valley of Oregon and Washington would be able to do?

Mr. CAIN. Not only today, but in the future, they will be justified in requesting disaster loans; but they would have been justified in going to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for disaster assistance prior to this time.

The tragedy in the Northwest gave to the Banking and Currency Committee and to the Senators generally an opportunity to work for the country, as well as to work for their own distressed areas.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I simply wish to say for the RECORD that those are the facts.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation is that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has requested unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill; is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. That is my request.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I simply wish to confirm what the Senator from Washington has just said. I served with him on the committee this morning and this afternoon in the preparation of this bill. We think it presents a logical and effective way to relieve flood disasters not only in Oregon and Washington but in Indiana or wherever flood disasters have occurred or may occur in the future.

As the Senator from Washington has pointed out, under this bill Congress would not appropriate any more money, but would liberalize the proportion of available funds which could be used in flood-control cases, and would extend from 10 years to 25 years the time in which the loans could be used.

I hope no objection will be made to this measure, in view of the emergency now existing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I wish to say that he has been detained at a meeting of the Appropriations Committee, in the Capitol Building, and could not be present for this discussion. But he wishes to have it stated for the RECORD that he joins the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself in support of this bill.

In behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon, I wish to thank the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who worked with us long and hard today in drafting this bill, to the end of having this matter handled through the RFC, which, it seems to us under the circumstances, provides the best procedure for the handling of this emergency, and sets a pattern under the disaster section of the RFC for handling similar disaster problems throughout the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to endorse the request for the consideration and passage of the bill at this time, for I think the bill, when enacted, will expedite the giving of relief to the unfortunate people on the west coast. I think this bill constitutes the best solution of their problem.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Washington. I understand that this bill provides for a loan to permit the people to rehabilitate themselves. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. Only with respect to their homes, but not as to personal property or services or equipment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that this is a very worthy bill.

I may say that today the Committee on Public Works reported a bill for emergency relief to meet every kind of disaster which may occur in the United States. I know that Senators who are interested in the bill now being discussed, on behalf of the people of their States who have suffered such severe losses in the recent floods, will be glad to know of the general provision which has been made, under the bill reported today from the committee, for emergency relief to meet such situations as that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, permit me to say that, speaking for all of us who come from the Pacific Northwest, we are individually and collectively extremely appreciative of the consideration and thought which have been given to the scope of our problem in the Northwest; and because of what the Senate has found it possible to do, we think that in the future better protection and quicker relief will be afforded to the unfortunate victims of disasters.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 158) for the relief of certain Basque aliens, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit Gaspar Ybarzabal, Pedro Ybarzabal, and Antonio Monasterio to reside in the United States as temporary visitors for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, provided they remain employed in the sheep industry. If any of the above-named aliens fails to maintain his occupation in the sheep industry at any time within 5 years after the date of enactment hereof, he shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended.

If, at the expiration of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, the Attorney General shall, after due investigation, find that any of the above-named aliens has maintained an employment in the sheep industry during the entire 5-year period, he is hereby authorized and directed to record such alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States if he is otherwise found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. The Attorney General shall communicate his findings to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien so lawfully admitted for permanent residence from the quota of Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

SANTIAGO SOLABARRIETA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 765) for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit Santiago Solabarrieta, of Parma, Idaho, to reside in the United States as a temporary visitor for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof, provided he remains employed in the sheep industry. In the event that the said Santiago Solabarrieta fails to maintain his occupation in the sheep industry at any time within 5 years after the date of enactment hereof, he shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

If, at the expiration of 5 years from the date of enactment hereof the Attorney General shall, after due investigation, find that the said Santiago Solabarrieta has maintained an employment in the sheep industry during the entire five-year period, he is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Santiago Solabarrieta as of December 1, 1924, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and head tax of $8, if he is otherwise found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. The Attorney General shall communicate his finding to the Secretary of State, who shall thereupon instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CHILDREN'S FUND

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Victimizing Children," appearing in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTIMIZING CHILDREN

Whether the quality of congressional mercy toward the hungry children of Europe is to be strained through "cold war" prejudice and fear will be determined by the Senate-House conference on appropriations for the European recovery plan. If the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in cutting from 60 to 20 million dollars the authorization for the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations is upheld, this Government will be in a vulnerable position before the world.

Both its humanitarianism and the honor of its intentions toward the UN would be questioned if the cut were allowed to stand. But its remissness would have a positive implication that would be even more damaging. The fund will be used as a matching basis for other nations' contributions, and the object of setting aside $60,000,000 was to have at our disposal a sufficient fund with which to encourage generosity. Approval of this ruthless slashing, therefore, would be virtual notice to prospective donors that the United States did not care how much they gave.

Certain Senators in the Appropriations Committee who insisted on the cut—some even wanted the fund wiped out—objected to American money being used to feed children in eastern Europe. Such an attitude toward hungry and diseased children seems incredible in a Nation that boasts of its generosity. It is a strange reversal of the legislative attitude of a few years ago when both houses of Congress supported a plan to feed children in countries dominated by the Nazis. Even more recently, when ERP legislation passed both Houses the authorization for the children's fund, attached as a rider to the omnibus bill, went by without opposition. There is diplomacy as well as charity in such ignoring of the iron curtain.

As the one international agency not torn by the "cold war," and operating without regard to race, religion, politics, or geography, the children's fund offers a small beginning toward one world—at least for children. If the people of the United States permit their legislators to inject power politics into this enterprise, they may as well abandon any claim to moral or even democratic leadership.

CANCELLATION BY PERU OF BRANIFF INTERNATIONAL AIRWAYS PERMIT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have written to the Secretary of State with reference to the action of the Republic of Peru in canceling a permit to the Braniff International Airways to operate in Peru, after making an agreement with the Government that it could operate there, and after issuing a permit.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
June 16, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Braniff International Airways, Inc. has its headquarters at Dallas, Tex., in my State, and serves Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Tennessee, Colorado, and Texas.

The United States Civil Aeronautics Board, with the approval of the President, awarded Braniff International Airways a route into South America on May 22, 1946. Before the company could initiate service to South America, it was necessary for the State Department to negotiate bilateral air transport agreements, or to assist Braniff to obtain operating permits with countries of South America. Among the countries to be served was Peru.

On December 27, 1946, the Government of Peru signed a joint air-transport agreement with the Government of the United States, providing for reciprocal rights for air lines to operate between the two countries. This agreement gave permission to Peruvian air lines to operate to the United States.

In accordance with the terms of this bilateral agreement, the Government of Peru issued to Braniff Airways an operating permit providing Braniff with the right to operate between the United States and Peru via intermediate points and to points beyond. Reciprocally, on July 24, 1947, the United States Civil Aeronautics Board granted a foreign air-carrier permit to Peruvian International Airways, giving them the right to fly into the United States and serve Washington, New York City, and points beyond.

The Civil Aeronautics Board in its foreign air-carrier permit stated that Braniff was authorized by the United States to provide service on a route—

From Houston, Tex., through Habana, Canal Zone, and along the west coast of South America, via points including Lima, to the terminal points Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and Buenos Aires, Argentina.

In preparation for the inauguration of this service, Braniff expended some $4,000,000 in providing radio stations and securing employed and trained personnel, and the purchase of aircraft.

Only a few days before Braniff Airways was ready to initiate its first scheduled service as far as Lima, Peru, the Government of Peru suspended the Braniff permit on the claim that Peru had had no previous knowledge that Braniff was going to serve Habana, Cuba, en route to Lima, and thus it would compete with its own air line, Peruvian Airways. My information is that the Government of Peru had full knowledge of the exact

route to be operated by Braniff at the time the permit was granted.

The action of the Government of Peru has worked a great hardship upon Braniff Airways and has resulted in a breach of Peru's agreement with the United States and in a breach of the permit with the Braniff Airways. It also may result in preventing the extension of Braniff service to Bolivia, Brazil, and Argentina by reason of blocking the service through Peru.

In view of our heretofore cordial and friendly relations with Peru, it is difficult to understand how it would take such action, which is contrary to its agreement with this Government and to its issuance of the permit to Braniff.

Therefore, I most respectfully urge that you make a protest to the Government of Peru with respect to this matter and that you insist upon a restoration of the permit to Braniff Airways, and observance by Peru of its agreement with the Government of the United States with respect to the joint air-transport agreement of December 27, 1946.

We want to cultivate cordial and friendly relations with the people of Latin-America. International travel and contacts between our respective peoples will have a most salutary effect in bringing about these desirable results. Therefore, I beg to repeat my urgent request that this matter be taken up with the Government of Peru with a view to inducing it to rectify what seems to be an unjustified action on its part.

Sincerely,

TOM CONNALLY.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Rear Adm. Thorvald A. Solberg, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years; and

Lucien M. Grant, Lloyd Harrison, and Roy T. Cowdrey, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Paul R. Leake, of Woodland, Calif., to be collector of customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.;

Carl K. Connell, of Cameron, Mo., to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri; and

Fred S. Martin, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of William T. Sherwood, resigned.

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive H, Eightieth Congress, second session. A convention between the United States of America and Denmark, signed at Washington on May 6, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on income; with a reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 10); and

Executive I, Eightieth Congress, second session. A convention between the United States of America and the Netherlands, signed at Washington on April 29, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of evasion in the case of taxes on income; with reservations (Ex. Rept. No. 11).

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it appears that we have concluded the work for today's session of the Senate. I should like to state for the RECORD, inasmuch as several Senators have asked when it is expected to have another call of the Legislative Calendar, that we should like to have the unfinished business concluded tomorrow, if that is possible. If the unfinished business is concluded by the middle of tomorrow afternoon or tomorrow night, I think there will then be plenty of time to have a call of the Legislative Calendar.

However, if debate continues for several days, we shall have to arrange to have a call of the Consent Calendar, because it is very necessary that the Consent Calendar be called once again. When it is called, I think we should recur to the point where the calling of the calendar was stopped when the question of oleomargarine came up to block the handling of the remainder of the calendar, as all of us remember.

Mr. President, with that announcement and observation, and in the hope that Senators will get a good night's sleep, and be ready for work tomorrow, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 17, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of the ages, everywhere Thou art present except in the hearts of the wicked. As Thou art most holy and most wise, direct our minds beyond all barriers of false imagination and animate our thoughts as to our responsibility in these remaining hours. If we have sought to serve our country relying solely upon ourselves, if we have endeavored to slake our thirst at broken cisterns or veil the flame within, teach us that to know the way we must have the abiding reality of truth. Fill us with the satisfaction born of honest, conscientious toil, realizing the brotherhood of man in the fatherhood of God. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary";

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 299. An act to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas;

S. 580. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon;

S. 1183. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REED, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN,

and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) entitled "An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. MCCLELLAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) entitled "An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. O'CONOR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. J. Res. 117) entitled "An act providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6628. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation; and

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. National Archives.
5. Office of the Housing Expediter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

YOUTH GOVERNMENT PROJECT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in my county of Orange, in the great State of New York, we have had for the past several years a youth and Government project, which to my way of thinking, could well be introduced into every county and every high school in our Nation.

Every spring the seniors of all the high schools in the county have a political campaign, in which they hold two party conventions, write two party platforms, and elect all county officials and one member of Congress.

After the campaign is over the duly elected officials spend 1 day with their prototypes, who are actually in office. During that day they are shown all the workings of the offices such as, county clerk, county treasurer, and so forth.

Today it is my pleasure and honor to have the young man, William Walker, who was elected as a member of Congress with me on the floor of the House. He is visiting Washington and will have a very fair and accurate idea of what a Congressman's day is like.

Mr. Speaker, our Government in recent years has gotten very far away from the people. The fault, in my opinion, rests with the people themselves.

Our form of Government cannot survive and cannot be made to function as it should, unless all our citizens know very thoroughly what their duties as voters and as participants in local, county and Federal Government are.

It is not easy to be a citizen of a free Republic. We have got to learn our duties and for that reason projects such as this youth in government project should be in all our schools.

Our young people should be taught their duties and responsibilities to God and country, and it makes me very proud to think that in my county we may be the pioneers of a new movement that will teach the youth of America what its duties and responsibilities are and through that knowledge this Republic will go on from strength to strength and fulfill its great destiny in the modern world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have an article in my hand in which Mr. Ralph King, of Massachusetts, said there are no better drivers in the State of Massachusetts than the amputees and the paralyzed veterans.

I ask unanimous consent to extend this article as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

STREAM-POLLUTION BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, insist on the House amendments, agree to the conference requested by the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DONDERO, AUCHINCLOSS, MCGREGOR, CUNNINGHAM, WHITTINGTON, PICKETT, and BLATNIK.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. SMATHERS (at the request of Mr. GORE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made yesterday at the Democratic State Convention in Indianapolis, and also to extend his remarks on the retirement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

CATHERINE MARTIN

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry that 1-minute speeches are not in order on this particular day.

The House should honor this day. It is the birthday of a fine American woman, the mother of our great Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR. It is mother Catherine Martin's eighty-sixth birthday. My colleagues join me in compliments and wishes for many happy returns to Mother Martin and Speaker MARTIN.

It is a fine blessing for a man to be privileged to reach the pinnacle of a great distinguished career and still enjoy the living love of his mother. Many are not so fortunate. A few are. Congratulations, Mr. Speaker, and may we all invoke God's continued blessing for you, Mother Martin, and your family.

LT. GEN. LESLIE RICHARD GROVES

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House passed a bill which was on the Private Calendar, H. R. 5596. There is an identical bill at the Speaker's desk which has passed the Senate, S. 2223, to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Whereas the development of an atomic bomb by the Manhattan Engineer District, United States Army, during World War II represents not only the greatest achievement in weapon production but also one of the greatest achievements in the coordination of science, industry, and management in world history and was also a major factor in bringing that war to an earlier victorious close resulting in the saving of thousands of lives and great stores of resources; and

Whereas this accomplishment has also opened unlimited possibilities for peacetime and humanitarian application and expansion of atomic science for future use for the benefit of mankind; and

Whereas this initial achievement was successfully concluded under the leadership, supervision, and direction of Leslie Richard Groves, as Director of the Manhattan Engineer District, with superior judgment and courage and in accordance with the highest traditions of the United States Army; and

Whereas the said Leslie Richard Groves has requested that he be retired from service as an officer of the United States Army and such retirement has been authorized; and

Whereas the American people and the Congress of the United States deeply appreciate the outstanding and unique service to the Nation and to humanity thus rendered by the said Leslie Richard Groves and desire to express this appreciation by means of official recognition thereof: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint, without confirmation by the Senate, Leslie Richard Groves, Army serial No. O–12043, lieutenant general, Army of the United States, to the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Army, such appointment to be effective as of the day prior to the effective date of his retirement from the active list of the Regular Army and such appointment shall entitle him to receive the retired pay of major general of the Regular Army.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized and requested, without confirmation by the Senate, to place the said Leslie Richard Groves on the retired list with the rank and grade of lieutenant general with honorary date of rank thereof as of July 16, 1945, which date commemorates the first explosion by man of an atomic bomb, at the Trinity site, Alamogordo, N. Mex. Such advancement in grade and rank on the retired list, however, shall not result in any increase in retired pay.

SEC. 3. This act shall result in no permanent increase in the authorized number of major generals on the active list of the Regular Army.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill, H. R. 5596, was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said Senate engrossed amendment, after the word "certified" insert "by the Governor of the State in which the property is situated and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
EDWARD J. THYE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 4 may be regarded as perfecting in that they do not make any change in the intent of legislation. Upon this ground the House conferees have receded from its disagreements.

With respect to amendment No. 3, the House conferees have agreed to the same with amendment, the purpose of which is to make sure that the Governor of a State, in which the property referred to in this bill is situated, shall be consulted with respect to the transfer of that property to the State and that the transfer shall be conditioned upon his request for it.

The Senate receded from its amendment No. 5. That amendment, were it to remain in the act, would have excluded from the terms of the act a certain single county in the State of West Virginia. The House conferees contended that an exclusion of this sort inserted in an act, having general application the country over, would be contrary to wise legislative policy.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
MELVIN C. SNYDER,
CARTER MANASCO,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 2239.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not see the ranking minority members of the committee present and I do not know whether they have been consulted or what their attitude on the proposal is.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present. I think the Members ought to be here if we are going to transact business of this importance.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the time being.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ala.	Lusk
Bell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMahon
Bland	Hart	Miller, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Hartley	Mundt
Buffett	Hébert	O'Toole
Carroll	Hedrick	Peden
Celler	Hendricks	Price, Fla.
Chadwick	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Chelf	Hinshaw	Regan
Chiperfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Robertson
Clark	Jensen	Sabath
Clippinger	Johnson, Ill.	Sarbacher
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ind.	Scoblick
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Scott, Hardie
Crosser	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kee	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Ill.	Kefauver	Stigler
Dingell	King	Stockman
Fellows	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Gallagher	Lane	West
Gossett	Ludlow	Wolcott

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some telegrams, a speech of Mrs. Roosevelt, Attorney General Clark, a letter from Chaim Weitzmann, and a speech I made at the testimonial dinner given to our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and Mr. Speaker, if this extension exceeds the two pages of the RECORD allowed, I ask that it be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

POSTAL AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY INCREASE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an effort was made by our minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to obtain information from the majority as to what legislation the House would have an opportunity to consider during the week in view of the adjournment of Congress Saturday.

Little satisfaction was given to the membership of the House as to just what legislation we would have an opportunity to consider and pass on before the Congress adjourns. It is recognized that there are many important bills pending before this House that have been voted out by various committees. It is recognized that many highly important bills to the welfare of the people are not going to be considered before we adjourn the Congress. The leadership of the Republican Party must assume the responsibility for this inaction.

In view of the fact that there are so many highly important problems pending that will likely not be considered, I think this Congress should return after the conventions and complete its work.

However, since at this point it is evidently determined that we will not return, I want to insist, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress do something about alleviating the burden of postal and other Federal employees.

It is well recognized that the cost of living has increased tremendously over the past 2 years. Most of the Members of this House, including the leadership on both sides, have taken the position that they see the justification of some relief by granting an increase in pay to these groups. To be fair to these employees, this relief should have been given weeks ago. It is not a matter that should be kicked around for political expediency.

Several weeks ago hearings were held by the committee and they were shown, by many substantial groups, an increase of $800 annually was justified to take care of the increased cost of living. I personally feel that this would have been an appropriate adjustment for the work they are doing and in order that they may continue to give the service that is demanded of them.

Several weeks ago the committee voted out a bill that would give to postal workers an increase of $585 on an annual basis for 14 months, and $468 to classified employes. This bill has been held up in the Rules Committee and the House has had no opportunity of considering it.

I understand that those in position to hold up this legislation are doing so on the basis that it does not meet with their approval. This action, Mr. Speaker, is highly inappropriate in legislative procedure to which I must express my disapproval.

I understand now that the leadership has ordered the committee to consider an additional bill that would provide a permanent increase to postal employees of $450 annually, and a temporary increase of $360 to the other Federal workers whose salaries are fixed by the Classification Act.

This certainly would not be adequate to take care of the increased cost of living imposed upon these employees. Naturally, it would give some relief and I would therefore reluctantly support it. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, it is arbitrary and ill-considered action, however, and there is ample time yet to permit this House to pass its better judgment on this problem. I join with others in insisting that this opportunity be given.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the farm program.

THE DRAFT BILL—THE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of South Carolina, is now in session at our State capital, Columbia. This morning I received a telegram from the Department Commander Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., which reads as follows:

American Legion convention in session Columbia today urge you to support draft bill.

It is comforting to know the sentiments of the membership of the American Legion because its membership consists entirely of honorably discharged veterans of World War I and II. I believe that those of us who have served in the armed forces are probably in a better position to determine whether or not under all of the circumstances it is necessary for us to pass the pending bill providing for selective service. I readily acknowledge that there are many who seriously disagree with the terms of the pending bill or with any other measure providing for compulsory military training. The people of my district know and have known for several years that I favor adequate military strength. Thus far, in spite of unprecedented inducements and advantages, voluntary enlistments have proven insufficient. I believe it is imperative, in view of world conditions, that we pass the bill we have before us today in the interest of national security. My reply to the above-mentioned telegram is as follows:

Appreciate telegram sent by American Legion convention in session in Columbia endorsing and urging prompt passage of pending draft bill. I have consistently supported this measure in view of grave international situation. I shall continue to urge the enactment of this too long delayed provision so necessary to preserve national security.

Mr. Speaker, I hear, though unofficially, that the Rules Committee does not plan to give the House an opportunity to pass upon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill or any other bill making provisions for and adding encouragement in the housing program. This morning I received a telegram from my district from Hon. Bruce Littlejohn which reads as follows:

Spartanburg County Post, No. 5093, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urge favorable action T-E-W housing bill before adjournment.

Mr. Littlejohn is not only the liaison officer of the local post of Veterans of Foreign Wars; he is speaker and presiding officer of the House of Representatives of South Carolina.

While I do not approve of all the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, I am strongly in favor of the enactment of some law without delay that would facilitate the building of houses so sorely needed for many of our citizens, especially veterans. My reply to the aforementioned telegram is as follows:

Having signed the discharge petition, I naturally am urging immediate favorable action by the House on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill without further delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay written by a constituent of his, Miss Hamilton, of Hughes, Ark.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Peace and More" by Paul Breese, of Ontario, Calif.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PLUMLEY, JOHNSON of Indiana, PLOESER, SCRIVNER, ENGEL of Michigan, SHEPPARD, THOMAS of Texas, HENDRICKS, and ANDREWS of Alabama.

SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT OF 1944

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLIED AVIATION CORP.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp. with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$108,753.13" and insert "$234,195.20."

Page 1, line 8, after "sustained", insert "under contract NO-S-92657."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PLOESER, JENSEN, COUDERT, CLEVENGER, MAHON, WHITTEN, and GORE.

FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEONARD W. HALL, HALE, MILLER of Connecticut, CHAPMAN, and PRIEST.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the last major appropriation bill of the session. Twenty minutes on a side is rather restrictive. Might I suggest that general debate be confined to the bill, and time saved in that way?

Mr. TABER. How would an hour do?

Mr. CANNON. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, then, that general debate be confined to the bill and consume not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6935, with Mr. HOPE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a total appropriation of $485,200,000 approximately. It carries contract authorizations of a little over $300,000,000. These contract authorizations are for the purpose of construction work in various places where the amounts called for payments cannot be made this coming fiscal year. That is, they will extend over. There are a few items of minor importance, including some deficiencies of an ordinary character. There is $25,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture to pay the bill for the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. There is an item for forests, roads, and trails.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the sympathetic consideration that the chairman and the committee gave this request for additional appropriations for forest highways. We are pleased to see that the committee has allowed a total amount of $15,000,000 for that item. Let me say here as I indicated at the committee hearing that these roads are in a deplorable condition. We know that this appropriation is needed badly. We want to tell the chairman we are very pleased with the splendid cooperation we have received at the hands of the committee.

Mr. TABER. There is an item of $32,000,000 for construction for the Army, mostly outside the continental limits of the United States. There are $6,000,000 for emergency flood control in the Oregon-Washington territory to fix up a group of dikes that were destroyed by the unprecedented floods up there. There is an item in the Navy for $47,000,000 for public works, most of which are of an emergency character, and all of which are required for the proper development of our defenses. There is also contract authorization for $50,000,000.

There are some deficiency items for the Post Office Department. In the State Department, we have provided for the continuation of the surplus property operation abroad and have provided reasonable amounts for the operations of the State Department, War Department, Navy Department, and transportation of that surplus property.

There was little controversy in the committee on the bill.

Unless there are some questions at this point, I will reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it was a privilege to be present this morning at a meeting in honor of the American and foreign representatives attending the 1948 session of the World Assembly of the Moral Rearmament Association, sponsored by our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I am certain that all who had the opportunity to meet representatives of practically every nation on the globe and hear their timely addresses were profoundly impressed. Neither money nor power of arms alone can rehabilitate the world or achieve complete and lasting peace. The speakers emphasized convincingly the indispensable necessity of moral rearmament in the equation and I venture to express the hope that our host on this occasion, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] will give us the benefit of at least a part of the program by including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the notable addresses by the distinguished speakers in attendance this morning.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is the last appropriation bill of the session and the Congress. It is the inevitable catch-all bill into which are thrown last-minute deficiency appropriations which must suffice until another Congress—or at least another session—convenes.

Such bills are made up of routine items the need for which could not have been foreseen and for which emergency provision must be made before adjournment. But a feature of this particular bill, as in the last deficiency bill, is the number of replacement items providing funds which should have been included in the annual supply bills. They are to make up deficiencies occasioned by the failure to appropriate sufficient funds on the original estimates. Throughout this Congress arbitrary cuts have been made in estimates and the amounts thus sequestered advertised as savings and retrenchments when it was evident that the activities involved could not be effectively operated without them.

The refusal to appropriate the $800,000,000 required for tax refunds is a classic example. The saving of the

$800,000,000 was widely publicized as a retrenchment and it was claimed that the burden of the taxpayers of the United States would be correspondingly lightened. Of course, as everyone knows, we not only had to put the $800,000,000 back, but we have had to appropriate a good deal more and the Government has been put to inconvenience, and the time of the committee and the Congress has been taken up with the additional hearings and other complications involved in processing these additional estimates and appropriations.

Likewise, in the drafting of the pending bill we have been compelled to consider estimates and hold hearings on items which should have been carried in the annual supply bills.

For example, in this bill we are including amounts which have been cut from former bills and which are replacements of amounts requested in previous estimates, as follows:

In the Department of Justice, salaries and expenses in the field, $38,000.

Salaries and expenses of marshals, $80,000.

Fees of witnesses, $50,000.

Immigration and Nationalization Service, $2,390,000.

Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, $25,400,000.

In the Post Office Department: Printing and binding, $25,000.

Damage claims, $40,000.

Rural delivery service, out of the $1,125,000 provided in this bill $500,000 were cut from the estimate last year, and the $500,000 is a restoration.

Foreign mail transportation, $2,000,000.

Balances due foreign countries out of an estimate of $5,000,000, $250,000 is restoration.

Manufacture and distribution of stamps and stamped paper, $570,000 restoration in an estimate of $758,000.

Post Office stationery, equipment, and supplies, $194,000.

Vehicle service: Out of an appropriation of $2,564,000; $732,000 is restoration.

Public buildings: Out of an appropriation of $230,500,000; $88,200 is a restoration.

As a matter of fact, one bill, the Post Office bill, was so heavily cut on estimates undoubtedly necessary for its reasonable operation, that the Department will close the fiscal year 1948 with a deficit of $310,000,000 or more.

During the hearings on the deficiency bill an estimate was reached for reconversion of unemployment benefits for seamen, for an addition in the fiscal year 1949, reconversion employment benefits, $1,530,000. The original estimate was for only $5,000,000; so I asked if the item was another restoration of an amount previously requested, and when told that it was not, that the amount previously requested had been appropriated in full, I withdrew the question.

Thereupon the chairman, contrary to the practice and procedure of both the committee and the House, insisted that it be included in the record. The correct practice is indicated by the unbroken precedents of the committee and by the law of the House as indicated in Hinds' Precedents, volume V, sections 6971 and 7024; Cannon's Precedents, volume VIII, section 3468, and in the Procedure of the House of Representatives, page 316. I refer to the incident in detail in view of the fact that a transcript of the proceedings has been circulated on the floor of the House.

Whether or not the question was included is immaterial. It merely indicated at least one item which was not a restoration. At the same time it served to emphasize the other items which were restorations and the consistent policy of the committee in arbitrarily cutting estimates and representing the reductions as savings and then subsequently restoring them in deficiency appropriations.

There are two provisions in this bill, Mr. Chairman, in which I trust the House will concur. I am constitutionally opposed to legislative riders on appropriation bills. If there has ever been instances in which a contravention of this rule is justified, in which the end justifies the means, it is in these two provisions, the paragraph repealing the Penalty Mail Act of 1944, and the paragraph reenacting the contract-renegotiation provisions of the National Defense Act of 1942.

Under misguided zeal, some 4 years ago, largely sparked by the contention that the departments were sending out an undue amount of printed matter and otherwise abusing the privilege of free distribution of Government publications, we passed a law providing that they should expend for such purposes only the amount appropriated each year for postage.

From the beginning it was evident that the intended reform was a costly mistake, and I have repeatedly urged the legislative committee to consider the evidence adduced by the Committee on Appropriations with a view to repealing the law. The legislative committee has taken no action. But the inconvenience and expense involved in the administration of the law, without compensating advantage, is now so patent that in the pending bill we include a provision repealing the law.

Experience has demonstrated increasingly that the departments were not sending out an undue amount of printed matter, but, on the contrary, that their distribution of public publications has been well and adequately administered. On the other hand, evidence presented before the committee showed it was costing a large amount of money—a quarter of a million dollars a year in one department alone—to enforce this law, with no corresponding benefits whatever. I trust the recommendation of the committee will meet with the approval of the House.

We are also including in this bill, under title IV, section 401, another provision under which we propose to reenact a provision originally enacted in the sixth supplemental national defense bill for the renegotiation of contracts, with special view to regulating contracts for the manufacture of war material or material contracted for in connection with national defense. In every war and in times of other national calamities there have been those who sought to capitalize national disaster and to coin the blood of our soldiers into personal profit, and, although a majority of contractors have patriotically endeavored to serve the Nation by producing such materials at a fair and reasonable profit, conditions have been so unsettled in time of war that it was impossible to estimate in advance the ultimate cost of production. To regulate the few who seek to profiteer and to assist the many who seek to produce at a reasonable cost, we recommend the reenactment of the negotiation provision.

This law in its original form was passed in a bill which I reported to the House on April 21, 1942—the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, section 403—which became Public Law 528 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Conditions now warrant its reenactment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have often talked about taking the profits out of war. I doubt whether we can ever do that although I certainly favor minimizing them as much as possible. However, does the gentleman believe the reenactment of this renegotiation plan will tend to do that so that we can get 100 cents on the dollar for what we spend in our national defense effort?

Mr. CANNON. What the gentleman says is eminently true. There is a possibility that we cannot eliminate all of the unwarranted profits in time of war. But, certainly, as the gentleman indicates, in the enactment of this legislation we are taking the most direct and immediate step that can be taken with that in view.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak for just a few minutes on the two legislative provisions in the bill.

PENALTY MAIL

First, with respect to penalty mail. As the gentleman from Missouri has said, we include a paragraph which provides for the repeal of the penalty-mail payments by the various departments and agencies of the Government. I think, however, I should clear the record on what has happened.

The legislative committee has acted on this matter, for it reported to the House the repealer in bill H. R. 6406 on the 2d of June 1948, accompanied by House Report 2151. That bill was passed by the House of Representatives on June 8, 1948. So the matter has had the consideration of the legislative committee and the House. The only reason for incorporating it in this appropriation bill is that it was thought that H. R. 6406 might not receive consideration in the other body due to the shortness of time. But the action of including penalty-mail provisions here is consonant with and supports the action of the legislative committee of the House and the House itself.

DEVELOPMENT OF RENEGOTIATION

With respect to the renegotiation paragraph, as the Members of the House who were here during the war know, I have followed this renegotiation matter from the time when I initiated it by an amendment to the sixth supplemental defense bill back in the spring of 1942, which introduced the word "renegotiation" into the Federal statutes.

I am happy to say that only 2 or 3 days ago, this week, the Supreme Court, by a unanimous decision, as I understand, upheld the constitutionality of the wartime Renegotiations Act. Under that act something over $10,000,000,000 was recovered for the United States Treasury besides other large savings in forward pricing and the advantages to national morale by avoiding some of the profiteering that marked World War I. Our wartime renegotiation statute expired with the end of 1945.

A few weeks ago, when we had before us the supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 6226, which established the 70-group air force and provided money for activating it, I felt that we should again call upon the process of the renegotiations statute in order to protect the Government against undue profits in the rapid expansion of aircraft procurement, and particularly, perhaps, in the procurement of new types for which there was not sufficient cost experience.

So in the consideration of that bill I prepared and proposed an amendment for the reactivation and incorporation of the renegotiation statute in that bill. The amendment was adopted by the House.

When the bill went over to the other body the paragraph which we had adopted in the House was expanded into a section which became section 3 of Public Law 547 of the Eightieth Congress, which carries with it a statement that it shall be cited as the Renegotiation Act of 1948. That section made the Renegotiation Act of 1948 applicable to the money in that bill and to moneys merged with the funds in that bill. In order that the terms of the new statute may be available for convenient reference in connection with section 401 of the pending bill, with permission of the House I shall include its text in my remarks at this point:

[From Public Law 547, 80th Cong., approved May 21, 1948]

SEC. 3. (a) All contracts in excess of $1,000 entered into under the authority of this act, obligating funds appropriated hereby, obligating funds consolidated by this act with funds appropriated hereby, or entered into through contract authorizations herein granted, and all subcontracts thereunder in excess of $1,000 shall contain the following article:

"Renegotiation article: This contract is subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1948 and the contractor hereby agrees to insert a like article in all contracts or purchase orders to make or furnish any article or to perform all or any part of the work required for the performance of this contract."

(b) Whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense excessive profits are reflected under any contract or contracts or subcontract or subcontracts required to contain the renegotiation article prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized and directed to renegotiate such contracts and subcontracts for the purpose of eliminating excessive profits. He shall endeavor to make an agreement with the contractor or subcontractor with respect to the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and to their elimination. If no such agreement is reached, the Secretary shall issue an order determining the amount, if any, of such excessive profits and shall eliminate them by any of the methods set forth in subsection (c) (2) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended. In eliminating excessive profits the Secretary shall allow the contractor or subcontractor credit for Federal income and excess profits taxes as provided in section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code. The powers hereby conferred upon the Secretary shall be exercised with respect to the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued under all such contracts and subcontracts by the contractor or subcontractor during his fiscal year or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon; except that this section shall not be applicable in the event that the aggregate of the amounts so received or accrued is less than $100,000 during any fiscal year.

(c) For the purpose of administering this section the Secretary of Defense shall have the right to audit the books and records of any contractor or subcontractor subject to this section. In the interest of economy and the avoidance of duplication of inspection and audit, the services of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be made available to the extent determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making examinations and audits under this section.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any of the contracts or subcontracts specified in subsection (i) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, and the Secretary of Defense in his discretion may exempt from the provisions of this section any other contract or subcontract both individually and by general classes or types.

(e) Agreements or orders determining excessive profits shall be final and conclusive in accordance with their terms and except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or willful misrepresentation of a material fact shall not be annulled, modified, reopened, or disregarded, except that in the case of orders determining excessive profits the amount of the excessive profits, if any, may be redetermined by the Tax Court of the United States in the manner prescribed in subsection (e) (1) of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, except that such redetermination shall be subject to review to the extent and in the manner provided by subchapter B of chapter 5 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(f) The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register regulations interpreting and applying this section and prescribing standards and procedures for determining and eliminating excessive profits hereunder using so far as he deems practicable the principles and procedures of the Renegotiation Act of February 25, 1944, as amended, having regard for the different economic conditions existing on or after the effective date of this act from those prevailing during the period 1942 to 1945. In any case in which the contract price of any such contract or subcontract was based upon estimated costs, then the Secretary of Defense shall determine the difference between such estimated costs and actual costs and shall, in eliminating excessive profits, take into consideration as an element the extent to which such difference is the result of the efficiency of the contractor or subcontractor.

(g) The powers and duties hereby conferred upon the Secretary of Defense may be delegated by him to any officer (military or civilian) or agency of the National Military Establishment.

(h) Any person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish any information, records, or data required of him under this section, or who knowingly furnishes any such information, records, or data containing information which is false or misleading in any material respect, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(i) This section may be cited as the Renegotiation Act of 1948.

Since passage of that bill, H. R. 6226, we have considered and passed in the House two appropriation bills which go into the field of large procurement. Both the Army and the Navy appropriation bill this year carry vast sums of money for the procurement of heavy ordnance, for the development of new types of equipment.

So, here again we have the same problem as during the war, the rapid expansion in procurement, and the development of new types of equipment for which there is no cost experience. Members of the committee have agreed that these should be brought under the provisions of the Renegotiation Act of 1948.

Obviously it would be neither practicable nor desirable for a contractor to be working at the same time on two contracts for identical planes, one subject to negotiation and the other not. Nor should development projects in new types be on a cost-plus basis without adequate opportunity for the Government to pass upon properly allowable costs.

Again, in the pending bill, we have some large funds for procurement of material and equipment and also for offshore construction. There are funds in this bill for the construction of large facilities in Alaska and in Guam. Everyone knows that where you are dealing with construction in Alaska and in Guam any bid must be something in the nature of a guess. Either you have to have cost-plus contracts, which open the door to vast waste and huge expenditures, or you must have some procedure such as the Renegotiation Act so that the final payment can be based upon audited and determined proper costs.

So, for this bill, again, I prepared and the committee has included a paragraph, which is section 401 of the bill, which applies the Renegotiation Act of 1948 to the funds in this bill and to contracts entered into hereafter. When we come to the consideration of that section of the bill I shall offer a minor amendment which defines subcontracts, on the suggestion of counsel, which we think is wholly in keeping with the spirit of the act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I congratulate the gentleman and the committee on reincorporating this provision in the law. I favored it during the war. In October 1939 I was naive enough to believe that we might take the illegitimate profits out of war, which at that time seemed approaching, and I introduced a bill to

that effect, but without avail. I hope this will accomplish what the gentleman hopes for during our national defense efforts or any future emergency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We certainly hope so. It must be remembered that the excess profits tax which followed the Renegotiation Act during the war has been modified, so that we do not have the protection of that now. Hence, it is doubly important now to have this renegotiation section in this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the other members of the subcommittee to the item for the General Accounting Office on page 9.

Salaries: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Salaries," $450,000.

May I point out that the reduction of $230,000 in the budget estimate is a matter of more far-reaching importance than the dollars concerned would indicate. The subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is chairman, and of which I happen to be a member has been conducting executive session investigations for several weeks into the overpayment by the Government during the war of transportation charges by the railroads, since the passage of the 1940 Transportation Act. The evidence has been amazing as to the amount of overpayments as a result of the elimination of the preaudit that existed prior to 1940. Already, as a result of an accelerated audit, the General Accounting Office has recovered $250,000,000, and discovered $104,000,000 more that the railroads owe, and this was not the result of a complete reaudit, as a complete reaudit is now underway. It is safe to say that with a thorough reaudit, and this amount of $680,000 is very important in that respect, tens of millions of dollars more will be discovered to be recoverable from the railroads or other persons who were paid transportation charges by the Government.

It is in connection with that that I want to call the attention of my friend from New York that we of the subcommittee feel very strongly, and I think express the views of all Members on both sides that this is an item of extreme importance which cannot be stressed too strongly.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think that what the gentleman has said is true. It is a matter of great importance, and we regard it in that way. We had our hearings with the general counsel. They already have some funds with which they are operating on this. It is extremely difficult for them to get the type of help they need to do the job. After our hearings we felt that this was all the money that they would be able to expend effectively on this job. We have always been very liberal with the General Accounting Office. Last year they had an unexpended balance at the end of the year of $2,300,000. They have had an unexpended balance of over $400,000 every year. Frankly, I believe that if we carried no money for this, they would have enough in their appropriation to take care of their job. But even so I do not believe they could spend on this job more than $450,000 which we have carried here. That was the basis on which we proceeded. I think they will have plenty of money to proceed with. If I had any idea that they would not, I would be in favor of the full amount. It is not with any idea of slowing it down, but it is with the idea of what it is possible for them to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from New York that his observation that it is hard to get trained employees is correct. There is no question about that. The evidence has disclosed how difficult it is to get trained rate experts and specialists. It is amazing to me that some of our universities and colleges have not surveyed that field with a view to affording their students an opportunity to be educated in that field, because there is a demand for them, not only in Government, but in private industry. It takes years to make a trained rate expert. It was a revelation to me; in fact I was amazed when I heard the evidence as to how difficult it is to get trained men. What the gentleman from New York said in that respect is absolutely correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. It seems to be that the only source of trained help, really good trained help, is that group that formerly were employed by the railroads on railroad freight rates.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is true.

Mr. TABER. That is the situation we are up against.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the Government is up against the situation where their good men are being taken away from them by the railroads by paying them higher salaries. There is that difficulty. However, I did not rise with the intention of offering any amendment but to get the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], representing the views of his subcommittee. Am I safe in saying that the subcommittee recognizes the importance of this reaudit?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. McCORMACK. And would I be correct in stating that the fact that $230,000 has been deducted from the estimate is not due to any lack of appreciation on the part of the committee as to this reaudit being made as quickly as possible, and when they come before the subcommittee or satisfy the Committee on Appropriations in the future that they can get the trained help, the necessary and justifiable appropriations will be made?

Mr. TABER. Anything that is needed to carry on this work effectively will be supported by this committee, I am sure.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand that the reaudit to which the gentleman refers is to save the Treasury from the result of overcharges?

Mr. McCORMACK. The reaudit is in connection with money paid from 1940 on by the Government, and to collect back overpayments made for transportation charges. Already there has been $250,000,000 recovered, and $104,000,000 more discovered that was overpaid, because by the Transportation Act of 1940 we wiped out the preaudit by any agency, and all the railroads had to do was to present their vouchers or their bills of lading and they were paid. Naturally, they sought and received the higher amount.

Mr. MURDOCK. In that case, this reaudit of wartime transportation charges is as important as the renegotiation of wartime contracts, for the protection of the Treasury from overcharges.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very important, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has clearly indicated that he and the members of his subcommittee appreciate that fact. We members of the Committee on Expenditures, who realize what the picture is, are very glad to hear that, because we feel that for every dollar spent in connection with this matter, the Government will receive back at least a hundred dollars in overpayments that have been made.

My purpose, Mr. Chairman, in addressing the committee is to call attention to the item on page 9 of the bill under the heading "General Accounting Office" providing an additional amount of $450,000 for salaries for the fiscal year 1949. The report of the Appropriations Committee shows that this represents a decrease of $230,000 below the amount of $680,000 requested by the General Accounting Office. Hearings before the committee show that the amount requested is for the purpose of conducting during the fiscal year 1949 a reaudit of certain transportation accounts which were audited during the period October 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947. On the basis of a test reaudit conducted by the General Accounting Office, it is estimated that $100,000,000 will be found in overpayments to carriers as a result of the complete reaudit, in addition to the $250,000,000 already collected and placed in the Treasury and over $100,000,000 further already stated as overpayments but not yet collected. This reaudit activity is now being carried on by the General Accounting Office with existing funds, but in order to continue it during the fiscal year 1949, the Office will need a supplemental appropriation. It was explained to the Appropriations Committee that the amount of $680,000 would provide for 110 examiners and 54 lower-grade people in the Transportation Division, as well as 50 employees in the Reconciliation and Clearance Division engaged in handling accounts.

The Expenditures Committee Subcommittee on Procurement and Buildings has conducted extensive inquiries into the audit by the General Accounting Office of wartime transportation payments, and I am satisfied that the Comptroller General by the reaudit is doing all in his power to provide the greatest possible protection to the Government. How-

ever, the number of people available to carry on this activity is limited. The Comptroller General has estimated that the minimum amount he will need to conduct the activity effectively during 1949 is $680,000. The result of the cut which has been made will be to postpone to a later year the work which could be accomplished during the fiscal year 1949 on this reaudit. The Comptroller General has not been able to make an estimate of how long it will take to do the reaudit job with the employees whom he can obtain if the money is provided. However, if the money requested is not granted in full, the time required to complete the job will necessarily be lengthened. I feel that the House should be on notice of that fact, since the effectiveness of the job will depend partly upon the timeliness of determining and attempting to collect these additional overpayments to carriers which will be found in the reaudit.

The General Accounting Office has been one of the very few agencies which have turned back to the Treasury substantial amounts not needed for current requirements, and even for the fiscal year 1948 it is estimated that $2,000,000 will be so turned back. I, therefore, regret to see a reduction in this item below the amount which the Comptroller General has estimated is needed to carry on an activity which should result in collections of many times the entire amount requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out a provision in this bill which I think is important, when you consider the floods in the Columbia River Valley.

I doubt very much if there are any Members of Congress who have not at least had one or two constituents who have said, "You are able to give billions to Europe. Why not a few million to the folks back home?"

I am taking this time to point out the work of the subcommittee on deficiency appropriations, as recorded in this bill. I think it is fundamental, and I think we ought to face it up. I have to. The greatest flood in 54 years has occurred in the Columbia River Valley. More water flows down that single river than any other river, with the exception of the lower Mississippi, and today it is a flood tide, it is receding. At least 44 persons have lost their lives. The damage, of course, is in the millions. The folks out there reading about the Congress appropriating billions to Europe on almost a blank-check basis are wondering where they come out in this matter of Federal responsibility in relief of the Columbia River Valley. I think quite properly they are asking me: "You are giving billions to Europe, where do we come out in this matter?" And I should like to take this time to point out that I think a rather constructive and businesslike approach to the Columbia River relief problem has been at least attempted on the part of Congress.

I want to read from the bill at this time the following language, to which I subscribe, language which I think is sound. It appears on page 6, line 24:

Provided, That no expenditure shall be made with respect to any such catastrophe in any State until the Governor of such State shall have entered into an agreement with such agency of the Government as the President might designate under assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or other agencies for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe.

Mr. Chairman, this is a Union of sovereign States, this Nation of ours. There are certain designated responsibilities which apply to the Federal Government, which apply to State governments, which apply to county governments. If we would have a bright and brilliant future for our own Nation, we must keep those responsibilities always clear and not confuse them. In the moments of catastrophe there is danger of confusing them. I want to say in behalf of my colleagues from the catastrophe area and for the Appropriations Committee that we have attempted at all times during this catastrophe to keep these responsibilities clear. We knew when this damage occurred that there were already funds which existed and could be drawn upon. Certain public-housing agencies had $25,000,000 available under certain statutes and certain rules of expenditure. We knew that the Public Roads Administration had $6,000,000 which could be applied out in this catastrophe area, and that damage to roads was tremendous. We knew that the RFC had $22,000,000 which could be made available in the form of loans to certain individuals and under certain circumstances. We knew that the Red Cross, not a Federal or governmental agency, had funds and there were other funds which were available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. We knew that the President's fund for emergency relief had $38,000 in it. This bill carries an additional half million. I am not sure that that amount is adequate, but if it is not it can yet be made adequate in conference and it should be expended under strict rules.

This bill carries $6,000,000 to be directly applied to the Columbia River damage area by the Army engineers.

Also in this bill are appropriations and contract authorization totaling $15,000,000 for rebuilding of forest roads and trails all over the country. Much of this amount is badly needed right now in the Pacific Northwest for replacing roads and bridges washed out in the national forests by flash floods. Often these roads are the only connection between many communities and the outside world.

The civil-functions bill carries $3,300,000, which can be applied, I understand, at the discretion of the Army Engineers on an emergency basis throughout the Nation. When this bill goes to conference after action on it by the other body, there probably will be about three and a half million dollars made available to the catastrophe area for emergency crop and seed loans. There may be other items made necessary after due examination and proper treatment by the departments and proper request for funds.

Mr. Chairman, I mention this at the present time because the people in our districts are saying, "You are giving billions to Europe; why not a few millions for the folks at home?"

Mr. Chairman, we are doing this thing right with regard to the Columbia River drainage area where a catastrophe has occurred. We are trying to determine what the damages are and what the responsibilities are, what the responsibilities of the Federal Government and the Congress are with regard to that damaged area. It is proper that we should do this. But with regard to the billions for Europe, I submit that we have had some rather reluctant votes in favor of those billions for Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, those billions were not properly justified. I submit that it was under a good deal of international pressure that this Congress acted, and I submit that before we appropriate any more money for work outside the United States we should attempt to justify those appropriations in the same way that we justify the work of relieving a catastrophe at home, specifically and item by item.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. Out in the upper reaches of the Columbia River we also suffered as you did in the lower reaches. As one whose district embraces some of the tributaries of the Columbia River, I want to express the appreciation of our section for the amounts that were put in for flood relief and which are available for us up there.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. By the inclusion of this $6,000,000 in the deficiency appropriation bill for current use in the Columbia River Basin for emergency purposes, we have made a start toward helping out a very serious situation in that area. I thank the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee for granting these appropriations.

Mr. HORAN. I think we all appreciate the action of that committee.

DIGEST OF REPORT FROM L. E. DURKEE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY, PORTLAND, JUNE 16, 1948

Columbia and Willamette are dropping faster than estimated with prospects of 2-foot recession by Saturday. Portland level down to 29.35 and Vancouver stage at 29.6 Tuesday noon. River forecaster Elmer Fisher expects river at Portland to be 28.4 Thursday, 27.9 Friday, and 27.5 Saturday.

Downriver dikes, seriously saturated, described as still critical, but no new breaks reported. Levee repairs on upper Puget Island about completed which will permit faster drainage of flooded acreage below, and

the Columbia slough, filling the Multnomah drainage district northeast of Portland since Friday morning, has been plugged at both ends. Army engineers expressed hope their battle was nearing end.

Flood levels started dropping on the upper Columbia four days ago and in British Columbia the flood control commission announced recessions in the Frazer River Valley.

Known dead attributable to the flood placed at 42, missing at 28.

Red Cross case load in Oregon and Washington numbered 8,523 families Tuesday, homeless families 43,440. It is sheltering 3,533 individuals and feeding 19,354. Peak case load registration expected to reach 12,000 families.

Red Cross emergency relief expenditures so far approximate $600,000 for food, clothing, some shelter, and hay for cattle.

Housing—Dr. J. Bion Philipson, representing Foley, arrived Monday, visited Vancouver Tuesday with Epstein and Portland Vancouver Housing Authority. Floyd S. Ratchford, Vancouver, said 22 apartment wings at Ogden Meadows would be renovated, work starting today and first families moving in July 1. Rearrangement will provide 43 three-room units, 88 two-room, and 12 one-room units. The buildings were up for sale three days before the Vanport disaster. Bids were returned and the sale canceled. Cost estimate for work is $400,000 to come out of $10,000,000 flood relief fund.

Ten buildings being renovated at Vancouver barracks include four barracks type buildings to be made into 128 three- and four-bedroom apartments, three apartments to house 26 families, and two nurses homes to be developed into 16 apartments. Believe War Assets would make more buildings available at the deactivated army post. About 1,300 evacuees already housed at Swan Island.

Unable yet to get working figure on estimated number of housing units needed. Two hundred eighty-three trailers expected by Thursday at Guilds Lake housing site, under FWA assignment. Been coming in since Saturday from Stockton and 106 due Wednesday afternoon on 50 flatcars from San Antonio. A trailer city is growing on the housing site. Water and sewers ready to be hooked up.

Philipson unwilling to guess number of houses needed, everybody else reluctant to hazard opinion at this time, among the Federal men.

FWA—Large amounts of materials, expendable and unexpendable are converging on Portland by trains, trucks, and vans. Beds, mattresses, and bedding for more than 1,500 families, other furniture, mobile unexpendable equipment out of WAA surplus, are being assigned to various areas of the disaster district. Formal applications for such assistance are being received from towns, counties, and diking districts. The big impact of the movement has not yet arrived but eight carloads of additional furniture including 560 beds, mattresses, chests, chairs, and tables would reach the FWA warehouses on Swan Island by tonight. Twenty-five van loads of furniture and expendable equipment from housing projects and military installations in Texas, Arkansas, New Mexico, and Kansas were expected in Portland by Sunday. An additional 25 van loads of materials and equipment, including furniture, have been loaded at Willow Run, Mich., Ottawa, Ill., and Manitowoc, Wis., for shipment here.

Movement of nonexpendable equipment into the flood disaster areas about Bonners Ferry, Orofino and St. Maries, Idaho, includes 32 Quonset huts in transit from Cincinnati to replace city and county buildings lost in the flood at Orofino. Equipment also includes dump trucks, draglines, a bulldozer, and lumber for rebuilding bridges. Materials were moving into the Kootenai River flood areas from the Ogden Army Depot and WAA warehouses in Spokane and San Francisco, and included 43,000 feet of cable, power shovels and trucks, a suction dredge, pile driver, and steam cleaning unit. Also included were DDT spray and portable sprayers. A water purification system for Bonners Ferry was located at the University of Idaho.

Have assigned a fire pumper truck located by WAA in Portland to the mayor of Clatskanie.

Public Health: Dr. H. M. Erickson, Oregon State health director, and Porter Stephens, in charge of the Portland-Vancouver area for the State sanitary service, report excellent cooperation with USPHS, Department of the Interior, FWA, and other Federal agencies. The present need is for prompt immunization and typhoid vaccine has been received in sufficient quantities. Sanitary engineers have been sent to the flood area from Atlanta, New Orleans, and San Francisco, with Federal entomologists. The environmental sanitation problem will grow as the water recedes, and work of mosquito and fly eradication is already proceeding. In the Oregon-Washington area 10,000 pounds of 40 percent DDT, 400 pounds of 100 percent DDT, and 3,000 gallons of oil are now available.

Interior expects more funds by July 1 for its work on rat control. Col. Roy Bessey, executive director for the Pacific Northwest region, says that mobile and electrical equipment and transportation services have been supplied to flooded areas.

Public Roads, FWA—the Union Avenue cut-off is now serving for emergency travel—busses, milk, vegetables, and other perishables. PRA engineers in Washington, Montana, and Idaho are reporting on the condition of roads, and the State highway departments in Washington and Oregon are taking care of emergency traffic with detours and temporary work, such as sandbagging between Portland and Longview, Wash.

Department of Agriculture: Reports engineering assistance and the assignment of equipment, bulldozers, drag lines, etc., in rehabilitation of irrigation work in Okanogan County, and the Methow and Kittitas Valleys, in Washington, and in northern Idaho. (Don't know about the reported $1,400,000 residue from 1942 act.)

Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Receiving some applications for loans for repair or rebuilding of barns and other farm buildings, William Kennedy, Portland manager, said. RFC has opened offices in Woodland, Rainier, and Vancouver. Two examiners from Cleveland and two from San Francisco, experienced in disaster work, have been assigned to Portland. An anticipated situation of considerable gravity is expected as the flood waters recede.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, during this session of Congress the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Public Lands has held extensive hearings on manganese, chromite, and copper, on stock piling, and on a preliminary review of the conditions and problems of the tungsten and mercury mining industries. Information has been obtained on a number of other minerals and metals.

It has been administration policy to encourage and stimulate development and production of minerals and metals in foreign countries to the exclusion and detriment of the mining industry of the United States. The policies and practices of the State, Commerce, Interior, Treasury, and War Departments, as well as those of the Munitions Board and Bureau of the Budget have been to aid and stimulate foreign production and allow thousands of domestic mines to be abandoned at great loss to this Nation of its strategic and critical minerals and metals resources. President Truman has gone on record in this respect. In one instance, in his message on signing the Stock-Piling Act of the Seventy-ninth Congress, he directed that the buy-American clause be ignored. Again, in his veto message on the Allen bill last year, which would have extended the life of hundreds of copper, lead, and zinc mines, he showed a complete lack of concern in American minerals production.

As a result of administration policy, harmful tariff reductions have been made; foreign cartels have been permitted to dump materials on the domestic market forcing the closing of American mines. American occupation commands have permitted or encouraged currency manipulation in occupied countries to enable the export of materials to the United States at artificially low prices. The American occupation authorities have acted as agents in the sale of foreign materials in the United States at below-market prices. Government purchases of strategic minerals and metals for the national stock pile have been almost entirely from foreign sources.

The United States has substantial resources of manganese, copper, lead, zinc, vanadium, tungsten, and a number of other strategic and critical minerals and metals. Montana offers substantial deposits of manganese and copper, and 75 percent of the domestic chromite resources. The last 2 years of the war found thousands of new mines producing minerals and metals throughout the United States. In order to keep them open and develop our resources, we must pay a price that will permit the payment of American wages and cover the cost of equipment and materials.

In framing and passing the Stock-Piling Act Congress recognized the need of encouraging the exploration and development of these domestic resources and of stimulating domestic production from mining operations which then were active. Congress wrote that policy into the Stock-Piling Act, and implemented it with a "buy American" provision designed to provide domestic producers with adequate prices. However, the intention of Congress has been ignored completely. Approximately 95 percent of the strategic and critical minerals and metals procured by the Munitions Board through the Bureau of Federal Supply has been obtained from foreign sources. The Munitions Board has not procured any domestic copper, lead, zinc, manganese, tungsten, or mercury from domestic mines since the close of the war. This is only a partial list. Only one would-be producer is known to have received a contract for domestic chromite. Some vanadium oxide has been procured from the two substantial companies who monopolize the manufacture of vanadium oxide and ferrovanadium, but the many ore producers have been by-passed.

Although it is acknowledged that mines in active operation serve as the

best stock pile, so to speak, we find that only one small chromite producer remains in operation. Two or three of the larger mercury producers and four or five of the more substantial tungsten producers have continued to operate by mining their high-grade ore at reduced capacity and wasting the low-grade ore. These few mines are expected to close within the next few months. Only one producer of manganese ore, a large mining company, is in operation today. Several hundred copper, lead, and zinc producers have continued in operations since the termination of the premium-price plan last year by robbing their mines of richer ore or by suffering losses in anticipation of the passage of the Russell bill at this session of Congress. These mines also will close within the next few months unless measures are taken to provide them with going prices for their products. This is the present condition of the various mineral and metal mining industries which are so vital to the security and future welfare of this Nation.

It is to be regretted that so few people have the opportunity to gain an insight into the mining situation and that so few are aware of the importance of the minerals and metals. However, should we be forced into a war emergency, public attention would quickly be focused upon the fact that Government indifference and lack of foresight has permitted us to become wholly unprepared and dependent upon foreign nations for the most vital minerals and metals. We will not have time in an emergency to build up our stock piles and make our mines resume production. Mines which close often lose forever the rich resources which they might have uncovered. In any preparation for national defense, an active mining industry should be one of the first requirements. Unfortunately, the administration has done nothing to preserve or stimulate such an industry.

It is the sense of the Committee on Public Lands that the security of the United States can best be provided by using the stock-piling funds for the purchase of materials which are available in the United States. In this manner we will gain not only the immediate increase of our stock piles, but we will also preserve an active mining operation which will be ready to produce immediately and continuously throughout any emergency.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire as to the use of the funds that are appropriated for construction and improvement of buildings. All through this present session the chairman and the members of the committee have expressed their intention that the committtee did not wish to have any funds used for the installation of new oil-burning equipment or for diversions from coal to oil, in view of the situation which confronts us, unless it can be clearly shown that it is economically necessary to undertake such construction. I assume that is true in connection with this bill.

Mr. TABER. We want that followed, as far as it can be. There are some emergency items in the nature of experimental developments on the part of the Navy where that rule cannot apply. That is true especially across the sea, in Guam and in Alaska.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman and want now to express my sincere appreciation for his cooperation and that of the chairmen and members of the subcommittees. As I recall it, this guide to spending funds in the bills passed at this session was adopted with but two exceptions. Certainly the members of the committee who have helped develop this administrative guide can never be criticized if we are unfortunate enough to have further shortages in petroleum products. By this action we have clearly provided a standard which must be used by those administering the expenditure of funds appropriated this year. I have no question but that this will be done. But I also want to assure my colleagues that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will follow this closely in connection with its discharge of its responsibilities in formulating and recommending a national fuel policy to meet the needs of this country in connection with its expanding domestic economy and its security. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] announced this morning that the Committee had scheduled continued hearings on the export phase of this problem beginning June 29. Beyond that, the Committee on Rules reported late yesterday House Resolution 595, and I have no doubt but that it will be unanimously voted to enable the Committee to act continuously and effectively throughout the recess to prevent, if humanly possible, any repetition of the difficulties of last winter. That resolution is as follows:

Whereas it appears that current and anticipated shortages of petroleum products threaten the present and future economy and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such shortages must be considered in the light of the availability of other fuels and energy resources; and

Whereas, in order to deal effectively with the problem of making petroleum and other fuels available in quantities adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, it is necessary to formulate sound national policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy adequate to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, including recommendations for a national petroleum policy and the integration of such policy with policies relating to other fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; and for such purposes the committee shall study the current and future fuel supply and demand of the United States and shall study methods of encouraging needed developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committeee shall make a report not later than the close of the present Congress. Such report may be made to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member;

(2) may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies;

(3) may seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a full and correct ascertainment of the facts.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and members of the committee who have worked so long and laboriously on this bill. It is a good bill and covers a number of most essential projects. I am particularly interested in the bill by reason of the inclusion in it of $6,000,000 for disaster flood control and $500,000 for the President's disaster relief fund and also an item of $300,000 to acquire a site and prepare plans and specifications for a new post office building in Portland and the remodeling of the old building on the Hoyt Street site. The post office facilities in Portland are woefully inadequate and for a number of years have resulted in much difficulty in handling the large volume of mail in the Portland area. These funds will permit carrying out the mandate of the bill I recently introduced which was approved and became Public Law No. 457. With these funds immediate action may be taken to secure the site and prepare the plans so that construction work may be authorized at the next Congress.

The tragic flood in the Columbia River area has wrought immense damage not only in my congressional district but for 120 miles up and down the Columbia River and as a result many miles of roads, dikes and public facilities, both of the Federal Government and local communities, have been destroyed. There has been immense loss of private property and thousands of acres of fertile agricultural land have been submerged, whole cities and villages have been wiped out and thousands of farm homes and buildings destroyed any many lives lost. Between 60,000 and 100,000 people have been rendered homeless and over $100,000,000 in property destroyed.

Certainly the Federal Government after spending billions around the world for the relief of peoples in distress can, in good grace, afford relief and protection to our own people who have met with disaster. As I have said before,

we are deeply grateful to the Congress in passing the relief measure for temporary housing. There yet remains to be passed legislation providing for loans for low cost housing for those who have been rendered homeless and for repairing and replacing public property and facilities which have been destroyed. I have today introduced a bill to amend the RFC law.

The purpose of this bill is to alleviate the situation that has recently developed as a result of floods, especially in the Portland-Vancouver, the Spokane, Wash., and the Helena, Mont., areas.

The amount presently available for disaster loans by the RFC is limited to $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time, $21,000,000 of which is now unused. The bill would increase the amount permitted to be outstanding at any one time to $45,000,000 and at the same time would permit the RFC to make disaster loans without regard to the present 10-year limitation on maturities.

The necessity for the enactment of this legislation arises primarily because of the acute housing situation, requiring repair and restoration in the devastated areas.

While it is not specifically provided in the bill for a dollar limitation for loans made for dwelling accommodations, it is urged that the RFC, in the administration of this law, should not exceed $7,500 for any dwelling designed for a single family residence, $12,500 for a 2-family residence, $16,000 for a 3-family residence, or $18,500 for a 4-family residence.

Under the present law maturities for all loans made by the RFC, including disaster loans, are limited to 10 years. This bill would remove this limitation as to maturities, but only with respect to disaster loans. However, it is contemplated that in no situation will a maturity in excess of 25 years be permitted. It is believed the maximum assistance in the devastated areas can be achieved, particularly with respect to the repair and restoration of dwellings, only by the removal of the existing maturity limitation.

I urge early consideration and passage of this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I request this time to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee what action was taken on the request I submitted for funds for the establishment of an air traffic control tower at Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colo., by the CAA.

Mr. TABER. We have contacted the Department on that matter, and we intended to say in the report that we expect them to do that job with the funds that we have provided here. We feel that they will do it. It was our intention to include that in the report, but through some inadvertence it was left out.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate the action taken by his committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services having to do with the authorization of projects for the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, and the public-works projects throughout the world, that I am happy, and I know the committee is, at the fine treatment that these services received from the Committee on Appropriations. We realize full well, as the result of the debate on the floor of the House yesterday in regard to the selective-service bill, and the debate that will continue today on the same subject matter, how perilous the situation is throughout the world and how important it is for us to utilize every means we possibly can to safeguard the security of the United States of America.

This appropriation bill, as I am given to understand by the naval authorities, with one exception, embraces about all that they could desire. We all realize how important it is to develop these facilities, especially in those most strategic parts of the world where our security would become more imperiled than in any other place, especially in the northern latitudes. There is one item, however, that is not in this bill that we all were very much interested in. We are not blaming the Committee on Appropriations, because we fully realize that the authorization bill has not yet been signed by the President.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it has not yet been signed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We understand that the request for this one appropriation was not submitted to the Committee on Appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget, and I have in mind, of course, the development of the naval air training station at Annapolis. The Committee on Armed Services, especially its subcommittee, has given weeks and months of study to the importance of the development of the aviators' indoctrinizational training of the naval cadets at Annapolis in order that they may be better fitted to carry their responsibilities if we are at any future time thrown into an emergency. Everybody fully realizes the important part that naval aviation played in the most recent war, and the important part that it played in the advances that we made from island to island in the Pacific. We understand thoroughly the tremendous losses that we suffered, but we know also the tremendous losses the Japanese air force, the kamikazes, suffered as the result of the brilliance of our naval aviators.

Naval aviation has now become part of the curriculum of the Naval Academy. It is considered to be of the highest priority, almost at the top of those things that the Navy Department believes ought to be inaugurated and carried out in order that we may fully and adequately train those midshipmen not only as to the operations on the surface of the water and under the sea, but the operations in aviation, and in the air.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that although time does not permit it today, if the Senate Committee on Appropriations, includes this item in the Senate appropriation bill, that we shall have an opportunity here in the House to vote for sufficient money so that we may acquire the land and start the preliminary engineering work. We do not feel that it is necessary to do the construction this year, but we do feel very strongly that we ought to acquire the land and carry out the preliminary investigations and engineering surveys, so that when the new Congress comes in the first of the year we shall be able to go ahead and build these facilities which are so important to the proper training of the midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone would want to go back and face the mothers and fathers of the naval cadets without starting the purchase of land at Annapolis and making plans for the training of the cadets.

Mr. Chairman, I rise also to ask this Deficiency Appropriations Committee if they will go along with the Senate if the Senate appropriates money in order that dividends on insurance may be made out to the veterans who carry insurance. The Veterans' Administration, as I understand it, has approximately $2,000,000,000 that could be used in the payment of dividends to those who are carrying insurance. They told me and our Committee on Veterans' Affairs they have been holding up the payment of the insurance dividends until the famous Zazov case was settled. The Supreme Court upheld the Veterans' Administration in the Zazov case. So that money may now be paid in dividends to these veterans. They have earned these dividends. I have already demanded they be paid. Any private insurance company would pay them. Certainly the Government should pay them dividends. The accumulated money belongs to the veterans. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs made an exhaustive study on insurance administration in the Veterans' Administration. Some of the committee's recommendations have been carried out; others should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and open to points of order and amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the bill? The Chair will not receive points of order after amendments are considered. The Chair hears none.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 3, after line 7, insert the following:

"For payment to James C. Davis, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Lowe* v. *Davis* as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $1,289.08, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

"For payment to James C. Davis, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Mankin* v. *Davis* as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

"For payment to Helen Douglas Mankin, contestant, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Mankin* v. *Davis* as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

"For payment to David J. Wilson, contestant, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Wilson* v. *Granger* as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a routine amendment. The amounts carried in the proposal are undoubtedly due and we accept it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 39, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "or subcontract" and at the end of the paragraph strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and all subcontracts under such contract. For the purposes of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 the term 'subcontract' means any purchase order or agreement to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any article, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment merely restores language carried originally in the act of 1944 which was inadvertently omitted in drafting the bill. We accept the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment merely moves subcontracts down to the end of the paragraph and defines the term as it is defined in the former act. The amendment is for the purpose of clarity and was suggested by those who are acquainted with administrative problems.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 14, line 19, after the period, add a new section as follows:

"Rural Electrification Administration, salaries and expenses, for an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for administrative expenses to be available immediately and to remain available until expended, $450,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it carries legislation in the words "which will be available until expended."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment provides additional funds for the administrative expenses for the Rural Electrification Administration. It carries the same wording as was carried in the original act providing the funds. It is in accordance with the budget estimate, and it seems to me it is not subject to a point of order. It is not legislation because it is authorized by law.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the words "to be available until expended" make it legislation, and therefore the amendment is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOPE in the chair). The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment in its present form with the language "to be available until expended" is clearly legislation. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 14, line 19, after the period add a new section to read as follows:

"Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses, for an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for administrative expenses, $450,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is aware of the fact that we put $450,000 in conference in the regular bill. I am not inferring that the entire budget request was agreed to. We agreed to the Senate proposal for an additional $450,000, and that is $450,000 under the budget estimate.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will hear me a moment he will be aware of the situation and of the fact that I am not duplicating anything that will appear in the regular Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct in saying that. You are not duplicating, except that it happens that the House first agreed to $5,000,000, the Senate added $450,000, which in conference the House agreed to. This $5,450,000 is however $450,000 under the original budget estimate of $5,900,000. Hence the confusion as to the $450,000 figure.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But our appropriations subcommittee did agree with the Senate on its raise of $450,000. Moreover, the Senators and we agreed that this would replace any request for a deficiency upon this particular item.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the House of Representatives can work its will in a matter of this kind.

Briefly, here is the situation: I frankly admit that perhaps the Members of the House generally are not familiar with all the facts, but one thing can be marked down as a certainty, all the REA co-ops in our districts are aware of the situation. We are in this situation: We have appropriated in recent months for Rural Electrification loans $175,000,000, plus $400,000,000, or a total of $575,000,000. The Congress deserves much credit for this tremendous advancement in the REA program. While we have more than doubled the REA program, we are not going to get the results which we anticipated and hoped for, because while we increased the loan funds by more than double, we did not sufficiently increase the administrative funds, and applications from the local co-ops have to go through the mill here at the Washington office of the REA before action can be secured. The budget estimate was sent up here for $900,000 to take care of the additional administrative expense incident to the huge increase in REA loan funds. This would have increased the amount for administrative expenses from $5,000,000 to $5,900,000. After all, if it requires $5,000,000 to administer a program of $225,000,000, certainly an additional $900,000 is not too much for the tremendous increase of $275,000,000 in REA loans which we have provided for.

I would in the normal procedure have offered this amendment in the Committee on Appropriations, except that in our rush to bring the House to adjournment it did not seem best to follow that procedure. But in collaboration with others interested, particularly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who helped draft the amendment, I have offered it now. The sum requested, relatively speaking, is not a large sum. It is only $450,000 for additional administrative expenses so that a half-billion dollars in loans can be processed, so that the REA co-ops can get the money, and so that the people living in rural areas can get the lines and the electricity. With a $225,000,000 program costing $5,000,000 to administer, certainly $5,900,000 will not be too much for a program more than twice the size of the program which had been planned.

If we go home and say, "We appropriated the money for REA loans but not the administrative funds to make the loans effective to the farmers," we will be in an unhappy situation. It is true that in the Department of Agriculture conference report on the regular bill, $450,000 is provided. This provides an additional $450,000, the full amount requested by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. I hope that this matter is perfectly clear, and if it is not clear I would be glad to yield to anybody who desires to make an inquiry about it.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The objection that has been raised heretofore in the processing of these applications is that the backlog in the office is too great. The place where funds can be used to greatest advantage in expediting the REA program is in the administrative office of the REA.

Mr. MAHON. That is true. The situation is this. Opponents of REA have said: "No, let us not increase the authorization of loans for REA; they have not

expended the money we have let them have." The trouble too often has been that REA officials have not had sufficient funds for administrative expenses. In this amendment we provide the additional sum of $450,000 requested by the Budget for administrative expenses. It is a good amendment and ought to be passed.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The REA at the present time has probably the best loss record of any one agency, less than one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. MAHON. That is right, an excellent record.

Mr. POAGE. How can we expect them to maintain that loss record if we do not give them sufficient money to service these loans?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is right. It certainly seems to me that for the supervision of loans to the extent of $575,000,000 a cost of $5,900,000 is not too much adminstrative expenses and I sincerely trust that the House will take action to provide the funds. We have made a good record in this session in trying to take care of the needs of REA. This amendment will get power lines and electric light to the rural homes faster than they otherwise would get there. That is the reason I am asking your support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can arrive at a limitation of time for further debate on this amendment. I see four Members standing. I suggest 3 minutes apiece.

Mr. RANKIN. Will not the gentleman make it 5?

Mr. TABER. I think 3 minutes apiece ought to be enough.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, the last 3 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has very well explained the situation. No agency of Government has a better lending record than the REA. No private lending agency with which I have any familiarity has a better lending record. When it comes to losses, the REA has had a minimum of losses. It has made sound, safe loans. It could not do this if it did not have an opportunity to study the loans it makes to local cooperatives. It is necessary for REA to study the needs of every cooperative if it is to maintain the fine record in which we take so much pride.

The truth is that the cost of proper study is greater today than it was in the early days of REA. Then it was possible to build lines almost anywhere with the assurance that they would have customers. Now with a little over half the rural homes served, it takes more study to put the lines where they will serve the people who still need service with a minimum of useless line.

Then it was possible to get all the power that the cooperatives needed from the private power companies, although the companies did charge outrageous prices. Now in many sections, the private power companies simply do not have the power to supply their own needs, much less to supply the power the cooperatives need. REA is having to spend money trying to find adequate and dependable sources of power.

When their work began, there was no problem of equipment and supplies. If you could get the money, there would be a salesman anxious to sell them to you. Now REA has to help the cooperatives locate conductor poles, transformers, and so forth.

And, finally, as these cooperatives become larger and their business more complex, it becomes more difficult and expensive to analyze their income and their business. There is no reduction in REA's duties.

REA has handled your money safely and successfully, without loss to the public. It has rendered a great service with small overhead charges. Why should we break that record and cause the taxpayers the loss of untold millions because of lack of sufficient administrative funds to supervise the loans? It seems to me that anyone who would suggest that it was economy at this time to reduce the relative amount of money and to deny the REA a reasonable amount of money to administer these loans wants it to lose money and wants it to have a bad record here next year. I want to see the REA continue the splendid record it has made in the past. I want it to come up here next year with the same fine record so that we can justify continuation of this fine work.

You cannot expect a continuation of this record if you give this agency less than 1 percent for administrative purposes. You have got to give the REA some more money if you are to expect them to properly handle the great sums you have told them to loan. You gave them $5,000,000 to handle $225,000,000 worth of funds last year. Now you add an additional $350,000,000 in loans and give them an increase of only 9 percent over what they had last year for administrative purposes. That means they must do two and a half times the work they did last year; handle 250 percent of the amount of money they handled last year on only a 9-percent increase in funds for administrative purposes. It is fantastic; it cannot be done by any agency.

Surely we must apply the law of common sense to the administration of these loans. The REA is no different from any other lending agency, your local bank, or other local business institutions. When your local institutions more than double the volume of their business, you expect that their administrative expenses are going to increase at least a great deal more than 9 percent; yet, that is all the increase you are giving REA. We simply ask you by this amendment to give the REA a little less than a million dollars to administer $350,000,000 worth of additional loans. That is less than one-third of a cent for each dollar's worth of business you ask REA to handle. That, my friends, is all we ask. If that is not as low as the administrative costs of any agency you have ever dealt with, then I call on you to name it. I submit you cannot point to another agency in this Government that can handle money at a rate so low and handle it with the efficiency that the REA has handled it. Many of the appropriation bills you have passed have provided 10 to 20 times this percentage for administration.

The budget has asked for this amount. The REA has pointed out that this is necessary if they are to carry out the program we have prescribed for them. If we deny REA these funds, we must expect delay in the processing of the loan applications of your local cooperatives. We must expect such delay that your farm people will not actually get the great benefits we held out to them when we approved the greatest loaning program in history. If you do not give REA the needed funds, then you can expect it to show up with losses next year and in the years to come, and if it does come in here next year with substantial losses, do not charge it up to the REA; charge it up to the refusal of this House to give its agency the straw it needed to make sound bricks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was responsible perhaps more than any man in Congress for placing the additional $100,000,000 in loan authorizations in the regular agricultural appropriation bill for 1949. This will demonstrate, Mr. Chairman, that certainly I am among the many in this House who are very friendly to the REA. Most of us want that agency to have all the money it legitimately needs.

Let me call attention to the fact that I mentioned previously when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] was speaking. We agreed with the Senate in conference on this point and it was understood by our conferees, in advancing the amount for administrative expenses from $5,000,000 to $5,450,000, that this would be ample and no deficiency would be requested. In adding another $450,000 here, Mr. Chairman, under a deficiency bill we would be breaking faith with the agreement that we of the Appropriations Subcommittee had in conference with the Senate. If I for 1 minute thought REA would suffer because of not enough administrative funds, I would gladly urge the acceptance of Mr. MAHON's amendment. But such is not the case.

There is one more point. The Senate advanced the additional loan authorizations as a reason for giving to the legal department of the Department of Agriculture an additional $50,000, which we in conference, agreed to. REA has a right to be proud of this fine job it is doing and what the other gentlemen have had to say about the splendid record of repayment by the near 1,000 associations has often been called to the attention

of the Congress by me when previous bills were on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question here as to loan authorizations. The question is how much shall we permit REA to expend directly for its expenses of administration. My associates have now had much experience and do not need the same degree of guidance from national headquarters as they did at the beginning of the program. Our REA Boards of Directors have occasionally complained of too much unnecessary interference and too many visits from field men and such. Surely, $5,450,000 will pay for a lot of top administrative work. Remember that REA has also available a good portion of the legal talent of the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Agriculture, for which latter office we are appropriating this year $2,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that we are being very generous with REA, and much as I would like to give these additional funds Mr. MAHON requests, there is always present our responsibilities of providing billions of dollars for our veterans and national defense. We must draw the line somewhere, so that other very essential activities of government can properly be taken care of. I hope that Mr. MAHON's amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, by all means this amendment should be adopted. It would merely provide the Rural Electrification Administration with the funds they need to administer the $400,000,000 we provided for next year and $173,000,000 that we added for the balance of this fiscal year.

The gentleman from Minnesota evidently does not understand that all these projects have to be submitted to the REA in Washington, they have to be scanned and investigated carefully, and ought to be.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I personally understand the situation very well.

Mr. RANKIN. They cannot do this with the amount of funds they have. This battle has been going on for 15 years, and yet with all the progress we have made the United States is not as well electrified today as Japan. Japan has a larger percentage of her farms electrified than we have in the United States.

Germany has a larger percentage of her farms electrified than they do in Minnesota or than we have throughout the whole United States.

Italy, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Holland have a larger percentage of their farms electrified than we have in the United States.

We have provided $400,000,000 for rural electrification during this fiscal year and $400,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and I submit that it is nothing but good economics to supply the Rural Electrification Administration with sufficient funds to adequately and properly administer these funds, and in order to do so it is necessary that we have this additional $450,000 which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has asked for in this amendment, and which the Rural Electrification Administration says is absolutely necessary in order to enable them to do this work.

You are not wasting money here. This is not like all those billions you are pouring into the sink holes of Europe, Asia, and Africa. This is not like this $300,000,000 you voted to waste in China a few days ago. This is not like the $900,000,000 you are going to spend to send tobacco to Europe. This is money to help electrify the farm houses of your own country. Every dollar of it will come back with interest, and it will add immeasurably to the wealth of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment ought to be carried by an overwhelming majority; by unanimous consent, if you please.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will pass on this item on the basis of fairness and need. The Senate committee, after all the funds that are involved in rural electrification construction had been voted by the House, and after they had the whole picture before them, held hearings on this item. Mr. Wickard, head of this organization, appeared before them, and on page 932 of the hearings he said that about $479,000 out of the $900,000 would be devoted to helping in the engineering and construction work. And that is all they have to do. Now, why should we add to the amount that the Senate committee recommended? On that Senate committee are some who have a record of being amongst the most liberal with REA. So, why should we come out here and raise a figure that the Senate Committee on Agricultural Appropriations put in and which the House, after a conference, agreed to as the amount needed? That does not make sense. It is simply turning over $450,000 more to the bureaucrats to waste. I am willing to let them have what they need, but I do not believe that we should stretch ourselves so as to give them money to waste. You destroy the efficiency of governmental organization when you do that. The interest of REA and its successful administration requires that we refuse to give them more money than they need; more than the Senate Committee on Appropriations determined they should have.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 60, noes 92.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 93, noes 137.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: On page 20 line 6 after the word "expended", insert a new paragraph as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

"The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized in his discretion to accept in the name of the United States the tract of land comprising the Valparaiso golf course at Valparaiso, Eglin Field, Fla.: *Provided*, That no appropriated funds shall be used for the acquiring or maintenance or upkeep of the golf course now on the said lands or for the maintenance of any recreational activities placed thereon."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The idea of this is simply that it allows funds that have been made out of the profits of an officers' mess at this place to be used for maintaining their golf course. It does not take any money for that purpose out of the Federal Treasury, is that correct?

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. It prohibits the use of any appropriated funds to be used for that purpose, either for the acquiring of the property or its maintenance or operation for recreational facilities. That would all have to be done out of the profits of this officers' mess, is that correct?

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I do not object to it. The amendment is drawn in such language that it is perfectly plain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] in offering this amendment is again demonstrating the great service that he has rendered as a Member of this body, carrying on right to the end representing the people of his State in his able and effectual manner. All of us who have ever had the honor of serving with him have a most profound respect for our friend from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

His service has been outstanding, constructive, and courageous. We will all respect the reasons which prompted him to voluntarily retire. We regret very much his retirement from the Congress. He retires with the knowledge that his record while a Member will accupy a prominent place in the pages of congressional history.

The very fact that he is offering this amendment in the closing days of the Congress is typical of the type of service that my dear friend has rendered during the years that he has been a Member of this House.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I thank my chairman and other members of the committee for accepting this amendment, and I say "thank you" to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] with whom I have had a very pleasant association.

Unless there are some further questions I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 20, after the Hendricks amendment, at the end of line 6, insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"For construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, $1,500,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this Tennessee-Tombigbee project has been approved by the Army engineers, and by the present Chief of Army Engineers, as well as by his predecessor.

It has been pointed out time and time again that it is the most important project of its kind that has yet been proposed. It is the only place on earth where you can transfer traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such a tremendous saving in transportation costs and distances.

The Army engineers have made their plans. They have drawn their blueprints. They have everything ready to proceed. They are now asking that we provide the money to begin.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended this $1,500,000. That is what I am asking for in this amendment.

I pointed out the other day that this project will cut the water distance from the Gulf of Mexico to our Oak Ridge plant on the Tennessee River where our atomic bombs are made by 786 miles. A bargeload of 14,000 tons going from Mobile to that project would save $30,380 on its fuel bill alone. If it were going into Michigan or into the Great Lakes or upper Mississippi River or upper Missouri, it would save $20,160 on its fuel bill alone.

When I say the upper Mississippi, I mean St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn. This means more to the people who pay transportation costs in the great Mississippi Valley, extending from Pittsburgh, Pa., all the way across, than any other project that has ever been proposed.

If this bargeload went up the Ohio River it would save $22,160 on its fuel bill alone.

At the same time it would have the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

Oh, I know there are some men behind the iron curtain of discriminatory freight rates who do not want the people west of the Mississippi River or south of the Ohio to get any relief from these penalties they have paid throughout all the years that have passed and gone. They are willing to paralyze our entire water-transportation system; they are willing to jeopardize, if you please, to that extent, the safety of the Nation. If we were to become involved in a war in the years to come, in which the atomic bomb would be the principal weapon, this would give us not only a short water route but it would give us two outlets from Oak Ridge to the sea. So it would add to the defense of the Nation more than any other expenditure that could be made at this time of anything like the amount proposed.

It seems to me that while you are spending all these hundreds of millions of dollars of lend-lease American money to rebuild the Dnieperstroi Dam in Russia, while you are spending these millions—or should I say billions—to build hydroelectric plants over Europe, while you are spending the hundreds of millions of dollars to be wasted in China, it seems to me that the Congress of the United States might do what we are going to have to do sooner or later, and that is to provide the small amount necessary to begin construction of this waterway, the most important, the most necessary project of its kind that has yet been proposed. Ask any member of the Corps of Army Engineers. Go to General Wheeler, go to General Reibold who has just retired, go to any of those men who know. They will tell you that this is the most important project of its kind they have ever had to pass upon.

You might as well approve this amendment, for I am going to keep this proposition before you until this great project is constructed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the Tombigbee Canal may be a desirable project to construct at some time. The House voted on three different occasions against the authorization of the Tombigbee Canal. Finally it was authorized.

The House Committee did not include it in the civil functions appropriation bill this year. It was suggested in the other body but in conference it was pointed out that the two waterways, the Overton Canal and the Tombigbee Waterway, would together cost $189,000,000.

The Tombigbee Canal cannot be built this week, this year, or next year. It is a long-range proposition.

The Committee on Civil Functions believed that it was much better to put our money on flood-control projects now where immediate results could be obtained, where there was an urgency, where life and property were in danger. The waterway canal which duplicates existing facilities for transportation does not have the urgency that is evident in flood-control projects or is evident in the expenditures we have been called upon to make for increased numbers of aircraft.

When the gentleman says that it means more for national defense than any other money that can be appropriated he is flying in the face of what he himself has said with regard to the importance of a 70-group air force and of doing some of these other things which are done directly in the name of national defense.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No.

I think the Tombigbee Canal has some merit; and some day when we need a public-works program it will be a good time to put some labor on some of these things that do not have immediate urgency, but it ought not to be in this final deficiency bill that the House will vote on this session.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrosssed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 14, line 19, after the period add a new section to read as follows:

"Rural Electrication Administration. Salaries and expenses. For an additional amount for the fiscal year 1949 for administrative expenses, $450,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 78, noes 148.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 204, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—199

Abbitt	Forand	Morrison
Abernethy	Garmatz	Multer
Albert	Gary	Murdock
Allen, La.	Gordon	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.	Gore	Norblad
Arnold	Gorski	Norrell
Banta	Gossett	Norton
Barden	Granger	O'Brien
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	O'Konski
Battle	Gregory	O'Toole
Beckworth	Hagen	Pace
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Passman
Bennett, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bland	Harris	Peterson
Blatnik	Harrison	Pfeifer
Bloom	Hart	Philbin
Boggs, La.	Havenner	Pickett
Bonner	Hays	Poage
Brehm	Hedrick	Potter
Brooks	Heffernan	Powell
Brown, Ga.	Hendricks	Preston
Bryson	Hill	Price, Fla.
Buchanan	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Buckley	Holifield	Priest
Burleson	Huber	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Hull	Ramey
Camp	Isacson	Rankin
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Rayburn
Carroll	Jarman	Redden
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, Ala.	Richards
Celler	Jones, N. C.	Riley
Chapman	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Chelf	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Kelley	Rooney
Cole, Mo.	Kennedy	Russell
Colmer	Keogh	Sabath
Combs	Kerr	Sadowski
Cooley	Kilday	Sasscer
Cooper	King	Schwabe, Mo.
Courtney	Kirwan	Sheppard
Cox	Klein	Sikes
Cravens	Lanham	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	Larcade	Smathers
Curtis	Lea	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Ga.	Lemke	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Somers
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Spence
Deane	Lusk	Stanley
Delaney	Lyle	Stefan
D'Ewart	Lynch	Stevenson
Dingell	McCormack	Teague
Domengeaux	McCowen	Thomas, Tex.
Donohue	McCulloch	Thompson
Dorn	McMillan, S. C.	Trimble
Doughton	MacKinnon	Vinson
Douglas	Madden	Walter
Durham	Mahon	Wheeler
Eberharter	Manasco	Whitaker
Elliott	Mansfield	Whitten
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Whittington
Evins	Meade, Ky.	Williams
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Fernandez	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Fisher	Mills	Wood
Flannagan	Monroney	Worley
Fogarty	Morgan	
Folger	Morris	

NAYS—204

Allen, Calif.	Bradley	Cole, N. Y.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bramblett	Corbett
	Brophy	Cotton
Anderson, Calif.	Buck	Coudert
Andresen, August H.	Buffett	Crawford
	Busbey	Crow
Andrews, N. Y.	Butler	Cunningham
Angell	Byrnes, Wis.	Dague
Arends	Canfield	Davis, Wis.
Auchincloss	Carson	Dawson, Utah
Bakewell	Case, N. J.	Devitt
Barrett	Chadwick	Dolliver
Bates, Mass.	Chenoweth	Dondero
Beall	Chiperfield	Eaton
Bell	Church	Ellis
Bender	Clason	Ellsworth
Bishop	Clevenger	Elsaesser
Blackney	Clippinger	Elston
Boggs, Del.	Coffin	Engel, Mich.
Bolton	Cole, Kans.	Fallon
Fellows	Kearney	Poulson
Fenton	Kearns	Reed, Ill.
Fletcher	Keating	Reed, N. Y.
Foote	Keefe	Rees
Fuller	Kersten, Wis.	Reeves
Fulton	Kilburn	Rich
Gallagher	Knutson	Riehlman
Gamble	Kunkel	Rizley
Gavin	Landis	Rockwell
Gillette	Latham	Rogers, Mass.
Gillie	LeCompte	Rohrbough
Goff	LeFevre	Ross
Goodwin	Lewis, Ky.	Sadlak
Graham	Lewis, Ohio	St. George
Grant, Ind.	Lichtenwalter	Sanborn
Griffiths	Lodge	Sarbacher
Gross	Love	Schwabe, Okla.
Gwinn, N. Y.	McConnell	Scott, Hardie
Gwynne, Iowa	McDonough	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Hale	McDowell	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGarvey	Scrivner
	McGregor	Seely-Brown
Hall, Leonard W.	McMahon	Shafer
	McMillen, Ill.	Short
Halleck	Mack	Smith, Ohio
Hand	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Harness, Ind.	Maloney	Snyder
Harvey	Martin, Iowa	Stockman
Heselton	Mason	Stratton
Hess	Mathews	Sundstrom
Hinshaw	Meade, Md.	Taber
Hoeven	Merrow	Talle
Hoffman	Meyer	Taylor
Holmes	Michener	Tibbott
Hope	Miller, Conn.	Tollefson
Horan	Miller, Md.	Towe
Jackson, Calif.	Mitchell	Twyman
Javits	Morton	Vail
Jenison	Muhlenberg	Van Zandt
Jenkins, Ohio	Murray, Wis.	Vorys
Jenkins, Pa.	Nicholson	Wadsworth
Jennings	Nixon	Weichel
Jensen	Nodar	Welch
Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara	Wigglesworth
Johnson, Ill.	Patterson	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Calif.	Wolcott
Jones, Wash.	Phillips, Tenn.	Wolverton
Jonkman	Ploeser	Woodruff
Judd	Plumley	Youngblood
Kean	Potts	

NOT VOTING—27

Allen, Ill.	Hébert	Regan
Boykin	Herter	Robertson
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Scoblick
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Burke	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lane	Stigler
Gathings	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Gearhart	Mundt	Vursell
Hartley	Peden	West

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Stigler for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Mr. Peden for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Ludlow for, with Mr. Scoblick against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mrs. Smith of Maine against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. Gearhart with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. West.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mr. McCOWEN changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is consideration of the President's veto of H. R. 6355.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the President vetoed the bill H. R. 6355, which carries nearly $1,000,000,000 of appropriations for functioning of the Social Security Administration, some portions of the Public Health Service and the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor. That is the question before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the rules is not the majority granted the privilege of discussing this message?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his moving of the previous question it would be in order. Otherwise it is not in order.

The question is on the previous question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 161, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—238

Allen, Calif.	Coudert	Hand
Andersen, H. Carl	Crawford	Harness, Ind.
	Crow	Harvey
Anderson, Calif.	Cunningham	Heselton
Andresen, August H.	Curtis	Hess
	Dague	Hill
Andrews, N. Y.	Davis, Wis.	Hinshaw
Angell	Dawson, Utah	Hoeven
Arends	Devitt	Hoffman
Arnold	D'Ewart	Holmes
Auchincloss	Dirksen	Hope
Bakewell	Dolliver	Horan
Banta	Domengeaux	Hull
Barrett	Dondero	Jackson, Calif.
Bates, Mass.	Doughton	Javits
Beall	Eaton	Jenison
Bender	Elliott	Jenkins, Ohio
Bennett, Mich.	Ellis	Jenkins, Pa.
Bennett, Mo.	Ellsworth	Jennings
Bishop	Elsaesser	Jensen
Blackney	Elston	Johnson, Calif.
Boggs, Del.	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.
Bolton	Fellows	Johnson, Ind.
Bradley	Fenton	Jones, Wash.
Bramblett	Fisher	Jonkman
Brehm	Fletcher	Judd
Brophy	Foote	Kean
Buck	Fuller	Kearney
Buffett	Fulton	Kearns
Burke	Gallagher	Keating
Busbey	Gamble	Keefe
Butler	Gavin	Kilburn
Byrnes, Wis.	Gearhart	Kilday
Canfield	Gillette	Knutson
Carson	Gillie	Kunkel
Case, N. J.	Goff	Landis
Case, S. Dak.	Goodwin	Latham
Chadwick	Graham	LeCompte
Chenoweth	Grant, Ind.	LeFevre
Chiperfield	Griffiths	Lewis, Ohio
Church	Gross	Lichtenwalter
Clason	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lodge
Clevenger	Gwynne, Iowa	Love
Clippinger	Hagen	Lucas
Coffin	Hale	McConnell
Cole, Kans.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCowen
Cole, Mo.		McCulloch
Cole, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	McDonough
Corbett		McDowell
Cotton	Halleck	McGarvey

McGregor	Ploeser	Shafer
McMahon	Plumley	Short
McMillen, Ill.	Poage	Simpson, Ill.
Mack	Potter	Smith, Kans.
MacKinnon	Potts	Smith, Ohio
Macy	Poulson	Smith, Wis.
Mahon	Ramey	Snyder
Maloney	Reed, Ill.	Stefan
Martin, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.	Stevenson
Mason	Rees	Stockman
Mathews	Reeves	Stratton
Meade, Ky.	Rich	Sundstrom
Merrow	Riehlman	Taber
Meyer	Rivers	Talle
Michener	Rizley	Taylor
Miller, Conn.	Rockwell	Tibbott
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Tollefson
Miller, Nebr.	Rohrbough	Towe
Mitchell	Ross	Twyman
Morton	Russell	Vail
Muhlenberg	Sadlak	Van Zandt
Murray, Wis.	St. George	Vorys
Nicholson	Sanborn	Vursell
Nixon	Sarbacher	Wadsworth
Nodar	Schwabe, Mo.	Weichel
Norblad	Schwabe, Okla.	Wigglesworth
O'Hara	Scott, Hardie	Wilson, Ind.
O'Konski	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wilson, Tex.
Patterson	Scrivner	Wolcott
Phillips, Calif.	Seely-Brown	Wolverton
Phillips, Tenn.		Woodruff

NAYS—161

Abbitt	Fogarty	Monroney
Abernethy	Folger	Morgan
Albert	Forand	Morris
Allen, La.	Garmatz	Morrison
Andrews, Ala.	Gary	Multer
Barden	Gordon	Murdock
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Battle	Gorski	Norrell
Beckworth	Gossett	Norton
Bell	Granger	O'Brien
Bland	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Blatnik	Gregory	Pace
Bloom	Hardy	Passman
Boggs, La.	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bonner	Harris	Peterson
Brooks	Harrison	Pfeifer
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Philbin
Bryson	Havenner	Pickett
Buchanan	Hays	Powell
Buckley	Hedrick	Preston
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Price, Fla.
Burleson	Hendricks	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hobbs	Priest
Camp	Holifield	Rains
Cannon	Huber	Rankin
Carroll	Isacson	Redden
Celler	Jackson, Wash.	Richards
Chapman	Jarman	Riley
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Jones, N. C.	Rooney
Combs	Karsten, Mo.	Sabath
Cooley	Kee	Sasscer
Cooper	Kelley	Sheppard
Courtney	Kennedy	Sikes
Cox	Keogh	Smathers
Cravens	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Crosser	King	Somers
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Stanley
Dawson, Ill.	Lanham	Teague
Dean	Larcade	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney	Lesinski	Thompson
Dingell	Lusk	Trimble
Donohue	Lyle	Walter
Dorn	Lynch	Welch
Douglas	McCormack	Wheeler
Durham	McMillan, S. C.	Whitaker
Eberharter	Madden	Whitten
Engle, Calif.	Manasco	Whittington
Evins	Mansfield	Williams
Fallon	Marcantonio	Winstead
Feighan	Meade, Md.	Wood
Fernandez	Miller, Calif.	Worley
Flannagan	Mills	

NOT VOTING—31

Allen, Ill.	Kersten, Wis.	Sadowski
Boykin	Lane	Scoblick
Brown, Ohio	Lea	Simpson, Pa.
Clark	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Gathings	Lewis, Ky.	Stigler
Hartley	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Hébert	Mundt	Vinson
Herter	Peden	West
Johnson, Okla.	Rayburn	Youngblood
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	
Kefauver	Robertson	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. West against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Peden against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Johnson of Texas against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Youngblood for, with Mr. Vinson, against.

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Additional general pair:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot qualify on this vote but I want the RECORD to show that if I had been here I would have voted "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution this must be a record vote. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 288, nays 115, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—288

Abbitt	Cole, Mo.	Hale
Allen, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Hall,
Allen, Ill.	Cooper	Edwin Arthur
Allen, La.	Corbett	Hall,
Andersen, H. Carl	Cotton	Leonard W.
Anderson, Calif.	Coudert	Halleck
Andresen, August H.	Cox	Hand
Andrews, N. Y.	Cravens	Hardy
Angell	Crawford	Harless, Ariz.
Arends	Crow	Harness, Ind.
Arnold	Cunningham	Harris
Auchincloss	Curtis	Harrison
Bakewell	Dague	Harvey
Banta	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Barrett	Davis, Tenn.	Hendricks
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Wis.	Heselton
Beall	Dawson, Utah	Hess
Bender	Devitt	Hill
Bennett, Mich.	D'Ewart	Hinshaw
Bennett, Mo.	Dirksen	Hoeven
Bishop	Dolliver	Hoffman
Blackney	Dondero	Holmes
Bland	Dorn	Hope
Boggs, Del.	Durham	Horan
Bolton	Eaton	Hull
Bradley	Elliott	Jackson, Calif.
Bramblett	Ellis	Javits
Brehm	Ellsworth	Jenison
Brooks	Elsaesser	Jenkins, Ohio
Brophy	Elston	Jenkins, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Engel, Mich.	Jennings
Bryson	Fellows	Jensen
Buck	Fenton	Johnson, Calif.
Buffett	Fernandez	Johnson, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Fisher	Johnson, Ind.
Burke	Fletcher	Jones, Wash.
Burleson	Foote	Jonkman
Busbey	Fuller	Judd
Butler	Fulton	Kean
Byrnes, Wis.	Gallagher	Kearney
Camp	Gamble	Kearns
Canfield	Gary	Keating
Carson	Gavin	Keefe
Case, N. J.	Gearhart	Kerr
Case, S. Dak.	Gillette	Kilburn
Chadwick	Gillie	Kilday
Chenoweth	Goff	Knutson
Chiperfield	Goodwin	Kunkel
Church	Gore	Landis
Clark	Gossett	Larcade
Clason	Graham	Latham
Clevenger	Grant, Ind.	LeCompte
Clippinger	Griffiths	LeFevre
Cofin	Gross	Lewis, Ohio
Cole, Kans.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lichtenwalter
	Gwynne, Iowa	Lodge
	Hagen	Love
Lucas	Patterson	Short
McConnell	Peterson	Sikes
McCowen	Phillips, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
McCulloch	Phillips, Tenn.	Smith, Kans.
McDonough	Pickett	Smith, Ohio
McDowell	Ploeser	Smith, Va.
McGarvey	Plumley	Smith, Wis.
McGregor	Poage	Snyder
McMahon	Potter	Stanley
McMillan, S. C.	Potts	Stefan
McMillen, Ill.	Poulson	Stevenson
Mack	Preston	Stockman
MacKinnon	Price, Fla.	Stratton
Macy	Ramey	Sundstrom
Mahon	Reed, Ill.	Taber
Maloney	Reed, N. Y.	Talle
Martin, Iowa	Rees	Taylor
Mason	Reeves	Thompson
Mathews	Rich	Tibbott
Meade, Ky.	Richards	Towe
Meade, Md.	Riehlman	Twyman
Merrow	Riley	Vail
Meyer	Rivers	Van Zandt
Michener	Rizley	Vinson
Miller, Conn.	Rockwell	Vorys
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Vursell
Miller, Nebr.	Rohrbough	Wadsworth
Mitchell	Ross	Weichel
Morrison	Russell	Wheeler
Morton	Sadlak	Whitten
Muhlenberg	St. George	Whittington
Murray, Tenn.	Sanborn	Wigglesworth
Murray, Wis.	Sarbacher	Wilson, Ind.
Nicholson	Schwabe, Mo.	Wilson, Tex.
Nixon	Schwabe, Okla.	Wolcott
Nodar	Scott, Hardie	Wolverton
Norblad	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wood
Norrell	Scrivner	Woodruff
O'Hara	Seely-Brown	Worley
O'Konski	Shafer	Youngblood
Passman		

NAYS—115

Abernethy	Folger	Mills
Albert	Forand	Monroney
Andrews, Ala.	Garmatz	Morgan
Barden	Gordon	Morris
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	Multer
Battle	Granger	Murdock
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Norton
Bell	Gregory	O'Brien
Blatnik	Hart	O'Toole
Bloom	Havenner	Pace
Boggs, La.	Hedrick	Patman
Bonner	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Buchanan	Hobbs	Philbin
Buckley	Holifield	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Price, Ill.
Cannon	Isacson	Priest
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	Rains
Celler	Jarman	Rankin
Chapman	Jones, Ala.	Rayburn
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Redden
Colmer	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Combs	Kee	Rooney
Cooley	Kelley	Sabath
Courtney	Kennedy	Sadowski
Crosser	Keogh	Sasscer
Dawson, Ill.	King	Sheppard
Deane	Kirwan	Smathers
Delaney	Klein	Somers
Dingell	Lanham	Spence
Donohue	Lesinski	Teague
Doughton	Lusk	Thomas, Tex.
Douglas	Lyle	Trimble
Eberharter	Lynch	Walter
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Welch
Evins	Madden	Whitaker
Fallon	Manasco	Williams
Feighan	Mansfield	Winstead
Flannagan	Marcantonio	
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—27

Boykin	Kefauver	Regan
Brown, Ohio	Kersten, Wis.	Robertson
Domengeaux	Lane	Scoblick
Gathings	Lea	Simpson, Pa.
Hartley	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Hébert	Lewis, Ky.	Stigler
Herter	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	Mundt	Tollefson
Johnson, Tex.	Peden	West

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Stigler.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Mundt with Mr. Gathings.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. CHELF changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WINSTEAD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to sustain the President.

I do not know why any Member of this House should feel or express surprise that the President felt it necessary to veto H. R. 6355. It is true that this veto attaches, under our law, to the bill as a whole—to the appropriation as well as the organizational features. His veto message, however, as well as his prior conduct, leaves no doubt as to the fact that the bill is unacceptable to him because it would transfer the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency. The President's position on the subject of this transfer had been made abundantly clear long before the bill in question was drafted.

In 1947, and again this year, the President submitted reorganization plans to this Congress, under special legislative authority reposed in him, for the permanent location of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor. These plans were rejected. The principal reason assigned for the rejection of the plan submitted this year was the fact that any basic reorganization of executive functions should await recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government which is presently making a study of such structure. The passage of H. R. 6355, despite Congress' attitude on the reorganization plan referred to, is an act of flagrant inconsistency.

When the President's efforts to achieve a permanent integration of the employment service functions with the labor functions of this Government failed, no course remained open to him but the exercise of his ultimate prerogative of veto in attempting to spare the country the effects of unwise legislation. The responsibility for the present situation which finds one of the major independent agencies of the Government without funds for the coming fiscal year, lies with the proponents and supporters of H. R. 6355—not with the President.

The action of coupling in one measure appropriation provisions with organizational provisions affecting the basic structure of this Government in a manner known to be deeply contrary to the President's wishes is a reprehensible one. That the Chief Executive of these United States refused to yield to the expedient offered him in this legislation is to his lasting credit.

Referring for a moment to the operation of the Employment Service in the Department of Labor. I wonder if even now its history is fully understood.

In the first place, it was not transferred from the Department of Labor pursuant to a superior organizational scheme. The necessities of wartime administration alone prompted its removal. When these necessities ceased, the employment function, as it was expected, was returned by Executive order to its original home in the Labor Department.

It seems clear and simple to me that employment has a good deal to do with labor and that one cannot exist very long without the other.

Prior to the war, the disassociation of employment matters from the Department of Labor would have seemed completely unreasonable. Any suggestion at that time that employment was not a matter of primary concern to the Department of Labor would have aroused storms of indignation. Since the inception of the Employment Service it has spent a number of highly successful years in the Department of Labor. In the face of its worthy record there, in the face of its achievements there, and in the face of well-considered theories of Government organization which decree that its proper location is there, the employment service would again be uprooted by this Congress from its rightful location in a Cabinet department of this Government and shunted over to the Federal Security Agency. The ostensible reason for this move, as I understand it, is to prevent malfeasance of the program under Labor Department administration. Again, I say the Employment Service record in the Labor Department speaks for itself. The expression of the fear of maladministration after numerous years of Labor Department supervision during which any evidence of improper administration is singularly lacking, is not only completely without justification, but also ridiculous.

Before H. R. 6355 is reconsidered, I think it would be well if Congress took a few minutes off and reflected upon its actions in the realm of labor and its attitude toward the Department of Labor. A department of labor is no stepchild in the scheme of a democratic government. It is entitled to occupy a responsible and respected position in this country of all countries where the working man and woman is cast in a particularly important role under our prevailing democratic principles. I think it is time this Congress withdrew its fire from the Labor Department and its officials spent some time evaluating its own motives. The experience of the late Secretary of Labor with this Congress, of which we have intimate knowledge, reflects more eloquently than any words I could choose, the indefensible congressional attitude toward labor matters. When another man assumes the great responsibilities which belong to the office of the Secretary of Labor, I hope he will find the actions of this body toward him and his Department actuated by principle—not prejudice.

Thank God we have a President who has the courage to veto this unfair bill, obviously designed to weaken the Department of Labor by removing functions which properly belong in the Labor Department.

REPEAL THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Hartley law is wrecking the American labor movement. That is clear after a year of operation. That is why I have introduced my bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

The worst is still ahead.

Many union contracts were signed just before the law went into effect on August 22, 1947. That means that there will be a wave of contract renewals coming up in the middle of this summer. Additional hundreds of thousands of union members will find out at first hand what a slave-labor law can do to their organizations.

But enough is on the record already.

The record proves that there is only one thing to do with the Taft-Hartley law. It cannot be amended. It must be repealed, thrown into the ashcan of history along with Hitler's Nazi state and all other efforts of greedy men to break the organizations of free workers.

This conclusion was foreseen a year ago by organized labor. It is supported now throughout the country. In the words of the distinguished minority report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management Relations:

> Through the encouragement offered to antiunion employers and through the justified suspicion and resentment engendered among wage earners, the act has laid the basis for industrial unrest.

The report recommends "immediate repeal of the act to avoid the serious injury to our economy which we foresee."

A free and powerful labor movement is the best guaranty of the preservation of democracy. No President in our history ever received more wholehearted support from the bulk of the people than Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is no accident that the bedrock of Roosevelt's support lay with the unions.

Neither is it an accident that in both Italy and Germany when fascism was installed the trade-unions had to be wiped out in the course of only a few months, in order to clear the way for smashing all civil rights.

The unions are labor's first line of defense against starvation. Much more than that, a union organized through the

free choice of workers without help or hindrance from government, is a worker's best guaranty that he can walk in dignity, head high in the face of the overlords of industry.

Pork chops are important, but unions give workers more than pork chops. When the unions are under frontal assault, flank attacks are made by reaction on all civil and economic rights of the people. This is why the CIO was right in saying before the Joint Labor-Management Relations Committee on June 4:

> The antilabor aspects of the Taft-Hartley Act have set in motion other forms of repression on local levels. It is not merely the Federal courts who are engaged in a flood of injunctions. In the State courts as well we find that the issuance of antilabor injunctions limiting and frequently outlawing all picketing is now becoming routine under the stimulus of the Taft-Hartley Act. We find on the State level an increasing resort to use of many of the instrumentalities of government to repress the organizational activities of working people and to break strikes.

Workers in all parts of the world are jealous of their liberties. But a free labor movement is above all the seal of what is really the American way of life, and I do not mean the NAM way of life.

Our fathers came to this country to escape the tyrannies of an Old World and to build free institutions for themselves and their children. Say "America" in any country and one of the first ideas which comes to mind is "production." America's mighty power to produce wealth is not the creation of boards of directors or coupon clippers but above all it stems from free people working under the protection of free unions, able to earn decent wages to purchase the necessities of life in adequate amounts.

When I say free labor I do not mean that American workers have had a paradise on earth which is being taken from them now by the Taft-Hartley Act. From the first day any immigrant ever walked out of steerage he and his children and their children have had to fight for anything they ever won.

We have gone through the horrors of war and the miseries of depression. We have seen our children hungry when there were no jobs. We have seen our sisters and cousins burnt in the filthy sweatshops. We have seen our brothers and uncles pale and worn out under the lash of the corporation conveyor belts. We have seen arrogance and brutality pitted against the workers' efforts to organize to protect themselves and their families.

Through all the hardships and struggles we have gained steadily. We have built great cities and mighty industries for which the money changers take credit. Nothing has been given but much has been won.

Because the workers of America were united and organized, behind Roosevelt, we won the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act, in spite of the high-priced publicity of the National Association of Manufacturers, did not give us anything on silver platters either. It did right a few ancient wrongs. It did set a limit on the lawless repression with which the corporations attempted to hold down the workers who made them rich. And it did make possible the further progress of our Nation.

Free American labor, organized into democratic unions, produced on an unbelievable scale when the call to arms came in the Second World War. From the hands of American workers came the decisive share of the weapons which defeated fascism.

But when the war was over, and labor thought it could rest on its laurels, the corporations and their agents went to work to destroy the Wagner Act.

The elections of 1946 were lost by the people who stayed away from the polls. And as a result, Taft-Hartley was passed.

The Taft-Hartley law does much more than wreck the Wagner Act. What we face today is something worse than the sweatshop and speed-up and hired finks and cops of the 1920's and 1930's. Then at least labor was free to fight although against great odds. No matter what the odds, as long as we can fight we can win.

The Taft-Hartley Act is a straitjacket. It not only puts weapons in the hands of the industrialists, it ties the hands of labor and leaves the unions defenseless.

Here is the way Taft-Hartley has worked:

First. It has put a brake on organizational drives. Unions cannot stand still while vast unorganized groups of workers need their protection. The unorganized areas stand as a welcoming sign for runaway plants. The unorganized areas are a pit of open shops and low wages into which the unions can be dragged.

A few figures show clearly what Taft-Hartley has done to stop organization. Between August 1947 and March 1948 only 950 elections were held. During the same period in the preceding year, 3,500 elections under the Wagner Act were held.

Along the same lines, the rate of filing of petitions for certification was about three times as great in the year before Taft-Hartley as it was after the law was passed.

Second. The Taft-Hartley law has reached into the union halls and interfered in the conduct of internal union business. The affidavit requirements make it possible for the NLRB to dictate in effect who the unions shall choose for leaders. In this connection it is worth noting that many unions which bar Communists from office—for example, the mine workers and the steel workers—have nevertheless held out against compliance with the non-Communist affidavit requirements.

Furthermore, the dodge of noncompliance has been used by some corporations—for example, Remington Rand and the Government Services cafeterias—as a new means of all-out attack on unions, as they used to do with such devices as the Mohawk Valley plan. This is done in spite of the fact that compliance is not and cannot be required by law.

In the words of William S. Tyson, solicitor of labor, in a memorandum of January 23, 1948, to the Secretary of Labor:

> 1. There is nothing in section 9 (f) or (h) which interferes with the right of unions to continue traditional and legitimate trade-union activities without resort to the procedures and remedies provided in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, if they choose to proceed in this fashion.
>
> 2. Similarly, there is nothing in the act which prevents an employer, if he so desires, from bargaining with an otherwise qualified union, since the filing of affidavits and organizational and financial data is a condition precedent to resort by unions to the Board and not to the practice of free collective bargaining by unions and employers.

Third. The act outlawed the closed shop and is the jump-off point for an attack on all forms of union security. The NLRB is bogged down in a mess of union-shop-election cases. The spokesmen for big business now propose another way out of the difficulty of union-shop elections which have gone overwhelmingly in favor of keeping the union shop: they want to ban union shops altogether.

The hiring hall, which put an end to the day of the crimp on the water front, is also under employer fire with Taft-Hartley as the weapon held over the heads of the maritime workers.

Fourth. The act has interfered in accepted and orderly union practices. Even peaceful picketing has been branded as an unfair-labor practice. Suits involving more than $15,000,000 have been filed against unions for such practices.

Fifth. Most important of all, the act is being manipulated to bar national strikes. Here it must be noted that while the act in itself is bad, it is being diligently enforced by an administration which supposedly opposes it.

The President chose the applause of reactionary Congressmen by saying he would do his constitutional duty of administering the act, rather than the applause of American progressives, which would have been his if he had added that the law must be repealed.

An administration genuinely concerned with protecting the workers' organizations can do much to prevent abuse of labor in the operations of the Taft-Hartley law. There are areas in the law where there is room for interpretation, where the administration could exercise discretion in favor of the worker. This the administration has not done. The law has instead been consistently and exaggeratedly interpreted to favor the employers.

The power to set up a board of inquiry is optional with the President. President Truman on five occasions has not hesitated to declare the existence of national emergencies and set the machinery of Taft-Hartley in motion to rob workers of their strike weapon. Senator Taft himself could not have acted more promptly against the coal miners, the maritime workers, the long-lines telephone operators, or the atomic-energy workers.

The injunction weapon has been used against the miners, the railroad workers, and the maritime workers. In each case the corporations had only to hold fast to a position of no concessions. When the unions had to resort to the strike call—their only weapon after the corporation side refused to yield in any

degree—the power of the Government injunction was thrown against them.

There is a note of bitter mockery in the fact-finding report which led to the injunction issued June 11 against the maritime strike set for June 15. The report of President Truman's board concludes with these words:

And if the status quo can be continued, real and sincere collective bargaining may finally avoid disruption.

To continue the status quo means, of course, to seek an injunction and hamstring the unions by banning a strike. But what kind of "real and sincere collective bargaining" can be carried on when the shipowners know that the workers are powerless to do more than talk about their needs? No union was built with words alone, no union can long be preserved when strikes are outlawed.

The strike is a last resort, an act of tremendous sacrifice on the part of workers, who generally, having no savings, are still willing to go without wages for weeks if need be to win their demands. Strikes cannot be called by so-called "hotheads or agitators." As any union man knows, a strike to succeed at all must be an expression of the collective will of virtually all the organized workers.

By robbing unions of their defensive weapon of the strike and instituting government by injunction, the Taft-Hartley Act has created the first links in the chain of fascism.

By robbing workers of their best defense against inflation—free collective bargaining for better wages and working conditions—the Taft-Hartley Act has laid the basis for reduced purchasing power, lower living standards, and an eventual economic crisis which is bound to shake our economic system.

Along with the Taft-Hartley law, corporate wealth will be used to fight tradeunions and undermine living standards. In depression days ahead those who are profiteering from inflation will be able to sit down on their money bags, while the people are starving and are subjected more and more to attempts at complete economic and political domination by big business.

It will take a vigorous, well-organized new political party—speaking a language politicians understand, the language of votes, to secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The leadership of both the Republican and Democratic Parties has clearly demonstrated that in practice they support this bipartisan antilabor legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a statement before the Rules Committee.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

DISPLACED-PERSONS BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT FILED

Mr. FELLOWS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (e) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

ECA APPROPRIATION BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that the Speaker appoint conferees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the European relief program appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman conferred with the minority?

Mr. TABER. I have notified the minority leader. I have had his office called and tried to locate him to advise him that I was going to ask to send this to conference.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the request of the gentleman from New York is merely to send the bill to conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TABER. The only member of the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations I could contact was the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]. I spoke to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 2286, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES BY CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4007) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that a bill has passed the Senate, now on the Speaker's desk, that is not as broad as this one but a bill which will provide benefits to this group of deserving veterans. May I ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts if my understanding is correct?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. The bill, S. 1391, would cost about half as much as the bill now on the House Consent Calendar. As the gentleman knows, I have been trying to get that bill up for consideration and passage for over a year. It takes care of a group of very seriously disabled veterans. There are about 40 amputees in Washington today asking that the bill be passed before the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman from New Jersey if he would be agreeable to the passage of this bill and substituting the Senate bill?

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that we have a rule that bills allowing benefits of a million dollars shall not be taken from the Consent Calendar and passed. This bill would cost $19,000,000, which would mean that the bill to which the gentleman refers would cost some $10,000,000.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PREVENTING MULTIPLE STATE INCOME TAXES ON SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 127) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PAYMENT TO SWISS GOVERNMENT FOR DAMAGE INFLICTED DURING WORLD WAR II BY UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1605) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5318) to provide for the continuation of the transportation services of the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the disposition of its property and other interests, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very important piece of legislation to be considered on the Consent Calendar, and I think the House ought to have a little more information about it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is general agreement all around as to the provisions in this bill. There was quite an extensive study made by the Committee on Small Business of the House dealing with this subject, later by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government Corporations, and then by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The only objection that arose at all to the provisions of the bill was eliminated by an amendment, I think offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], and the House has already appropriated funds in the Government corporations appropriation bill, which was concurred in by the Senate, so there is no disagreement. The appropriation took into consideration the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. When is it proposed to dispose of this corporation?

Mr. PLOESER. It permits disposal under conditions which would conform to the organic act.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. How is it to be sold? Is it to be sold to private interests for cash or is it to be sold on time payments, or how is it to be sold?

Mr. PLOESER. We leave that practically up to the Department of Commerce to handle. Of course, it will be sold to private interests.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. What has been done with reference to the continuation of this type of service.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman were familiar with the organic act he would know that the service provided there would have to be continued, and this provides for the continuation of the service on the Mississippi and on the Missouri, with the same type of less-than-bargeload-lot service as is being given now.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell me whether this bill has the approval of the American Waterways Association?

Mr. PLOESER. The competitive barge operators? No. Neither do they furnish the same service. Not all oppose this—but some want to kill the service.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I consider this bill of vital importance, particularly to the lower Mississippi Valley, and I do not feel that it should be taken up in this fashion. I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

CREDIT SERVICE AS A CADET FOR PAY PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 657) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONVEY CERTAIN LANDS TO HOWARD UNIVERSITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5509) to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUEL PLANTS ACT OF 1948

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5475) to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BUILDINGS FOR OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BUREAU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3907) to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER JURISDICTION OVER SCHOOL BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5433) to transfer jurisdiction over certain school buildings in Vanport, Oreg., to the Federal Works Administrator and to authorize an appropriation to rebuild a school building in Vanport, Oreg., which was destroyed by fire.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FUR PRODUCTS LABELING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3734) to protect consumers, retailers, distributors, manufacturers, dealers, and producers from misnaming, misbranding, improper identification, and deceptive or misleading advertising of fur products and articles made in part or in whole from fur, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. LARCADE, and Mr. BOGGS of Delaware objected.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6502) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

WYANDOTTE TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3685) authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this with the chairman of the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

BASE PERIOD FOR DETERMINATION OF PARITY FOR MARYLAND TOBACCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5111) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to change the base period for the determination of parity for Maryland tobacco from August 1919 to July 1929 to the period from January 1936 to December 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill in the committee, and I objected to its consideration the last time the Consent Calendar was called. Last Saturday we passed a bill dealing with many crops on which we put support prices of 60 to 90 percent of parity. Tobacco has 90 percent of parity. Now they want to adopt this plan to increase the present support price. I again object.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are required.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I object, Mr. Speaker.

MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5842) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. GRIFFITHS objected.

NATIONAL RESERVE OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6098) to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION OF BOARDS OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3657) to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 239) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the committee amendment. I do not know whether or not the Senate bill is identical with the House bill with the committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the bill be passed over until we have had a chance to compare the two bills.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would it not be possible to consider the House bill and the committee amendments and then take up the Senate bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the provisions of the House bill as passed?

The SPEAKER. That could be done.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be appointed on or before the last day of every year a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 2. Each Board shall consist of seven persons appointed by the President: The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee; three other members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee; four other members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. (a) After the date of enactment of this act, the members of each Board shall serve as such during the next succeeding year after appointment and not more than two-thirds of the members of each Board shall be replaced by new members when annual appointments are made in accordance with sections 1 and 2 of this act.

(b) In case of the death or resignation of any member of each Board during the term for which said member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Said successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member being succeeded.

SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed at least once annually at such time as the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, shall designate, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, officially visit the Academy concerned at other times during the year, in groups or individually, as the members of each respective Board on matters pertaining to the duties of each Board. The Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, shall notify the Superintendent of the Naval Academy or the Superintendent of the Military Academy, as the case may be, and members of the Board concerned, of the date of the annual visit and any official visit other than that designated as the annual visit.

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of each Board to inquire into the state of discipline, curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, and other matters relating to the Academy concerned which the Board may decide to consider.

(b) Each Board shall within 60 days after the meeting designated as the annual visit, submit a written annual report to the President regarding its action as such Board, together with its views and recommendations pertaining to the Academy concerned. Any report based on a visit other than the annual visit (except reports of the visitors to the United States naval postgraduate school) shall be submitted by the originator or originators thereof to the President within 60 days after approval of said report by at least a majority of the members of the Board.

(c) Each Board is authorized to call into consultation upon prior approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, such advisers as it may deem necessary or advisable to effectuate the duties imposed upon it by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Each member of each Board shall receive not more than $5 per day and be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for actual expenses of travel while performing duties as a member of either Board.

(b) Advisers called for consultation by either Board in connection with the business of the Board shall be compensated in the same manner as members of the Boards in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to prescribe such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem necessary to effect annual and other visits to the United States naval postgraduate school by either the Board or a committee composed of members thereof, and the Secretary shall prescribe the manner in which reports of said visitors regarding visits to said school shall be prepared and submitted to the President.

(b) Visits to the postgraduate school shall be governed by and conducted in accordance with the provisions of sections 5 (a), 5 (c), and 6 of this act.

SEC. 8. That part of the act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," which relates to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy (39 Stat. 608) and reads as follows: "From and after the passage of this act there shall be appointed every year, in the following manner, a Board of Visitors, to visit the Academy, the date of the annual visit of the Board aforesaid to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy: Seven persons shall be appointed by the President and four Senators and five Members of the House of Representatives shall be designated as visitors by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, in the month of January of each year. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio members of said Board.

"Each member of said Board shall receive while engaged upon duties as a member of the Board not to exceed $5 a day and actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. (a) So much of the provision of the act of August 9, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," which provides as follows: "*Provided*, That the act approved May 28, 1908, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows: That hereafter the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy shall consist of five members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and seven members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen thereof; the members

so appointed shall visit the Military Academy annually at such time as the chairman of said committees shall appoint, and the members from each of said committees may visit said Academy together or separately as the said committees may elect during the session of Congress; and the Superintendent of the Academy and the members of the Board of Visitors shall be notified of such date by the chairmen of the said committees. The expenses of the members of the Board shall be their actual expenses while engaged upon their duties as members of said Board not to exceed $5 per day and their actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

(b) The act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 597), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Delete section 2 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Each Board shall be constituted as follows:

"(a) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee;

"(b) Three other Members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

"(c) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee;

"(d) Four other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

"(e) Nine persons to be appointed by the President. The first Board to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall, with respect to the nine Presidential appointees, consist of three persons appointed to serve for a period of 1 year, three persons appointed to serve for a period of 2 years, and three persons appointed to serve for a period of 3 years. Three Presidential appointees shall be appointed to each subsequent Board to serve for a period of 3 years."

Delete section 3 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. In case of the death or resignation of a member of a Board during the term for which such member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Such successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member who died or resigned."

Delete section 4 and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed once annually in April, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, make such other visits on matters pertaining to the duties of the Board, or for purposes of consulting with the respective Superintendents of the Academies, as the Board or its members may determine to be desirable."

On page 3 in line 12 insert the words "morale and" after the word "of."

On page 3, in line 13, insert the words "academic methods", after the words "fiscal affairs."

On page 3 in lines 21 and 22 delete the words "(except reports of the visitors to the United States naval postgraduate school)."

On page 4 in line 3 delete the word "War" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "the Army."

Delete section 7.

Renumber sections 8 and 9 as sections 7 and 8, respectively.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the committee amendment:

On page 3, line 24, strike out "Nine persons" and insert "Six persons."

On page 4, in lines 2, 3, and 4, strike out "three persons" and insert "two persons" in each place.

Page 4, line 5, strike out "Three Presidential appointees" and insert "Two Presidential appointees."

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and laid on the table.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 239) to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be appointed on or before the last day of every year a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 2. Each Board shall be constituted as follows:

(a) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee;

(b) Three other members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(c) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee;

(d) Four other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(e) Nine persons to be appointed by the President. The first Board to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall, with respect to the nine Presidential appointees, consist of three persons appointed to serve for a period of 1 year, three persons appointed to serve for a period of 2 years, and three persons appointed to serve for a period of 3 years. Three Presidential appointees shall be appointed to each subsequent Board to serve for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 3. In case of the death or resignation of a member of a Board during the term for which such member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Such successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member who died or resigned.

SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed once annually in April, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, make such other visits on matters pertaining to the duties of the Board, or for purposes of consulting with the respective Superintendents of the Academies, as the Board or its members may determine to be desirable.

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of each Board to inquire into the state of morale and discipline, curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy concerned which the Board may decide to consider.

(b) Each Board shall, within 60 days after the meeting designated as the annual visit, submit a written annual report to the President regarding its action as such Board, together with its views and recommendations pertaining to the Academy concerned. Any report based on a visit other than the annual visit shall be submitted by the originator or originators thereof to the President within 60 days after approval of said report by at least a majority of the members of the Board.

(c) Each Board is authorized to call into consultation upon prior approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, such advisers as it may deem necessary or advisable to effectuate the duties imposed upon it by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Each member of each Board shall receive not more than $5 per day and be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for actual expenses of travel while performing duties as a member of either Board.

(b) Advisers called for consultation by either Board in connection with the business of the Board shall be compensated in the same manner as members of the Boards in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 7. That part of the act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," which relates to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy (39 Stat. 608) and reads as follows: "From and after the passage of this act there shall be appointed every year, in the following manner, a Board of Visitors, to visit the Academy, the date of the annual visit of the Board aforesaid to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy: Seven persons shall be appointed by the President and four Senators and five Members of the House of Representatives shall be designated as visitors by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, in the month of January of each year. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio members of said Board.

"Each member of said Board shall receive while engaged upon duties as a member of the Board not to exceed $5 a day and actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. (a) So much of the provision of the act of August 9, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," which provides as follows: "*Provided*, That the act approved May 28, 1908, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows: That hereafter the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy shall consist of five members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the

Senate and seven members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen thereof; the members so appointed shall visit the Military Academy annually at such time as the chairman of said committees shall appoint, and the members from each of said committees may visit said Academy together or separately as the said committees may elect during the session of Congress; and the Superintendent of the Academy and the members of the Board of Visitors shall be notified of such date by the chairmen of the said committees. The expenses of the members of the Board shall be their actual expenses while engaged upon their duties as members of said Board not to exceed $5 per day and their actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes" is hereby repealed.

(b) The act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 597), is hereby repealed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 239 and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 3657, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 3657, was laid on the table.

NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6494) to provide that personnel of the National Guard of the United States and the Organized Reserve Corps shall have a common Federal appointment or enlistment as Reserves of the Army of the United States, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this bill with officials of the National Guard Bureau and the National Guard Association. While there are some benefits contained in the bill that might be advantageous to the National Guard, there are other provisions which are detrimental and therefore I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4365) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

JUDGES IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1052) to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I asked the gentleman to yield as I am without the privilege of raising any objection or reserving the right to object, and have only the right to speak the point of view of the people of Hawaii when a measure of this character is presented. This is a very small bill, and involves the salaries of only 12 judges in the Territory of Hawaii. If the will of the House had prevailed, and the Territory of Hawaii had been made a State, this obligation would have been assumed by the people of the Territory very willingly. The bar association of our Territory is unanimously in favor of making these increases in pay and feels that the failure to do so is a great injustice to our judges and will work an injury to our judiciary. In the event that we are made a State we will pay these salaries. We have always been generous in the matter of salaries for our public officials. Insofar as this is so completely a problem involving the people of the Territory, and insofar as we are quite willing when the opportunity is given us to pay these salaries, I appeal to you in a sense of fair play, Judge HOBBS, to withdraw your objection. Otherwise the bill will be lost.

S. 1052 would increase the salary of the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii from $10,500 a year to $15,500 a year, and the salaries of the two associate justices from $10,000 a year to $15,000 a year.

It would also increase the salaries of the six judges of the First Judicial Circuit of the Territory of Hawaii from $7,500 a year to $12,500 a year, and of the three judges of the Second, Third, and Fifth Judicial Districts of the Territory of Hawaii from $7,000 to $12,500 a year.

The Bar Association of Hawaii, which embraces all of the practicing attorneys of the Territory, is unanimously and aggressively in favor of this legislation. It not only filed a brief in support of the legislation but arranged for witnesses who had come all the way from Hawaii to appear before the House to urge its enactment.

The inadequacy of the salaries of the present supreme and circuit courts of Hawaii was so marked in the opinion of the members of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii that in the session of 1945 additional compensation in the amount of $3,000 a year was voted to the members of the supreme court and the circuit judges. This money was appropriated from the revenues of the Territory under condition that as soon as the Federal Government raised these salaries that it would be discontinued.

The Legislature of Hawaii acted in the belief that this action should be taken to meet an emergency and that Territorial funds should not be provided for the compensation of these judges as a normal practice. The Territory believes that so long as appointment of these judges is the responsibility of the Federal Government it should not be expected to pay their compensation.

Although the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the judges in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska were included in Public Law 567, the judges of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the judges of the circuit courts of Hawaii were omitted.

The omission of the judges of the supreme and circuit courts of Hawaii was either through inadvertence or because there was a separate piece of legislation pending which did not become incorporated into Public Law 567 relating to compensation of judges of the United States appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The enactment of S. 1052 will remedy the injustice done to the judges of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii and permit Hawaii to preserve and foster a strong and competent judiciary.

When the Congress omitted the judges of the supreme court and circuit courts of Hawaii from the provisions of Public Law 567, it departed from a traditional relationship and ratio that had been established and maintained ever since annexation of Hawaii in 1898. It has been the settled policy of the Congress to fix the compensation of the district judges of Hawaii and the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii at nearly an equal level. Thus in 1900, judges of both courts received annual compensation of $5,000. In 1926, the compensation of United States district judges including judges of the district court for Hawaii were increased to $10,000 per annum; 2 years later the salaries of the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii were similarly advanced, the chief justice receiving $10,500 per annum and the associate justices $10,000.

The duties and responsibilities of the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii are certainly no less than those of the judges of the district courts of the United States District Court for Hawaii. In fact the decisions of the Supreme Court of Hawaii on local questions are binding upon the Federal courts.

The Bar Association of Hawaii, in a brief filed with the House Judiciary Subcommittee, makes this statement:

Hawaii, as was remarked by Senator Collum in the debates on the organic act "is an old country and an old government." It is proud of its judicial system and its judges have been historically highly respected and fairly well paid. As far back as 1870 the compensation for the chief justice was fixed at $10,000 per annum. Prior to the adoption of the organic act, the salary of the chief justice was fixed at $12,000 per annum and each of the two associates at $10,000 per annum and after the establishment of the Republic of Hawaii the compensation of the chief justice and the associate justices was fixed at $12,000 and $10,000 per annum respectively and that of the circuit judges of the first circuit was fixed at $8,000.

It will be noted that with the adoption of the Hawaiian Organic Act, the salaries of the judges of the supreme court and circuit courts were more than cut in half. This no doubt was to bring the judges in Hawaii to a parity with district judges in the several States who in 1900 received $5,000 per annum. The compensation of the chief justice was fixed at $5,500 per annum and the associate justices at $5,000 per annum.

In view of the foregoing history it is little wonder that the Bar of Hawaii is exercised over the matter of the compensation of our Territorial judges.

The question of the salaries of these judges was not passed on by the judicial conference of the senior circuit judges as these courts do not come within the field of the responsibilities of the conference. The Administrative Office of the United States Courts is responsible for these judges only to the extent of placing in the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary appropriation bill the item necessary to cover the salaries of the judges. The total item for this purpose for the fiscal year 1948 was $96,500 and the fiscal year 1949 is $106,500.

Henry P. Chandler, in a letter to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee on this subject, makes this statement:

The increase in the salaries of United States district judges has definitely strengthened the desire in Hawaii for a corresponding increase in the salaries of the justices of the supreme court of that Territory. The increase provided for in the salaries of the justices of the supreme court would, in turn, call for an increase in the salaries of the circuit judges, if the two are to be kept in correspondence. In recognition mainly of the higher cost of living in the Territories, there is very generally in effect a differential of 25 percent in the salaries of Government employes in those areas. This difference is urged with considerable justice in support of higher salaries of the judges in Hawaii whose salaries are fixed by law. I am informed that according to the Consumers Price Index, prepared and reported from time to time by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, the cost of living in Honolulu in March 1945, which is the latest date for which the comparison was available, on the basis of 100 percent for Los Angeles, was 125 percent, or 25 percent higher. It would seem, however, that in any consideration of the salaries of the Territorial judges of Hawaii their total compensation from both the United States and from the Territory should be taken into account.

A letter was addressed to the House Judiciary Committee on June 27, 1947, by Douglas W. McGregor, the Assistant to the Attorney General. This related to H. R. 854. The latter is identical with S. 1052 except that the salary provided for judges of the circuit courts is $12,500 instead of $10,000 as provided in the House bill.

In his letter Mr. McGregor said:

Question has been raised as to whether the entire cost of operating these courts should not, in fact, be borne by the Territorial government in view of the local nature of the business handled by them, and an analogy is drawn to the situation in the District of Columbia where a certain percentage of the expenses of the courts is reimbursed to the United States from District of Columbia funds.

Your attention is invited to one other phase of this entire question. Sentiment has recently increased in favor of granting statehood to the Territory of Hawaii, and a measure of such import (H. R. 49) has received favorable consideration by the House Committee on Public Lands. Should statehood be granted to the Territory of Hawaii the questions involved in the bill here under consideration would be largely resolved. In such event it is presumed the expenses of operation of courts of purely local character would be borne by the local government and not by the Federal Government.

Whether this bill should be enacted involves a question of legislative policy concerning which this Department prefers not to make any suggestion.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

The answer to the proposal that these salaries be met by the Territory has already been presented.

The situation with reference to legislation providing statehood for Hawaii has now changed. The bill passed by the House providing statehood for Hawaii was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The committee on May 8 voted to defer action on the measure. The committee's action means the present session of Congress probably will adjourn without taking any action on this legislation.

Failure of this Congress to enact the legislation increasing the salaries of the judges of the Territory would be a great injustice and injurious to the general welfare of the judiciary.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not the purpose of this bill to bring the salaries of the judges affected up to that of other judges doing comparable work in the administration of United States law?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes; it is. The standard of compensation is that given the United States district court judges. When their salaries were increased to $15,000, our feeling was that our supreme court judges should go to the same figure. They get $10,000 at the present time.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman and to the House that nothing is further from my thought than to be unfair, and I am perfectly sure that one of the last places on earth where I would be unfair, were I to be so in any event, would be the lovely islands of Hawaii, particularly when represented by the distinguished gentleman who is the representative of those Islands at this time. I simply wish the House to be informed, however, that these are not Federal judges. These are Territorial judges. They were put upon the Federal pay roll because of the financial condition of the islands at the time of annexation. The problem that affects my attitude in this matter more than anything else is that there is grave doubt as to the situation that confronts the House in considering this bill.

First, if it be true that immediately upon granting of statehood to Hawaii this would cease, and Hawaii would assume the full burden of paying the salaries of said judges, then that is one thing which I submit would militate against approval of this bill when Hawaiian statehood may become a fact tonight, since the President of the United States has recommended it, the House has passed the statehood bill by an overwhelming majority, and all that is necessary is for the Senate's consent. But suppose that does not happen. Then, I submit that if you will read this bill carefully, as I have, you will see that nothing like that is stated in the bill, and for all time to come, insofar as the bill provides, the Federal Government will be saddled with the payment of the salaries of the 12 judges of the named courts in Hawaii, as well as our own judges exercising Federal jurisdiction that were taken care of in my act of 1946. Both of the Federal judges in Hawaii are already drawing that increased pay. So these other 12 judges at some $15,000 each ought not to be put upon the Federal pay roll permanently whether or not statehood ensues. If this bill does go through it will mean a big question mark, and it will be the first time in the history of the United States that any such risk has been run. We have gloried in the record of the distinguished gentleman representing these islands. I have no animus in the matter, but I do feel it my duty under the circumstances to ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice until the matter of statehood, at least, has been decided.

Please let me read the bill in question:

S. 1052

An act to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii

Be it enacted, etc., That the following salaries shall be paid to the several justices and judges hereinafter mentioned, namely:

To the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, $15,500 per year, and to each of the associate justices thereof, $15,000 per year.

To each of the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, $12,500.

SEC. 2. All of said salaries shall be paid in equal monthly installments.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first month next following its approval.

This is the letter I wrote on the date indicated:

JUNE 10, 1948.

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: In compliance with my promise, I went into the questions which trouble me arising out of the Senate bill 1052, increasing the salaries of certain Hawaiian judges, and I have restudied them in the light of the memorandum you submitted to me yesterday morning. Also in compliance with that promise I telephoned your office yesterday afternoon after I had been unable to find you on the floor or in the Capitol. I was told by your secretary, who was most gracious, that you were engaged in an important conference and could not be reached, so I left a message for you with her that still I was unable to change my attitude toward this legislation, as much as I regretted not being able to "go along."

May I clear up some points as to which there seems to be misapprehension as evidenced by the memoranda which have been submitted in support of the bill?

1. Public Law 567 did not omit the judges of the supreme and circuit courts of Hawaii inadvertently. The courts these judges serve are Territorial, not Federal. Herewith enclosed I beg to hand you a copy of Public Law 567, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 31, 1946. You will notice that it covers and increases the salaries of the judges of the several district courts of the United States, of Hawaii, and fixes their increased compensation at the rate of $15,000 per year, just as was fixed thereby for all other district courts exercising Federal jurisdiction.

2. Public Law 567, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, was designed to cover only judges exercising Federal jurisdiction, or, as we commonly refer to them, "title III judges." It was not intended to cover Territorial judges any more than it was intended to cover judges of State courts. Until the pas-

sage of the Reorganization Act the Judiciary Committees had no jurisdiction to propose legislation for Territorial courts nor their judges. This jurisdiction was in and exercised by the Committee on Territories. The only other bill similar to S. 1052 that has ever been handled by the Judiciary Committee of the House was the bill aimed at including the Territorial judges of Hawaii in the retirement system applying to Federal courts. This bill was adversed by our committee on the same theory which now applies to S. 1052.

3. The only exceptions to the rule I am following in this case are those caused by Senate amendments and not by any action of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

4. The Department of Justice did not and has not approved nor recommended the passage of S. 1052 nor its House counterpart.

5. Neither the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges nor the Administrative Office of the United States Courts had any jurisdiction with reference to the subject matter of S. 1052, since that bill relates exclusively to judges of Territorial courts; hence neither of these organizations nor the Bureau of the Budget has approved nor recommended this proposed legislation.

6. It is easy to understand and appreciate the attitude of the bench and bar of Hawaii toward the remedial legislation proposed by S. 1052. It should be borne in mind, however, that if Hawaii becomes a State, it would have to bear every cent of the cost of its State courts, including the judges, and these courts that are now Territorial would be by statehood converted into State courts. The President of the United States has recommended statehood for Hawaii, and the House passed the bill making Hawaii the forty-ninth State of our Union by an overwhelming majority. Should the Senate join in the enactment of the House bill, there would be no necessity whatever for the enactment of S. 1052, increasing the salaries provided for Territorial judges, who would then have become extinct.

Cordially your friend,

SAM HOBBS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6635) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6732) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in poliomyelitis and other diseases, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this legislation came to the House from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am hopeful that I may have the attention of the objectors if their mind is open. Unfortunately it would seem from the remarks that have been made, not for the record, but for my hearing at least, that the mind of at least one objector is not open.

It is difficult for me to conceive how any individual who has given even the slightest consideration to this bill would make any objection to it. This House during this session of Congress has made a splendid record in its effort to do those things that would be helpful in promoting the public health of this Nation. We have passed a bill that would set up a heart research institution, and a dental institute. We have already done so with respect to cancer. In numerous ways we have strengthened and built up the Public Health Service. We now have before us a bill that touches our very hearts. It deals with that type of dread disease that has come into many homes. It is a disease that may strike overnight. To see the victims of polio handicapped as they are so frequently touches the heart of every human being. To see a child who has been afflicted with polio creates in us a desire to help. It creates a feeling of thankfulness that our own little ones have not felt its devastation, and a prayer for those who have.

This bill permits the Surgeon General to study the question with the thought in mind that after such study and survey there might be with his approval set up an institute for research in this disease that strikes our little ones, and even older persons so frequently, and so often creates epidemics. I do hope that no one will object to the consideration of this bill. Think of those in whose interest we seek to provide this helpful service. Think of those whom we seek to help and those whom we seek to guard against the ravages of this disease. I hope in the interest of these that the objectors and other Members of the House will permit this bill to go through the House today, so that this worthy bill may have the attention of the Senate at this session of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey that the bill go over without prejudice?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6657) to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GOODWIN. I object.

AIR PARCEL POST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COURT REVIEW OF ORDERS OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1470) to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

THREE-JUDGE DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2271) to incorporate into the Judicial Code the provisions of certain statutes relating to three-judge district courts, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMISSION TO HEAR AND DETERMINE THE CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1260) to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. BYRNES of Wisconsin, DAVIS of Wisconsin, and SCRIVNER objected.

TRAINING OF AIR-TRAFFIC-CONTROL-TOWER OPERATORS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3) to provide for the training of air-traffic-control operators.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority side has no report on this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this is a Senate bill and comes under a Senate report which accompanies the bill in House Report No. 2207. It is a bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. MCCARRAN. I trust the gentleman will not object.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, we have no report on this side.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman like to hear what the bill does?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. It authorizes a program for air-traffic-control-tower operators, both civilian and governmental. In connection with the training program, it authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Administrator to conduct studies and researches as to the most desirable qualifications for air-traffic-control-tower operators. This bill provides that the Civil Aeronautics Administrator shall propose a budget in connection with it in the

next budget presentation. It makes no appropriation at the present time. We find it very difficult indeed to secure competent control-tower operators and you know how important that is to air traffic in your own home cities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 302 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, to train civilian and governmental air-traffic-control-tower operators or to conduct programs for such training, including studies and researches as to the most desirable qualifications for air-traffic-control-tower operators. Such training or programs shall be conducted pursuant to such regulations as the Administrator may from time to time prescribe, including such fees as the Administrator may deem necessary or desirable. Such training or programs may be carried out by the Administrator either through the use of his own facilities and personnel or by contracts with educational institutions, or other persons.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to lease or accept loans of such real property, and to purchase, lease, exchange, or accept loans of such personal property and facilities, and to repair, maintain, and operate such property and such facilities, as may be necessary or desirable for carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(3) For the purpose of carrying out his functions under this section, the Administrator is authorized to exercise all powers conferred upon him by any other provisions of this act and to appoint and fix the compensation for instructors, airmen, medical and other professional examiners, and experts in training or research without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to contracts with educational institutions and other persons for the use of aircraft, control towers, or other facilities or for the performance of services authorized by this section.

"(4) Any executive department or independent establishment is hereby authorized to cooperate with the Administrator in carrying out the purposes of this section, and for such purposes may lend or transfer to the Administrator, by contract or otherwise, or if so requested by the Administrator, lend to educational institutions or other persons cooperating with the Administrator in the conduct of any such training or program, officials, experts, or employees, aircraft, control towers and other property or equipment, and lands or buildings under its control. For the purposes of this section, the Administrator shall have the power to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, equipment, facilities, and information of any State, Territory, or political subdivision, or any agency thereof.

"(5) Any executive department or independent establishment is hereby authorized to detail personnel of such executive department or independent establishment to be trained as provided herein at Government expense: *Provided*, That no such personnel shall lose their individual status or seniority rating in the executive department or independent establishment merely by reason of absence due to such training.

"(6) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARIES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES IN PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2508) relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have no reports on any of the bills following on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I will have to ask for a short explanation on each of these bills. I would like to have an explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the pay of certain employees who are on the pay roll in Puerto Rico representing the Federal Government and also for the annual salaries of the chief justice and associate justices of Puerto Rico, whose salaries remain at $6,000 under the organic act passed by the Congress many, many years ago. This is a bill to somewhat alleviate the economic pressure under which these public officials find themselves in that their salaries cannot be increased by reason of the fixation of the organic act.

The committee has unanimously approved the bill and feels that these increases are justified.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if those are Territorial judges or Federal judges?

Mr. CRAWFORD. These are the salaries of the chief justice and associate justices of Puerto Rico whose salaries were fixed by organic act.

Mr. HOBBS. They are Territorial judges?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOBBS. Not Territorial judges.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Insular possessions.

Mr. HOBBS. Well, whatever they are.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of section 49b of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 793b (1)) is amended by striking out "$7,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000 to be paid out of funds appropriated by Congress for such purpose."

SEC. 2. Section 50 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, secs. 797 and 798) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 50. Except as otherwise provided in this or any other act, the salaries and office expenses of all officials of Puerto Rico, including deputies, assistants, and other help, shall be such and be so paid out of the revenues of Puerto Rico as shall from time to time be determined by the legislature of Puerto Rico and approved by the Governor; and if the legislature shall fail to make an appropriation for such salaries, the salaries theretofore fixed shall be paid without the necessity of further appropriations therefor. Until otherwise prescribed as provided by this section the annual salary of the Governor shall be $10,000; in addition to which he shall be entitled to the occupancy of the buildings heretofore used by the chief executive of Puerto Rico, with the furniture and effects therein, free of rental; and the annual salary of the head of each executive department shall be $6,000.

"Notwithstanding the foregoing, the annual salary of the chief justice of the supreme court shall be $10,500, and the annual salary of each associate justice of the supreme court shall be $10,000. All of said salaries of the chief justice and associate justices shall be paid in equal monthly installments.

"Where any officer, during such time as his salary is fixed by this act, is required to give a bond, the premium thereof shall be paid from the insular treasury."

SEC. 3. So much of section 34 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 838) as reads "Except as otherwise provided in this act, no law shall extend the term of any public officer, or increase or diminish his salary or emoluments after his election or appointment, nor permit any officer or employee to draw compensation for more than one office or position." is amended to read as follows:

"Except as otherwise provided in this act, no law shall extend the term of any public officer, permit any officer or employee to draw compensation for more than one office or position, or increase or diminish the salary or emoluments of any senator or representative during the term for which he is elected or appointed."

SEC. 4. Section 31 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 620) is amended by striking out "That members" and inserting in lieu thereof "Until otherwise prescribed pursuant to section 50 of this act, members."

SEC. 5. Section 20 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 786) is amended by inserting after "$6,000" the following: "or such other sum not less than that payable to the head of any executive department as may be prescribed pursuant to section 50 of this act."

SEC. 6. Section 22 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 779) is amended by inserting after "$5,000" the following: "or such other sum as may be prescribed pursuant to section 50 of this act."

SEC. 7. The third and fourth sentences of section 38 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 750) are amended to read as follows: "The public service commissioner shall devote his entire time to his duties as such commissioner. Until otherwise prescribed pursuant to section 50 of this act—

"(a) the salary of the public service commissioner shall be $6,000 a year, and

"(b) the compensation of the associated members shall be $10 for each day's attendance at the sessions of the commission, but in no case shall they receive more than $1,000 during any 1 year."

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2675) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain briefly what this bill does?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The purpose of this bill is to exempt Puerto Ricans, who were collectively naturalized as citizens of the United States, from the expatriation provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

Now, we have this situation with respect to Puerto Rico. When we took over Puerto Rico some 50 years ago they went ahead under the jurisdiction of the United States until the organic act was passed, at which time Puerto Ricans were made citizens of the United States and naturalized. Then in 1940 there was an act passed which provided that if Puerto Ricans who had, prior to that time become naturalized citizens of the United States under the act of Congress should leave Puerto Rico, for instance to go to Brazil, and remove themselves from Puerto Rico for a period of 5 years, let us say, that they would lose their citizenship. That was the 1940 act. This bill seeks to remedy that situation; that Puerto Ricans, who are citizens of the United States, may leave Puerto Rico for a period of 5 years, and still retain their citizenship as citizens of the United States, and the committee has felt that they should thus be protected.

Mr. CARROLL. Was this bill unanimously reported?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand, the bill was reported unanimously by the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. CARROLL. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (39 Stat. 951) is amended by inserting the following new section:

"SEC. 5b. Section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 804 (c)), shall not be applicable to persons who acquired citizenship under the provisions of sections 5 and 5a of this act." This amendment to be retroactive to October 13, 1945.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSERVATION OF FRESH WATER AT END OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 618) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report on the feasibility from the standpoint of national defense and other beneficial purposes of the conservation of fresh water at the northerly end of San Francisco Bay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, after hearing the explanation on H. R. 750, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the proper conservation and use of the waters arising in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Basins of California constitute an invaluable resource to the State of California and the Nation; and

Whereas the development of the major portion of the central part of the State of California depends upon the wise utilization and conservation of those waters; and

Whereas there are needs for further fresh-water supplies in the Delta area of the Sacramento River down to San Francisco Bay; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior has made a portion of the investigation necessary to ascertain the best means to provide fresh-water supplies for reclamation, domestic, and municipal purposes in this area; and

Whereas any means to conserve and utilize fresh water in the Delta and upper bay areas would have to be coordinated with the operation of Shasta Dam, Keswick Dam, Friant Dam, the Contra Costa Canal, and other facilities of the Central Valley project, and pertinent features of future development in the Central Valley, such as the Monticello Reservoir of the Solano project, such features being constructed and operated, or planned, by the Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas the San Francisco Bay area and the territory adjacent thereto are of high strategic importance to any adequate defense of the Pacific Coast; and

Whereas the conservation and use of such fresh waters is important to the maintenance of defense facilities in this area, such as Mare Island Navy Yard, Hunters Point Navy Yard, Risdon Naval Plant, Oakland Naval Air Base, Oakland Supply Base, Stockton Annex Navy Supply Depot, Benicia Arsenal, the Presidio Military Reservation, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Mason, the Army transport docks, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, United States Army Signal Department, Stockton General Depot, United States Army Moffett Air Field, United States Bombardment Base Mather Field Air Force, Fairfield-Suisun Air Base United States Air Force, Sacramento-McClellan United States Air Field, Merced Air Field United States Air Force; and

Whereas because of the huge shift of population to California unparalleled in the history of this Nation, even with normal precipitation it will be impossible to meet the demands of the civilian population, let alone the military and defense and power facilities required for their support unless the limited water supplies are utilized to the fullest possible degree; and

Whereas it is estimated that some 37,700,000 acre-feet of fresh water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers are now wasting into the Bay of San Francisco annually; and

Whereas it is imperative that necessary steps be taken at the earliest practicable moment to conserve fresh water for semiarid California in the interest of the economy and the development of the area and of the national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and report upon the feasibility and the justification of means to conserve, maintain, and utilize the fresh waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and other possible water supplies at the northerly end of San Francisco Bay and in the Delta area, and in this connection to consider the water requirements and facilities required to provide water supplies to lands which are now irrigated or may be reclaimed, and for domestic, municipal, and defense purposes in the affected area, and any other features deemed pertinent, desirable, and justifiable, all to be contained in a report with appropriate recommendations to be forwarded to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior as soon as practicable.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 2, strike out "is hereby authorized and directed to" and insert "should."

Page 3, line 15, strike out section 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report on the feasibility from the standpoint of national defense and other beneficial purposes of the conservation of fresh water at the northerly end of San Francisco Bay."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR HOME AND OTHER SITES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5555) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the same situation obtains here as with respect to H. R. 750. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended by the act approved July 14, 1945 (59 Stat. 467; 43 U. S. C. sec. 682 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to sell or lease to any person or organization described in section 3 of this act a tract of not exceeding five acres of any vacant, unreserved public lands, public lands withdrawn by Executive Orders Nos. 6910 of November 26, 1934, and 6964 of February 5, 1935, for classification, or public lands withdrawn or reserved by the Secretary of the Interior for any purposes, which the Secretary may classify as chiefly valuable for residence, recreation, business, or community site purposes, in reasonably compact form and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, at a price to be determined by him, for such use: *Provided*, That no land may be sold hereunder unless it has been surveyed. No person or organization shall be permitted to purchase or lease more than one tract under the provisions of this act, except upon a showing of good faith and reasons satisfactory to the Secretary.

"SEC. 2. No tract shall be sold for less than the cost of making any survey necessary to describe properly the land sold. Patents for all tracts purchased under the provisions of this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

"SEC. 3. A lease may be issued or a sale made under this act to any of the following: (a) An individual who is a citizen of the United States, or who has filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen as required by the naturalization laws; (b) a partnership or an association, each of the members of which is a citizen of the United States or has filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen; (c) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof, and authorized to do business in the State or Territory in which the land is located; (d) a State, Territory, municipality, or other governmental subdivision.

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Department of the Interior, stationed in Alaska, notwithstanding such employment, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, purchase or lease under this act one tract for residence purposes in the Territory of Alaska."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "purposes", insert "if he finds that such sale or lease of the lands would not unreasonably interfere with the use of water for grazing purposes nor unduly impair the protection of watershed areas."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES TRAVEL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6136) to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 773), entitled "An act to encourage travel in the United States, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to encourage, promote, and develop travel within the United States, its Territories and possessions, providing such activities do not compete with the activities of private agencies. For the purpose of performing the functions prescribed by this act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior a bureau, to be designated the 'United States Travel Bureau,' which shall be under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. The chief administrative officer of the United States Travel Bureau shall be a Director, suitably qualified by education and experience relating to travel promotion and development, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. There shall also be in the United States Travel Bureau such additional employees, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, as shall be required to execute properly the functions prescribed by this act. The Secretary is authorized and directed to take such action, through the United States Travel Bureau, as he may deem appropriate to carry out the intent and the provisions of this act efficiently and in the public interest. In the administration of this act, the Secretary may also utilize the facilities or services of any other agency of the Department of the Interior."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of said act of July 19, 1940, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 1, line 10, after "of", insert "public or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6695) to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation of the purpose of this bill?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a year ago this Congress lifted the ceiling on salaries of employees who are trained scientists so the War and Navy Departments may employ as many as 45 men who are trained in science, and can pay as high as $15,000 per year if they desire to do so. They have filled only six of these positions. That legislation applied only to the War and Navy Departments. This bill assigns 10 of those positions to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, so that they can employ men at salaries of more than $10,000 a year if they see fit to do so. This is a very important piece of legislation for the reason that the National Advisory Committee is presently engaged in some very highly technical research and needs scientists.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. As I understand, this bill provides for employing up to 10 of these professional men at salaries in excess of $10,000, but what salaries will they get?

Mr. REES. I am glad to explain. It should be explained. Those who testified on behalf of the agencies told us they will pay salaries of about $12,000, but they may have to pay one or two of the men as high as $15,000. These trained men whom they need can go into industry, as the gentleman well knows, and earn higher salaries than $15,000. They say that a number of these men are leaving the Government. The most valuable men are leaving the Government and going into private industry.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas whether full hearings were held on the bill?

Mr. REES. Full hearings were held. Dr. Alfred M. Richardson, who is president of the National Academy of Science, and who is familiar with the problem, called our attention to the fact that we are spending millions of dollars in research presently in connection with our defense program. Compared to that sum, the small amount involved in this bill is infinitesimal.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Was the committee unanimous in its report?

Mr. REES. The committee was unanimous. The chairman of the committee, as the gentleman knows, happens to be one of those who have always tried to hold the ceilings down just as much as could be done within reason, but he is convinced, and every member of the committee was convinced, that this proposed legislation is necessary at the present time and ought to be passed. I do appreciate the gentleman's interest in this matter. It appears to be a case of necessity.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am sure the gentleman and I are equally interested in economy. I thank him for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments", approved August 1, 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows: "That (a) the Secretary of the Army is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within the Department of the Army, not more than 30 positions, and the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within the Department of the Navy, not more than 15 positions, in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the Department of the Army or the Department of the Navy which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed 10 positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.

"(c) The rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act of August 1, 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively, shall submit to the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report setting forth the number of positions established pursuant to this act in the Department of the Army, in the Department of the Navy, and in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively, during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each. In any instance where the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics may consider full public report on these items detrimental to the national security, he is authorized to omit such items from his annual report and, in lieu thereof, to present such information in executive sessions of such committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as the presiding officers of those bodies shall designate."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILL OF 1948

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6007) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity,

and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a very important bill. We passed it in the House once but the President vetoed it. I think it is too important to be brought up by unanimous consent. I therefore object.

FOREST SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2028) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I had intended to object to the consideration of this bill because of the committee amendment inserting section 12. My understanding is that this committee amendment will be withdrawn. May I ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF] if that is correct?

Mr. GOFF. I am authorized to state for the chairman of the committee that if consent is given to the consideration of the bill we will withdraw the committee amendment to which the gentleman refers, that is, the one inserting section 12.

Mr. ROCKWELL. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of existing law and without regard to section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255), but within the limitations of cost otherwise applicable, appropriations of the Forest Service may be expended for the erection of buildings, lookout towers, and other structures on land owned by States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, corporations, or individuals: *Provided*, That prior to such erection there is obtained the right to use the land for the estimated life of or need for the structure.

SEC. 2. That so much of the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. 415, 429, 16 U. S. C. 504), as provides: "That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may procure such seed, cones, and nursery stock by open purchase, without advertisements for proposals, whenever in his discretion such method is most economical and in the public interest and when the cost thereof will not exceed $500:", is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to any purchase by the Forest Service of forest-tree seed or cones or of forage plant seed when the amount involved does not exceed $10,000, nor to any purchase of forest-tree nursery stock when the amount involved does not exceed $500, whenever, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, such method is in the public interest."

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to purchases by the Forest Service of (1) materials to be tested or upon which experiments are to be made or (2) special devices, test models, or parts thereof, to be used (a) for experimentation to determine their suitability for or adaptability to accomplishment of the work for which designed or (b) in the designing or developing of new equipment: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 may be expended in any one fiscal year pursuant to this authority.

SEC. 4. That section 205 of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, approved September 21, 1944 (Public Law 425, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. The Forest Service by contract or otherwise may provide for procurement and operation of aerial facilities and services for the protection and management of the national forests, with authority to renew any contract for such purpose annually, not more than twice, without additional advertising."

SEC. 5. That section 1 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1132; 16 U. S. C. 572), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. (a) The Forest Service is authorized to cooperate with, or where the public interest justifies, assist public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and persons in performing work on land in State, county, municipal, or private ownership, situated within or near a national forest, for which the administering agency, owner, or other interested party deposits in one or more payments a sufficient sum to cover the total estimated cost or the depositor's share thereof, for administration, protection, improvement, reforestation, and such other kinds of work as the Forest Service is authorized to do on lands of the United States: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be liable to the depositor or landowner for any damage incident to the performance of such work.

"(b) Cooperation and assistance on the same basis as that authorized in subsection (a) is authorized also in the performance of any such kinds of work in connection with the occupancy or use of the national forests or other lands administered by the Forest Service.

"(c) Moneys deposited under this section shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby made available until expended for payment of the cost of work performed by the Forest Service and for refunds to depositors of amounts deposited by them in excess of their share of said cost: *Provided*, That when deposits are received for a number of similar types of work on adjacent or overlapping areas, or on areas which in the aggregate are determined to cover a single work unit, they may be expended on such combined areas for the purposes for which deposited, in which event refunds to the depositors of the total amount of the excess deposits involved will be made on a proportionate basis: *Provided further*, That when so provided by written agreement payment for work undertaken pursuant to this section may be made from any Forest Service appropriation available for similar types of work, and reimbursement received from said agencies, organizations, institutions, or persons covering their proportionate share of the cost shall be deposited to the credit of the Forest Service appropriation from which initially paid or to appropriations for similar purposes currently available at the time of deposit: *Provided further*, That when by the terms of a written agreement either party thereto furnishes materials, supplies, equipment, or services for fire emergencies in excess of its proportionate share, adjustment may be made by reimbursement or by replacement in kind of supplies, materials, and equipment consumed or destroyed in excess of the furnishing party's proportionate share."

SEC. 6. That so much of the act of August 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 446, 462; 16 U. S. C. 490), as provides: "That hereafter deposits may be received from timber purchasers in such sums as the Secretary of Agriculture may require to cover the cost to the United States of disposing of brush and other debris resulting from cutting operations in sales of national-forest timber; such deposits shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, to pay the cost of such work and to make refunds to the depositors of amounts deposited by them in excess of such cost.", is hereby amended to read as follows: "Purchasers of national-forest timber may be required to deposit the estimated cost to the United States of disposing of brush and other debris resulting from their cutting operations, such deposits to be covered into the Treasury and constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and shall remain available for three fiscal years following the year of deposit: *Provided*, That any deposits in excess of the amount expended for disposals shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts, forest-reserve fund, to be credited to the receipts of the year in which such transfer is made."

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture, under such regulations as he may prescribe and at rates and for periods not exceeding 30 years as determined by him, is hereby authorized to permit the use by public and private agencies, corporations, firms, associations, or individuals, of structures or improvements under the administrative control of the Forest Service and land used in connection therewith: *Provided*, That as all or a part of the consideration for permits issued under this section, the Secretary may require the permittees at their expense to recondition and maintain the structures to a satisfactory standard.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to furnish persons attending Forest Service demonstrations, and users of national-forest resources and recreational facilities, with meals, lodging, bedding, fuel, and other services, where such facilities are not otherwise available, at rates approximating but not less than the actual or estimated cost thereof and to deposit all moneys received therefor to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost thereof is paid, or a similar appropriation current at the time the moneys are received: *Provided*, That such receipts obtained in excess of $10,000 in any one fiscal year shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, to sell forest-tree seed and nursery stock to States and political subdivisions thereof and to public agencies of other countries, at rates not less than the actual or estimated cost to the United States of procuring or producing such seed or nursery stock, moneys received from the sale thereof to be credited to the appropriation or appropriations of the Forest Service currently available for the procurement or production of seed or nursery stock at the time such moneys are deposited: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may exchange with such public agencies forest-tree seed and nursery stock for forest-tree seed or nursery stock of the same or different species upon a determination that such exchange is in the interest of the United States and that the value of the property given in exchange does not exceed the value of the property received: *Provided further*, That no nursery stock shall be sold or exchanged under this section as ornamental or other stock for landscape planting of the types commonly grown by established commercial nurserymen.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 7 of the act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U. S. C. 679), appropriations for the protection and management of the national forests shall be available to pay for telephone service installed in residences of seasonal employees and of persons cooperating with the Forest Service who reside within or near the national forests when such installation is needed in protecting the national forests: *Provided*, That in addition to the monthly local service charge the Government may pay only such tolls or other

charges as are required strictly for the public business.

SEC. 11. Whenever such action is deemed to be in the public interest, the Forest Service is authorized to pay from any appropriation available for the protection and management of the national forests all or any part of the cost of leasing, seeding, and protective fencing of public range land other than national-forest land and privately owned land intermingled with or adjacent to national-forest or other land administered by the Forest Service, if the use of the land to be seeded is controlled by the Forest Service under a lease or agreement which in the judgment of the Chief of the Forest Service gives the Forest Service control over the land for a sufficient period to justify such expenditures: *Provided*, That payment may not be made under authority of this section for the seeding of more than 1,000 acres in any one private ownership: *Provided further*, That payment may not be made under authority of this section for the seeding of more than 25,000 acres in any one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the period of any lease under this authority may not exceed 20 years.

SEC. 12. Appropriations of the Forest Service available for fire protection on the national forests or for cooperation with State and other agencies in fire protection may be expended for the procurement of printed material needed to conduct campaigns for the prevention of forest fires: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "National-forest protection and management," and not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriation for "Forest-fire cooperation" may be transferred in any one fiscal year to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Agriculture," for such purposes.

SEC. 13. That section 5 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1133; 16 U. S. C. 555), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Where no suitable Government land is available for national-forest headquarters, ranger stations, dwellings, or for other sites required for the effective conduct of the authorized activities of the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to purchase such lands out of the appropriation applicable to the purpose for which the land is to be used, and to accept donations of land for any national-forest or experimental purpose: *Provided*, That such lands may be acquired subject to such reservations and outstanding interests as the Secretary determines will not interfere with the purpose for which acquired: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $25,000 may be expended in any one fiscal year pursuant to this authority."

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated—

(a) such sums as may be necessary for the acquisition of parcels of land and interests in land in Sanders County, Mont., needed by the Forest Service to provide winter range for its saddle, pack, and draft animals;

(b) not to exceed $15,000 for the acquisition of additional land adjacent to the present site of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.; and

(c) not to exceed $25,000 for the acquisition of one helicopter landing site in southern California.

Land acquired under this section may be subject to such reservations and outstanding interests as the Secretary of Agriculture determines will not interfere with the purpose for which acquired.

SEC. 15. That section 6 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1133; 16 U. S. C. 557), is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That when a transient without permanent residence, or any other person while away from his place of residence, is temporarily employed by the Forest Service and while so employed becomes disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, he may be provided hospitalization and other necessary medical care, subsistence, and lodging for a period of not to exceed 15 days during such disability, the cost thereof to be payable from any funds available to the Forest Service applicable to the work for which such person is employed."

SEC. 16. Appropriations of the Forest Service chargeable with salaries and wages shall be available for payment to temporary employees of the Forest Service for loss of time due to injury in official work at rates not in excess of those provided by the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C., 751 and the following), when the injured person is in need of immediate financial assistance to avoid hardship: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made for a period in excess of 15 days and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission shall be notified promptly of the amount so paid, which amount shall be deducted from the amount, if any, otherwise payable by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission to the employee on account of the injury, the amount so deducted by the Commission to be paid to the Forest Service for deposit to the credit of the Forest Service appropriation from which the expenditure was made: *Provided further*, That when any person assisting in the suppression of forest fires or in other emergency work under the direction of the Forest Service, without compensation from the United States, pursuant to the terms of a contract, agreement, or permit, is injured in such work, the Forest Service may furnish hospitalization and other medical care, subsistence, and lodging for a period of not to exceed 15 days during such disability, the cost thereof to be payable from the appropriation applicable to the work upon which the injury occurred, except that this proviso shall not apply when such person is within the purview of a State or other compensation act: *Provided further*, That determination by the Forest Service that payment is allowable under this section shall be final as to payments made hereunder, but such determination or payments with respect to employees shall not prevent the United States Employees' Compensation Commission from denying further payments should the Commission determine that compensation is not properly allowable under the provisions of the Employees' Compensation Act.

SEC. 17. (a) Section 2 of the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1132; 16 U. S. C. 571); the second proviso in section 1 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699; 16 U. S. C. 581); and section 1 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 387; 16 U. S. C. 573), are hereby repealed.

(b) The second proviso in section 13 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, 963), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Section 1: At the end of the section, strike out the period and substitute in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "including the right to remove any such structure within a reasonable time after the termination of the right to use the land."

Section 3: Immediately preceding the period at the end of the section, insert the following: "and not to exceed $10,000 on any one item or purchase."

Section 4: Strike out "(Public Law 425, 78th Cong.)" and substitute in lieu thereof: "(58 Stat. 736, 16 U. S. C. 579a)".

Section 5: In the first line of subsection (a) insert after the word "authorized" a comma and the following: "where the public interest justifies,"; strike out the same words where they appear in the second line of that subsection, and also strike out the comma after the word "with" in that line.

Section 6: In the new language of this section, after the words "shall remain available" (p. 6, line 5), strike out the words "for three fiscal years following the year of deposit" and insert in lieu thereof the words "until expended."

Section 7: In the last line of this section, after the word "structures", insert the words "and land."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Following section 11 insert a new section, numbered 12, as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Agriculture, when in his judgment such action will be in the public interest, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, may require any grazing permittee of a national forest to make deposits of money, in addition to payments for the use of the range, to cover the cost to the United States of (1) artificial revegetation, including the collection or purchase of necessary seed, (2) construction and maintenance of drift or division fences and stock-watering places, bridges, corrals, driveways, or other necessary range improvements, (3) control of range-destroying rodents, or (4) eradication of poisonous plants and noxious weeds, on such national forest in order to protect or improve the future productivity of the range: *Provided*, That such deposits shall constitute a special fund, without fiscal year limitation, to be available to cover the cost to the United States of such artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous or noxious plants: *Provided further*, That whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that any portion of any deposit is in excess of the cost of doing said work, such excess shall be transferred to Miscellaneous Receipts, Forest Reserve Fund, as a national-forest receipt of the fiscal year in which such transfer is made."

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this committee amendment be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Section 12 et seq.: Change the section numbers to conform to the above amendment.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the previous amendment inserting a new section 12 was withdrawn, it is unnecessary to change the section numbers. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Section 14, in subsection (b), strike out "$15,000" and insert "$50,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4330) to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until such time as the President shall determine and proclaim

that a German Government capable of representing its own nationals in the United States and its Territories and possessions has been established, and under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, the Department of State is authorized to perform consular functions for German nationals within the United States and its Territories and possessions, and to collect fees and make charges for services rendered: *Provided*, That any money so received shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6822) to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of Ohio). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the author of the bill how long this continues these two additional Secretaries of State?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, up to 1946 we had four Assistant Secretaries of State. At that time we appointed two additional Assistant Secretaries of State for what was in effect a term of 2 years. This term will expire on December 31, 1948. I do not think it requires argument to show that at the present time our foreign relations and the work of the Secretary of State with reference thereto is fully as complex and voluminous as it was at that time. All this bill does is to extend that time for 1 year further.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman inform the House whether these Secretaries are concerned with the Voice of America?

Mr. JONKMAN. Of course, it falls within the province of one of these Secretaries, but, if this bill is not passed, it would not be certain as to which two Assistant Secretaries of State would be eliminated. There would have to be a general reshuffling so as to have the work now done by six Assistant Secretaries of State done by four Assistant Secretaries of State.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, insofar as this is only for a period of 1 year and recognizing that the affairs of the State Department are in a horrible mess, I withdraw my reservation of objection in the hope that in another year things will improve.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of December 8, 1944 (58 Stat. 798), is hereby amended by deleting the words "not to exceed 2 years" and inserting in lieu thereof, the words "not to exceed 3 years."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6698) to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill if the course of instruction is paid for by the Philippine Republic or by the United States.

Mr. TOWE. By the United States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Why should the United States be paying for their instruction now that they have been given their independence?

Mr. TOWE. We have done it on other occasions. We have men at both Academies.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is that the custom of the United States, to pay for it, as well as the Philippines?

Mr. TOWE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw the reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not exceeding four Filipinos at a time, one for each class, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. The Filipinos receiving instruction under authority of this act shall receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments, to be paid from the same appropriations, and, subject to such exceptions as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as midshipmen at the Naval Academy appointed from the United States; but such persons shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Navy by reason of their graduation from the Naval Academy.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "time", strike out "one for each class."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECREATIONAL PARK ON THE GROUNDS OF UNITED STATES NAVAL HOSPITAL, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2251) to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., for the convenience and pleasure of the patients of that hospital.

SEC. 2. The site of the recreational park and its construction shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. The construction of the recreational park and all work performed in connection therewith shall be without cost to the United States.

SEC. 3. Upon completion of the recreational park the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to accept it as an unconditional gift to the United States from the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT MOULTRIE MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2912) providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed without compensation to the State of South Carolina, that portion of land constituting the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation, together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined by him to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right without paying compensation to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the State of South Carolina shall, at any time, cease to use the property so conveyed for public purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "War" and insert the words "the Army."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "War" and insert after the word "Department" the words "of the Army."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the words "War or" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "Navy," insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACKSON BARRACKS MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3479) providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has there been any inquiry made of the Veterans' Administration as to whether any of this property might be used for veterans' hospitals?

Mr. ELSTON. We did not hear of any objection on the part of the Veterans' Administration. There was nothing before our committee indicating that the Veterans' Administration could use this property for hospital purposes.

Mr. BROOKS. I hardly think they are suitable for that purpose, in any event.

Mr. ELSTON. I think not.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed without compensation to the State of Louisiana that portion of land constituting the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation situated in Orleans Parish, La., together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right without paying compensation to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the State of Louisiana shall at any time cease to use the property so conveyed for military purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 4. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that the action of the Governor of the State of Louisiana in receiving the property described herein on behalf of the State of Louisiana shall be subject to the power of the Legislature of Louisiana to rescind the donation and stipulations made pursuant thereto, as required by section 64 of Act 164 of the Regular Session of 1940, as amended, acts of the Legislature of Louisiana.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the word "War" and, after the word "Department", insert "of the Army."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "War" and insert "the Army."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "War" and after the word "Department", insert "of the Army."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "War" and insert "the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT NEW YORK NAVAL SHIPYARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6709) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York a perpetual easement in, over, and upon a twenty-nine one-hundredths acre parcel of land at the New York Naval Shipyard.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to grant to the city of New York without cost to said city, and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may consider appropriate, a perpetual easement for public-highway purposes in, over, and upon a parcel of land containing twenty-nine one-hundredths acre, more or less, lying between the New York Naval Shipyard, Hudson Avenue and York Street in the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, metes-and-bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY JUSTICE IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5937) to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have this bill explained.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the purpose of providing for the administration of military justice in the United States Air Force. A similar bill has passed the other body. I might say to the gentleman that the only purpose in asking for the passage of this legislation is to take care of the situation that exists in the Air Force by reason of the opinion of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force to the effect that if this legislation is not passed some habeas corpus proceedings might be brought by new enlistees.

Under the National Security Act, and an administrative order issued thereunder, the Air Force, for a period of 2 years beginning July 26, 1947, was vested with the same authority exercised by the Army in court-martial cases, except as to cases on appeal.

The purpose of this bill is to establish in the United States Air Force the office of the Judge Advocate General of the United States Air Force. The Judge Advocate General shall be an officer with the rank of major general. That does not mean a new general is to be created. It will simply result in the assignment of a major general from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Air Force.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman is not trying to set up a separate military judicial system for the Air Corps?

Mr. ELSTON. Not at all; and I might say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Defense has already appointed a committee with a view to having that committee recommend a uniform system of military justice for all the services.

Mr. CARROLL. Is this bill recommended by the Judge Advocate of the Army?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; and by the Secretary of Defense. The primary purpose of this bill is to permit the Air Force to handle its own cases including those on appeal until a uniform system is set up, and to remove any doubt as to the legality of any proceedings in the Air Force.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think we need three systems of military justice in the three services, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force? I thought there was to be a major consolidation with unification of the services, that whereas we have heretofore had two systems of military justice, one for the Navy and one for the Army, that there would be one that applied to all the services. It now appears that there is to be a third system of military justice, this time for the Air Corps, and instead of having unification we are having an expansion and an increase. Does the gentleman think there should be three systems of military justice in the service?

Mr. ELSTON. I do not permanently. I asked the same question, I might say, when we began hearings on the Army justice bill. There is a difference between the systems in the Army and the Navy. It would not be possible for the Army system to apply in all respects to the Navy. Since our hearings were completed and after the passage of the Army bill, the Secretary of Defense indicated he intended to appoint a committee for the purpose of recommending to the next Congress a unified bill that will be applicable to all the services.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is the author of the bill which was passed in the House setting up the system of military justice in the Army. That bill was

debated for several days. This is a highly important bill. Does the gentleman think this type of bill should be passed on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; I think as far as this bill is concerned it should because I consider it simply stopgap legislation until a unified plan can be prepared.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to empower the Secretary of the United States Air Force to administer military justice under existing law over its own personnel to the same extent as the Army and the Navy. The bill specifically provides that the Articles of War shall be of equal force and effect with respect to the United States Air Force as they presently apply to the United States Army, creates the Office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, and provides for designation of the United States Air Force officers as judge advocates.

The responsibilities and duties of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, and judge advocates, United States Air Force, will be identical with those of the Judge Advocate General of the Army and members of his department, respectively.

Following the passage of the National Security Act of 1947 the Secretaries of Defense, Army, and Air Force agreed that, since military justice is a judicial function, the establishment of such functions in the United States Air Force should be by congressional action, rather than by means of a transfer order of the Secretary of Defense under the National Security Act.

Pursuant to the foregoing agreements, the air judge advocate assumes all judge advocate functions within the Air Force, relative to military justice, except appellate review and confirmation of sentences. Staff judge advocates, trial judge advocates, defense counsel, members of the court, and convening authorities are Air Force personnel appointed by Air Force officers. In spite of the fact that the Air Force personnel are accomplishing more than 90 percent of the judge-advocate duties in the Department of Air, the Department of the Air Force ceases to have any further responsibility or authority over a general-court-martial case after findings and sentence of the court. The record of trial is forwarded directly to the Department of the Army for appellate review in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army and, when required by statute, for confirmation by the Secretary of the Army.

At the present time there are a total of 46 active court-martial jurisdictions of the United States Air Force in the United States and overseas. A recent summary, covering a 6 months' period, revealed that the Air Force was processing court-martial cases at the following rates per thousand: General-court-martial cases, 0.45; special-court-martial cases, 2.03; summary-court-martial cases, 4.52.

In furtherance of the agreement of the Secretaries that the Air Force would assume complete responsibility for the administration of military justice in the Air Force, 60 former officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army have been transferred to the United States Air Force, and an additional 125 qualified lawyers were commissioned in the Air Force for the performance of military-justice functions, all of whom had wartime experience in judge-advocate duties. In addition, approximately 158 Reserve officers are now performing judge-advocate duties with the Air Force on extended active duty. While it is not considered that this is an adequate number of legally qualified personnel to properly perform the legal duties, including military justice, in the Air Force, the ratio compares favorably with that maintained in the Army and the Navy.

The Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, is responsible for the maintenance and enforcement of discipline within the entire Air Force, and the Air Force submits that this total responsibility should not be subjected to policies and supervision of a sister service. The Air Judge Advocate is the military legal adviser to the Chief of Staff, and in the discharge of his duties relating to the administration of military justice, it is considered advisable to recognize his professional position.

At the direction of the Secretary of Defense a committee consisting of representatives of the Army, Navy, and Air Force has been formed for the purpose of making a thorough study of the many problems involved in attempting to make more uniform the administration of military justice in the three services. It is certain that no legislative recommendations can come from this committee before the convening of the Eighty-first Congress. In the meantime a reasonable doubt has arisen as to whether or not the Department of the Air Force has jurisdiction over transferees into the Air Force and those who may subsequently be drafted into the Air Force. While there is substantial opinion that the Department of Air will have adequate jurisdiction over such personnel, it is considered advisable to remove all doubt by the enactment of the present legislation rather than perpetuate the possibility that the Department of Air will find it necessary to defend its jurisdiction in habeas corpus proceedings.

Favorable consideration of the proposed legislation by the Committee on Armed Services making the Articles of War equally applicable to the Department of Air is not intended to indicate an approval of the present Articles of War. This committee of the House of Representatives have previously expressed themselves on this subject through the passage of H. R. 2575, a bill for the revision of the Articles of War and the improvement of military justice. It is considered that nothing less than the provisions of H. R. 2575 will provide an adequate system of military justice. Therefore, the present legislation is considered to be stopgap legislation which will legalize beyond doubt the present activities of the Air Judge Advocate and subordinate personnel until such time as the Congress shall enact legislation for an improved and unified system of justice, equally applicable, insofar as the basic differences of the services will permit, to all of the armed services.

The Secretary of Defense endorses the legislation upon the above-stated basis. It is not anticipated that the enactment of the legislation will result in any additional cost to the Government, except for minor administrative costs for clerical personnel in the Office of the Air Judge Advocate.

The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Air recommend the enactment of the proposed legislation, as is evidenced by their respective letters which were made a part of our report on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Air Force the office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force. The office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be occupied by the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among qualified officers of the United States Air Force, for a term of 4 years. The Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be charged with supervising the administration of military justice in the United States Air Force and the performance of such other legal duties as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 2. The Articles of War and all other laws now in effect relating to the Judge Advocate General's Department, The Judge Advocate General of the Army, and the administration of military justice within the United States Army shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force with respect to the personnel hereof, and all references in such laws to the Department of the Army (War), the Army of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Army (War), The Judge Advocate General, Assistant Judge Advocates General, and officers of or assigned to the Judge Advocate General's Department shall be construed for the purposes of this act, as referring to, and vesting like authority, duties, functions, and responsibilities in, the Department of the Air Force, the Air Force of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, and officers of the United States Air Force designated by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, as judge advocates, respectively: *Provided*, That until the expiration of the transfer period prescribed by section 208 (e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.), the jurisdiction conferred hereby may be exercised with respect to personnel of any component of the Department of the Army who may be under the command and authority of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 3. Any officer of the United States Air Force who shall have served as The Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall, upon retirement, or if recalled to active duty from the retired list upon release from active duty, be advanced on the retired list to the highest active-duty grade held while so serving and shall receive retired pay computed upon such higher active-duty grade.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent the prosecution, punishment, mitigation, or other action, by the United States acting through appropriate officers of either the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force as to any offense made punishable by the Articles of

War committed prior to the date of this act by any person subject to military law, and either of those departments may enforce or mitigate any penalty, forfeiture, fine, or liability, heretofore adjudged against such person.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 6, after the word "retirement", strike out the balance of line 8, all of line 9, and the word "duty" on line 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 3, line 7, after the word "served", insert the words "not less than 4 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill, S. 2401, an act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Air Force the office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force. The office of the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be occupied by the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among qualified officers of the United States Air Force, for a term of 4 years. The Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall be charged with supervising the administration of military justice in the United States Air Force and the performance of such other legal duties as may be directed by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 2. The Articles of War and all other laws now in effect relating to the Judge Advocate General's Department, the Judge Advocate General of the Army, and the administration of military justice within the United States Army shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force with respect to the personnel thereof, and all references in such laws to the Department of the Army (War), the Army of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Army (War), the Judge Advocate General, Assistant Judge Advocates General, and officers of or assigned to the Judge Advocate General's Department shall be construed for the purposes of this act, as referring to, and vesting like authority, duties, functions, and responsibilities in, the Department of the Air Force, the Air Force of the United States and its components, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, and officers of the United States Air Force designated by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, as judge advocates, respectively: *Provided*, That until the expiration of the transfer period prescribed by section 208 (e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.), the jurisdiction conferred hereby may be exercised with respect to personnel of any component of the Department of the Army who may be under the command and authority of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

SEC. 3. Any officer of the United States Air Force who shall have served not less than four years as the Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, shall, upon retirement, be advanced on the retired list to the highest active-duty grade held while so serving and shall receive retired pay computed upon such higher active-duty grade.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent the prosecution, punishment, mitigation, or other actions, by the United States acting through appropriate officers of either the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force as to any offense made punishable by the Articles of War committed prior to the date of this Act by any person subject to military law, and either of those departments may enforce or mitigate any penalty, forfeiture, fine, or liability, heretofore adjudged against such person.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent the proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 5937) was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

SUMMARY TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT TO PROTECT NATIONAL SECURITY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1561) to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary termination of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] explain the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I have studied this bill. I think it is a dangerous bill to the right of civil-service employees, and I am constrained to object.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5861) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to convey to the State of Oklahoma, without consideration and on behalf of the United States, the southeast quarter and the east half of the southwest quarter of section 9 and the northeast quarter and the east half of the northwest quarter of section 16, township 3 north, range 23 east, of the Indian meridian, Le Flore County, Okla., for the purpose of constructing a dam.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ORGANIC ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1087) to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (Public Law 425, 78th Cong., 58 Stat. 739, 740), as amended by Public Law 563, Seventy-eighth Congress (58 Stat. 925), is further amended by inserting after the words "to cooperative associations" the words "and municipalities"; and by inserting after the words "said cooperative associations" a comma and the words "and municipalities to the extent that such indebtedness was incurred with respect to electric transmission and distribution lines or systems or portions thereof serving persons in rural areas."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE OF MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES AT FULL STRENGTH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4984) to provide for the maintaining of the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the regiment of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306; 10 U. S. C. 1091d), is amended to read: "When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of the Army may, in his discretion, bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified candidates recommended by the academic board: *Provided*, That at least two-thirds of the existing vacancies shall be set aside for the appointment of qualified recommended alternate candidates nominated by the Vice President, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, Delegates and Resident Commissioners, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Governor of the Panama Canal, and not more than one-third of the existing vacancies may be filled by the appointment of qualified recommended candidates, other than those for whom two-thirds of the existing vacancies are reserved: *Provided further*, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law."

SEC. 2. When upon the admission of a new class to the United States Naval Academy the total number of midshipmen is less than the number authorized, the Secretary of the Navy may bring the regiment of the midshipmen to full authorized strength by appointing alternates and candidates recommended by the academic board who have been found to be qualified as provided by law, at least two-thirds thereof from among alternates qualified for appointments allowed under section 1 of the act of December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, upon the nomination of Members of Congress and not more than one-third thereof from among candidates and alternates, other than those nominated by Members of Congress, qualified for appointments authorized under section 1 of said act of December 20, 1917, and other provisions of law: *Provided*, That any appointments made hereunder shall be in addition to and not in lieu of appointments otherwise authorized by law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "discretion", insert "and within the capacity of the facilities of the Military Academy."

Page 2, strike out line 15 to 25, inclusive, and lines 1 to 6, on page 3, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. When upon the admission of a new class to the United States Naval Academy, as determined on July 1 of each year, the total number of midshipmen is less than the number authorized, the Secretary of the Navy may, within the capacity of the Naval Academy, upon recommendation of the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, appoint additional midshipmen to be admitted in such class in such number to best meet the needs of the naval service, but not to exceed the authorized strength of the brigade of midshipmen, from candidates holding alternate appointments or other candidates recommended and found to be qualified by the academic board, at least two-thirds of those so appointed to be from among candidates holding alternate appointments allowed under section 1 of the act of December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, upon the nomination of Members of Congress, and not more than one-third of those so appointed to be from among candidates other than those holding such alternate appointments: *Provided*, That any appointments made pursuant to this section shall be in addition to and not in lieu of appointments otherwise authorized by law."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the maintaining of the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy and the Brigade of Midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FOR CIVIL WORKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6751) to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor flood-control improvements.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the officer of the Corps of Engineers assigned to duty as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of civil works, including river and harbor and flood-control improvements, shall, while assigned to such duty, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier general: *Provided*, That this position shall not be charged against the authorized strength of general officers of the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That the pay and allowances, mileage and travel allowances of the officer holding such position shall be paid from the appropriations for the work or works upon which he is engaged.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR HIDALGO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4367) authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge and originally designed approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Hidalgo, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge: *Provided*, That the construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction shall have been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its originally designed approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

SEC. 3. The said Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5252) to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., authorized to be built by Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by an act of Congress approved July 31, 1946, is hereby extended until July 31, 1949. Construction of such bridge shall be commenced on or before such date and shall be prosecuted with reasonable diligence until same is completed.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6079) establishing a procedure by which the Administrator may assure veterans full educational and training opportunities commensurate with the tuition charges by educational and training institutions, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF NATURAL FIBERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied area and sold.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING USE OF OLEOMARGARINE BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6334) to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. H. CARL ANDERSEN, HULL, SMITH of Wisconsin, MURRAY of Wisconsin, and CLEVENGER objected.

RATES OF PAY FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT FIELD INSTALLATIONS OF VETERANS' FACILITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6656) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE WEST VIRGINIA PLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6439) to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the

construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans of World War II and to the feasibility and desirability of adopting, developing, and extending such plan throughout the United States. Such investigation and study shall include, among other matters, the following aspects of the West Virginia plan:

(1) Financial arrangements by corporations, labor unions, and cooperatives for the acquisition of land and for the construction of housing facilities for their employees and members who are veterans of World War II;

(2) The use of production-line methods in the construction of such housing facilities.

(3) Acquisition of housing facilities by veterans under contracts of sale with corporations, labor unions, and cooperatives;

(4) Individual loans to veterans by banks and building and loan associations and the guaranty of such loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; and

(5) The operation of the West Virginia plan generally in West Virginia and other States where such plan, or a similar plan, has been used.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall report to the Congress, at the earliest practicable date, the result of his investigation and study of the West Virginia plan, together with such recommendations as he deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, in carrying out his functions under this act, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and independent agencies of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 6, strike out all of section 4.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2505) to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act, entitled "An act to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments", approved August 1, 1947, is amended, to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are respectively authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, within their respective departments, not more than 13 positions each, and the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 6 positions, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the National Military Establishment which requires the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel: *Provided*, That the rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this act shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum, and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report setting forth the number of positions established pursuant to this act in the National Military Establishment during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each. In any instance where the Secretary may consider full public report on these items detrimental to the national security, he is authorized to omit such items from his annual report and, in lieu thereof, to present such information in executive sessions of such committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as the presiding officers of those bodies shall designate."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6641), to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "If an annuitant who elected to name a survivor annuitant pursuant to this paragraph died prior to April 1, 1948, such survivor annuitant shall receive, beginning as of April 1, 1948, the annuity provided for survivor annuitants by this paragraph."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance on November 19, 1948, a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING PENSIONS TO CERTAIN PERSONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 451) to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GRATUITOUS INSURANCE FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4159) to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa, the Veterans' Administration is against this bill as they say it would go to any time in the future.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from New Jersey that this bill undertakes to correct an injustice with respect to a small group of Army and Navy cadets who were taking flight training, a few of whom were killed on authorized flights during the war and found themselves without the customary national life insurance with the premium paid by the Government. There are only a very few cases involved. The information that was obtained from the Veterans' Administration was that the reason these men had been classified as cadets rather than as flying cadets was perhaps partly due to an oversight in one of the departments or perhaps because of excessive paper work.

Mr. KEAN. The Veterans' Administration says that this would apply, respectively, to any time in the future.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Any time in the future, if they were so listed? As a matter of fact, this applies only to a group of men who were taking flight training but had not been so classified during the war.

Mr. KEAN. Does it not apply to men in the future?

Mr. LECOMPTE. If they were having flight training.

Mr. KEAN. Why should we give preference to those?

Mr. LECOMPTE. We gave all flight trainees war-risk insurance with the premiums paid by the Government, but there were a few who, because of the classification, were not brought under the same coverage.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am very much in sympathy with the general purpose of this particular bill, but it provides that payments be made to the parents of the deceased without regard to dependency. I have no objection to that if it were the general rule, but that is more than we did for the men who were killed during the war and who had not taken out insurance.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. It provides the same order of payment as in the other cases.

Mr. MACKINNON. The order is the same but the dependency requirement is not present in this bill. I have in my

district the case of a boy who in the early days of the war was on duty on a destroyer in the Far East, who died in a hospital at Surabaya, in Java, and he had absolutely no opportunity to take out insurance. I have gone into the matter very carefully, and the Veterans' Administration will not pay any insurance to his parents, because they were not dependent upon him. Yet, by this language here they would be forced to pay that to the parents of these few individuals, many of whom did not die in actual service, regardless of dependency.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It applies to no one in the world except those who died in training in the Army or in the service.

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes, but I am talking about dying in actual battle.

Mr. LECOMPTE. War-risk insurance applies to all soldiers and seamen who carried the insurance, whether they died in camp, in combat, or in the hospitals.

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes, but what we are talking about is gratuitous insurance provided in instances where the men did not have an opportunity to make application therefor. That is the identical situation you are covering here, and which is covered with respect to other men who were in the position as was the boy in my district, who had no opportunity at the start of the war, and who was injured immediately. Under the general law applicable to these situations those boys who were on actual duty in the Pacific when the war started, and who were killed, get no insurance money at all unless their parents were dependent upon them. But this bill would make payments to this small class of parents regardless of dependency, and I cannot justify that discrimination against those who were killed in the early days of the Pacific war.

I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDING THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"GENERAL

"SEC. 302. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to designate and establish such civil airways as may be required in the public interest. The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, (1) to acquire, establish, and improve air navigation facilities wherever necessary; (2) to operate and maintain such air navigation facilities; (3) to arrange for publication of aeronautical maps and charts necessary for the safe and efficient movement of aircraft in civil air navigation utilizing the facilities and assistance of existing agencies of the Government so far as practicable; and (4) to provide necessary facilites and personnel for the regulation and protection of air traffic."

SEC. 2. Section 302 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (c) of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

"ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY

"(c) The Administrator, on behalf of the United States, is authorized, where appropriate to carry out this section, (1) to accept any conditional or unconditional gift or donation of money or other property, real or personal, or of services; (2) within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress therefor, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, lease, or otherwise, real property or interests therein, including easements through or other interests in air space; and (3) for adequate compensation, by sale, lease, or otherwise, to dispose of any real or personal property or interest therein, so acquired. Any such acquisition by condemnation may be made in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (40 U. S. C. 257; 25 Stat. 357), the act of February 26, 1931 (40 U. S. C. 258a–258e; 46 Stat. 1421), or any other applicable act of Congress."

SEC. 3. Title III of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new section as follows:

"POWER TO CONDUCT HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

"SEC. —. In the conduct of any public hearings or investigations authorized by this act or by Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Administrator or any duly designated examiner shall have the same powers to take evidence, issue subpenas, take depositions, and compel testimony as are vested in members of the Board and its duly designated examiners by section 1004 of this act. Actions of the Administrator or his examiners in such cases shall be governed by the procedures specified in section 1004, and be enforced in the manner provided therein."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 302 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'GENERAL

" 'SEC. 302. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to designate and establish such civil airways as may be required in the public interest. The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress, (1) to acquire, establish, and improve air-navigation facilities wherever necessary; (2) to operate and maintain such air-navigation facilities; (3) to arrange for publication of aeronautical maps and charts necessary for the safe and efficient movement of aircraft in civil air navigation utilizing the facilities and assistance of existing agencies of the Government so far as practicable; and (4) to provide necessary facilities and personnel for the regulation and protection of air traffic. In exercising the authority granted in this subsection, the Administrator shall give full consideration to the requirements of national defense.'

"SEC. 2. Section 302 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (c) of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

" 'ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY

" '(c) The Administrator, on behalf of the United States, is authorized, where appropriate to carry out this section, (1) to accept any conditional or unconditional gift or donation of money or other property, real or personal, or of services; (2) within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress therefor, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, lease, or otherwise, real property or interests therein, including, in the case of air-navigation facilities (including airports) owned by the United States and operated under the direction of the Administrator, easements through or other interests in airspace; and (3) for adequate compensation, by sale, lease, or otherwise, to dispose of any real or personal property or interests therein, so acquired. Any such acquisition by condemnation may be made in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 1, 1888 (40 U. S. C. 257; 25 Stat. 357), the act of February 26, 1931 (40 U. S. C. 258a–258e; 46 Stat. 1421), or any other applicable act of Congress.'

"SEC. 3. Title III of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" 'POWER TO CONDUCT HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

" 'SEC. 309. In the conduct of any public hearings or investigations authorized by this act or by the Federal Airport Act, the Administrator or any duly designated examiner shall have the same powers to take evidence, issue subpenas, take depositions, and compel testimony as are vested in members of the Board and its duly designated examiners by section 1004 of this act. Actions of the Administrator or his examiners in such cases shall be governed by the procedures specified in section 1004, and be enforced in the manner provided therein.'

"SEC. 4. Section 601 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new subsection as follows:

" 'DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

" '(c) The Civil Aeronautics Board, subject to such terms, conditions, and limitations as the Board may specify, is empowered to delegate to the Administrator the power or authority to prescribe rules, regulations, and standards under this title and to perform functions authorized under section 702 of this act. The Board may modify, suspend, revoke, or terminate such power or authority so delegated by it to the Administrator and may prescribe by rules and regulations such provisions and procedures for review of actions taken by the Administrator under authority delegated hereunder as it may deem necessary and appropriate in the public interest. Except as specifically provided in the rules and regulations of the Board, the filing of a petition for review shall not excuse any person from complying with the action of the Administrator nor operate in any manner to stay the enforcement of such action: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed as amending, modifying, or repealing any provision of the Administrative Procedure Act.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4962) to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the dependent unremarried widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion

and the Philippine Insurrection, who is barred from the receipt of pension because her marriage to the veteran occurred subsequent to December 31, 1937, but who is otherwise entitled to such pension under the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382; 38 U. S. C., 364a), as reenacted by the act of August 13, 1935 (49 Stat. 614; 38 U. S. C., 368), shall be entitled to pension in her own right under said act, as amended, under the conditions specified therein (except date of marriage) and at the rate authorized by section 4 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 611, 79th Cong.), as amended by the act of July 30, 1947 (Public Law 270, 80th Cong.), and to the additional pension provided for children under the act of May 1, 1926, as amended, provided she married the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death and lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death except where there was a separation which was due to misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the widow: *Provided*, That if pension has been granted to a child or children of the veteran, the widow shall not be entitled to the pension authorized by this section until the pension to the child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and when these conditions are fulfilled and the pension is granted to the widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; except that in the event the amount being paid to such child or children is less than the amount authorized to the widow by this act, then the difference between said amounts will be paid to the widow: *Provided further*, That no pension shall be payable under this section to a widow under 60 years of age.

SEC. 2. Payment of pension as provided in section 1 shall be effective as of the date of the death of the veteran, if application is filed within 1 year after the death of such veteran, otherwise as of the date of receipt of application in the Veterans' Administration, and in no event prior to the date of the enactment of this act.. Pension under section 1 hereof shall not be paid to the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, who has remarried either once or more than once since the death of the veteran, and upon the remarriage of such widow her pension shall be terminated. The penal and forfeiture provisions of laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration providing pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, shall be applicable to the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSPITALIZATION OF SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5464) to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AMENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6868) to amend section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, with respect to widows of certain deceased Coast Guard personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 253 (b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The widows of deceased Coast Guard personnel who died while on active duty during the period from November 1, 1941, to January 1, 1946, both dates inclusive, other than widows of deceased temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve, shall be entitled to medical advice, out-patient treatment, and hospitalization in like manner as dependents of active-duty personnel of the Coast Guard."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6860) to amend the Federal Airport Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of the brief title of the bill, would the author of the bill or a committee member explain the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. During the war the military services created certain damage upon municipal airports. This bill authorizes the assaying of the damages done, and when so accomplished, it becomes a contractual obligation of the United States to repair the damages.

Mr. DEANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Federal Airport Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Reimbursement shall be made to public agencies, as provided in this section, for the necessary rehabilitation or repair of public airports heretofore or hereafter substantially damaged by any Federal agency. The Administrator is authorized to render such assistance as he deems necessary to public agencies in the preparation of requests for reimbursement for the cost of rehabilitation or repair of public airports, under the control or management of such public agencies, which have been substantially damaged by any Federal agency and, upon receipt of such a request from a public agency, the Administrator is further authorized, on behalf of the United States, to consider, ascertain, and determine, in accordance with regulations he shall prescribe pursuant to this section, the actual or estimated cost of such necessary rehabilitation or repair for which such public agency is entitled to reimbursement from the United States.

"(b) Such amount as may be found by the Administrator to be the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair shall be certified by the Administrator to Congress, which certification shall include a brief statement of the character of the damage upon which the request for reimbursement is based and of the work performed or to be performed to accomplish such rehabilitation or repair. In the event that, upon completion of such rehabilitation or repair, it is determined that the actual cost thereof, as approved by the Administrator, exceeds the amount of the estimate certified to Congress by him, the Administrator shall certify to Congress the amount by which such actual cost exceeds such estimate including in such certification a brief statement of the cause of the variation between the estimated and the actual cost of such rehabilitation and repair. Certifications made hereunder by the Administrator shall be deemed contractual obligations of the United States, payable as hereinafter provided.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Administrator to make payments as provided for in this section to public agencies, either upon completion of the rehabilitation or repair involved, or as such rehabilitation or repair progresses, it being the purpose of this subsection to authorize the Administrator to make payments to public agencies, out of funds appropriated pursuant to this section, as reimbursement for the cost of such public agencies of work performed in accomplishing rehabilitation or repair prior to final completion of such work and at such time or times as may be determined by the Administrator, after consultation with the public agency involved: *Provided*, That no such payment made by the Administrator shall be in an amount which, together with all previous payments made to reimburse such public agency for the cost of such rehabilitation or repair, shall exceed the estimated cost of the work then performed. If the Administrator shall determine at any time that the aggregate of such payments exceeds the actual cost of the work then performed the United States shall be entitled to recover such excess. In the event the estimate of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of an airport as certified to Congress by the Administrator exceeds the actual cost of such rehabilitation or repair, the amount of such excess shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Appropriations made pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until June 30, 1953, unless sooner expended.

"(d) No request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair to a public airport submitted pursuant to this section shall be considered by the Administrator unless such request has been submitted to him within 6 months after the occurrence of the damage upon which the request is based, except that in case of a request relating to damage caused by operations of a military nature during time of war, such request may be submitted within 6 months after the date of termination of such war unless the airport is under the control and management of the United States at the time of termination of such war, in which event the request may be submitted to the Administrator within 6 months after the transfer of such control or management of the airport to the public agency involved."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOPPAGE OF WORK ON CERTAIN COMBATANT VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6049) to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso of title III of the Second Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" (60 Stat. 227), in the discretion of the President shall not apply to the following vessels: *Kentucky* (BB66), *Hawaii* (CB3), *Wagner* (DE539), *Vandiver* (DE540), *Castle* (DD720), *Woodrow R. Thompson* (DD721), *Lansdale* (DD766), *Seymour D. Owens*

(DD767), *Hoel* (DD768), *Abner Read* (DD769), *Seaman* (DD791), *Unicorn* (SS436), and *Walrus* (SS437).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 2400) to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso of title III of the Second Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels" (60 Stat. 227), in the discretion of the President shall not apply to the following vessels: *Kentucky* (BB66), *Hawaii* (CB3), *Wagner* (DE539), *Vandiver* (DE540), *Castle* (DD720), *Woodrow R. Thompson* (DD721), *Lansdale* (DD766), *Seymour D. Owens* (DD767), *Hoel* (DD768), *Abner Read* (DD769), *Seaman* (DD791), *Unicorn* (SS436), and *Walrus* (SS437).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6049) was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT ADAPTABLE FOR AUXILIARY MILITARY SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6501) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for too large an expenditure of money to be considered on the Consent Calendar. I ask unanimous that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING BENEFITS OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5715) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of subsection (c) of section 1 of the civil service retirement act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "This subsection shall become effective as of July 1, 1945."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce the annuity or in any way to affect the rights of any person who is receiving an annuity under the provisions of the amendment to section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, made by the act approved August 8, 1946 (Public Law 638, 79th Cong).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out lines 3 to 6 inclusive and insert the following: "That subsection (c) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided, That any officer or employee so separated between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1947, both dates inclusive, who is living on the date of enactment of this proviso, shall be considered as having been separated as of the date of such enactment, except that no credit for service under this act shall be allowed for the period following actual separation.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1447) to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand this bill, it provides for humane housing in connection with the importation of foreign wild animals and birds. I am not going to object to its consideration. However, I think we should give some thought to the consideration of providing humane housing for the one-third of our Nation who are ill-housed. A bill has been reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency providing for public housing. That bill is now fouled up in the Rules Committee. I want to be kind to these foreign wild animals, and I shall not object to the consideration of this bill, but at the same time I urge that the Rules Committee bring out that housing bill so that we can be kind to our people who are ill-housed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 241 of the Act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 391), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 241. (a) The importation into the United States or any Territory or district thereof, of the mongoose, the so-called 'flying foxes' or fruit bats, the English sparrow, the starling, and such other birds and animals as the Secretary of the Interior may from time to time declare to be injurious to the interests of agriculture or horticulture, is hereby prohibited; and all such birds and animals shall, upon arrival at any port of the United States, be destroyed or returned at the expense of the owner. Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the importation of natural-history specimens for museums or scientific collections, or of certain cage birds, such as domesticated canaries, parrots, or such other birds as the Secretary of the Interior may designate. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this subsection and subsection (b).

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such requirements and issue such permits as he may deem necessary for the transportation of wild animals and birds under humane and healthful conditions, and it shall be unlawful for any person, including any importer, knowingly to cause or permit any wild animal or bird to be transported to the United States, or any Territory or district thereof, under inhumane or unhealthful conditions or in violation of such requirements. In any criminal prosecution for violation of this subsection and in any administrative proceeding for the suspension of the issuance of further permits—

"(1) The condition of any vessel or conveyance, or the enclosures in which wild animals or birds are confined therein, upon its arrival in the United States, or any Territory or district thereof, shall constitute relevant evidence in determining whether the provisions of this subsection have been violated; and

"(2) The presence in such vessel or conveyance at such time of a substantial ratio of dead, crippled, diseased, or starving wild animals or birds shall be deemed prima facie evidence of the violation of the provisions of this subsection."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5807) to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 625 (a) of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1040), is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof the following: "In the case of any project on which construction has begun between August 13, 1946, and the date of the approval of the State plan, the Surgeon General, with the concurrence of the State agency, may waive compliance with any requirement of this subsection, if he finds that the purpose of such requirement has been fulfilled."

SEC. 2. Section 631 (1) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "(including, in the case of projects on which construction has begun after August 13, 1946, and before approval of the State plan, costs incurred before such approval)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

O'SULLIVAN DAM

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, after consulting the majority and minority leaders, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 795, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the dam known as South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project shall hereafter be known as O'Sullivan Dam, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of South Coulee Dam shall be held to

refer to such dam under and by the name O'Sullivan Dam.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "South Coulee" and insert "Potholes" and on line 7 strike out "South Coulee" and insert "Potholes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT TO THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2770) a bill to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements. That bill is identical to the bill on the Consent Calendar No. 769, H. R. 6751, which was just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the officer of the Corps of Engineers assigned to duty as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of civil works, including river and harbor and flood-control improvements, shall, while assigned to such duty, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier general: *Provided*, That this position shall not be charged against the authorized strength of general officers of the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That the pay and allowances, mileage and travel allowances, of the officer holding such position shall be paid from the appropriations for the work or works upon which he is engaged.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the House bill, H. R. 6751, was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a long one but it is an important one. The bill will make the rank of Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements that of a brigadier general. It will give this position the same rank as held by the assistant in charge of Army construction. It will give proper recognition to the office of the assistant engineer who handles the great flood-control and river and harbor program.

The official who serves as assistant engineer in charge of river and harbor and flood-control projects has a vast responsibility imposed upon him. He is required to handle hundreds of millions of dollars in projects annually and his work takes him into every department of the Government and every State in the Union. He is required to deal with Cabinet members and the highest officers in Army, Navy, and diplomatic corps. Heretofore he has been a colonel and it has been difficult for a colonel to carry on his work and deal with officials so much higher in rank than the one he enjoys.

In addition to this, the bill is important because it creates an additional incentive for young engineers to remain in river and harbor and flood-control work. These young men now have the incentive of working up to a position of more importance with the engineers department. They know that when they handle their work competently they may be rewarded proportionately for the fine type of service rendered.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is in this great program of flood control. When a small matter such as giving this additional rank and importance to the position of assistant engineer can mean so much to the program of flood control and rivers and harbors, I cannot be otherwise than most enthusiastically for the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks with two additions in two instances, one at that point in the RECORD where Consent Calendar No. 725, S. 1052, was under consideration, the addition being the bill itself, S. 1052, and a letter which he wrote to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the platform of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous material in connection with certain remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters from the Union Trust Co. I am informed by the Public Printer that this material comprises two and a quarter pages and will cost $159.75.

The SPEAKER. Without objection and notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out: "13. Tax Court ____ 271"

Renumber items 15 to 23, inclusive, as follows:

Old No.	New No.
15	13
17	15
19	17
21	19
23	21

Page 5, section 48, in the eleventh line, immediately after "Fort Worth,", insert "Jacksonville."

Page 28, section 118, in first line of subsection (b) under heading "Middle District", strike out "Blair," at end of line; in second line of subsection (c) under heading "Western District", insert "Blair," immediately before "Butler."

Page 35, section 127, in second paragraph of subsection (a), immediately after "Alexandria,", insert "Newport News."

Page 38, section 133, at bottom of page, after "Indiana", under—

"Northern ---------- 1"

insert—

"Southern ---------- 1"

Page 44, strike out, near bottom of page, "Chapter 13—Tax Court" and all that follows thereafter to bottom of page.

Page 45, strike out all of this page.

Page 46, at top of page, after "Chapter," in chapter heading, strike out "15" and insert "13."

Page 48, near top of page, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "17" and insert "15."

Page 49, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "19" and insert "17."

Page 51, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "21" and insert "19."

Page 55, at top of page, after "Chapter", in chapter heading, strike out "23" and insert "21"; section 451, second paragraph, fifth and sixth lines thereof, after "Customs Court," strike out "the Tax Court"; section 451, fourth paragraph, after "Customs Court," strike out "Tax Court."

Page 56, in third line from bottom of page, after "Columbia", insert "and"; in second line from bottom of page, strike out "and the Tax Court of the United States."

Page 64, near top of page, strike out

"57. Tax Court ---------- 911"

In item 59, strike out "59" and insert "57."

Page 64, section 603, in second line of section 603, immediately after "salary of", strike out "$9,376.50" and insert: "$7,500."

Page 66, section 605, second paragraph, fourth line, after "Customs Court", insert "and"; and after "Claims" strike out "and the Tax Court."

Page 67, in third line from top of page, after "Appeals", strike out "the Customs Court, the Tax Court, and all other courts of the United States established by act of Congress" and insert "and the Customs Court."

Page 67, section 631, in subsection (a), fourth line, immediately after "parks" insert "Big Bend, Crater Lake."

Page 68, section 632, in the fifth line, strike out "civil actions and."

Page 74, section 752, after last line on page, insert "The chief judge of a district court having five or more district judges may also appoint an assistant secretary."

Page 76, after last line on page, insert "furnished in criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons allowed."

Page 78, section 792, in subsection (c), third line, immediately after "findings of fact", insert "and recommendations for conclusions of law."

Page 81, commencing near top of page, strike out the chapter heading "Chapter 57—Tax Court" and all that follows thereafter down to but not including "Chapter 59—General provisions applicable to court officers and employees"; near middle of page, after "Chapter" in chapter heading, strike out "59" and insert "57."

Page 82, strike out:

"Each clerk of court and his deputies, and each employee of the Tax Court designated in writing for that purpose by the chief judge of such court, may administer oaths and affirmations and take acknowledgments."

And insert:

"Each clerk of court and his deputies may administer oaths and affirmations and take acknowledgments."

Page 84, near top of page, strike out

"97. Tax Court---------- 1621"

Page 86, near middle of page, strike out "1294. Tax Court decisions", immediately following the above, renumber item "1295" as "1294."

Page 87, near middle of page, strike out "§ 1294. Tax Court decisions" and the three lines following immediately thereafter; at middle of page, strike out "§ 1295" and insert in lieu thereof "§ 1294"; in line following immediately thereafter, preceding "Appeals", strike out "(a)"; strike out the last six lines on this page.

Page 92, lines 11 and 12, after the word "courts", strike out "including the district courts for the Territories and Possessions of the United States" and insert "together with the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone and the District Court of the Virgin Islands."

Page 97, section 1402, in subsection (b), first line, after "Any", strike out "tort claim action" and insert "civil action on a tort claim."

Page 104, section 1504, after "district" in second line, strike out "court in tort claims cases" and insert "courts in civil actions based on tort claims."

Page 105, section 1583, in third line, immediately after word "same", insert a comma; in fourth line, immediately after word "chargeable", strike out the comma and insert "and."

Page 105, near bottom of page, strike out the chapter heading "Chapter 97—Tax Court" and all that follows to bottom of page.

Page 106, strike out the first two lines on this page.

Page 107, near bottom of page, strike out "1696. Tax Court; service."

Page 108, preceding chapter 115, strike out "§ 1696. Tax Court; service" and the two lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 115, under chapter 119, strike out "1826. Payment of Tax Court witnesses."

Page 116, below middle of page, strike out: "§ 1826. Payment of Tax Court witnesses" and the seven lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 120, at middle of page, strike out "1930. Tax Court."

Page 125, near middle of page, strike out: "§ 1930. Tax Court" and the seven lines following immediately thereafter.

Page 130, section 2072, add the following sentence at end of last paragraph: "Nothing in this title anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 130, section 2073, add the following sentence at end of last paragraph: "Nothing in this title anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 133, at bottom of page strike out: "167. Tax Court procedure---------- 2551"

Page 134, at top of page, renumber items 169, 171, and 173 as follows:

Old No.	New No.
169	167
171	169
173	171

Page 134, preceding section 2241, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 153, strike out "2244. Finality of determination; rehearsing" and insert "2244. Finality of determination."

Page 136, section 2244, strike out all of section 2244 and insert:

"§ 2244. Finality of determination.

"No circuit or district judge shall be required to entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the detention of a person pursuant to a judgment of a court of the United States, or of any State, if it appears that the legality of such detention has been determined by a judge or court of the United States on a prior application for a writ of habeas corpus and the petition presents no new ground not theretofore presented and determined, and the judge or court is satisfied that the ends of justice will not be served by such inquiry."

Page 137, section 2253, in first line of section strike out "circut" and insert "circuit."

Page 138, section 2254, strike out all of section 2254 and insert:

"§ 2254. State custody: remedies in State courts.

"An application for a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted unless it appears that the applicant has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, or that there is either an absence of available State corrective process or the existence of circumstances rendering such process ineffective to protect the rights of the prisoner.

"An applicant shall not be deemed to have exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, within the meaning of this section, if he has the right under the law of the State to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented."

Page 143, section 2401, strike out all of subsection (b) of section 2401 beginning "(b) A tort claim" and concluding "final disposition of the claim." and insert:

"(b) A tort claim against the United States shall be forever barred unless action is begun thereon within 1 year after such claim accrues, or unless, if it is a claim not exceeding $1,000, it is presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within 1 year after such claim accrues. If a claim not exceeding $1,000 has been presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within that period of time, suit thereon shall not be barred until the expiration of a period of 6 months after either the date of withdrawal of such claim from the agency or the date of mailing notice by the agency of final disposition of the claim."

Page 147, section 2414, in first line, strike out "final" and insert "Payment of final."

Page 150, section 2503, in line 12, immediately following the word "Commissioner", insert "and when directed by the court his recommendations for conclusions of law."

Page 155, strike out all of this page.

Page 156, strike out all of this page.

Page 157, commencing at top of page, strike out all preceding the chapter heading "Chapter 169—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals procedure"; in the chapter heading "Chapter 169—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals procedure" strike out "169" and insert "167."

Page 158, near top of page, in the chapter heading, after "Chapter", strike out "171" and insert "169."

Page 161, near top of page in the chapter heading, after "Chapter", strike out "173" and insert "171."

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, strike out "2676. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure applicable", and renumber items "2677" and "2678" as items "2676" and "2677", respectively.

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in item 2679 of analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, strike out "2679. Attorneys' " preceding "fees" and insert "2678. Attorney."

Page 161, preceding section 2671, in analysis of sections under heading of chapter 173, renumber items "2680" and "2681" as "2679" and "2680", respectively.

Page 162, third line of page, immediately preceding "actions", insert "civil."

Page 162, section 2674, in fourth line of section 2674, strike out "for punitive damages" and insert "for interest prior to judgment or for punitive damages.

"If, however, in any case wherein death was caused, the law of the place where the act or omission complained of occurred provides, or has been construed to provide, for damages only punitive in nature, the United States shall be liable for actual or compensatory damages, measured by the pecuniary injuries resulting from such death to the persons respectively, for whose benefit the action was brought, in lieu thereof."

Page 163, sections 2676–2678, strike out all of section 2676 and renumber sections 2677 and 2678 as follows: section 2677 as section 2676, section 2678 as section 2677.

Page 163, section 2679, in catch line, strike out "2679" and insert "2678", strike out "Attorneys' " and insert "Attorney"; in fourth line of section, strike out "2678" and insert "2677"; in sixth line of section, strike out "attorney's" and insert "attorney."

Page 163, section 2680, in catch line, strike out "2680" and insert "2679."

Page 164, section 2681, in catch line, strike out "2681" and insert "2680."

Page 165, strike out all of section 2, consisting of first six lines on this page, and insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Chief Justices of the United States Courts of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the Court of Claims, and the presiding judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, in office on the effective date of this act, shall be the chief judges of their respective courts.

"(b) The provisions of title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, of the United States Code, set out in section 1 of this act, with respect to the organization of each of the several courts therein provided for and of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall be construed as continuations of existing law, and the tenure of the judges, officers, and employees thereof and of the United States attorneys and marshals and their deputies and assistants, in office on the effective date of this act, shall not be affected by its enactment, but each of them shall continue to serve in the same capacity under the appropriate provisions of title 28, as set out in section 1 of this act, pursuant to his prior appointment: *Provided, however,* That each circuit court of appeals shall, as in said title 28 set out, hereafter be known as a United States court of appeals. No loss of rights, interruption of jurisdiction, or prejudice to matters pending in any of such courts on the effective date of this act shall result from its enactment.

"(c) The sum of $7,500 specified in this act as the salary which the Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall receive, and the sum of $7,500 specified in this act as the salary which each commissioner whom the Court of Claims may appoint shall receive, shall each respectively be that basic compensation on which shall be computed and paid the additional basic compensation mentioned in section 521 of the act of June 30, 1945 (ch. 212, 59 Stat. 301), as amended by the act of May 24, 1946 (ch. 270, sec. 6, 60 Stat. 217).

"(d) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the provision of section 14 of the act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 358, 58 Stat. 663), are not hereby repealed."

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert:

"SEC. 36. Section 1141 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The circuit courts of appeals and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction to review the decisions of the Tax Court, except as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code, in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions of the district courts in civil actions tried without a jury; and the judgment of any such court shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari, in the manner provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.'"

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert:

"SEC. 37. Section 6 of the act approved August 7, 1946 (ch. 864, 60 Stat. 903), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. Whenever any claimant under this act is dissatisfied with the action of a department or agency of the Government in either granting or denying his claim, such claimant shall have the right within 6 months to file a petition with the Court of Claims or, if the claim does not exceed $10,000 in amount or suit has heretofore been brought or is brought within 30 days after the enactment of this amendatory act, with any Federal district court of competent jurisdiction, asking a determination by the court of the equities involved in such claim; and upon the filing of such a petition, the court, sitting as a court of equity, shall have jurisdiction to determine the amount, if any, to which such claimant and petitioner may be equitably entitled (not exceeding the amount which might have been allowed by the department or agency concerned under the terms of this act) and to enter an order directing such department or agency to settle the claim in accordance with the finding of the court; and thereafter either party may appeal from the decision if it was rendered by a district court or petition the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari if it was rendered by the Court of Claims, as in other cases. Any case heretofore brought in a district court under this section may, at the election of the petitioner to be exercised within 30 days after the enactment of this amendatory act, be transferred to the Court of Claims for original disposition in that court.'"

Page 173, near bottom of page, insert the following section:

"SEC. 38. The provisions of this act shall take effect on September 1, 1948."

Page 173, at bottom of page, renumber "SEC. 36" as "SEC. 39", and in the first line, immediately after the word "Statutes", insert "of the District of Columbia, Revised Statutes of the United States."

Page 178, near top of page, strike out:

De....	231	275-281, 286, 287, 289-290, 292-298-300	36	1164-1169	28	411, 412, 413, 415-417, 418, 423, 424, 430-434, 441-443

And insert:

De....	231	275-281, 286, 287, 289, 290, 292-296, 298-300	36	1164-1169	28	411, 412, 413, 415-417, 418, 423, 424, 430, 431-434, 441-443

Page 186, in list of acts on this page, strike out:

1939—Feb. 10	2	1100-1105, 1110-1121, 1130-1133, 1141-1145, 3741, 3744, 3745 (b) (c) (d)	53	158-165, 460, 461	26	1100-1105, 1110-1121, 1130-1133, 1141-1145, 3741, 3744, 3745 (b) (c) (d)

Page 187, in the list of acts on this page, strike out:

1942—Oct. 21..	619	V	504	(a)	56	957	26 1100

And the column headings immediately above and below such line.

Page 188, in the list of acts on this page, strike out:

1944—Feb. 25..	63	V		503	58	72	26 1114

And the column headings immediately above and below this line.

Page 189, in acts for year 1945, strike out:

1945—May 3..	106	I	I (part)	59	[32] 127	26	1102, note
Do.....	108	II	213	59	134	28	830a

And insert:

1945—May 3..	108	II	213	59	134	28	830a

Page 189, in acts for year 1946, strike out:

1946—July 5..	541	IV (part)	----	60	[47] 477	28	296a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	----	60	[48] 478	28	412a

And insert:

1946—July 5..	541	II (part)	----	60	[49a] 460	28	604a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	----	60	[47] 477	28	296a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	----	60	[48] 478	28	412a
Do.....	541	IV (part)	----	60	[49a] 478, 479	28	374b

Page 189, in the list of 1946 acts on this page, strike out:

July 31...	704	1	60	710	26	1102 (c)
					28	5, 213, 241, 296, 301, 324
					D. C. Code	11-202, 11-203

And insert:

July 31..	704	1 (part)[49a]	60	710	28	5, 213, 241, 296, 301, 324
					D. C. Code	11-202, 11-203

Page 189, strike out the ruled line at the end of the schedule of repeals and insert:

1947—May 15.....	55	1-4	61	91, 92	16	158a-158d
Do.....	57	------	61	62	16	403c-5

Date	Statutes at Large					U. S. Code	
	Chapter	Title	Section	Volume	Page	Title	Section
1947—							
July 9..	211	II (part)	----	61	[51a] 290	28	604a
Do..	211	IV (part)	----	61	[52] 303	28	296a
Do..	211	IV (part)	----	61	[53] 304	28	412a
Do..	211	IV (part)	----	61	[54] 304, 305	28	374b
Do..	211	IV (part)	----	61	[55] 306	28	830

Date	Statutes at Large				U. S. Code	
	Chapter	Section	Volume	Page	Title	Section
1947—July 11..	224	----	61	310	28	184
July 23..	300	1, 2	61	409	28	374c, 374d
Aug. 1..	446	1	61	722	28	931

United States Code

Title:	Section
17	101 (f)
17	102
17	103
17	110
17	111

Page 189, in footnotes at bottom of page, strike out all of footnote No. 38.

Page 189, in footnotes at bottom of page, after and underneath footnote No. 46, insert:

"[46] Third proviso in paragraph commencing 'Fees of witnesses', said proviso ending on page 461."

After and underneath footnote No. 48, insert:

"[48a] The two provisos in the paragraph commencing near the bottom of page 478 and ending on page 479."

Page 189, bottom of page, after and underneath footnote No. 50, insert:

"[51] All of this section except the words: 'That the following salaries shall be paid to the several judges hereinafter mentioned in lieu of the salaries now provided by law, namely:', the words 'To each of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States at the rate of $15,000 per year', and the words 'That all of said salaries shall be paid in monthly installments'. All of the foregoing quoted words shall remain in full force and effect."

"[51a] Third proviso in the paragraph commencing 'Fees of witnesses' appearing on this page.

"[52] First proviso in the paragraph headed 'United States Customs Court' appearing on this page.

"[53] Only the following words in the sixth full paragraph appearing on this page: '$5 per day, not exceeding three days for any one term of court.'

"[54] The two provisos in the paragraph commencing near the bottom of page 304 and ending on page 305.

"[55] All of the second paragraph appearing on this page."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 3214, to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," which, in my opinion, represents one of the most important improvements in the structure of the Federal statutory law since the adoption of the United States Code more than 20 years ago, was prepared by a group of experts under the supervision of Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary and its law revision counsel with the active cooperation and advice of an outstanding group of judges and lawyers. This bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and as it passed the House, transferred the provisions relating to the Tax Court for the Internal Revenue Code to the Judicial Code. After hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee at which testimony was adduced revealing a controversy between bar associations and accountants groups as to whether the right of accountants to practice before that court should be preserved, the bill was amended by the Senate Judiciary Committee to eliminate Tax Court provisions. Your committee being apprehensive that a controversy of this nature might cause undue delay and interfere with final action on the bill at this session accordingly has authorized me to request unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table and concur in the Senate amendments. We believe, however, that the Tax Court provisions should be incorporated in the Judicial Code at the earliest date.

H. R. 3214 includes a provision designed to eliminate the effects of the decision of *Dobson* v. *Commission* (320 U. S. 489). The hearings in the Senate make absolutely clear the purpose of this provision, but it seems desirable to enlarge upon the brief statement in the Senate committee report with respect to that provision so that there can be no question about the intent of Congress.

Section 36 of the bill, as it passed the Senate, removes all traces of the Dobson decision. Prior to the decision in that case the statutory provision for review of

Tax Court decisions by circuit courts of appeal had always been construed to grant the same scope of review over Tax Court decisions as over decisions of United States district courts. This meant that questions of law were fully reviewable and questions of fact were subject to the same sort of limited review as is available in review of district court decisions. However, in the Dobson decision, the Supreme Court created new rules as to the scope of review as to questions of law and fact, although the point had not been raised by counsel.

The present bill amends the law that is interpreted in the Dobson decision and restores to the circuit courts of appeal the power to review Tax Court decisions in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions of the district courts in civil actions tried without a jury. The bill does not attempt to define what is a question of fact or what is a question of law or to answer any of the other complicated questions which would be involved in spelling out de novo the complete scope of review. There is no necessity to do this. It is sufficient that whatever the scope of review over civil actions—whether tax cases or nontax cases—coming from the district courts, the same scope of review should exist over cases coming from the Tax Court.

At a meeting of the full Committee of the Judiciary on June 15, the following expression of views with respect to the Senate amendments was unanimously agreed upon for insertion in the RECORD.

VIEWS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY WITH RESPECT TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 3214

In order to insure and expedite final action on the bill, H. R. 3214 to revise, codify and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary", the Committee on the Judiciary authorizes the chairman of subcommittee No. 1 to take from the Speaker's table the bill with the Senate amendments and request unanimous consent to agree to said amendments.

Many of the Senate amendments are intended to eliminate from the bill all provisions relating to the Tax Court. Under the existing law those provisions are set out in title 26 of the United States Code, the Internal Revenue Code, and the bill, H. R. 3214, as agreed to by the House, transferred these provisions from the Internal Revenue Code to the Judicial Code. It is the belief of the Committee on the Judiciary that the transfer of these provisions constituted more of a change in form than in substance. The Tax Court of the United States is already a court in both name and fact, exercising purely judicial functions, but its housekeeping administration needs clarification. However, rather than to jeopardize final action upon the bill at this late date, the committee agrees to the Senate amendments eliminating those provisions from the bill. It is hoped that the judicial code will be amended early in the next Congress by incorporating the desired clarification.

THE RULE IN THE DOBSON CASE

Section 1294 of title 28 of the United States Code, set out in H. R. 3214 as it passed the House, relating to appeals from the Tax Court, provided that Tax Court decisions shall be subject to review by the courts of appeals in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions in the district courts in cases tried without a jury. That section accomplished the much-needed correction of the effects of the rule laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of *Dobson* v. *Commissioner* (320 U. S. 489 (1943)). In that case, the Supreme Court held that the review of the Tax Court decisions by the circuit courts of appeal should be a very limited review because of some peculiar characteristics of the Tax Court. Accordingly, in the Dobson decision, the Supreme Court construed section 1141 of the Internal Revenue Code in such a way as to reduce the right of review in either the taxpayer or the Government in the great majority of Tax Court cases.

Section 1141 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for court review of Tax Court decisions. From the time this appellate review was established by the Revenue Act of 1926 until the Dobson decision in 1943, there had been no suggestion that the review of the Tax Court decisions was any more limited than the appellate review of decisions of the United States district courts. It was assumed by the courts that, on appeal from the Tax Court, questions of law were fully reviewable and questions of fact were subject to the same sort of limited review that prevailed on appeals from United States district courts. The Supreme Court in the Dobson case, however, created a new rule of law which would not permit even law questions to be reviewed unless they were clear-cut questions of law, and which would not permit any worth-while review of decisions of fact. In effect, it was an abdication by the Supreme Court, on behalf of itself and the circuit courts of appeal, of judicial authority conferred upon the courts by Congress.

Section 1294 of the Judicial Code set out in H. R. 3214, as passed by the House of Representatives, remedied the effect of the Dobson decision. In view of the elimination of the Tax Court provisions from the bill in the Senate, and the consequent elimination of section 1294, the Senate has substituted an amendment to section 1141 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code with the same result intended by section 1294. This provision, which is section 36 of the bill as it passed the Senate, restores to the circuit courts of appeal the power to review cases coming from the Tax Court in the same manner and to the same extent as they have power to review other cases—whether tax cases or nontax cases—coming from a district court in a case tried without a jury.

It will be noted that the bill does not attempt to define what is a question of law or what is a question of fact, or to answer any of the other complicated questions which would be involved in spelling out de novo the complete scope of review. The distinction between questions of law and questions of fact is one well-established in the law, and one with which lawyers and judges have long been familiar. Without the necessity of here defining it or answering any of the other difficult questions involved in defining the scope of review, it will suffice to say that whatever the scope of review over cases—whether tax cases or nontax cases—coming from a district court, the same scope of review should exist over cases coming from the Tax Court.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the motion is to agree to the Senate amendments rather than to request a conference with the Senate. The House, by an overwhelming vote, approved the transfer of the Tax Court from the executive to the judicial branch of the Government. Our position is impregnable from the standpoint of logic and constitutional intent, yet because of certain incidents in the peculiar history of this splendid court, it is classified technically as an agency of the executive branch. No one can question the fact that it is a court legislatively established as prescribed by the Constitution. The amendment to which we are asked to agree defeats the action of the House in approving its transfer to the department where it logically belongs. Our concurrence with the Senate perpetuates one of the strangest anomalies in the Government. This is an ideal time to accomplish the transfer, and I am keenly disappointed that it must be postponed. I recognize that the members of the House Judiciary Committee are reluctant to take any action that would jeopardize the passage of H. R. 3214 by insisting on the transfer of the Tax Court, and I must bow to their decision. I am confident, however, that steps will be taken to secure consideration of this transfer in separate measures, and I shall join the committee members in urging favorable action thereon when presented with the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, let me again state my conviction that no court has a finer personnel or more distinguished record than the present Tax Court of the United States. Due recognition of this service should not be postponed indefinitely.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. Reed of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorandum expressing the views of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to certain of the Senate amendments.)

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 117, providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the amendment of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. JACKSON of California, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. COURTNEY.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-four Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 112]

Bell	Johnson Okla.	Regan
Bloom	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Boggs, La.	Kee	Sabath
Brown Ohio	Kefauver	Scoblick
Busbey	King	Shafer
Clark	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Clippinger	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Cox	Lynch	Smith, Va.
Crawford	Manasco	Spence
Flannagan	Morton	Stigler
Fogarty	Mundt	Stratton
Hartley	O'Toole	Thomas, N. J.
Herter	Patman	West
Holifield	Peden	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REQUEST CONCERNING HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us about how long we are going to continue tonight? I want to know whether I can get home tonight in time to get here tomorrow morning.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know about that. I may be able to advise the gentleman later.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, then I will object in order to find out.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 117.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

MOTION CONCERNING HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 6401, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment to section 4, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York, as a committee amendment:

On page 4, line 3, after the word "Act", insert a colon in lieu of the period, and insert the following proviso: *"Provided*, That no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act until the President proclaims not earlier than 75 days after the date of enactment (1) that an insufficient number of persons is on active service in the armed forces to maintain an adequate national defense, and (2) that a sufficient number of such persons cannot, in his judgment, be attained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary request for call to active duty. Immediately upon the issuance of such proclamation the provisions of this act authorizing the induction of persons into the armed forces and the ordering of persons into active service without their consent shall be effective, but no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act prior to 90 days after the date of its enactment."

Page 5, line 2, strike out the words "and 23" and substitute the word "Section" for the word "Sections."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe those who could hear the reading of the amendment will understand it very clearly. In effect, it puts off the invocation of the act for 75 days from the date of enactment, and leaves it to the President alone to invoke the act, depending upon whether enlistments at that time have met the demands of the armed forces.

I might say that this amendment was adopted by the full Committee on Armed Services about 2 weeks ago, and notification of the adoption of the amendment was transmitted to the Rules Committee. It was by unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Was a similar amendment adopted in the other body?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The amendment was defeated in the other body by a substantial vote.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am wondering, since the gentleman is offering the amendment to defer the drafting for 90 days after the act goes into effect, and the President indicates it is necessary, why would it not be well to extend it another 90 days and accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], which would make it effective January 30?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is an entirely different amendment. That amendment also calls for a concurrent resolution of the Congress. We might as well not enact this bill today. As soon as we get back in January we would have to take it up again. I am here in behalf of the committee amendment unanimously adopted in the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I might suggest that if there is such a great emergency you should not wait 75 days. Either there is an emergency or there is not. You are attempting to smooth it over by saying, "We have got 90 days; we can wait." Now, do we have 90 days or not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We have 75 days before the President can invoke any provision of this bill, during which time he cannot call any member of the Reserves, without his consent, or can anybody be inducted. That is simply and clearly what this amendment provides. It was unanimously adopted in the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then I wanted to ask the gentleman if there is any emergency at this time which makes it so necessary to get the draft into effect. We have been told all along that we could not delay; that we should move quickly. If that is true, why insert an amendment that will hold it up for 90 days?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may not be expressing my personal opinion. I agreed with the committee to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. You are sugar-coating it just a little, in other words.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. It is not quite clear to me. Is the effect of this amendment to place the burden upon the President to activate this program?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is true it places the burden directly on the President of the United States at the time this period runs out, rather than on the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Is it not a fact that this does not place any more burden on the President than the other provision of the

bill which requires the President to issue a proclamation as to when the draftees will have to register, and also to issue the proclamation when the doctors have to go into the service?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The President must issue proclamations in any case.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is not this in substance the same amendment that was proposed in another body, which was rejected there, an amendment which was intended to place the burden on the President?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It was defeated in the Senate by a substantial margin.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the gentleman now stating to this body that the other body has abandoned their position in refusing to place the onus upon the President rather than this Congress which should assume its own responsibility under this important piece of legislation?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is a matter for each man's own judgment. The committee is offering this as a committee amendment which was unanimously adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not fair to say that assuming this measure is enacted by the Congress and becomes law, then, of course, the mechanics of the act will begin to take effect and in the time which is covered by this amendment it is conceivable that the situation in the world might be so altered or changed that those who have the first responsibility in respect to the conduct of our foreign affairs, and even the Commander in Chief, might see a reason for not putting the act into effect.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No one could hope for a clarifying of certain things more than I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD to the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Strike out all of section 23 and insert: "This act shall be effective on the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations 100 percent of all profits and earnings in excess of the average annual profits and earnings of such corporations engaged in the manufacture of war materials or any other service connected with the war effort and/or the Selective Service Act of 1948."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Now that we are considering the drafting of young men we had better start talking about drafting industry and dollars and do something about it.

An amendment somewhat similar to this was offered in the Senate and it was held to be germane in that body.

I feel that if this emergency which supposedly confronts us at the present time is of such a grave nature that we have got to pass this bill then we had better go all the way and do the job now while we have the chance to consider this matter calmly.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment is germane to this particular proposal because like the Andrews amendment it sets a beginning date as to the time when this law should go into operation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment as presented would strike out all of section 23. This section is not now under consideration and for that reason a motion to strike it out would not be in order at this time.

The Chair may also say, however, as to the point raised by the gentleman from New York that the amendment proposes to make the effectiveness of this act contingent upon an unrelated matter and therefore would not be germane to the pending amendment.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, section 23, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, is stricken from this bill. Because of that I was forced to offer this amendment—voluntarily of course—to the amendment which he had offered so that it would be inserted in the right place.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering today a proposal to draft young American men through a selective service law into the armed forces of the United States. I offered my amendment because of my way of thinking nothing is more important than a man's life and if we are going to ask a man to serve, and perhaps die in the service of his country, then I feel we have just as much right to demand that a man's money or business can be drafted also.

Other Members have spoken on this floor in favor of selective service who said they were officers in the Army Reserve and who stated they were going back into camp this summer. I want to speak as one who served as an enlisted man in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

I have a pretty good idea what these boys are going to be up against and I would like to speak on their behalf for a change. Boys who will be called under this act will enter the services as enlisted men and they are the ones who will be most affected by this measure. I offered my amendment because to my way of thinking nothing is more important than a man's life. If we are going to ask a man to serve and perhaps die in the service of his country, then I feel we have just as much right to ask that a man's money or business be drafted also.

One thing which has disturbed me in all our wars, is that we have consistently refused to take the profit out of war. We have seen this country spend the blood of its best young men and at the same time, we have in every war in which we have been engaged, noted how our huge corporations made tremendous profits. The cost of the last war was $336,000,000,000 plus a million casualties in killed, wounded, and missing. At the same time these enormous sacrifices were being made the corporations in this country made the huge profit of $56,000,000,000. That profit-taking spree has been accelerated and continued down to the present time.

This Congress should, in my opinion, have taken immediate action on my amendment because we all know if this amendment had been adopted, that we were expressing very forcibly the wishes of the great majority of the American people. If we are going to draft our manpower, as this bill contemplates, then I say let us also draft the money—the high excess profits which have been one of the results of wars and which will be needed to pay for part of the twenty-one billion needed to carry on our military program for 1949. If we are to put our boys back in uniform, let us put our corporations under the same military discipline. If this is a world crisis we have to win, I feel we should go all out in the matter of preparation for it. Selective service itself is just a piecemeal approach to a problem which I feel has been exaggerated. If we are really in difficulty, my suggestion would be to adopt this amendment so that we can be prepared thoroughly for the difficult days which lie ahead.

No democracy has a right to draft men for any immediate danger which is not great enough to justify and compel drafting dollars at the same time. The military can increase their power immeasurably through selective service and UMT. Wall Street and industry can be assured of huge profits through maintenance of a huge military establishment with its demands for goods and services. Both are powerful in Washington at this time and both can gain advantages from whipping up a war scare.

If the talk of the military is not a bluff, let them prove it by submitting industry to the draft, which they seek for living human beings. Not a man should be forced into uniform unless we are sure every dollar is enlisted too.

Corporations should be satisfied with normal, peacetime profits in time of war or national emergency. No one should complain about their dollars being drafted if we pass this measure to draft our young men. Now is the time to stand up and be counted on this vital issue of dollars versus men because what we do in this House today may well decide our future for generations to come.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that in the suggested amendment offered by the Committee on Armed Services it is trying to put a little sugar-coating on this bitter pill so it will be a little easier for you to swallow. I think the committee and this Congress will be dodging their responsibility if they say that the President must declare that an emergency exists, and then proceed to put the machinery into

operation 75 days after the act passes, and it allows 90 days for the individuals who are going into the armed service.

We have been led to believe by the military that there is a grave emergency existing. We read in this bill that at the "earliest possible practical date" this conscription bill shall be put into effect. I submit if the Armed Services Committee are going to keep faith with this Congress they have no right to put in here machinery that is going to delay it until 4 or 5 days before the election. That is what it does.

Why do you put this sugar-coated provision in here? Do you think someone might swallow it a little easier? It would be far better to adopt the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] which provides that there must be a speed-up in our induction machinery—better pay for the enlisted man and then the President and the next Congress must take action by January 30, 1949—that amendment should be adopted. Then the Congress can have an opportunity to review the situation in the world.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the emergency does not exist now, what is the excuse or the reason for this bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is what I would like to know. The committee says that the emergency does not exist now.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is what we have been told over and over again; that the emergency is not here. If it is not here, what is the reason for this bill?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Should it not also be pointed out that under the Shafer amendment the Army is required to take specific steps to get volunteer enlistments before the bill goes into effect, whereas under this amendment there is no such provision for any such action on the part of the Army.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct. As I understand under the Shafer amendment there will be an increase of 10 percent in the pay of the enlisted men and the military must take some certain, definite steps to get enlistments in the Army, which they have not been doing up to this time.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Dr. MILLER, how can we talk about adjourning here on Saturday and at the same time drafting these boys into the service on the basis of a great emergency existing? If an emergency exists, then we ought to stay right here and work with it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In this amendment the committee tells us that the emergency no longer exists.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. I have been led to believe that a great emergency does exist which necessitates the passage of the very type of legislation that is before the House. Frankly, I had intended to vote for this bill because I believed, in good faith, that an emergency did exist. But, if it does not exist, and the committee by this amendment admits that it does not exist, I see no reason for the law at all. Why not just let it go along until the Congress can determine that an emergency does exist?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Certainly I think the committee weakens the bill when they tell us there is an emergency existing, and then come in with machinery that puts the responsibility on the President, dodging our responsibility, mind you, by saying, "Well now, we think there ought to be, but you tell us, Mr. President, when it ought to be. You put it into effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has raised a very pertinent question here. I am a little surprised to hear that the Committee on Military Affairs has unanimously agreed on the amendment postponing the operation of this act.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] a question. As I understand the amendment, it postpones the operation of this law for 75 days, at least, and then it is 90 days before any man can be drafted; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It postpones the induction of the men; that is right. In the meantime it simply defers for 75 days the date on which the President would be required to make his proclamation.

Mr. BARDEN. In doing that the committee unanimously reached the conclusion that there was no such emergency existing as to jeopardize this country or the safety of this country for 75 or 90 days; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct, but while there may not be an international crisis today there is an intense manpower need. We do not know what the lack of these men is going to mean if it goes on.

Mr. BARDEN. The committee gave all that consideration at the time it adopted this committee amendment unanimously, did it not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is right.

Mr. BARDEN. And by so doing your committee unanimously agreed that no real emergency exists, but you have kind of salved over the situation, and now you are going to give the Army 75 days to try to recruit men, are you not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No, we are going to give 75 days more to the President to decide whether it is really needed, to see if we can get them, to see if there is any improvement in the situation.

Mr. BARDEN. And to see whether or not the Army has been able to recruit the needed men, is not that right?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. As far as I personally am concerned, I think we ought to invoke the act immediately, today, at midnight.

Mr. BARDEN. But the gentleman did not vote that way on this amendment, did he?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No.

Mr. BARDEN. Does not the gentleman feel that a little added inducement would enable the Army to recruit more men in the next 75 days, that is, to offer the men a little bit better pay from sergeant down?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No, I do not think that will make much difference. However, if selective service goes into effect today voluntary enlistments would automatically go up in all the services. Studies made throughout the war showed that that immediately takes place.

The gentleman asked me how I voted. How did he vote on the 70-group air force?

Mr. BARDEN. I voted for it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is what I thought.

Mr. BARDEN. I would vote for it again. The only thing I want to do is see that it is made active and available.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have a very high regard for the gentleman's opinion, and when he voted for the 70-group air force and the House voted overwhelmingly for it, 349 to 3, I believe. Where are you going to get the men to implement ground forces to support the 70-group air force? You all wanted the 70-group air force and now the question is of developing a program to support with ground forces the proposed Air Force set-up.

Mr. BARDEN. I would get the men to implement the Air Force the same way you are going to get the planes for them to fly. I would pay them to go into the Air Force, just as you will pay the men in the factories to build the airplanes they are going to use. You would force the men to go into the ranks as privates at $75 a month, but the very same gentlemen, sitting right there, will appropriate billions to pay the men who make the airplanes, and pay them at the rate of $2 an hour or better.

Mr. GAVIN. The same thing goes for the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. That is my answer to the gentleman's question. Voting for the Air Force has no bearing on this issue.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman was glad to endorse the legislation, so I say the same principle applies to him.

Mr. BARDEN. Of course, I agree with the gentleman about an enlarged Air Force. But why not be as fair to those taken in the Army as those who build the planes?

Mr. GAVIN. When the 70-group air force was being considered, and the Secretary of National Defense said that we needed a rounded-out service and that 55 groups would suffice for the time being, the gentleman wanted a 70-group air force. Now you have it. How are you going to implement it?

Mr. BARDEN. I am going to implement it by being fair to the men who operate and keep up the planes and offer sufficient pay inducement and incentive that we will get sufficient vountary enlistments.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman has not offered any suggestion as to how it should be done.

Mr. BARDEN. I am going to implement it by paying the men and being fair to them. The gentleman knows it is not fair to force them into the service without fair compensation—and if fair compensation and inducements are offered you will get sufficient men without the draft.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this bill. After listening to the many arguments for and against it, and after careful reflection, I believe that the opponents of the bill have made out a strong case against it.

They have proved to my satisfaction that there is no need at this time for an increase in our military manpower. The voluntary system of enlistments would suffice if the Army had not raised its peacetime standards too high, and if certain reforms were made within the armed forces. It might be pointed out that the true unification of the armed services as provided by Congress during the first session of the Eightieth Congress would go further toward strengthening our national security than any draft law. Action on the part of the Defense Establishment to carry out the intent of Congress in this respect is long overdue. Until this is done, I do not advocate passage of any legislation placing the lives of the youth of the Nation at the disposal of men who cannot even resolve the differences caused by the old feuds and petty jealousies among the services. It would be worse than futile—it would be a betrayal of the trust which the American people showed when they voted us into office.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I apprehend that the revival of the draft would be regarded by other nations as an aggressive act on the part of the United States and proof of lack of faith in the methods of international cooperation which we have been advocating. It would tend to accelerate the armaments race and so bring us one step nearer to the third world war. A weapon is a dangerous thing to possess even when one does not intend to use it. An army of young men at the disposal of men trained to use them in warfare could be disastrous in time of peace.

I am also opposed to the draft on economy grounds. The cost of this program would be heavy. And it would inevitably be followed by an increase in the tax burden. The expenditure of billions for defense will mean a reduction in the levels of living of the American people as well as the impairment of public services of which the Nation is in great need.

I concede the necessity of the draft in time of war, Mr. Chairman, but to impose it in time of peace would be contrary to our priceless American heritage of human liberty. It would be a step in the direction of the complete militarization of the country. It would exalt the military over the civil branches of the Government. What real assurance have we that the draft will not be expanded in the future and that the safeguards proposed at this time will not be abandoned?

This program may well be regarded as an effort to cover up the mistakes of our foreign policy. In my opinion, we have not yet exhausted all the other ways of dealing with the Soviet Union. It is a confession of moral bankruptcy and acknowledgment to the world that a system of government based upon the freedom and dignity of the individual has been tried in time of crises and found lacking. We must remember that our democratic traditions are supposed to function in time of stress as well as in times of peace and plenty.

But the arguments against this bill, Mr. Chairman, which seem most convincing to me are those which relate to its impact upon the young men of America. Hundreds of thousands of young men, recently graduated from our high schools and colleges, are now making good in business and the professions. Others are in the midst of their college work. Passage of this bill would mean that their education and business careers would be interrupted with incalculable results. The diversion of thousands of young men from industry will cause a decline in our industrial production and a corresponding economic loss to the Nation. Other young men will be taken from the farms and service trades which depend upon their work. Are we forgetting so soon that at the time of the last peacetime draft, the youth of the country were sent to fight and die on foreign soil even though we were promised "again, and again, and again" that such a thing would not happen?

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the many labor, farm, religious, educational, and civic organizations whose leaders have opposed this bill. And for all these reasons I intend to vote against it.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear to me that the chairman and other members of the Armed Services Committee evidently have been subjected to great pressure since yesterday's adjournment. I do not want to appear to be too critical but in view of the almost complete reversal of the committee's position by presenting the amendment under consideration, I feel it is my duty to comment on the situation which now confronts us.

First, however, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee to explain to the Members of the House the difference between the bill which the House has under consideration and the bill recently passed by the Senate concerning the same subject matter. In short, I want to know the difference, if any, of the date when selective service is to operate.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The difference between the Senate bill and ours is that under the Senate bill the process would start immediately.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, under the terms of the bill passed by the other body, the act becomes operative immediately.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. And according to this bill, 75 days would elapse before this selective-service law becomes effective.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. In about 90 days, because it is presumed that it will take from 75 to 90 days to get the thing in operation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the committee's position on the pending amendment is clearly a retreat on their part from the position which they have heretofore taken. I suppose the committee is fearful that this legislation will not pass and therefore is sugar-coating the pill. This amendment is a callous attempt to shift the responsibility from this body to the executive branch of the Government, in which the President of the United States will be called upon to activate this program. If we accept this amendment this is notice to the people of our Nation that we are reluctant to meet the issue which now confronts this body—head-on. This amendment is in the nature of a defense mechanism; it is an attempt to shirk a duty which so clearly belongs to the legislative branch of this Nation.

There is no doubt that all of us have given a great deal of study and attention to this perplexing problem. It is an especially difficult situation to meet in an election year. For my part, it is a subject to which I have given weeks and months of study in the hope that somewhere along the line I would gain enough information to reach a proper conclusion. As a result of intensive study, I have come to the conclusion that it is in the interest of this Nation and of the peace of the world to have a strong national-security program.

I shall confess, frankly, the dangers involved in the passage of this type of legislation, but as I weigh them against the possible dangers that confront us if we do not act now, it seems to me there is no alternative unless we are prepared to gamble with the peace of the world and the future of our own Nation.

As I look back upon my service and acquaintance with the Members of the Eightieth Congress, I cannot help but believe that we have enough courage—enough personal courage—to face our individual responsibilities—not only representing people in our particular congressional districts, but that we shall have the courage to assume our responsibilities as Members of Congress in representing that which is good for the whole Nation. How can we in good faith, how can we avoid the indictment

of political cowardice if we accept this amendment, an amendment which is purely political in its nature and is designed to shift our responsibilities upon the President of the United States? The responsibility is with this body and not with the President.

There is nothing new in this amendment. As this same legislation was being debated just a week or 10 days ago in the Senate of the United States, an effort was made to enact the same amendment which would have the same effect of shifting responsibility upon the President in the drafting of the young men of this Nation. I cannot recall just how many voted for the amendment, but it is sufficient to say that it was rejected with a substantial majority.

I call upon you to assume your individual responsibility as members of a legislative body of a great democracy. Do not run away from this issue for fear of facing your people at home. If you are in favor of this legislation, vote for it. If you think selective service is not necessary at this time, vote against the bill; then go back home to meet your people and look them in the eye, giving them your honest opinion. Let every tub stand on its own bottom. Certainly conscientious Members of the House should not try to shift their responsibility to someone else for political advancement. Do not try to put the burden upon the President of the United States.

Every Member here owes it to his people at home, and to the people of the Nation, and to the men who are going to be drafted into the service of this Nation, to stand up in a forthright and courageous manner on this important issue.

As I followed the debate in the Senate of the United States when a similar bill was under consideration, and as I have heard the debates before the House, one would be led to believe that we are discussing different bills. The truth is that the basic principle of both bills is the same. However, during the debates before the other body there seemed to be none of the fear and reluctance to face the issue that has been characteristic of this debate so far. In the Senate, as they proceeded from section to section of the bill, there was intelligent questioning—careful, calm, considered, mature judgment being exercised. Great emphasis was placed upon the future and security of this Nation and the peace of the world.

In the Senate debate the leaders talked about building up the Reserve components and the National Guard. On the other hand, in this body so far little light has been thrown upon that latter subject, although that is one of the most important aspects of the bill. In the other body there was intelligent probing by many Members, seeking the best means and the best manner to build up the forces of this Nation in order to implement a program for peace. There was little talk about the threat of war and almost every Member who spoke upon the floor of that body laid particular stress upon the point that selective service legislation is not a war measure, and that in the passage of this type of legislation this Nation was not threatening the other nations of the world; that we do not want to incite the other nations of the world to believe that this is a war measure. Again and again it was emphasized that in the light of recent events and the conditions existing in the world today that this measure had become an imperative necessity for our national security and for the peace of the world.

It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that at the conclusion of 5 days' deliberation, able men of different political philosophies voted in favor of legislation which is almost identical with the bill we have under consideration. The vote of that body was 78 for the bill and 10 against.

Mr. Chairman, as a veteran of two wars, I know something about the problems of the men in service, the problems of the families who have men in service, and the devastating effect of war. My record is known to all who care to read of my stand on the military hierarchy in general, and the possible danger of the military reaching so dominant a position in our national life.

I am bitterly opposed to war and have advocated and will continue to advocate the strengthening of the United Nations and any world cooperation program that will bring us peace. Nothing would please me more than to be able to vote against this type of legislation but in view of all the circumstances, and in view of the advice of leaders whose duty it is to know, and in view of the action of the Senate of the United States, I feel that I cannot in good conscience vote against this measure, pitting my limited knowledge against the overwhelming weight of the judgment and decisions of others whose knowledge and experience is far superior to mine.

So that the record may be crystal clear, I want it distinctly understood that I do not subscribe to the theory or the philosophy of a permanent, continuous, compulsory military program, nor am I in favor of a tremendous Reserve program except insofar as it is necessary to replenish and replace a reasonable Regular Military Establishment. Were it not for existing world conditions I would not, under any circumstances, cast my vote to compel any American to serve in the military forces of this Nation. Let the record show also, that in the event the international tensions have eased at the expiration of this act, I shall vote to abolish any system of compulsory military training.

Speaking also for the record, I should like to point out that in my opinion this body has the cart before the horse. Only the urgent necessity of the occasion compels my favorable consideration of this type of legislation. The failure of this Congress to act on other important measures imperils the security of this Nation. For example, the total disregard of the leadership of this body of the problems of inflation threatens not only our own national economy but our national security and eventually the cause of world peace itself. This piecemeal treatment of basic problems may well lead us along the path to economic chaos. I cannot emphasize too strongly that an economic bust in this Nation will imperil our national security and certainly will destroy whatever position we hold as a leader in the United Nations and in the search for world peace. The leadership of this body is either ignorant of or deliberately avoids proper treatment of problems which affect millions of our people. I refer to the increase in the cost of living, housing, Federal aid to education, and similar measures which concern the welfare of the people.

I have stated my position on this measure in order to demonstrate that there is no need for one to be fearful or apprehensive as to the soundness of his decision when he goes home to face his people, if he has a sincere and abiding conviction that he is acting in the national interests and acting in the interests of world peace.

And so I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that the committee's amendment will be rejected and that we, as Members of this great body, shall cast our votes honestly and courageously, and will not be a party to any political plot which seeks to throw the burden upon the President of the United States.

Under the Constitution, it is our duty to make the laws. It is the duty of the President of the United States to execute the laws which we make. In a Presidential election year, if we attempt to shirk our duty you may be assured that such action will not fool the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, but we are working under pressure as we are now running into the last 3 days of this session of the Congress. It seems best that we limit ourselves accordingly.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I do not believe it involves anything fundamental in connection with the bill. This is one bill coming before the Congress that was written by your committee. This bill was not written in any Government department. The bill went through a number of committee prints before it was ever brought to the House. Several of those committee prints contained provisions similar to the one that is now offered as a committee amendment. When the bill was offered it contained another provision. No one has mentioned it in the debate. The bill as reported by the committee had exactly the same time lag in it as is provided in this amendment.

Section 23 of the bill, on page 49, as it is pending here, provides that no person shall be inducted under this act within 90 days after the date of its enactment. This amendment does the same thing, except that if, within a period of 75 days, voluntary recruitment is sufficient, then the President would not have to put it into effect, if he did not see fit to do so.

Now, we are attempting in this bill, by many provisions, to secure voluntary enlistments and to augment the Reserve components—I agree with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]; I wish we could get down to discussing those provisions in the bill—we have had to spend

so much time yesterday, and apparently we are going to do the same thing today, listening to opponents to any measure of this sort, attempting to perfect it. Frankly, I am a little suspicious of opponents of a bill perfecting it; but that is the situation with which we are confronted.

In this bill we attempt to channel into the armed forces by voluntary recruitments and into the Reserve components, just as many men as we can.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I sought to have the gentleman from Colorado yield, but he declined to do so. If I understood him correctly, he said he was against this bill. Possibly his opposition to this amendment is because it would make it more difficult for him to vote against the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. I understood the gentleman to say that he could not in good conscience vote against the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I thought my remarks were very clear, that I was not opposed to this bill. But whether or not I would be for it or against it, I would have the courage to cast my vote based upon my convictions, and based upon the debates held here.

Mr. KILDAY. I understood the gentleman to say that he wished in good conscience he could vote against the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sorry, but I misunderstood what the gentleman from Colorado said.

Mr. KILDAY. The point about placing the burden on the President is apparent, but not real. The entire bill provides that the President must issue his proclamation for the date of registration. The President must issue a proclamation for the quotas to be inducted. He has to do everything to put this bill into effect. So that all you do by this amendment is to make it clear that the machinery is here in a stand-by position. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are parts of the executive department of the Government and operate under the President. They know how many they have, how many they need, how many they expect to get. When they reach the point where they feel they will not get all they need, they inform the President and he issues a proclamation. At the same time, if they do secure adequate numbers by voluntary enlistments, then they will not have the inductions. That is what we want—to get as many as we possibly can by voluntary enlistments, and to channel as many as possible into the Reserve components.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. Under this amendment could the President make any invocation until 75 days shall have elapsed?

Mr. KILDAY. He could not. Under the provisions of the bill nothing could happen for a period of 90 days. So it is exactly the same period of time, because he must issue his proclamation no earlier than 75 days, and the inductions could not become effective in less than 90 days. So the time lag is exactly the same.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Would not the gentleman agree that if the amendment is adopted, the provisions of the bill are not held in abeyance—are not in a stand-by position?

Mr. KILDAY. It will take 90 days.

Mr. COLE of New York. As a matter of fact, the mechanics of the bill start in motion when the bill is signed by the President. Men will be required to register, and it is assumed that it will require 90 days for the registration. So there is no delay and no postponement.

Mr. KILDAY. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. The only thing that is postponed is the induction. The registration begins and even the classification.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object. In fact, I intend to offer a substitute.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's limitation is merely to this one amendment?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes, I merely ask for a limitation on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER to the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Strike out the words "75 days" and insert "150 days."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I still believe in American ideals. I have announced on and off the floor of this House that I am for a draft; and, if you please, I am for universal military training.

I trust that this bill when it comes to final passage will be in such form that I can vote for it. I also hope that in the true spirit of our country this bill and national security are not going to be made a political football.

The 75-day provision contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would require this proclamation to be made upon the eve of a national election. If no politics are being played with this amendment and with this bill, there should be no objection to changing that time to 150 days so that it will come after the election instead of before.

I urge, therefore, that the Committee accept my amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. BUFFETT. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I submitted a consent request to the House limiting debate and based the time estimate on the number of Members standing seeking recognition. They should be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. But unless a Member seeks recognition the Chair is not going to call any Member to speak.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORRIS. If a number of those originally desired to be heard do not now desire to be heard will the rest of us have as much as 5 minutes apiece? That is all I want, but I do want that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair took down the names of those Members who were on their feet at the time the consent request was submitted and the Chair is endeavoring to divide the time equally between them.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHAFER. Was the limitation in the request submitted by the gentleman from New York to his own amendment only?

The CHAIRMAN. The consent agreement was that all debate on his amendment conclude in 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. That would not include any amendment to the amendment or any substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, either there is an emergency now on which this Congress should act or there is not an emergency. It has to be either one or the other.

Here we have a situation that involves the most important issue that mankind has ever had before it, the issue of compulsion versus freedom. Certainly there should not be any attempt to cut off debate on the most important issue before Congress: Compulsion or freedom.

I can remember 2 years ago when this House in a moment of overexcitement

passed a conscription bill. Most of you remember it. Most of you also remember that 48 hours after that conscription bill was passed most of the Members of this House deeply regretted it.

That was when the President came in and wanted to draft strikers into the Army.

Now we have another proposal that would regiment the people of our land. The amendment that would put this draft off for 90 days is a device of psychological terrorism. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it is below the dignity of this House to use one of the favorite Nazi tricks, the device of psychological terrorism, on the youth of America.

Mr. Chairman, I have one further word for my Republican colleagues. We have seen the administration throw the Atlantic Charter into the wastebasket, we have seen the administration throw the four freedoms into the wastebasket, we have seen them break one pledge after another.

Now what pledge did the Republican Party make to the people 2 years ago when we were elected to a majority in this House? Let me read it to you:

Neither the war nor any other excuse shall be justification for fastening regimentation permanently upon the American people.

Here in this House is a Republican majority elected on the pledge to end regimentation. Now that same Republican majority is going to turn around and completely repudiate its commitment to the American people.

My mind goes back to when the Republican Party was started. It was started on the glorious promise to set men free, to bring freedom to all people of America.

I can think of nothing more tragic than for this Republican Congress to reverse that tradition and surrender the freedom from the people.

Could there be any worse betrayal for our party to make, a party that rose to greatness on establishing freedom for all the people of this country?

Would it not be a tragedy for our party to turn around now and take away the freedom of its young people, those who cannot protect themselves?

It would be much more just if we were to pass a law drafting men from 40 to 50, those who would make better policemen abroad because of their age and experience.

But, no, we are going to take the 19- and 20-year-olds and send them over to Germany and Japan to teach those people about freedom.

Is there anything more ridiculous than that? Is there anything more fantastic than to deprive the young men of their liberty, on the pretense of sending them to Japan or Germany to teach those people about freedom and liberty?

Does anybody think this kind of hypocrisy, this kind of double talk, is going to fool the people of America or of the world?

Mr. Chairman, you will not save this country from communism, by hypocrisy, and double dealing.

If there is an emergency, then the advocates of this measure should ask an immediate draft. They have exposed the hollowness of the whole scheme by amending the bill to delay the draft for 3 months or more.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION IS NOT THE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM OF OBTAINING WORLD PEACE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we are faced today with a bill which calls for the enactment of peacetime conscription of young men into the armed forces for a period of 2 years.

This bill calls for a revolutionary change in a policy of American democracy which has existed for 165 years. That policy has declared heretofore that no citizen of the United States shall be forced into military service during peacetime. Our constitutional fathers specifically repudiated peacetime conscription for military service. Enforced military service in Europe was one of the strongest factors in the prolongation of tyrannical monarchies and one of the chief reasons for early migration to America.

For 165 years we have carried on in the American tradition. During that time we have fought several great wars. We have never suffered military defeat, although our military forces drew their personnel from a citizenry of nonregimented, nonprofessional military class, and was based primarily on volunteer troops. It is true that we have supplemented our volunteer troops in wartime with conscripted personnel, but we have never departed in peacetime from our traditional position of a volunteer regular military force.

We have proven in every war worthy of mention that armies of free men can outwork and outfight the nations whose armies were based on conscripted slave workers and soldiers.

I cite as examples the defeat of Germany in World War I. A Germany that practiced peacetime conscription and trained her citizens in the militaristic Prussian method for conquest by war. The free armies of England, France, and the United States defeated Germany.

Again in World War II, the armies of Japan, Italy, and Germany were professionally trained through peacetime conscription of their soldiers, and yet they went down to defeat under the genius and initiative of citizen soldiers drawn from the free democracies of the United States, Great Britain, and our allies—none of whom practiced peacetime conscription.

What has happened to cause us to consider reversing the American tradition which has proven successful, and now causes us to embrace the Prussian theory of militarism contained in this bill?

In my opinion, we are falling victim to the propaganda of the professional militarists of the late war, generals and colonels and majors who see their wartime jobs disappearing and know that their return to civilian life will mean a reduction in pay, privileges, and authority. We are also falling victim to the propaganda of the war munition and matériel manufacturers, whose wartime profits have ceased.

We are also absorbing the propaganda of the people who say that war with Russia is inevitable, who in their hysteria of fear have turned their backs on the United Nations and returned to militaristic nationalism as the formula for a peaceful world. Such a formula is madness, it means an armament race which will cost us $17,500,000,000 in the next fiscal year, and $21,000,000,000 the second fiscal year, and more thereafter. These amounts are based on testimony before the Armed Services Committee. Even this cost might be absorbed, although extremely inflationary and dangerous, if militaristic nationalism was the answer, but it is not the answer to the problem of obtaining a peaceful world.

It is a return to the discredited methods which have caused all our wars. Intense nationalism plus military rearming on the part of competing nations has always been the formula for war.

If we embark on this course we turn our back on all our hopes of achieving world peace through the United Nations. We confess that we have no faith in the glorious concept of peace for mankind through international law, through peaceful negotiation under rules of justice and equity. Peace obtained by majority decision of nations sitting in calm tribunals, rendering judgment in light of the rules of international justice and the great spirited and moral precepts.

I do not believe that we are ready to desert the principles of the United Nations and discard the hope of world peace contained therein for the discredited law of the nationalistic jungle.

And yet that is the meaning of peacetime conscription. It is the first step toward militarism. It lays the foundation for a permanent military caste in the United States. We lay the foundation for a complete reversal of our former concept of democratic government, that is, the concept that the civilian shall dominate our society and the military shall be subservient to the civilian. It is the nose of the camel under the tent, the body of the camel will follow and the owner of the tent will be ejected.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why peacetime conscription of our boys from 18 to 26 should not be adopted. One of the most important reasons is that the war of the future will not be fought by mass armies. The military leaders of today are planning for the wars of yesterday when they advocate peacetime conscription to build mass armies.

They are ignoring the capacity for immediate destruction contained in atomic bombs. Long wars are a thing of the past, future wars will be decided in days. Great centers of population and industrial production will be destroyed in days, not by months and years of long-range, old-style bombing.

Destruction will be so complete that occupation will be both unnecessary and unprofitable.

Complete defense against aircraft or air missiles which are atomic-armed is impossible, as proven by the testimony of our greatest military leaders, and yet anything short of complete defense is useless. Why? Because one aircraft carrying a modern atomic bomb can elim-

inate any modern industrial center from the war effort.

We are, in this bill for peacetime conscription, helping to perpetuate the military concept of World War II. We are duplicating the shortsighted judgment of the military leaders of the postwar I period, who court-martialed Billy Mitchell because he said the next war would be an air war.

We are building a Maginot line not of concrete and steel, as France did after World War I, but we are building a Maginot line of the bodies of our 18-year-old boys. Their bodies and all the obsolete methods of past wars will not protect us against atomic destruction.

Mankind cannot afford the luxury of another war. A war which will be decided by atomic and bacteriological methods, so destructive that civilization cannot withstand the shock.

There is only one hope for world peace, and that hope lies in the application of the principle of righteousness in the United Nations. This we can do only through the help of Almighty God. May we realize that the arm of flesh will fail us before it is too late. Let us bend all our energies, our statesmanship, and our resources to making the United Nations work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I gave you some information that was presented before the Ordnance Association in Detroit last week showing very conclusively that we do not have balanced arms or ammunition available to equip six and one-half divisions. Just a few minutes ago when the appropriation bill, H. R. 6935, was before us, there passed without comment, because of the extreme rush, consideration of the stock pile appropriation, and on page 17 of the hearings on the bill H. R. 6935 you will find that Mr. Thomas J. Hargrave, Chairman of the Munitions Board, testified before the Committee on Appropriations that in 2 years of effort since the enactment of Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress they have actually accomplished about 10 percent of the objectives on stock piling; that we are now literally behind the eight ball, and on that basis it will take probably 10 years to achieve our objective on stock piling. I would like to know what you are going to say to your constituents when you explain to them when you go back home that you have just gone that far in the matter of providing your boys with adequate weapons, in providing them with a 10 percent stock pile to provide more modern weapons in case the war should strike. I think it is very untimely to resort to the manpower draft first and in that way get the cart before the horse. I regret very much that we have failed so miserably in providing an adequate national defense on every other front, and yet we hysterically reach out now for the drafting of men in peacetime. Unlike the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I have no hesitancy in facing my constituents and telling them frankly and straightforwardly that I am opposed to the draft in peacetime. I have told them that for 27 years. I was sent to my congressional district by the War Department as a teacher of military science and tactics. My people know where I stand and I do not have to stutter about it. I think I have a thorough understanding of what is sound national defense, and I would hate terribly to see Congress place the draft for military service in peacetime ahead of the common-sense provision of the supply of arms that our boys need, and of the stock piles we need for the modernizing of equipment that will be needed in any future war.

For the better information of Congress in the consideration of the issue here under consideration I quote the questions asked of Mr. Hargrave by the gentleman from New Jersey, Hon. GORDON CANFIELD, member of the Appropriations Committee, and Mr. Hargrave's replies:

NEED FOR SPEEDING UP PROGRAM

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Hargrave, the goal for the completion of these stock piles is the end of the fiscal year 1951. Do you believe that this program should be speeded up in the light of the current international situation?

Mr. HARGRAVE. I believe it should. Regardless of the present situation, I have always believed that the stock piles should be materialized within the 5-year period, which is the original goal. Actually, we are very considerably behind the 8 ball now, so far as the quantity of the stock pile is concerned. Actually I believe we have built up about 10 percent of our objective in 2 years, two full years of the operation of the stock piling, and on that basis it would take considerably longer than a 10-year period. However, I will say that our accelerated rate has gone up very much during the first half of the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. MACK. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HARGRAVE. And I think that acceleration will be continued.

Mr. CANFIELD. Has the Board received any instructions from higher authority to accelerate this program?

Mr. HARGRAVE. None that I know of.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SHAFER for the committee amendment:

"SEC. —. (a) No person shall be registered or inducted under this act before January 31, 1949, and no person shall be registered or inducted under this act on or after January 31, 1949, unless the President and the Congress (by law enacted on or after such date) find that the requisite manpower strengths of the armed forces have not been attained and maintained by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign.

"(b) (1) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. For the purposes of such campaign and notwithstanding any other provisions of law—

"(A) the base pay of enlisted men on active duty in the armed forces of the United States is hereby increased by 10 percent;

"(B) the passing mark on the Army General Classification Test shall not exceed 70 points;

"(C) original enlistments in the armed forces for periods of 2 years shall be accepted from among all age groups suitable for military service, with such enlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for enlistments for periods of more than 2 years; and

"(D) reenlistments in the armed forces for periods of 1 or 2 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, shall be accepted with such reenlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for reenlistments for longer periods.

"(2) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each consult with, and make a monthly report to, the Joint Committee on Voluntary Enlistments with respect to the methods and results of the intensified voluntary enlistment campaign carried on pursuant to this section.

"SEC. —. (a) There is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Voluntary Enlistments (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), to be composed of five members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and five members of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(b) The joint committee shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the voluntary enlistment campaign required by section 23 of this act and shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable, not later than January 2, 1949.

"(c) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places within the United States during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(d) The joint committee shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan that it is not germane to the amendment for which it is offered as a substitute. It very obviously contains subject matter the provisions of which are not even contemplated by the bill, let alone the committee amendment for which it seeks to serve as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I believe, is germane because it has to do with the drafting of men into the United States Army or the delaying of the drafting of men into the Army. The amendment just offered dealt with giving them extra time so far as putting the legislation into effect.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is offered as a substitute for an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. The amendment for which it is offered as a substitute is limited to certain things. It relates wholly to the time of induction and the determination that a sufficient number cannot in the judgment of the President be obtained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary requests for call to active duty. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] goes far beyond the scope of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and proposes to create a joint congressional committee and deals with other matters beyond the scope of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Chair is constrained to rule that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is not germane as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will my amendment be germane at a later time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is hardly in a position to pass on that at this time. The Chair will consider that when the amendment is offered. That will depend partly on what it may be offered as a substitute for; whether it is offered as a direct amendment to the bill; its relation to the matter concerned at the point that it may be offered; and upon the condition of the bill at the time it may be offered.

The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANSFIELD) there were—ayes 145, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of California: On page 6, after line 16, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No persons shall be inducted under paragraphs (1) and (2) above until and unless the President shall find and so advise the President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, not before 3 months after the date of enactment of this act, that insufficient numbers of doctors of medicine, dentists, veterinarians, optometrists, osteopaths, and pharmacists have volunteered for service in the armed forces to maintain the ratio specified in said subsections. Upon such advice to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the authority in said subsections to induct persons into the armed forces shall become effective immediately."

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear first of all that I am definitely supporting this legislation. I voted for it as a member of the committee. I intend to support it, whether or not my amendment is adopted.

The amendment which I now offer was also offered in committee, and I think, primarily due to a misunderstanding, it was defeated by a rather close vote.

The amendment does not prevent, if necessary, the drafting of doctors, veterinarians, or any of the others mentioned in the amendment, but it does give the voluntary system with respect to those classifications an opportunity to work.

I should like to call to the attention of the members of the committee the fact that never in the history of the country have we found it necessary to draft doctors.

During World War II, through the Procurement and Assignment Service that was set up by the medical profession itself, we were able to obtain all the doctors necessary to properly care for the health needs of the men in the service. I think that at this time, in the passage of this legislation, it would be unwise, indeed, for us to provide for the drafting of doctors if they can be obtained through the Procurement and Assignment Service and by voluntary means.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the gentleman that as far as those at this table are concerned, we do not have any objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. If the other table will agree to my amendment I will revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that as far as I am concerned I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. If I am to understand there is no objection on the part of the committee, I will not proceed further.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. Has the committee made any endeavor to find out how many medical men are now in the Reserve Corps?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the committee has that information available; but there are not sufficient doctors now in the service to take care of the expanded needs of each branch of the armed forces.

Mr. FENTON. If the committee had seen fit to make inquiry up until yesterday they would have found that there are now in the medical reserve corps of the Army 14,162 physicians, and in the Navy 14,450, or a total of 40,960 already in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me, then, that the drafting of doctors at this time is not necessary.

Mr. FENTON. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I am glad the gentleman has offered this amendment. It is, of course, a departure from all previous practices to draft doctors. We have always been able to get all the medical services, not only doctors, but all the rest of the professional services on a volunteer basis. I feel that the gentleman's amendment is a good amendment and I expect to support it.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Like my colleague from California I too have been in contact with doctors all over my State of Tennessee. They are ready to offer their services whenever they are needed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. They have always done so throughout the history of our country.

Mr. JENNINGS. And they ought not to be drafted.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. I wish to say to my colleague that I am entirely in support of his amendment. The medical profession in my district likewise supports his amendment.

I wonder if the gentleman who is a member of the committee could tell us what you are going to do with 1 veterinarian for every 2,000 men. I thought they had gotten rid of all the horses in the Army.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think they have, but the term veterinary, as far as the armed forces is concerned, is out of date.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the additional number of physicians who will be needed if this bill goes into effect?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I cannot answer the gentleman, but he will find that information in the hearings.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in response to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] with regard to the veterinarians, the title "veterinarian" is obsolete. These veterinarians are really food inspectors.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that an amendment should be offered on page 5 as well, correcting the age limit 45, that it should be changed? Why discriminate against doctors, why draft doctors up to age 45?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. No, I do not think that age limit ought to be changed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Why should you discriminate against the doctor?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I do not think we are discriminating against the doctors. They will come in on a voluntary basis under the terms of my amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, you are, because that will still be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state to the gentleman from Connecticut that the Chair has examined the gentleman's amendment and is prepared to state that it is not in the nature of a substitute, but may be offered after the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is disposed of.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: On page 5, strike out all of page 5 and down to line 16 on page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just adopted is fine as far as it goes, but it certainly does not deal with this whole question whether or not we should draft into the service doctors, veterinarians, pharmacists, osteopaths, and others associated and affiliated with the medical profession. I may say at the outset that I have no personal interest in any doctor. No relative of mine is a physician. But no Member of the House has a higher regard for the medical profession and those who work with that profession than does the gentleman now addressing you.

The medical profession over the years has demonstrated that it has been ahead of our Army and Navy. It has always been ready for any national emergency and ready for the call of the Army and Navy. In 1917 the medical profession and the hospitals went out and organized medical units and then they had to sit around week after week waiting for orders to bring them to active duty. The same thing was true in preparation for World War II. The medical profession was ready. In my own State, and I am sure the same situation prevailed in other States, the medical profession had to set up committees to go around and urge some of the doctors who were badly needed at home to stay at home. They all wanted to leave and go into the armed services.

I am sure we do not want to pass any section of this bill that will cast any reflection on the patriotism of the medical profession or write any language in the bill that the medical profession feels does cast a reflection on their patriotism. I would remind you that a physician may be called into service under the terms of this bill and I admit that with the adoption of the Anderson amendment there would be very few inducted, certainly in the older age brackets. But take a doctor who is 36, 38, or 40, you call him into service in peacetime to simply serve a 2-year enlistment in the Army and you will ruin that man's practice. He is willing to do that in time of war. He is willing to leave his practice for 1, 5, or 6 years, but we are asking something of the medical profession under the terms of this bill that we do not ask of any other profession in the United States. This is true as to all doctors, osteopaths, veterinarians, and so forth, who are over age 26.

I hope the committee will strike out this whole section and permit the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy to get the doctors as they have up to this date, through the Officers Reserve Corps and through the procurement initiated and carried on by the medical profession itself.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will receive serious consideration and that it will be adopted.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment because never before in the history of our country have the doctors and dentists been charged with failure to respond to service when called.

This bill calls for the registration of doctors up to 45 years of age in contrast to all other male citizens up to 31 years. It therefore creates an assumption that medical men are lacking in patriotism and that they are singled out, specifically, as far as age is concerned.

I believe the records will show that the medical profession was the first to create a Reserve corps in the Army. Physicians leaving active service usually join the Reserve Corps. The Navy continues its service in the Reserve Corps indefinitely; the Army allows retirement from the Reserve Corps after 5 years. And, the records will further show that in the last two wars great numbers of physicians applied for commissions long before these wars were actually declared.

I am well experienced and very familiar with the work done by my profession in World Wars I and II—both in the field and in the hospitals. As a battalion surgeon of infantry in 1917–18 and 1919 I know, personally, of their accomplishments.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House during all of World War II, I naturally took a great interest in the work of my profession. As a matter of fact I visited in 1944, along with other members of that committee, the European theater of war. It was gratifying to me and my colleagues to hear day after day of the magnificent job the medical men were doing—and when I say medical men I mean also to include the Medical Corps—enlisted personnel and officers.

The members of our committee will forever remember what our great Army chiefs told us about the Medical Corps—Yes, Generals Eisenhower, Bradley, Patton, Clark, and dozens of other high ranking officers gave glowing accounts of the high type of work done by the medics.

My colleagues, the medical profession was the first to be prepared for the emergencies in 1917 and 1941. We not only volunteered as individuals but we prepared medical units for the field and organized many hospital units. I saw many of those hospital units in action in 1944—what a grand job they did.

Our national medical association—the AMA, our various State medical societies, our country medical societies working together and cooperating with the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission recruited 60,000 physicians for the armed services in World War II—60,000 physicians for an Army and Navy of 14,000,000—and they did a swell job.

On the basis of an armed service of a little over 2,000,000 and a ratio of 5 doctors per 1,000, there will be needed about 10,000 physicians. And you will easily get them, I am sure, by the same methods used in the past. But to place a stigma upon the patriotism of the present crop of physicians is unfair and I believe not justified.

At the close of World War II the medical profession set up another committee, called the Council on National Emergency Medical Service, which has been actively surveying the field and preparing for any new emergency or war. This committee or council has interviewed the authorities of our armed services in each branch for the purpose of determining in what way it can most effectively serve, and, in accordance with instructions, has stimulated the creation of a similar council in each State. The medical profession through these councils is preparing to meet not only the immediate demands of the armed services but also the problems that will arise among the civilians if and when they are exposed to an atomic explosion and the problems caused by invasion or an epidemic.

Yes, the medical profession is ahead of important groups in preparedness such as industry, transportation, and fuel.

Our medical schools have in their curricula appropriate courses to handle problems arising from atomic and biologic warfare and are cooperating with the Atomic Energy Commission as well as the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service.

At the present time the Army has 14,162 physicians in the Officers Reserve Corps and 5,508 dentists in the Officers Reserve Corps. In the Navy there are 14,215 physicians in the Naval Officers Reserve Corps and 7,075 dentists.

My colleagues, the medical profession will serve its country—draft or no draft—as it always has done. I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, under the agreement that we have, I deeply regret that we will have to be confined to 5 minutes. Therefore I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the statement has just been made that we must not draft these young men into the armed services without making very sure that they will have proper medical care. That is a wholly justified statement. But where is there a shred of evidence in the history of the United States that there were ever any men in our armed forces who did not have proper medical care voluntarily provided by members of the medical profession themselves? We did not have to draft a single doctor in the last war or in World War I. The medical profession itself provided more than enough. Doctors volunteered as individuals. They organized medical units for field service and hospital units at bases. Most were organized and ready months before the service called them. In addition the profession regulated itself by providing specialists where needed. It persuaded those of its members to go who had least obligations here at home, and who could render the greatest service in the armed forces. With remarkable success it tried to spread around those left at home, persuading men to go into those rural areas whose doctors had volunteered and left people without medical care.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me wholly unnecessary and utterly unjustified officially to stigmatize as unpatriotic the very professions that had the best record of volunteering of any groups in our whole population. They have not only done a superb job of being ready ahead of wars in the past; they are preparing for any future war right now. They have organized reserve units. They are voluntarily training their members and those of the nursing profession to take care of victims of possible atomic warfare and bacteriological warfare and every conceivable new type of injury that might be developed in another war.

So for us to single out for drafting up to 45 years of age the members of these professions which in the past, have rendered such outstanding service and have the highest percentage of volunteering, seems to me unnecessary, unjustified, unfair to the professions, and most of all unfair to the public.

What man is going to take his children or his wife to that doctor over whose head hangs the threat of being called at any moment into the armed services for 2 years? Just about the time that she will be ready to have her baby, Uncle Sam may call him up.

How will it be possible for him to build up his practice if he is likely to be pulled out at the age of 40 and taken into the service for 2 years? How can he establish himself when he gets back?

It is bad for the doctors, but far worse for the public itself to have all the healing professions in our country thrown into chaos and uncertainty.

In our country today there are about one and a half doctors for each one thousand of population. This bill authorizes the armed services to draft five for each thousand men. What patients require most of the doctors' time in civilian life? Three groups, the children, the aged, and women. The average for our civilian population including those who have the highest rate of illnesses is only one and a half doctors per one thousand. Yet here we are to take five for each thousand of young able bodied, carefully selected men who have been innoculated and vaccinated against diseases, fed vitamins and special foods, given maximum protection and in peacetime need the least medical care and not the most.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted. Physicians, nurses, dentists and the other professions have a high sense of duty. They have never failed this country in the past. They never will in the future. It will be better for all concerned, and especially for the civilian sick, to eliminate this unnecessary subsection 4 (c).

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The Committee may be interested in the statement, that the Navy sent out their recruiting officers to recruit dentists. Two thousand and seven hundred dentists signed up, expressing willingness to go into the service as of now, but as of this minute not one of the 2,700 has been taken; not one of them will be taken until this bill becomes law. They are waiting until this proposed legislation does become law before they will accept the 2,700 dentists who are pleading to enlist in the services. You see, it might hurt the chances of passage of this bill if these dentists were permitted to enlist and no shortage existed. I just thought you might be interested in knowing this fact.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this just to call attention to the fact that there are 5,000 doctors that would come in the first category. The commitee took this into very careful consideration. There are 5,000 doctors, trained at Government expense, in the Army or the Navy——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Just a moment.

Those men have no prior service. They are in the first category that would be drawn. In the first year that would just about meet the need.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How many of those 5,000 are 45 years of age?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. None of them, but the 45-year-old men are in the last category, and very few of them would ever be taken except in a supervisory way.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then, why do you have the draft age up to 45?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Simply to have them listed so we will know who they are.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Under present bill, all men up to 31 have to register and are eligible to be drafted, are they not?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No; they are not eligible for drafting. They are registered from 26 to 31. The registration figures are for one specific reason. Dr. Bush, of the Bureau of Scientific Research and Development, wanted to get an accurate estimate of the men who were in the service and to know where those men are in scientific fields and what they are doing. It is merely for the Bureau of Scientific Research and Development. That was the only reason for registering men from 26 to 31.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman know, from his work on the committee all during the last war, that the medical profession itself sorted out pretty well those of its members who ought to go into the service and could best be spared from the community needs, and succeeded in getting them to volunteer first?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. Then, why are you afraid the medical profession will fall down this time?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am particularly anxious to get the first category that are provided in this bill.

Mr. JUDD. And so in the medical profession.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Well, I am not so sure. I know one thing, that numbers of the medical profession are very anxious to have jobs in certain hospitals that are taken care of today by men in the service.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we do not adopt this amendment. We have gone far enough in adopting the Anderson amendment, in my opinion. Under that amendment the President will have the right to set up a priority system. That is the procedure under which we procured doctors in World War II. At the present time we have 8,150 doctors in

the Medical Corps. That includes the Air Force also. The number of doctors required for this expanded program is 11,350. So we will be short 2,100 doctors with the expanded program. The Navy also in their program at the present time have 2,750 doctors. That is based on 5.76 to each 1,000, which is a little more than this bill at this time carries. Under the expanded program the Navy will require 3,850 doctors and will be short 1,100 doctors.

This will make a total of 3,300 doctors short under the expanded program.

The 5,000 the chairman of the committee just mentioned are ASTP students with no prior service, and under this bill will be obligated to serve exclusive of the Anderson amendment. So you have a pool there of 5,000 students who have received practically all of their training paid for by the Government and should render some service. So the picture is not as bad as one would believe it to be. I know that at the present time that all of the medical schools in the country want doctors released. I have a wire today urging me to try to get a doctor out of the service to teach in a medical school. We are also faced with a situation in many parts of the country where there is a shortage of doctors.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. I am sure the gentleman is very fair. The gentleman, of course, is in favor of the Reserve Corps.

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly.

Mr. FENTON. Does the gentleman know there are now in the Army Reserve Corps 14,162 physicians and in the Navy Reserve Corps, 14,250?

Mr. DURHAM. I am glad to hear the doctor say that. I am not familiar with the exact number in the Reserve Corps. I am very much in favor of the Army and I hope it will be further extended.

Mr. FENTON. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman also has been very fair in his past deliberations on the Military Affairs Committee and he knows that the Committee on Procurement and Assignment in the last war did a very fine job.

Mr. DURHAM. A very excellent job. That is why I supported the Anderson amendment.

Mr. FENTON. And we certainly should leave it in the same hands to procure our physicians.

Mr. DURHAM. That is exactly what we have done if I understand the effect of the Anderson amendment.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. In view of the very excellent record that the medical profession made in the last world war, does the gentleman think it necessary to call our medical men to register up to 44?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not see anything wrong with having them register up to that age when you leave it up to a board like the one we operated under in the last World War. We need surgeons as well as doctors, and you do not get surgeons at age 25, you get them from age 35 to 40. You cannot run this on the basis of an age schedule like you can your ground forces and many other things because you have got to have these specialists who do not finish their training as specialists until they are much older.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair is advised that two or three Members wish to revise and extend their remarks at this point. The Chair will entertain such requests at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can come to an agreement in the matter of limiting debate on this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not yield to the gentleman for that purpose if this comes out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

The Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker resumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 110) entitled "An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2239) entitled "An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4051) entitled "An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. REED, Mr. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCMAHON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 6355) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives on reconsideration of the same, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 9 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in this section of the bill you are taking a left-handed slap at the physicians, the osteopaths, the veterinarians, and other men who in past wars have rendered an unusual service to our country. I was rather interested when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] stated there were 6½ doctors in the armed services for each thousand and he thought that these boys ought to have the very finest care they can get. The bill calls for 5 per 1,000. I would remind the gentleman that in civilian practice we have 1 physician to 800. He ought to be interested in seeing they get proper care before they go into the armed services.

May I also call your attention to the fact that the civilian population is made up partly of old men, women, and children, and expectant mothers, while the military services are made up of strong, healthy young men, who do not need these services. I am amazed at the gentleman that he would want to raise this to 6½ per 1,000, and that is what his words were. The bill provides for 5 per 1,000. He ought to be interested in seeing that they get pretty good care before they get into the armed services.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman realizes that the doctors and dentists who were in the service also cared for the children and the dependents in the service, which is not counted in the 5 to 1,000. Overseas they looked after civilian employees. You have to have a doctor on every ship of any size, you have to have a doctor at every military post regardless of size and organization, all of which makes necessary a higher percentage than you have in civilian life. I do not see how the gentleman is going to avoid that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are a number of civilians who were taken care of by the medical men in the military. I am going to offer an amendment to reduce the number of physicians to 2 per 1,000. The physicians have always been loyal in every war. They had a Reserve Corps ready to serve and right now in the Army and Navy Reserves there are more than 40,000

physicians who have signified their intention of rendering a service to the armed services if and when called. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there are about 5,000 ASTP students and the Army authorities tell me they are going to call those 5,000 under Executive order.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Those Reserve doctors cannot be called back to active duty without their consent. Many served in World War II.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is an Executive order calling these 5,000 I am speaking of into the service now.

May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if there is another war the atomic bomb will cause more damage to the civilian population than to many of the soldiers. You take the atomic bomb, bacteriological warfare and the other things that could occur to the people of this country and you are not going to have sufficient doctors at home to take care of them.

Now, this bill provides a ratio of 5 to 1,000. I live in a county of 4,000 people and we have two doctors. Under this bill, with the military ratio, we would have to have 20 doctors. I do not see why they should be so hoggish and want all of the professional material.

Mr. Chairman, I think this section ought to be stricken from the bill in order to keep from putting a stigma upon the physicians, dentists, and veterinarians of this country that they are not willing to serve their country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Just to keep the record straight, there were 10,000 ASTP students, not 5,000. I believe the record will show 10,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Five thousand of them are not eligible physically.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In order to follow the logic of this thing through, would it not be just as proper to draft all of the old hotel chefs?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. The gentleman asks, Why not carry this to a logical conclusion and draft all the old hotel chefs up to 45 years of age so the men will have good food in the Army.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Why not follow the logic still further and draft all Members of Congress who want this legislation?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, I would not go quite that far.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has pointed out that under this bill the Army plans to draft 1,238 veterinarians into peacetime service. I was amazed to learn this in view of the desperate shortage of trained veterinarians which now exists in this country.

Members of the veterinary profession are badly needed for civilian field work all over the country; they are needed by the Federal, State, and local governments for food inspection; they are needed for important research work—including research on foot-and-mouth disease, which now threatens American livestock.

Veterinary colleges in this country have not been able to train enough veterinarians for all civilian requirements. There are only 10 such colleges now, and, although 3 more are being added, it will be years before this will have any great effect on the situation.

I earnestly believe that the Army should give further consideration to their plans for the drafting of such a large number of veterinarians.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether my remarks are properly addressed to this amendment or to the one which the gentleman from Nebraska says he is about to offer. Of course, if this amendment carries, that will dispose of the issues embraced within the gentleman's proposal.

I say what I am about to say with the utmost charity and feeling of gratitude toward the Medical Corps of the Army. They are a fine group of men, and there are many splendid physicians and surgeons among them. To them I personally owe a deep debt as regards my own good health and possibly my life. But, in all frankness, it was my experience in the Army that they had too many doctors. Wherever I went, the doctors, with few exceptions, certainly were not working as hard as doctors in civilian life.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Apropos of the position taken on this amendment, I would like to remind the gentleman, and I know he knows, that in the theater in which he and I served one of the very finest hospitals, the Twentieth General Hospital, was entirely composed, from the commanding officer down through the doctors and the nurses, and practically all of the orderlies by voluntary enlistment from the University of Pennsylvania Hospital.

Mr. KEATING. That is perfectly true. Not a conscript doctor among them. And a fine outfit they were, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to subscribe to what the gentleman is saying about the number of doctors in the service. I was in the other theater of war, and it seemed to me that when we were not in battle we had more doctors than we had use for. While my service was not as broad or extensive as that of the gentleman from New York, wherever I did serve I always found that to be the case.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my friend from Florida for his observation. I know the gentleman's service was effective wherever he served, and I am interested to learn that his experience was the same as mine. I really feel, gentlemen of the Committee, that this amendment should carry. Nothing has been adduced in argument or in the record which I have read which convinces me that this compulsory service of doctors and other professional men is necessary. Its passage will work a great hardship on our civilians in many parts of the country where there is a serious shortage of doctors.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think something might well be said at this point also about what is going to happen to the morale and the skill of those doctors and dentists and veterinarians who are called into the service against their will.

Mr. KEATING. That is right. The gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman agree that if the original form of the bill were to go through it would probably create a very bad situation so far as the civilian needs are concerned?

Mr. KEATING. I think it would. I think that is borne out by what the gentleman from Nebraska told us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE].

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out that in some sections, if not in all parts of this country, there is a great shortage of civilian care on the part of the medical profession. I have in my district a county of over 10,000 people without one single physician to care for those people. In all other counties in my district there is a shortage of physicians. During my service in the Navy, after the war was over, I noticed that we had more doctors than we could even find good billets for.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman have any idea as to what the proportion of doctors to men are in this bill as compared to what they were during the war?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. It looks to me about the same.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that obviously you need more doctors when you are actually in a shooting war than you do when you are entering the service?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Of course, we take the cream of physicians crop into the service due to this draft and due to the high physical standards required.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Are not these 5,000 doctors that come under this first category subject to call now with or without their consent, if they have not already served?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. These 5,000 young men who were trained by the Army and Navy are still subject to call. It was part of the contract during their training period, and they will be called as needed and are being called as needed.

Mr. MORTON. Without this legislation?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Without this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 4, line 23, strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the desk similar to the one just offered by the gentleman from New York. I withdraw my amendment, and shall support his amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to reduce the term of service of the draftees to 12 months. Coming after the amendment to strike out completely the drafting of doctors, it would seem to me wholly in order to reduce the period of service of a drafted boy to a period of 1 year instead of 2 years, having in mind that in France and England and all the other countries of western Europe there is no country that drafts its boys for more than 1 year, and they all select them from the age groups of 19, 20, and 21.

I call your attention to the fact there is on the Speaker's desk a bill from the other end of the Capitol which drafts these boys for 2 full years. When a 2-year bill meets a 1-year bill in direct collision, the result may very well be an 18-month bill, so I think both the Members who favor a 1-year term of service and those who favor an 18-month term of service should support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there will come of age each year 1,140,000 boys. If this bill passes and we reduce the ages to make it from 19 through 21 as I propose to do in a later amendment, the Army will begin with three classes, and each additional year they will acquire another 1,100,000 men. If our generals and if our Secretaries have not the ability to operate an army with such a draft, together with the voluntary system, then let us get some generals with the ingenuity, ability, and intelligence to manage it.

The argument is made that it will be more expensive to take our boys for 1 year rather than for 2 years. Perhaps it will be. But for my part, I would rather pay the additional expense, and I would rather spare the boy and his family and the community the burden of two full years of service. I do not have to belabor the fact that 2 years taken out of a boy's life at his most formative period is far more serious to his future life and the development of a career.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. While it might be more expensive to the Army, it would be a great deal less expensive to the boys who are selected and put into the service.

Mr. COUDERT. Precisely.

Mr. Chairman, one further point that will be made against this is that a 1-year term of service is inefficient. Perhaps it is less efficient. I have no doubt that the generals would like to have a 7-year term of service. The old professional armies of Europe were composed of 7-year men. Perhaps they were better soldiers for some purposes—they were certainly better parade ground soldiers. They also complain, I understand, that this will make it a little more difficult to serve the occupied areas. Well, gentlemen, the military occupation is a police operation. It is a token garrison operation, and if it takes a little more trouble to send the 1-year man over there and turn them around and send them back, I would much rather do that than impose a wholly unjustified and harsh 2-year term on a handful of individuals.

Mr. Chairman, a third point. Liability to the draft should certainly be based upon a broad democratic foundation. A 2-year draft based upon figures that the Department of Defense now relies upon will mean a limited number of men only. A 1-year period will double the number serving and extend the foundation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the outset that I expect to support the draft bill. I do think, however, it could be improved in several particulars. This is one particular. You remember in 1945 we had almost 12,000,000 men under arms. At that time the recruiting sergeants and the recruiting officers were literally beating the drums everywhere saying that we needed more men. We were figting then, of course, in World War II, which encompased the whole world. If we get into another war, obviously it will not be any less in diameter; it will not be any less in intensity, nor any less in magnitude. The bill we are now considering takes into the service 2,500,000 men, one-sixth of those that we had in 1945. Therefore, obviously this bill is not designed to take in enough men to do us any good in the event we actually get into a shooting war. It is not designed to do that. It seems to me the purpose of it is to make those countries that are stamping out freedom throughout the world realize that we are getting ourselves ready and that we will go forward to resist aggression and totalitarianism.

The men who will be drafted under this bill will not be the colonels or the majors or the lieutenants. They will be the privates, the privates first class, and the sergeants. They will be the boys who are the orderlies for the colonels. They are the boys who will drive the jeeps and do the cooking and the baking. They are the boys who will do the police duty. They will also be given basic training. They will learn to shoot mortars, BAR's, flame throwers, and rifles. They can learn all that within a period of 1 year. There is no sense in keeping those boys in the service for 2 years to learn what they can get within 1 year. It is not fair to those young men to take them at the most formative period in their lives, as has been said, and keep them for over 1 year when to keep them is not necessary. What will they do the second year? They will pick up cigarette butts, wash down the barracks, and take long wasteful week ends.

Another thing, if they say it cuts down national defense, it cannot possibly be so, because under this bill, if we limit the time to 1 year, instead of training 2,500,000 we will train 4,010,000. So, if the purpose of the bill is to increase national defense, by this amendment we increase the number of trained men 100 percent.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I gladly yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Will you please tell us where you are going to get those 4,000,000 men? Are you going to take veterans or married men? There simply are not that many eligible in the pool.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the gentleman is going to ask me a question, I assume he will let me answer it. Under this bill the provisions of it will supply you with the number of men you need. As I understand from the chairman, you need only about 200,000 men. Certainly, we have enough men becoming eligible every year and within the provisions of this draft to meet the needs for each year.

Mr. KILDAY. Your figure is 600,000 rather than 200,000.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman know that under the figures of the Department of Defense, 1,140,000 young men turn 18 each year?

Mr. SMATHERS. So, obviously, if this bill is designed to increase national defense, it will do it by 100 percent, if we lessen the time that each man serves. Its clear that these men can get their basic training in 1 year.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct as to the number who will become 18, but he is not correct as to the number who will become eligible for military service. Our experience has been throughout selective service that you lose about 50 percent.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to add one other thought. That is the problem of morale. Young men can serve for 1 year and do a good job and feel like it has been a democratic process,

and that they have done their duty but if you take him for 2 years and keep him overseas, doing nothing but walking post he will get discouraged. He does not like the Army, he does not like the country. He does not like anything. Obviously, it is much more democratic to broaden the base of this bill and have more men serve and make each individual sacrifice less.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. Gladly to the able gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am in agreement with the gentleman on this 1-year proposition. I want to call to his attention the fact that in the last war we took men out of civilian life and trained them to be finished fighter and bomber pilots in 9 or 10 months. We took men out of civilian life and sent them through officer's candidate school in 3 months, and they came out and made good officers. I just cannot see the need for giving these men 2 years' service.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I well understand what prompts the amendment. The facts are that it does not gibe with the situation and the number we have in the available pool. The committee took into consideration the exemptions that it wanted to make, with the result that the effective pool is right down to hardpan now, on the basis of 2 years' service.

Of course, it is clear that if men go into the service they must be trained. In case of service overseas, in Japan or Germany or other places, they must be transported. They must be brought back home when they are discharged. Then, if you take a man into service for a year, he is certainly out of the picture. In the induction pool there are today 1,300,000 men.

In the first year the Army will need 250,000 new men to go from 540,000 to 790,000. That takes no account of the attrition that is going on in this year, men we are going to lose on short-term enlistments, enlistments longer even than 1 year. Every time you enlist a man for a year or 18 months you are going to face the same situation a year or 18 months later, you are going to have men going out every month.

The Navy will need 33,000 more to go from 437,000 to 460,000, plus 100,000 more to replace men leaving the Navy.

The Air Force needs 56,000 men to go from its present strength of 397,000 to 413,000, plus 166,000 to replace men leaving the Air Force, making a total of 222,000 for the Air Force.

The Marines need 10,000.

All this adds up to a total need of 903,000 men in the next year, during the coming fiscal year.

There will be 349,000 more men in the services to raise their strength, combined, from 1,466,000 on July 1, 1948, to 1,795,000 on July 1, 1949. This will leave 555,000 more men to replace the many leaving the services during the year.

Even if you got these men by enlistment rather than by induction it takes longer to train men in the Air Corps than in any other service. We have voted for a 70-group air force. It is going to take thousands of trained men to man that air force. The Air Force is not taking any enlistment under 3 years.

If the period of service is cut in half, twice as many men will be needed. Twice as many men will be needed under a 1-year period than under the proposed bill. There are simply not that many men in the pool under the bill as now drafted and we have endeavored to set up exemptions and deferments with the result that the pool is just about equal to the number of men that will be needed in the next fiscal year, considering the increase in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the replacements that will be necessary to fill the spaces created by those who drop out who had short-term enlistments. It just would not work with the pool. I want to remind you that according to the House bill we defer all fathers, we defer all those who have dependents, we defer all those under 18 years of age. Only in the 19–20 year group do we have a big pool, because after you get into and past the 21-year group you get into the group that saw service during the past war. We defer all members of the National Guard, we defer all members of the Reserve Corps, and all men who had 12 months' service in this war. The Senate bill does not do that.

The House defers all men who had 12 months of service in the past war or even 12 months' Federal service since the war provided they are now in the National Guard or Reserve Corps.

This amendment does not jibe with the facts and will leave us in a hopeless situation.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no easy road to peace. Witness the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. There is no happy way in which men can defend their country. There is no happiness in the heart, I am sure, of any man in this House when he reaches into the home, into the life of the people and asks them to serve their country.

I did not have anything to do with the mess that the world is in today. Perhaps if 15 or 20 years ago this Congress had had the courage to realize the cost of peace we would not be faced with this unfortunate position today.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because it will render useless both the 12 months of training of the soldier, the money it has cost the taxpayers, and the time of the Army.

This is not a training bill. It is, we hope, an opportunity to have military strength which, we pray God, we may never need, rather than military weakness in time of need. I, too, wish that the service of TEAGUE, WILLIAMS, and 16,000,000 other people, approximately, could have saved the House this terrible responsibility. But unfortunately, that is not true. I sincerely hope that no American will ever be called upon to engage in combat, for I know the dirty, nasty business of war; consequently, I shall accept my responsibility and ask young America to invest 2 years of their lives if necessary in the future of the world. If there is to be a future perhaps it will be decided by the courage and the foresight of this Congress.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman know of any country in history where conscription has prevented it from getting into war?

Mr. LYLE. I know of no period of western civilization in which there has never been a war.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I want to subscribe to the very worthy sentiments which the gentleman is expressing. If the gentleman says that what we need is more manpower, 1 year's training will give us twice as much manpower as the present set-up. That is one of the reasons for the amendment.

Mr. LYLE. This is not a training bill; this is a service bill. The training bill is still in the Rules Committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. Can the gentleman tell me of any new land that the United States intends to occupy other than what it is occupying right now?

Mr. LYLE. I join with the gentleman in the prayer that we never occupy one single bit of land that does not belong to America; but, if necessary, I want an army equipped, first, to defend my country, and, second, to occupy that which is necessary to defend my country.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman maintain when it took 12,000,000 men to defend us in World War II that 2,000,000 men can do it in world war III?

Mr. LYLE. I am assuming if this bill is passed and if we meet our responsibility and meet the challenge that is ours today and develop a striking, effective combat force, we will not have a war.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman says this is not a training bill. If this is not to train our young men to fill a niche in the defense of our beloved Republic and to help preserve it, what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. LYLE. The purpose of it is to build up the dwindling ranks of the Army.

Mr. BREHM. Then it is a training program?

Mr. LYLE. Necessarily, training is involved in it because these men will be given 12 or 13 weeks of basic training before they are assigned to a unit.

Mr. BREHM. It is either a training program to help defend America or it is preparation for war. It must be one or the other. The gentleman says it is not

a training program, so we must deduce then that it is a direct preparation for war. Basic training can be obtained in 13 weeks or less, why 2 years if it is not for general training provisions?

Mr. LYLE. I hope not, I sincerely hope not.

Mr. BREHM. That is the only logical conclusion to be drawn from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does not the gentleman think that this amendment is a determination of whether we will have a strong army or a weak one?

Mr. LYLE. I think if the pending amendment is adopted, the whole bill is useless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to limit the period of service to 1 year. This ominously broad bill is disturbing many people throughout the Republic. It is disturbing many in this Congress. It has been said that if you draft these young men for only 1 year that it will not work; that you will take the heart out of the program; that you will ruin the service. Oh, how many times have we heard that? How many bills have passed this Congress, gone into effect, and worked, when we have been told on this floor that the departments involved say, "It will not work; we cannot do it that way." This is a measure that reaches out into some families and takes a young man to serve in the armed forces while it passes by other families. On one hand it takes a young man to serve for 2 years. I maintain that 1 year is long enough. What harm can come from trying 1 year? What mistake can be made at this time in trying it for 1 year?

Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out that if this period of service is for 1 year it will result in having more men trained to serve their country. It will be more uniform; it will treat the boys and families alike if they are drafted for only 1 year. It will make a lasting difference in the educational, business, and family plans of many young men. It will enable them to hang onto the things which they hold dear to a far greater degree than if they are taken for 2 years. A boy may be able to serve a year without completely destroying his educational and life plans. With 2 years taken out of his life the danger is much greater.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to one other thing. We have talked about the available pool and that there would be certain exemptions and deferments. Do you realize that the number of deferments can and will be cut down if the draft is only for 1 year?

This is not, as has been pointed out, purely a training program. I am inclined to think that this country ought to have some sort of a training program. However, we are embarking upon a matter of selective service. This proposal is to draft boys for twice as long as did the Selective Service Act of 1940. It should be reduced to 1 year. You are voting for a law that is going to reach into some homes where there is a young man and it is going to pass by others. Why should you have it for 2 years? Let us try 1 year.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Is it not true that if it is ineffective for 1 year, that then we are to believe that the whole UMT program proposed before this was under a false argument?

Mr. CURTIS. That is right. I refuse yet to bow to the departments and bureaus of government which always advance the stock argument that any change in their proposals will render those proposals unworkable. Let us try it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON as a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]: Page 4, line 23, strike out "24" and insert "18."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply to give you a choice between 24 months, 18 months, and 12 months. It has been urged that 12 months is probably too short, when you take off the time that is to be spent in boot or basic training. If you are going to have a training program along with a program that makes up the deficit of the services, we may need not only a time for training but also a time for duties other than training, that is, field duty and occupation duty. So to be worth while to the Army, we are now arguing between something that may defeat the entire program, 12 months, on one hand, and 24 months on the other, and the 24 months may defeat the younger generation. As a compromise, I am offering 18 months.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman really wants, and I am sure he does, to give the House an absolute choice, would it not be better to permit a vote on the 12-month provision before we have a vote on the 18-month provision? If that is not the choice of the House, we still would have an opportunity to vote on the 18-month provision.

Mr. FULTON. No; I am sorry that I cannot agree.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in one-half hour.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the number of Members who have indicated a desire to speak on this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the action just taken limiting debate to 30 minutes be vacated and that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be fixed at 50 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, are we going to have an opportunity to vote tonight on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is within the control of the Committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I might state that with the adoption of the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] it will be my plan, once this amendment is voted up or down tonight, to move that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How long will this last limitation of time give each Member who wants to speak on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not counted all the Members standing but has noted the names of the Members and will divide the time accordingly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Might we know so that we might prepare our addresses?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida Mr. SIKES.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, let us be sure that we understand what this bill is for. It is not a training bill. We are not seeking a big backlog of trained men. We are not making gestures to other powers. We are filling the gaps in our armed services. This is a general service bill. We are at least a quarter of a million men short of the number of men who are needed for the efficient operation of the armed services today. Voluntary enlistments have failed to provide those men, despite inducements never before equalled. We have to have enough men to carry on the essential operations of the services and enough to insure an adequate measure of national security. Selective service is a democratic method of selection and it appears to be the only way to get essential men. I think we should remember that. Half of the men in the services roughly are overseas today. Let us see what we would do if we were to cut the period of service to 12 months for inductees. I think everyone realizes that it would be a waste of time to send a 12-month man overseas. It takes approximately 4 months to induct a man and to give him his basic training. After you have given a man 4 months of training, you have not made a soldier out of him. He is still a kid

who has learned something about wearing the uniform, military courtesy, and how to handle a gun. He does not know anything about the complex unit training which must be taught today. After 4 months of basic training he does not know how to conduct himself in a combat organization. If he were called on to do so to protect his country at that period he would be but little more than cannon fodder. If you give him another 4 months in unit training before you send him overseas you have just about enough time to stage him and ship him and then turn around and stage him and send him home from overseas.

This is a highly inefficient and a costly procedure. It is of little value to the services. But more than that, much more than that, it would not permit rotation of the men who are now overseas. A 12-month draft would virtually condemn men who are overseas to remain there. Certainly that is neither fair nor desirable. They too have loved ones at home. They too want to be at home.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered to my amendment, for a very simple reason. I say to those Members who want 18 months' service that the only possible chance they will have of getting 18 months' service is to vote for the original amendment putting a 1-year period in the House bill. We are only one-half of this Legislature. There is on the Speaker's table another bill from another body providing for 2 years. When a bill with a 2-year provision meets a bill with a 1-year provision in headlong collision, 18 months may be the result.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it true to say that your real objective is 18 months, and the way to get 18 months is to vote for your amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. My real objective is 1 year, but I have no illusions that we are likely to get anything better than 18 months.

Mr. JUDD. But if somebody has an objective of 18 months, the way to get it is to vote for your amendment?

Mr. COUDERT. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with this 12-month amendment. If it is true that it is impossible to train men to fight in 12 months, then a whole lot of fellows who did not know how to fight just finished whipping the devil out of Japan and Germany, because a whole lot of them were not in the Army 12 months.

As I said a while ago, pilot training in the United States Army, one of the highest of the technical-training divisions, only consists of 9 or 10 months. The same is true of navigation and bombardier training. It took only 3 months during the war to make an officer out of a man, to take him out of civilian life and make a second lieutenant out of him and send him overseas. The success of a military-training program depends on the manner in which the time of the trainee is applied. If he is kept in the Army for 2 years under this program, I venture to say that much of it will be wasted in such chores as picking up cigarette butts. That is what I fear if you do not vote this 12-month amendment. As a matter of fact, I think it is not entirely impossible that they could concentrate this training and make it in 6 months.

I hope that the 12-month period is voted in order that we can make sure that these boys will get sufficient training and yet not have them going around these various Army posts doing nothing and having nothing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coudert amendment.

A great deal has been said on the floor of this House about the necessity of having a 2-year training period. I never thought I would stand in the well of this House and hear such a proposition come before the American Congress. I have lived a great part of my life in conscript countries. It has been said today that in the conscript nations of Europe 1 year of training is considered enough.

We had a great deal of talk here about our lack of preparation and why we did not have bigger and better armies. Has anyone ever stopped to think that this Nation has never lost a war? As the gentleman from Mississippi has just very accurately said, we have no apologies to offer for our armies of freemen. They have always done the job. They always will.

We have heard talk today about 1 year being too short to train a man and send him abroad in the army of occupation. I submit to you that we do not want to send these young men over to take their places as armies of occupation. It is bad for the morale. They are not doing a good job now with these young recruits in Germany and Japan. Ask any Army officer who comes back from there.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the lady yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Three hundred thousand of them are overseas now. It is very difficult to find a way of rotating them home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. One year's training out of the university career of many of these young men is certainly enough. If it is enough to build up the conscript armies of Europe, it is enough to build up our armies, becase we have a bigger pool from which to draw.

What are we trying to do?

Are we trying to compete in numbers with the Soviet Union? Then we are wasting our time and our breath. You cannot outbreed Russia. But freemen—will win; they won at Marathon; they have won all through the ages, and they will win today.

Let us do this in the American way. Let us not try and imitate conscription as it has been carried out in Europe, as it is carried out under a totalitarian regime. That is not what we want for our boys, for our young people. We do not want them to go over there and act as policemen at the age of 21. That is not good training for any man. That is the best way in the world to build up the bullying instinct that is in a great many of us. No; let the occupation be taken care of by the seasoned men who have been in the service. Even they will not do too good a job and they are not too good for it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the gentlewoman from New York, myself, and many other Members have received letters from constituents who have been in the service and are seeking to get back in? We send the letters to the War Department, but never seem able to get those men back in the service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman is entirely correct; and I state again that I think the Army has raised their standards too high on purpose because the military want a conscript army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the 12-month amendment. I personally am opposed to breaking up or interfering with the education of our young men.

An amendment has been suggested to make the length of training 18 months. If you adopt such an amendment you might as well go to 2 years because you are going to interfere with 2 years of the boys' college work; but I am heartily in favor of the 12-month training period.

It is rather surpising to hear these remarks that training cannot be accomplished in 12 months. We have heard so much about UMT. They wanted the boys in for only 6 months. They have been trying to tell everybody that a 6-month period would be sufficient for UMT. Now they say 12 months is not enough.

On Sunday afternoon I talked to about seven college boys and I want to tell you members of the committee that we have really disturbed their college life. I have never heard so many questions such as: "What are you going to do with us? What is the best thing for us to do? Should we go into the Army today? Should we enlist now? We do not know what to do. We cannot study."

Mr. Chairman, the damage has already been done. I hope the 12-month amendment is adopted, so that their education will be interrupted for only 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment providing for

a 12-month period of training. I have listened pretty carefully to a number of World War II veterans who have spoken in support of the 1-year training period. I am impressed with the statements of these men, our own Members who are combat veterans, men who were right on the firing line. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who not only saw service but is badly crippled for life, has made a very convincing argument in favor of this 1-year amendment. He calls particular attention to the fact that these boys will get all necessary training in a period of 6 months, as far as training is concerned, and the military will have plenty to do to keep them occupied the remainder of the time. Attention is further directed to the fact that if this is a matter of training, then under the amendment, more men would have training than if the period of training is 2 years. Furthermore, the training would be equalized among more men who may be inducted under this proposed legislation. More than that, the young men who are called would not be required to sacrifice so much of their time from their regular pursuits. The chairman of the committee in charge of this measure has indicated there is no immediate demand. He has offered an amendment that postpones the effective date of this act for 75 days plus 60 days. He also says the requirement of the Army program is for approximately 200,000 men and that other components have all the men they need.

As I understand the program, it is intended that older men who are in the Regular Army will be expected to do whatever is required in the way of occupation forces in foreign countries. Most of the men inducted under this measure will be from 19 to 21 years of age. I am inclined to go along with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] when he says that boys, after they are inducted, should be given plenty to do in the way of training. In other words, kept busy in training that is worth while. Mr. Chairman, another thing that ought to be observed is that in countries where they have conscripted men in the armies for years, and have more or less militaristic governments, the period of training in many of these countries is for 1 year. I do not believe, just because some of our military leaders want a 2-year period of training, that should be the compelling reason why we should follow their advice. If our country were in immediate need for a large armed force, the situation would be different. I am for adequate security. I voted for the big air force and for all appropriations for our defenses—Army, Navy, and Air Corps. I believe 1 year of intensive training for inductees is not only adequate but more practical and more equitable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad once in my life to stand before the Congress and tell why I am against all of these proposals of sending your boys and my boys to war. I had two of them myself. I went through all of this. When the Congress of the United States says something about war it is bad. It is bad because we invite trouble.

Mr. Chairman, why should we draft anybody? I would like to ask someone to get up here and tell me why we should draft anybody to go to war? We are a peace-loving people, we can maintain peace if the State Department and the rest of the people who are apparently running this country will tell us why we should draft a single, solitary soul in this country to go to war. They talk about 6 months. Well, I was just as good a soldier in 6 months as I was in a year. Anyone who takes the intensive training of the Army, Navy, or anywhere else will be a good soldier if he has got it in his heart. If he has not, he will not be a good soldier.

Mr. Chairman, why does not someone get up here and tell me why I should draft my neighbor's boy and his daughter and somebody else to go to war? If they can tell me, I will vote with them. If it is in defense of my country, I will go myself, old as I am, but do not tell me that you have to draft anybody to go to war in this country. If we need it, let the President of the United States call for volunteers and he will get them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the duty before us is to keep an eye on the objective. It is a very unpleasant thing to have to draft men in time of peace, but if the purpose of it is to fill an active need in our armed services right now, economy indicates we should not reduce the period of training to a point where we would defeat the very purpose we are seeking. I am sorry to have to disagree with some of the gallant and eminent members who have spoken. We must remember, for one thing, that the intense training the gentleman from Mississippi and others went through in the last war was under the tremendous incentive of a fighting war. You cannot train men as fast as that in time of peace as I have learned from hard experience. The expense of training a recruit is great, both on account of other men required to train him and because of the need of taking care of him. His service should be long enough so that by the time he is ready to do a job he is not almost ready to quit. It does not seem to me fair to give up a sound scheme because somebody's boy may not have to go at all.

Mr. Chairman, we have to think of the real objective, which is to meet a present need.

We are about to act on a measure to draft our young men in time of peace. The only sound excuse for such a departure from our previous national policy is the belief that our safety and that of the freedom-loving nations of the world is at stake.

The weight of the evidence that has been presented to the Congress is to that effect; that the personnel of our armed services, particularly in the case of the Army, is inadequate, and the needed numbers cannot be secured by voluntary enlistments. Obviously we cannot take the appalling risk of again being unprepared to defend ourselves, while our potential enemies are armed to the teeth. That chance we must not take—even if the claims that our military leaders are exaggerating the situation have some foundation. This Congress cannot afford to repudiate the judgment of the overwhelming majority of our generals, admirals, and other military experts—not to mention our own fine Committee on Armed Services. If we cannot have confidence in them, we better get a whole new set of technical experts.

Yes, we will undoubtedly do what the admirals and the generals recommend. I hope, however, that the Pentagon planners will take heed of signs of dissatisfaction that are developing on many sides. I hope they will not be misled by this vote into believing that the Members of this body are satisfied or will, in the end, be tolerant of their inept and disinterested handling of the programs of the civilian components of the Army and Air Force. The National Guard and Organized Reserves have been badly neglected. During recent debates here in the House, Member after Member has voiced his dissatisfaction in this regard.

In reporting the military functions bill just the other day, the Appropriations Committee said on page 16 of its report:

> The committee was not impressed with the presentation of the needs for the funds requested or with the manner in which this program is apparently being conducted. Too many men are encouraged to enlist in the Reserves and then hear nothing further from such enlistment.

Those of us who are in close touch with the Reserve and National Guard affairs know that there is much disappointment and discontent in their ranks.

These are some of the manifestations of which the G2's and public relations experts better take note. The Pentagon planners and the high Army brass will be very badly fooled if they take the vote on this bill as a vote of confidence in the way they are handling the problems of the civilian components. I trust they will not be so misled. The fine soldiers and flyers that make up the National Guard and Army and and Air Corps Reserves are entitled to more understanding leadership. The Navy is doing much better in that regard. The Congress and the country want sound national preparedness with a minimum of expense and regimentation. This can only be accomplished by developing the volunteer civilian components to a maximum extent. It cannot be done if they are treated as unwelcome stepchildren of the regular establishments.

I hope the people of the country, as a whole, will also take to heart the situation that is confronting us.

Here we are drafting and spending billions on the armed services within less than 3 years after victory in the greatest war of all time. The pace is getting very fast. If democracy is to succeed our citizens must all work at it. It is a dangerous disregard of duty for an individual to fail to register, or to vote. The lack of interest shown in some localities in recent primaries is a danger signal. This country needs now, as never before, the best available leadership at each level of government.

We do not draft people to vote. It is a service, however, for which all good citizens should willingly volunteer. Manpower is not only needed on the farms and in the factories and the armed services—it is needed at the polls.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, the step that we are asked to take is a serious one. It is in violation of the traditions of this Nation. It is aping the military clique of Hitler, as well as bygone ages. Peacetime conscription is foreign to America. It is un-American and it has no business here. It is an armament race which always has and always will end in disaster. Where are the Caesars, the Alexanders, the Napoleons, and Hitlers today? What became of their military machines and their nations? History tells us.

The fact remains that we are told by the militarists that we were unprepared in the last two wars, but yet we won the wars that others started, and we can do it again, if necessary, without destroying ourselves first.

This bill is unconstitutional, but what is the use of talking about constitutionality when the Executive controls the courts? This bill has been brought here by the military clique during the closing days of Congress. This is unfair to the Members of this body and unfortunate for America. Why this rush? Before we enact this bill we should at least discuss it with our masters, we the people, during the coming election. Involuntary servitude is not national defense. Selective service is not voluntary.

We are all for national defense, but to destroy ourselves is not national defense. Just what is national defense? Is it huge bodies of men, right face, column right, column left, and to the rear march, or are these performances obsolete? We must not repeat the blunders that the Army made when they court-martialed Billy Mitchell for telling them that its methods of war were obsolete. Time has proven that Billy Mitchell was right and the brass hats were wrong.

Future wars will be fought from the air. They will be fought not only with explosives, but also by spreading disease germs. The fighting forces in the future will consist largely of aviators, technicians, electricians, biologists, scientists, and mechanics.

These can best be trained in our high schools, colleges, universities, National Guard, and ROTC. I believe some such program was adopted by the American Legion a year ago in San Francisco. Many retired Army and Navy officers, and some generals and admirals still in the armed forces, agree that this would be the best national defense. There are other matters of far greater importance to our national defense than to take teen-age youngsters out of their homes and place them in voluntary service in military camps, where, to say the least, the morals are none too high.

As part of our national defense, we must stock-pile necessary metals. We must stop the depletion of our natural resources. We are in far greater need of a stock pile than we are for teen-age youngsters. The testimony before my Subcommittee on Mines has brought out this deplorable fact, that in case of war we would be out of manganese in 1 year, and completely out of chromium in 6 months.

You cannot manufacture steel without manganese, nor stainless steel without chromium. We have had members of the Munitions Board and National Resources Board before us, and they all admitted the deplorable condition which we are in, in case of war. This not only in regard to these two metals, but many others. They all admitted that something should be done, and it was up to Congress to do it.

Yet some of the Members that sponsored this un-American bill have and are opposing real national defense—the Russell bill. They have succeeded temporarily in blocking that bill from coming up for a vote. In place of this brass-hat bill, we should now be debating the Russell bill. Are we afraid of real national defense? Do we wish to embark and sail unknown seas—involuntary servitude—selective service?

There is a woodchuck in the wood pile. Someone is trying to prevent real national defense. Let us stop shadow boxing. We are in a dangerous and precarious condition because we lack a stock pile of essential and necessary metals. Our national defense has been neglected and blocked in this Congress.

The public has a right to know the situation. Secretary Krug stated before the Appropriations Committee that our stock pile was nil. The testimony before our subcommittee shows that it is even worse than nil.

If those back of this un-American bill want real national defense, then they should assist us in getting the Russell bill—in getting a stock pile—in place of throwing monkey wrenches into the machinery.

In place of taking teen-age youngsters from their homes and placing them in military camps, we should see to it that in case of war our armed forces have the implements with which to defend themselves and their Nation. Here is a real emergency. We should see that we have a sufficient stock pile.

In place of passing this bill and taking the teen-age youngsters from their homes, education, and work, to waste a year or two in outmoded and obsolete training, we should pass the Russell bill.

I realize that the brass hats say that they are going to educate these youngsters. Let me ask the fathers and mothers of these youngsters and the Members of this Congress, Do you wish to duplicate our educational system? Do you wish to have the brass hats educate your youngsters in their way of thinking? If you do, then you had better say goodby to your liberty.

I am for national defense, but real national defense and not the kind that is proposed in this bill, which to say the least is questionable national defense.

Real soldiers are not teen-age drafted boys, but men who wish to make the Army their life work. These can be gotten in sufficient number and more than we need if the Army and Navy removes some of the uncalled-for and unnecessary restrictions. Through the ages the best soldiers and fighters were not perfect physical specimens.

I am informed that some 45 percent of the men offering to enlist have been rejected. Some because they are slightly flat-footed, although they can run faster and shoot straighter than the officers who reject them.

Our admirals, generals, and enlisted men of the Army and Navy have made a splendid record on all battle fronts. We are justly proud of them. But the Army and Navy Departments here in Washington are just bureaucracies. They are just as fallible as other bureaucracies. They are everlastingly asking for more money and more men.

Both the Army and Navy Departments are in a rut. In place of following their dictates blindly, let us protect our Nation, and our youth. Let us get them out of the rut and bring them up to date.

It costs billions to continue the selective draft, whereas stock pile would cost less than $80,000,000 a year. Yet there are those who object to the stock pile, and say that it costs too much, and then blindly support this un-American involuntary selective service in peacetime. They are among my erring friends who have voted billions for grafting, foreign politicians, and inefficient, and in some cases, corrupt foreign governments.

Why an armament race? What has happened to the 52 peace-loving nations? What is wrong with the UN, which was to bring about permanent peace? Thus, and thus alone, can our liberties be preserved and our form of government be protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall take the first minute, at least, of my time to try to save the time of the committee tomorrow. At the proper time tomorrow the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] will introduce an amendment concerning the exemption of certain wartime merchant seamen. I know from experience what the first reaction is going to be. They got too much money; they got twice what the armed services did, and all that sort of thing which I have been listening to for years. It is not the truth.

Yesterday I put into the RECORD on pages 8370 to 8372 tables submitted by the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission showing the facts. I ask that you who have that feeling look at those tables, study them over, and then do not raise that particular bogey unless you want to have it knocked down quickly by the figures. Perhaps we can save some time if you will just do that.

Insofar as this particular amendment is concerned, I hope that we do not stand for the 18 months. I should like to see a clean-cut vote on the 12 months one way or the other. If we adopt the 12 months we will probably get 18, but let us not pussyfoot; let us vote for the 12 months and see where we stand.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SARBACHER. I would like to add my voice to that of the other World War II veterans of the Eightieth Congress and say that as an ex-member of the Marine Corps I am strongly in favor of the 1-year period and shall support this amendment wholeheartedly. It was proven beyond doubt in my judgment during the past war that this is an adequate training period.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] made a very eloquent appeal to this body a few minutes ago. The words that she spoke should be echoed from coast to coast. She is a mother and was speaking for the mothers of America.

I want to tell this Committee briefly about the number of individuals rejected by the armed services. It took me about 2 months to find out how many men were actually being rejected; young men who came to the service saying, "I would like to get into the Army, the Navy, or the Air Corps." It is interesting to note that the Air Corps and the Navy and the Marine Corps have all the men they want, but do you know how many they rejected of those who volunteered to come in? Fifty-three percent. What did the Army do? I searched the records several weeks ago, as well as letters from the armed services. They rejected 37 percent of all the boys that applied to them for voluntary service. They wanted to get in. Why were they rejected? Because the Army saw fit to raise the standards higher than they had been during the draft days. I am not sure that they wanted them in the Army. I think they wanted to convince the Congress that they could not get them. That standard should be lowered. The men who want to go into the Army on a voluntary basis should certainly be permitted to go in.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this amendment for 12 months. I think it is the horse-sense approach to it. I think it is time for this Congress, as we say in Nebraska, to use a little common horse sense. There is no need of making this 24 months, 2 years. A war is not on. If war breaks out, there would be no difficulty in this country getting men who had served before, in all groups and classes, to come to the defense of their country. So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, you ought to support this amendment for 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I think I am patriotic. I believe I love my country and its security no better than you do but as well. But for the life of me I cannot see any logic or reason in declining to accept this amendment of 12 months instead of 2 years.

You heard one of the members of the Committee on Armed Services, in answer to a question propounded to him as to what they would do during these 12 months, "Is it a training program or is it something else," finally answer that they would receive 13 weeks of basic training. What is the idea of keeping them there 2 years instead of 1 to do something else, I do not know what? There might come a war, and it would last about 90 days. The bombing that would be done either in this country or in other countries that might be our enemy countries would end the whole thing in less than 6 months. The trouble we are in in talking about this draft bill on this occasion is that we are trying to prepare for a war upon the basis of using the weapons and the men in the manner we did in 1860, or prior even to the first war. I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, we are here debating the method of raising the personnel for the most expensive game in which man has ever participated, and that is, war and the preparation for war.

I have come to the conclusion in my own mind that it is less costly to this country from every standpoint to have men voluntarily inducted into the military service, regardless of the dollar cost, than it is to incur the cost of bringing them into the service through conscription or enforced service or selective draft. Therefore, I am going to support this amendment. I have great admiration for the gentleman from New York who has offered this amendment. I find myself in agreement with him on many things, and that adds diginity to this amendment.

I understand the Shafer amendment will be offered again, and if it comes up I shall vote for that amendment. Unless this bill is very materially altered from its present form, I shall vote against the bill because I so terribly detest the bringing into our life and our ideals and institutions of the great forces which are here proposed.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that two or three Members who have time are not here, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a debatable motion. It is always within the discretion of the gentleman handling the bill to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, under the arrangement entered into limiting debate on this amendment, will the Members who were scheduled to be recognized be recognized when the Committee resumes its deliberations?

The CHAIRMAN. They will be recognized, if the Committee should vote to rise, when the Committee meets again.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. My understanding is that all those gentlemen whose names are on the list will be recognized immediately tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The statement of the gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Did not the gentleman from New York agree that there would be a vote on this amendment tonight?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from New York can speak for himself as to that.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. My recollection is that I moved that the Committee continue debate on this amendment for 30 minutes, which motion was agreed to. After which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] asked unanimous consent that the time be extended to 50 minutes, which was agreed to, and also to vacate the proceedings by which the motion was agreed to to limit debate for 30 minutes. That was all that there was in that agreement.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of New York) there were—ayes 79, noes 94.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDREWS of New York and Mr. SMATHERS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 76, noes 139.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good time for the committee to vote on the amendment.

Vote down the 18-month amendment and vote for the 12-month amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for 2 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time. I think it is time to vote now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] for 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] for 2 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia for 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment and I expect to vote against this bill.

The gentleman from Minnesota a while ago said that if they had consulted history they would not have proposed to induct doctors into the Army. I would suggest that if the committee

had considered history at all this bill would not be on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, it seems rather tragic that after 160 years of glorious history, after demonstrating on two occasions a military might that surpassed anything in all history, a superiority in manpower and equipment that amazed the world, our leaders are now ready to forsake a system that made all this possible and accept a system that has never prevented a war, has never won a war, a system that had kept Europe in turmoil for centuries and has brought it to the depths of despair and financial and economic collapse.

Every page of history cries out against this damnable thing—peacetime conscription.

Peace or the will to fight is built in the moral fiber and the hearts of men, and not in statute books.

Fortitude in war has its roots in the morality of peace, for courage is not a chance gift of nature like an aptitude for games.

A man of character in peace is a man of courage in war. And character is a habit—the daily choice between right and wrong. It is a quality which grows and the bearing of an army provides an index to the character of the Nation.

In the long run a nation finds that its strongest defense lines are back in the homes and schools of this Nation where character is built. That is what gives free people the power to win and hold their freedom. In this we have the greatest defense.

It is ironical that this Congress appropriates billions for relief all over the world and the proposal before us, certainly of questionable value, will consume $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 annually, and we have nothing for aid to education.

Here you present a proposal that strikes at the very heart of a system that has created our strongest defense—the character, courage, and creative genius of our people.

All America rebels against regimentation. Every red-blooded American youth has an inherent hatred for compulsion. It is not the way of free people. It is un-American.

General Foch, generalissimo of the Allied armies in World War I said: "A nation has the kind of army it deserves."

His own beloved France in two decades offers an example by giving us the two extremes.

In 1914 France had a stable government and was economically sound. Her people were imbued with a patriotic fervor that gave her an army that received the admiration of all the world. How different in 1942.

France, after a decade of New Dealism under Premier Blum, became completely demoralized—morally, economically, and financially. This decadence was reflected in her armies which were literally trampled under foot by the German hordes. What a tragedy, and they had peacetime conscription.

Later in 1942 and 1943 we found the conscription armies of the United Nations waiting. Waiting for what? They were waiting for the production and armed might of the United States—the product of free enterprise and a free people; factors that won this war.

In the name of God and humanity do not destroy the greatest asset we have—the genius of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may revise and extend his remarks.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] for 2 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for 2 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to close the debate on the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object. He cannot do it under the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not do that, but the gentleman from Georgia may claim his time and yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the Chair instruct the Members how to proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I realize the situation that confronts me now. On the other hand, I do not feel that I would be justified in not taking the time inasmuch as I was charged with the obligation of handling the bill on behalf of the minority. So I hope I may have the attention of the membership.

I have been very much interested in noticing how many are voting for this amendment and against the bill. Again I realize the situation as it exists tonight.

I have also been interested in noticing that those who spoke in favor of the 12-month amendment very carefully avoided referring to the bill by the title which it bears: The Selective Service Act of 1948. They have insisted in referring to it as training rather than as service.

The bill comes before us because the armed forces are not up to strength, cannot be and have not been brought up to strength by voluntary enlistments and some form of compulsion is necessary.

I have no complaint with any man who votes against the bill. I do not impugn his motives or his patriotism. I am sure that each is voting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience. I do sincerely wish, however, that members of this committee would face the facts and vote for the bill or against the bill rather than to vote for amendments that will kill the bill. Each is responsible to his own conscience. If the present parliamentary manner satisfies your conscience, well and good.

Another thing I want to mention is the reference to 4,000,000 men that are going to be trained. There are not 4,000,000 in the pool.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the pool will not furnish that many men. What it means if you take them for 12 months is that those who have voluntarily enlisted for a period of 3 years remain overseas without any replacements. Those who are overseas stay there. There will be no replacement of those men. You do not want to take these men without training. We have said these men were to be trained. You want them to receive the same sort of basic training that the men received before. If you do that it means you are going to have a training period of 110 days; then if you make any sort of specialist out of him he is going to take an additional training period of 98 days. He is going to get, unless you do not want him to have it, 12 days' leave at the end of his training period.

It has been figured over a period of many years, and it always applied in the Regular Army, that a man was not sent overseas who had less than a full year of service. At the present time it is regarded that 15 months is the minimum of service remaining a man should have before he is sent overseas.

Mr. Chairman, this is a service bill. If you do not intend it to be that, just be frank, be honest, and vote against the whole bill and not resort to the device of attempting to kill it by inserting a period of 12 months of training. The situation is clear. The matter is up to you. Those of us on the committee have studied the matter and have analyzed the period of training necessary in order to secure some service out of these men, and we have brought you our recommendations.

I hope that there are enough Members here who will serve the best interests of the Nation by voting "no" on this amendment, that it will be defeated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, at the Clerk's desk I have an amendment to reduce the period of service to 18 months. I therefore support, of course, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. There may be great practical force in the argument made by the gentleman from New York that his amendment should be supported in order to obtain in conference a compromise on 18 months, in view of the action taken in the other body requiring a 2-year period of service. Indeed, the gentleman has indicated that is his objective. For that reason, and with that understanding, I shall also support his amendment in the likely event that the substitute fails.

Despite the great amount of thought and study I have given to this measure, it is not yet entirely clear to me how I

shall vote at the conclusion of the debate. It depends to a considerable degree on the extent to which this bill may be perfected by amendment here.

In due course I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], designed to require that every effort be made to secure voluntary enlistments before imposing conscription.

If a bill is passed, however, and whether or not my conscience shall eventually dictate support or otherwise, it is my hope, in the best interests of my country, that the measure finally adopted will be designed and worded in the manner most likely to achieve the underlying objective of strengthening our national defense.

It therefore seems important to me for us to bear in mind with regard to the precise issue now before us, that this is not a measure to provide for a program of universal military training but is a so-called selective-service bill to meet what is said, admittedly with much justification, to be in the nature of an existing emergency or, as others have phrased it, a period of tension.

The young men to be inducted under this program are to serve in the Army, not simply as trainees, as envisioned in the UMT measures, but as soldiers. In other words, if this bill passes they will be required to perform overseas duties and any and all required functions of a Regular soldier.

There is much merit, therefore, in the argument that if the bill is accepted it is not militarily or economically sound to shorten this period to 1 year. In fact, such a result would virtually preclude the possibility of any service for any inductees beyond the continental limits of this country.

On the other hand, if a 3- or 4-month training period be subtracted from the total, provided the period of service is made 18 months, it still leaves a possible period of more than 1 year's service overseas if the requirements of the Army are such that this disposition is considered militarily necessary.

The training programs to which the gentleman from New York has referred, in the various European countries, are more closely parallel to such a program as is envisioned within UMT legislation than a draft measure like that before us. One year, in my judgment, is too long for a training period, but is too short for service as a soldier. Two years, on the other hand, strikes me as unnecessarily long for a compulsory period of service as a soldier. For that reason, 18 months impresses me as a reasonable compromise. If, in order to achieve this period of time, it is necessary to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York, I bow to the exigencies of the situation.

Therefore, although I still reserve judgment on the final action which I shall take on this legislation, I shall support both of these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Fulton substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMATHERS) there were—ayes 156, noes 88.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include extraneous matters in my remarks made earlier in the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I file a privileged resolution for printing under the rules.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order if the gentleman withdraws his request?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DONDERO. submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 113]

Angell	Hartley	Mundt
Arnold	Hedrick	Murdock
Banta	Heffernan	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett	Herter	Norrell
Bates, Ky.	Hess	Norton
Boggs, Del.	Hinshaw	O'Hara
Boggs, La.	Hobbs	Patterson
Boykin	Holifield	Peden
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Preston
Buffett	Jenkins, Pa.	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Jensen	Regan
Camp	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Clason	Johnson, Tex.	Rooney
Clevenger	Jones, Wash.	Sasscer
Cooley	Kearney	Schwabe, Okla.
Cox	Keogh	Scoblick
Dawson, Ill.	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Utah	Kilburn	Smith, Maine
Deane	King	Smith, Va.
Delaney	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Dingell	Lane	Spence
Dirksen	Lanham	Stefan
Dolliver	Lea	Stigler
Ellis	Ludlow	Stockman
Ellsworth	Lusk	Thomas, N. J.
Evins	Mack	Thompson
Fenton	Macy	Tollefson
Fernandez	Manasco	Van Zandt
Folger	Meade, Ky.	Vinson
Garmatz	Miller, Conn.	Welch
Gathings	Mills	West
Gore	Morrison	Whitaker
Gorski	Morton	Youngblood
Griffiths	Muhlenberg	
Gross	Multer	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MAKING IN ORDER CERTAIN MOTIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 685, Rept. No. 2383), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the remainder of this week it shall be in order for the Speaker at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII; it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess, and said motion is hereby made of the highest privilege; and it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause (2) (b), rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby suspended during the balance of this week.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 110) entitled "An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

AMENDMENT TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 716)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message of the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 110, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, because it would permit an important segment of the economy to obtain immunity from the antitrust laws, and would do so without providing adequate safeguards to protect the public interest.

This bill would authorize exemption from the antitrust laws for any carrier acting in concert with one or more competing carriers in the establishment of rates and related matters, if the Interstate Commerce Commission approves the procedural agreements under which such action would be taken. The Commission would be required to approve these agreements, if it should find that exemption from the antitrust laws would be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy."

Under this bill private carrier associations and rate bureaus, free from the restraints of the antitrust laws, could exercise broad powers over most forms of domestic transportation, including railroads, trucks and busses, water carriers, pipe lines, and freight forwarders. Carriers could agree privately among themselves upon the rates to be filed with, or withheld from, the Interstate Commerce Commission. Acting through these bureaus, groups of carriers could exercise a powerful deterrent influence upon the filing by an individual carrier of proposed rates which might benefit the public.

The exercise by private groups of this substantial control over the transportation industry involves serious potential harm to the public. Transportation rates affect the cost of goods as they move through each phase of production—from raw materials, through finished products, to the consumer. Power to control transportation rates is power to influence the competitive success or failure of other businesses. Legislation furthering the exercise of this power by private groups would clearly be contrary to the public interest.

My disapproval of this bill does not signify opposition to carrier associations as such, or to all of their present functions. Many of their activities are useful and desirable. However, this legislation is not necessary for the continuation of such activities.

No legislation giving a major industry immunity from the antitrust laws should be enacted unless adequate alternative safeguards are provided for the public interest. This measure fails to provide such safeguards. Even the limited safeguards incorporated in the bill as originally passed by the Senate are omitted from the bill in its present form. It would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve any agreement which it finds to be in furtherance of the national transportation policy. This is a vague and general standard and is manifestly neither adequate nor appropriate as a criterion for waiving the protection afforded the public by the antitrust laws.

Furthermore, the Commission would be placed in the position of applying this general criterion to the basic procedural agreements without being able to foresee fully the nature and effect of the joint actions which would be taken thereunder. Nevertheless, the exemption from the antitrust laws would extend to these subsequent actions without the necessity of further Commission approval. It would extend, moreover, even beyond the parties to the basic agreement to any "other persons" who participate in such actions.

Even though transportation rates are subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the public interest nevertheless demands that the general national policy of maintaining competition continue to be applied to the industry. Our present transportation policy contemplates a pattern of partial regulation, within the framework of which the pressures of competition will remain substantially effective. Regulation cannot entirely replace these competitive pressures. It can guard against some of the potential abuses of monopoly power, but it cannot be an effective substitute for the affirmative stimulus toward improved service and lower rates which competition provides. By sanctioning rate control by groups of carriers, this legislation would represent a departure from the present transportation policy of regulated competition. This, I believe, would be a serious mistake, with far-reaching effects on our economy.

Antitrust cases are now before the courts challenging some of the very activities which would be covered by this bill. Pending judicial clarification of the issues raised in these proceedings, it would be inappropriate to provide the immunity proposed by this bill.

I have repeatedly urged upon the Congress the necessity for a vigorous antimonopoly program. This bill would be inconsistent with such a program.

For these compelling reasons, I find it necessary to withhold my approval from the measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 10, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread upon the Journal and the message and the bill printed as a public document.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the veto message be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, may have until midnight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am calling a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency to convene at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning in the Banking and Currency Committee room. I take this time to notify members so that they will all know that we will meet on the housing bill, H. R. 6959, at that time.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization instrument of amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to the Florida delegation be vacated, in view of the lateness of the hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FORT MOULTRIE MILITARY RESERVATION

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 2912) providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the military needs of the War Department, was passed on the Consent Calendar this afternoon, be vacated, and that the bill be considered at this time for the purpose of offering a clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed without compensation to the State of South Carolina, that portion of land constituting the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation, together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined by him to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right without paying compensation to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the State of South Carolina shall, at any time, cease to use the property so conveyed for public purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "War" and after "Department" insert "of the Army."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "War or" and insert "the Army."

Page 2, line 5, after "Navy", insert "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON:

On page 1, line 3, strike "war" and insert "the Department of the Army."

On page 1, line 4, after the word "to", insert "the Board of Township Commissioners for Sullivans Island, as trustee for."

On page 1, line 10, strike "War", delete the period after the word "Department", and insert "of the Army."

On page 2, section 2, lines 3, 4, and 5, strike "to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy", and insert "and when any of the armed services shall determine."

On page 2, section 3, line 12, after the word "the", insert "Board of Township Commissioners for Sullivans Island, as trustees for the."

On page 2, section 3, line 14, strike "use" and insert "retain fee simple title to", and in the same line strike "for public purposes", and insert "or cease to be used in the public interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to include in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole some extracts from hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, has there been any general authority granted to Members to extend their remarks in reply to the President's charges against Congress?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot answer that question. Does the gentleman want to extend his remarks?

Mr. MACKINNON. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include some extracts.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. Michael J. Ryan.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while Members were denied the opportunity of speaking in defense of President Truman's veto and to the previous question having moved, the President's veto of H. R. 6355 once again gave us the opportunity to reflect upon and reconsider the action taken by this House to carve up the Department of Labor. By substantive legislation in the form of an appropriation rider it transfers the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a form of legislative process which the Congress itself in the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 renounced. This, Mr. Speaker, is a usurpation by the Appropriations Committee of the proper functions and prerogatives of the legislative committees. This action, Mr. Speaker, is a repudiation of sound and deliberate legislative processes.

The question of transferring the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency has been long and carefully deliberated upon by the appropriate legislative committees. In 1947 the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 2, which provided for the permanent retention of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor where it properly belongs. That plan was rejected by the Congress on the grounds that the unemployment compensation and employment service programs which were closely interrelated should be administered in the same department of Government. In January of this year, consistent with the expressed desire of the Congress that both of these programs be administered in the same governmental agency, the President submitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, which, if it had been adopted, would have achieved this objective. This time it was rejected by the Congress because it was considered appropriate to await the report of the Hoover Commission which is making a study of the entire executive branch of the Government. Every Member of this House who spoke against Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, advocated that no action be taken to effect any transfer within the executive branch of the Government until Congress had had an opportunity to study the report of the Hoover Commission. Every Member of the Senate who spoke in opposition to that plan took precisely the same position. A prominent candidate for Republican nomination sounded the keynote on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of that plan and I quote from his statement:

> My own conclusion is that until we have a more comprehensive study of the whole Federal Government, and until we have a comprehensive reorganization plan, we ought to leave things as they are. The report of the Hoover Commission, I understand, is proceeding and is expected to be made by the first of next January, where it will be before the Congress.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, after full and deliberate consideration by both Houses of the Congress the verdict was to retain the status quo.

Hard upon the heels of this decision by the Congress, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] as chairman of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriations Subcommittee submitted to this body H. R. 6355 which provides for the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency, a provision which flies in the very teeth of the position taken by the Congress only a few weeks previously. This gentleman on June 11, 1946, himself made the following statement with respect to the proper location of the United States Employment Service and I quote from page 6684 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

> Mr. KEEFE. I have told you about the transfer to the War Manpower Commission of the Apprentice Training Service and the United States Employment Service. These services by administrative action have now been sent back to the Department of Labor so that we now have in the Department of Labor section of the (Appropriations) bill the Apprentice Training Service and the United States Employment Service again back in the Labor Department where they very properly belong.

Since that date there has not been a single development which should make the gentleman from Wisconsin undertake to change his mind.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Appropriations Committee in its consideration of this bill, quite properly deleted the appropriation rider transferring the Employment Service out of the Department of Labor, and the Senate itself sustained its former position to await the report of the Hoover Commission. I regret, therefore, that the conferees in their desire to reach an early agreement restored the appropriation rider.

Under the provisions of this bill, the United States Employment Service will be reduced from a bureau to a division in the Bureau of Employment Security, where once again its effectiveness will become seriously impaired and where its job-finding functions will be subordinated to the payment of unemployment compensation. I think we should bear in mind that it was precisely this organizational arrangement which the Congress intended to prohibit when in section 604 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 it provided that the agency administering the United States Employment Service shall administer that service as a separate operating entity. With its identity as a bureau lost, with a single appropriation for unemployment compensation and employment service activities both on the Federal and State levels, it is a foregone conclusion that the Employment Service will be unable to operate as a separate entity.

Four years ago with its eyes hopefully or frantically watching the ballot box, the majority pledged itself to consolidate in the Department of Labor all major labor functions. The action which the majority party has taken to transfer the Employment Service out of the Department of Labor completes its repudiation of its party pledge—or is this just another case of promises glibly made and just as glibly broken? If this veto is not sustained, not a single labor function will remain in the Department of Labor. Its dismemberment will be complete.

The Hoover commission report will be presented to the Congress within 10 days after it reconvenes in January 1949. In light of the position recently taken by this Congress that no action should be taken to transfer or reshuffle any functions in the executive branch of the Government, the President's veto will be sustained.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Red Lake-Clear Water River project and include letters, communications, and newspaper articles.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HERTER, for 2 days, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 580. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer;

H. R. 5883. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6628. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki;

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation;

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations; and

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 17, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1652. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1653. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of certain real property at Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., to the custody and control of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1654. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; without amendment (Rept. No. 2371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2617. An act to include certain lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Sixteenth report regarding investigation of Viers Mill Village veterans' housing project; without amendment (Rept. No. 2373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORTON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6734. A bill to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces, the merchant marine, and on war transfer by employees in the field services of the Post Office Department; with amendments (Rept. No. 2374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5355. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances; without amendment (Rept. No. 2377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOLTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory; without amendment (Rept. No. 2378). Referred to the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment; with amendments (Rept. No. 2379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III; with amendments (Rept. No. 2381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 685. A resolution making in order to suspend the rules, motions, for a recess and the consideration of reports from the Committee on Rules; without amendment (Rept. No. 2383). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6952. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 6953. A bill to provide a voluntary participation annuity plan for widows, minor children, and certain named beneficiaries of members of the uniform services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6954. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6955. A bill to designate as "Citizenship Day" each general election day and regular primary election day on which the people elect Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, Members of Congress, or candidates for President, Vice President, or Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 6956. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 6957. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6958. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6959. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 6960. A bill to amend section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 6961. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6962. A bill to provide for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 6963. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 6964. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 6965. A bill to create a General Property Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6966. A bill to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 6967. A bill to create a Veterans' Life Insurance Board; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 6968. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution relating to assignment of a section of the 50-megacycle band of radio frequencies for frequency modulation (FM); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. J. Res. 431. Joint resolution extending to January 1, 1950, certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Res. 684. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of part 2 of the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing, entitled "Statistics of Housing"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6969. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 6970. A bill for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 6971. A bill for the relief of Erich Neugebauer, Audrey Neugebauer, and Moonyeen Neugebauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6972. A bill for the relief of John L. Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2101. By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Youth Assembly Against Universal Military Training, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2102. Also, petition of Ricardo A. Richards and others, St. Croix, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appeal for the maintenance of the islands by granting money necessary for upkeep, especially for the continuance of the Virgin Islands Company; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2103. Also, petition of New York Teachers Chapter, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and urging its immediate passage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2104. Also, petition of New York Area Council, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defeat of the draft and universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou gracious benefactor, whose blessings are abundantly adequate for all our needs, may this moment of prayer be for each of us a cleansing of heart and a consecration to those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy.

Grant unto us the mind and the mood of the Master as we face the tasks and responsibilities of this day. May we never be recreant in any duty and may there be nothing in our character and conduct of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

When we stand at the crossroads and are in doubt which way to go, may we hear and heed Thy voice saying unto us: "This is the way, walk ye therein," for Thy ways are ways of pleasantness and Thy paths are paths of peace.

Hear us in the name of the Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 16, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 239) to provide for

a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2028. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2912. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army;

H. R. 3479. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 4984. An act to provide for the maintaining of the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the brigade of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5352. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5555. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended;

H. R. 5715. An act to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55;

H. R. 5807. An act to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 6136. An act to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940;

H. R. 6439. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6695. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6709. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York a perpetual easement in, over, and upon a twenty-nine one-hundredth acre parcel of land at New York Naval Shipyard;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. R. 6868. An act to amend section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, with respect to widows of certain deceased Coast Guard personnel; and

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

DRAFT OF PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO EXISTING APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 182)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (S. DOC. NO. 180)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Military Establishment—Department of the Navy, amounting to $3,294,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DISPLACED PERSONS PROGRAM (S. DOC. NO. 181)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for expenses in connection with the immigration of displaced persons, amounting to $4,000,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

SETTLEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to aid the settlement and development of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CONVENTION OF TWO COST-PLUS-A-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS BY MARITIME COMMISSION, ETC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning the conversion of two cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts between the United States Maritime Commission and the Permanente Metals Corp. to a fixed-price basis, and the subsequent settlement of the fixed-price contract (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES, U. S. COMMERCIAL COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, volume 8 of an audit report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations, dealing exclusively with the activities of the U. S. Commercial Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the office of the Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

The petition of Albert E. Swanson, of Murrysville, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing increased pay for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Telegrams in the nature of petitions from the Washington State Grange Executive Committee, of Spokane, Wash., and the Chamber of Commerce of San Jose, Calif., signed by Russell E. Pettit, manager, praying for the adoption of Senate concurrent resolution 59, relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Rosa L. Ellis, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to legislation providing increases in pensions paid to widows and orphans of veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Department of New Jersey Philippine-Pacific War Veterans, Hawthorne, N. J., favoring the enactment of House bill 4073, to restore to the Philippine veterans some of the benefits lost to them under the Recession Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Texas State Democratic Convention, assembled at Brownwood, Tex., relating to State ownership of certain submerged lands; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the International Institute of Metropolitan Detroit, Detroit, Mich., signed by Alice L. Sickels, executive director, remonstrating against the appointment of Senator COOPER and Senator MCGRATH as conferees on the part of the Senate on the bill providing admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4962. A bill to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; without amendment (Rept. No. 1747).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of George Bailey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1748);

S. 2299. A bill for the relief of Ella L. Browning; without amendment (Rept. No. 1749);

H. R. 915. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 1750);

H. R. 1780. A bill for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1754);

H. R. 2395. A bill for the relief of the Cypress Creek drainage district of the State of Arkansas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1751);

H. R. 4103. A bill for the relief of Charles M. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1752); and

H. R. 6186. A bill for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1753).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2605. A bill for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1744).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2482. A bill to amend sections 2, 4, and 8 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended, and section 5 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222; 16 U. S. C. 715), as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1756); and

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation services to, from, and within Alaska; with amendments (Rept. No. 1755).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2879. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Yannopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2880. A bill relating to the basis of computing compensation and insurance payable to certain veterans of World War I;

S. 2881. A bill relating to the basis for computation of compensation and insurance payable to certain veterans of World War I; and

S. 2882. A bill relating to the basis for the computation of compensation payable to the widows and children of certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) introduced Senate bill 2883, to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2884. A bill for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDENBERG (by request):

S. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution approving an Agreement Relating to the Resolution of Conflicting Claims to German Enemy Assets and Authorizing the President to enter into the agreement or other agreements similar in character with certain countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to correct an act, H. R. 5071, "To extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma," so as to provide for the proper distribution of proceeds accruing to the United States from leases of the oil and gas deposits in the lands affected by that act, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATUS QUO IN RESPECT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT TAXES AND SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage, and I request that a statement in explanation of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Alabama will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2883) to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HILL

The bill which Senator SPARKMAN and I have introduced repeals sections 1 and 2 of House Joint Resolution 296 which was passed over the President's veto on June 14. House Joint Resolution 296 contained two major provisions: (1) a provision defining the term "employee" for social-security purposes so as to apply "the usual common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship" (secs. 1 and 2 of the resolution); (2) to provide $5 a month additional to needy aged and blind persons and $3 additional for dependent children, in section 3.

The bill does not affect in any way whatsoever the latter provision for increasing the payments to needy aged and blind persons and dependent children. The provision increasing the Federal contribution to the needy aged, blind, and dependent children will inure to the benefit of over 3,000,000 persons now on the rolls. This is a highly meritorious provision, and, as a matter of fact, does not go far enough in our opinion in increasing payments to needy persons, which payments are most inadequate.

The sole purpose of the bill which we have introduced is to repeal those sections of House Joint Resolution 296 which had the effect of rendering uncertain, or jeopardizing or excluding, social-security rights to many thousands of persons who should be covered. We have long favored a broadening of the coverage and the liberalizing of the benefits of the program.

Under the terms of the United States Supreme Court decision in the Silk case, which was decided by the Supreme Court on June 16, 1947, the Social Security Administration and the Treasury Department were directed to apply a very liberal interpretation of the term "employee" for social-security purposes. The intent of House Joint Resolution 296 was to give a narrow and restrictive interpretation to the term "employee" which would have the effect of adversely affecting thousands of persons in building up rights under the social-security program. We believe that it is legally sound and administratively feasible to have a liberal interpretation of the term "employee" along the lines laid down by the United States Supreme Court. The bill which we have introduced would restore the status quo which existed prior to the enactment of House Joint Resolution 296, namely, that of applying the rule of law laid down by the United States Supreme Court.

We very much hope that Congress will act with expedition to assure the social-security rights of the thousands of persons adversely affected by sections 1 and 2 of House Joint Resolution 296.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES—TRAINING FACILITIES FOR NATIONAL GUARD AND NAVAL MILITIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALDWIN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1085) to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

INCREASE OF RATE OF COMPENSATION OF HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1537) to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments and of other officers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART (for Mr. JENNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JENNER to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART also (for Mr. JENNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JENNER to the bill (S. 2795) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies over-burdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 8, line 17, insert the following:

"To provide emergency aid for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public facilities owned by Federal or local public agencies damaged or destroyed by any flood, tornado, fire, or other catastrophe respecting which the President has heretofore made a determination under Public Law 233, approved July 25, 1947, including administrative expenses therefor, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to repair, restore, or reconstruct facilities owned by Federal agencies and make grants to local public agencies including counties, cities, towns, districts, and other local public entities, to assist them in defraying the cost of repairing, restoring, or reconstructing such public facilities: *Provided further*, That no grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to limit or in any way affect the existing authority of any Federal department or agency."

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6935, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

JOSIAH W. BAILEY

[Mr. TYDINGS, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. TAYLOR, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRO AMERICA—ADDRESS BY LOUISE HAWKES PADELFORD

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Pro America, by Louise Hawkes Padelford, at the national board meeting of Pro America, June 11, 1948, at Evanston, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY'S PROGRAM TO COMBAT CANCER—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Cancer Society's Program To Combat Cancer," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey division, American Cancer Society in Chattanooga, Tenn., March 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY W. S. ATKINS

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. W. S. Atkins, of Hope, Ark., at the Southwest Arkansas States' Rights Meeting held at Hope, Ark., on April 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOMORROW'S NO HOLIDAY—ADDRESS BY ALEX H. WASHBURN

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address entitled "Tomorrow's No Holiday," delivered by Alex H. Washburn at the Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, Pa., on June 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BILLIONS FOR DEFENSE, NOT ONE CENT FOR TRIBUTE!—EDITORIAL FROM THE DENVER POST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Billions for Defense, Not One Cent for Tribute," published in the Denver Post of June 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE "NEW" TRUMAN—ARTICLE BY BARNET NOVER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The 'New' Truman," written by Barnet Nover, and published in the Denver Post of June 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ECONOMIC TEST: WILL WE ACT IN TIME?—ARTICLE BY LEON H. KEYSERLING

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Economic Test: Will We Act in Time?" written by Leon H. Keyserling, and published in the New York Times magazine of June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF ERP APPROPRIATIONS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to insert in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "ERP in Conference," published in the June 17, 1948, issue of the Baltimore Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN RELIEF—INTERVIEW WITH JOSEPH P. KENNEDY

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Joseph P. Kennedy regarding European relief appropriations, published in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., June 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BURR McCLOSKEY AT JOHN BROWN MEMORIAL MEETING

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Burr McCloskey, general secretary of the United Labor Party of America, at Perkins Woods, Summit County, Ohio, on April 4, 1948, at a public meeting called to memorialize John Brown, famed abolitionist, which appears in the Appendix.]

NECESSITY FOR AN ADEQUATE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shipping Raid," published in the Washington Post of June 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—LETTER FROM CHARLES B. SHUMAN

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 10, 1948, from Charles B. Shuman, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, expressing appreciation of the work of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEMS—REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think it is fitting before the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress for me to make a brief report to the Congress as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Subcommittee on Health has been very active during both sessions of the Eightieth Congress. While there have been many bills covering various aspects of the health problem considered by the Committee, our principal attention has been directed to a consideration of the over-all health problem of the United States and the suggestions that have been made from time to time and incorporated in messages of the President of the United States in recommending the establishment of some form of compulsory health insurance for all our people.

The most important investigation undertaken by the committee during the hearings held in both sessions of the Eightieth Congress have been concerned with this very controversial issue of compulsory health insurance. Because of the fact that the subcommittee was unable to arrive at any definite conclusions with regard to this matter, the committee unanimously reported a resolution known as Senate Resolution 249, providing for a continuation of the study of national health problems by the committee and a report to the next Congress not later than March 15, 1949.

This matter is of such importance that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the full report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare accompanying Senate Resolution 249. Let me note in incorporating this report that it contains a reference to the poll made by the committee of the governors of the 48 States in order to obtain their views on the correct approach to this problem, and it also contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the Brookings Institution which was invited by the chairman of the subcommittee to make a report on this matter.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1571) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 249) to provide authorization for the Subcommittee on Health of the said committee to continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that it do pass.

The resolution is as follows:

"[S. Res. 249, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

"*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby author-

ized and directed through the Subcommittee on Health of the said committee to—

"(a) continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto which have been referred to the said subcommittee which study shall be primarily concerned with ascertaining the full extent and nature of existing national health problems and the action, if any, which the Federal Government should take in relation to said problems;

"(b) consult, in the course of such study, with Federal agencies administering health and related programs, with such other legislative committees of the Senate as are concerned with related matters, and with such other agencies, organizations, or persons as the subcommittee may desire to consult;

"(c) report to the Senate not later than March 15, 1949, the results of the study, together with such proposed legislation, if any, and such other recommendations as the subcommittee may deem desirable.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through the said Subcommittee on Health, is authorized to sit and act at such times and in such places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress; to employ such consultants, clerical, and other assistance; to procure such printing and binding; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures, within the limits below set forth, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

"(b) The expenses incurred under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

BACKGROUND SUMMARY OF WORK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

The Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concluded on June 1, 1948, a series of extensive hearings on major bills containing proposed health legislation. These hearings have continued intermittently over a period of more than a year during this Congress. Earlier hearings on corresponding measures were held during previous Congresses. A large number of witnesses representing many different organizations, groups, and individuals, and presenting different and often widely divergent views, were heard during this time. The resultant record of the direct testimony and other evidence available to the subcommittee is voluminous; it is likewise fundamental in its broad implications, as well as in its bearing on ways and means of dealing with health problems.

During the present Congress to date, a total of 27 bills on proposed health legislation have been referred to the Subcommittee on Health for consideration. Of these, S. 545, introduced by Mr. TAFT, for himself and others, and S. 1320, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, for himself and others, are comprehensive proposals containing, among their many provisions, various measures for dealing with the controversial question of medical care for individuals. Owing to the comprehensiveness and importance of these two major proposals, and because their provisions affect, overlap, or duplicate the contents of a majority of the remaining bills before the subcommittee, it was fitting that this subcommittee should devote the greater part of its available time to the consideration of these comprehensive measures. Hearings on S. 545 and S. 1320 were convened on 26 different days during this Congress. Hearings also have been held on the following bills: S. 1290, providing for grants-in-aid to the States to assist in the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment, of physical and mental defects and conditions; S. 720 and S. 2215 providing for the support of research, training, and control in diseases of the heart and circulation; S. 678, providing certain medical supplies and services to individuals; and S. 2341, authorizing an increase in the annual appropriation for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for research in tropical diseases. Scope of proposed legislation under consideration of the subcommittee also includes measures for the expansion and maintenance of local public-health units (S. 2189); for the training of medical, dental, nursing, and public-health personnel (S. 1455 and S. 2588); for the construction of nursing homes for aged persons (S. 2640); and others.

During this Congress to date, the bills reported to and passed by the Senate include: S. 176, providing for research, training, and control in dental diseases; S. 1454, providing for the promotion of Public Health Service commissioned personnel and for other administrative matters; and S. 2215, providing for research, training, and control in diseases of the heart and circulation. The provisions of these bills clearly fall within the province of, and they further support, established, long-range operations of the Federal Government in the public-health field. A majority of the other basic proposals under consideration by the Subcommittee on Health, however, involve serious differences of opinion with respect to their proper place in the overall approach to health problems, and with respect to the proper role of the Federal Government in relation thereto. Most of these proposals must be considered in relation to other health measures, existing and proposed, rather than piecemeal.

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES UNDERLYING THE CONSIDERATION OF POSTPONED HEALTH LEGISLATION

The problems involved in the consideration of health legislation are numerous and frequently complex. Yet, certain fundamental issues have emerged from the findings of the subcommittee which require further investigation and study, as a prelude to any broad recommendations governing health legislation. First, the question as to whether a serious national health problem actually exists is a debatable issue. Evidence available to the subcommittee on this matter is quite conflicting and further inquiry into the subject is deemed necessary. The issue involves consideration of (1) the state of the health of the population, (2) the distribution of the Nation's medical, hospital, dental, and other health services, and (3) whether or not the majority of the population has access to such services.

Second, there is a fundamental question as to whether, and to what extent, it is necessary for the Federal Government further to expand its operations in the field of health. Available evidence raises many questions as to the desirability, as well as the necessity, of wide-scale Federal intervention, particularly in the field of medical care for individuals.

Third, the basic issue involved in the provision of medical and certain other health services for individuals, in the event of further Federal expansion in this field, rests in the question of methods or systems to be employed. The two major proposals under consideration by the subcommittee, S. 545 and S. 1320, differ very fundamentally as to method. The former is essentially a grant-in-aid system to assist the States in developing their own health programs. It is predicated on the assumption that individuals and families able to pay for their own medical and other health care will do so, either through voluntary participation in existing prepayment plans or by direct payment of fees for services. Wide latitude is given the States in working out plans for providing required health services for persons unable to pay the costs. On the other hand, the basic medical-care provisions of S. 1320 call for the adoption of a system of compulsory health insurance, under which all employed persons would be taxed to support a central health fund. The Federal Government would have general supervision of the system, including necessary regulatory procedures and control of the central fund. The issues raised in consideration of such a compulsory system are multitudinous and extremely controversial. Moreover, such issues frequently extend far beyond the conditions directly associated with determinable health problems, involving and affecting, as they do, the form and functioning of the economic system, the operations and responsibilities of the respective levels of government, and the whole question of the rights of individuals.

Fourth, it is apparent that individual measures in proposed health legislation must be considered in proper perspective rather than individually. It is further apparent that health legislation as a whole, enacted and proposed, must be considered in relation to other broad welfare programs of government. The fundamental issue here is that of ascertaining the long-range effects of such proposals as compulsory health insurance and wide-scale grants-in-aid programs, assuming they were to be adopted and their resultant tax levies and regulatory requirements were added to those already existing. Very little light has been shed on this whole question; yet it is of the utmost importance to further deliberation on proposed health legislation.

Fifth, there is a basic question as to the proper administrative organization for dealing with health functions. Regardless of whatever specific health programs might be adopted by Congress, the organizational issue will have to be faced. Health programs and related functions of the Federal Government are now widely scattered throughout the various governmental departments and agencies, with an accompanying lack of full coordination. Present proposals before the committee involve organizational questions, although none of them cut across all the major departmental lines involved. There has been reported for consideration of the Senate during this Congress a bill (S. 140) providing for the creation of a new executive department to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security. Passage of this bill, or any similar proposal, would affect the ultimate consideration and perfection of pending health measures.

Furthermore, the entire organization of the executive branch of the Government is now being studied by the Commission specifically created for that purpose by Public Law 162, which was passed during the first session of this Congress. This Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government is giving detailed consideration to the existing Federal functions and organizational structure concerned with health and related matters. The Commission undoubtedly will make a number of fundamental recommendations affecting health and welfare administration when it reports to the Eighty-first Congress in January 1949. Since the Federal Government already is engaged in health and related activities to an extent much greater than may be generally realized, it is entirely fitting that the Subcommittee on Health should have the opportunity of availing itself of the Commission's recommendations on the organizational question.

Finally, it is a matter of fact, although frequently overlooked in testimony before the subcommittee, that health does not exist in a vacuum. Instead, health is the

net result of the working of a very considerable range of environmental, personal, and other interrelated factors. Legislation providing medical care alone, for example, will not necessarily guarantee the prevalence of good health. Should there be also an extension of the present Federal public-health program?

ORIGINAL EVIDENCE MADE AVAILABLE TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

In addition to the extensive hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Health, the inquiry into proposed health legislation has led to the recent production of certain original information on the subject which, it is believed, merits the careful consideration, not only of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare but of all Members of Congress and the public as well. This information deals, on the one hand, with the preferences of the State governors in regard to national health proposals and, on the other hand, with the results of a fundamental analysis of the issues underlying such proposals by the Brookings Institution. The basic import of this evidence, high lights of which are outlined below, is such that it necessitates considerable rethinking and reevaluation of proposed health legislation.

PREFERENCES OF STATE GOVERNORS

In August 1947, copies of the two principal national health proposals under consideration, S. 545 and S. 1320, were submitted to the respective State governors. The proposals were submitted on behalf of the Subcommittee on Health by its chairman, and the governors were requested to indicated their views and preferences as limited to a choice between the two major proposals. Replies were received from 40 of the 48 governors, a summary of which follows:

Classification of replies:	*Number of governors*
Favored S. 545 (with or without qualifications)	25
Favored S. 1320	0
No preference indicated	10
Not in favor of either S. 545 or S. 1320	5
Did not report	8
Total	48

Although this report of preferences of the governors clearly indicated their general disapproval of S. 1320, and thus of compulsory health insurance as therein provided, the reports were in no sense overwhelmingly favorable to the provisions of S. 545. While 25 governors expressed preference for this grant-in-aid measure over S. 1320, most of them did so with considerable reservation as to provisions of the bill. Perhaps equally significant was the fact that 5 governors expressly disapproved both of the proposals, while 10 did not elect to indicate any preference. Analysis of the detailed reports indicates that it is not unlikely that a much larger number of the governors than did would have indicated disapproval of both bills had such an alternative choice been included in the inquiry.

This inquiry was neither designed nor intended as a full-blown survey of the problem and its results are obviously of limited application. Nevertheless, the broad implications of the governors' reports cannot be ignored; namely, that in general the State governments, which they represent, do not appear to be confronted with health problems sufficiently serious at this time to demand either wide-scale intervention by the Federal Government or the introduction of revolutionary methods for dealing with the problems that do exist.

FINDINGS OF THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

In view of the controversial nature of the principal issues before the committee, a very real need has existed for a competent and expert analysis of the problem by a disinterested organization. Accordingly, in May 1947 the Brookings Institution was requested by the chairman of the subcomimttee to undertake such an analysis. The long-established reputation of this public service institution as an independent research foundation is well known in Congress and elsewhere. The Brookings Institution accepted the assignment as a public service to Congress and on February 17, 1948, transmitted an advance summary of their conclusions and recommendations to the subcommittee. Subsequently, the full context of the report, which was published by the institution in April 1948, was made available to the committee. The broad conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

1. Probably no great nation in the world has among its white population better health than prevails in the United States. A few small homogeneous countries, such as New Zealand with respect to its white population, are slightly ahead of the United States as a whole, but certain States of the United States with larger populations equal them.

2. It is apparent that the United States under its voluntary system of medical care has made greater progress in the application of medical and sanitary science than any other country. This progress is now reflected in low mortality and morbidity rates of infectious diseases and in increased life expectancy. There is every reason to believe that these trends will continue unabated under our present system of medical care.

3. The nonwhites in the United States have materially poorer health than the whites, but the evidence does not indicate that this condition is primarily or even mainly due to inadequacy of medical care.

4. The advances in health among both the whites and the nonwhites that have been made in the United States in the past four decades do not suggest basic defects in the American system.

5. Although the statistics resulting from the administration of the Selective Service Act—the so-called draft statistics—have been widely used to show bad health among the American people and the need for revolutionary changes in arrangements for medical care of individuals, they are unreliable as a measure of the health of the Nation and cannot be used to show the extent of the medical needs of the country as a whole.

6. Present medical care in the United States compares favorably with that which existed in other leading nations prior to the Second World War.

7. The conditions in extremely poor rural areas that lack the resources to support adequate public services, such as health work, education, and highways cannot be satisfactorily solved by subsidies. This problem calls for a radically different approach, either bringing in new or improved economic activities or getting the people to more favorable and administratively less expensive areas. This condition has been accentuated by the emigration of youth from these areas to urban communities.

8. The United States has some individuals and families not possessed of the resources to enable them to pay for adequate medical care. In the future, as in the past, provision must be made for them through public funds or philanthropy. The evidence suggests that many of them are elderly, impaired, or underendowed or are widows or deserted women or their dependents. It is doubtful that they could be effectively covered by compulsory insurance because they would lack the means to attain and maintain an insured status. The large majority of American families have the resources to pay for adequate medical care if they elect to give it a high priority among the several objects of expenditure. The issue is not whether they can afford medical care but whether they should be compelled by law to pool their risks and to give payment for medical care a top priority. The major alternative for people with ability to pay is to leave them free to determine for themselves what medical care they desire and whether they will pool their risks through voluntary arrangements.

9. Compulsory health insurance would necessitate a high degree of governmental regulation and control over the personnel and the agencies engaged in providing medical care. This field of regulation and control would be far more difficult than any other large field previously entered by the Government, and past experience with governmental regulations and control in the United States causes doubt as to whether it encourages initiative and development.

10. The problem of eliminating politics from Government administration is extremely difficult. It does not seem probable that politics could be eliminated from Medical care supplied under a governmental system.

11. Compulsory insurance would inject the Government into the relationship between practitioner and patient. A real danger exists that Government actions would impair that relationship and hence the quality of medical care.

12. The administration of compulsory insurance would require thousands of Government employees for accounting, auditing, and inspection and investigation.

13. The cost of medical care presumably would increase because of (a) administrative expenses; (b) the tendency of insured persons to make unnecessary and often unreasonable demands upon the medical-care services; and (c) the tendency of some practitioners and agencies to use the system for their own financial advantage.

14. The adoption of compulsory insurance would not immediately make available adequate medical service for all, because there are not at present the facilities nor a sufficient number of trained and experienced physicians, dentists, and nurses to meet the demand which would result from compulsory insurance.

15. Proposals for compulsory insurance provide for payment of practitioners under one or all of three methods: (a) Fee for service, (b) per capita, or (c) salary. Use of the fee-for-service device represents the minimum degree of socialization, but it is administratively difficult. Administrative difficulties would probably result in the adoption of the per-capita system which represents a higher degree of socialization or even in the salary system which represents practically complete socialization. It seems questionable whether a country which once embarks on compulsory insurance can turn back but must attempt to remedy defects by more complete Government control and administration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. For the present, in our judgment, the National Government would be wise to leave to the individual States the question of whether compulsory health insurance is to be adopted or whether the provision of professional services is to be left in the realm of free enterprise. It seems highly probable that in many communities the intelligent cooperation of consumers and practitioners will develop satisfactory arrangements that remain subject to their own control without National Government administration. It seems highly improbable that this experimentation—possible under our Federal form of government—will ultimately develop a single pattern that is applicable to all sections of the country and is desired by a large majority of the people. If such a pattern should develop, it will doubtless then be adopted with a great degree of unanimity. If compulsory insurance should be adopted now by a narrow vote in the Congress, large numbers of persons who are opposed to it

would start with a hostile attitude toward the whole undertaking.

2. For the time being the National Government and many of the State governments may well devote their resources and energies to:

(a) Research and developments in the fields of public health.

(b) Health education at the school level.

(c) Teaching of preventive medicine.

(d) Assisting in the acquisition of physical facilities and training of personnel.

(e) Providing systematic care for the indigent and the medically indigent.

3. From the standpoint of public relations, governments might be well advised to leave adult educational campaigns for the control and prevention of disease to the national, State, and local voluntary organizations, which have been able to enlist the active cooperation of leading laymen in most sections of the country. It must be remembered that good health is not exclusively a matter of medical care; it also impinges upon causative factors that are nonmedical, such as food, shelter, vice and crime, transportation, and industry. Its maintenance depends also upon the intelligence, interest, and cooperation of individuals, families, and local communities.

These recommendations are not widely at variance with those of the majority of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, arrived at in 1932 after a comprehensive study. The report of the committee says:

"* * * (The) majority of the committee does not endorse the recommendation which would make health insurance a legal requirement for certain sections of the population. These members realize that such a step may ultimately be necessary and desirable in some States, but they believe that for most States and probably for almost all of them at the present time, it is much more desirable (a) to encourage voluntary measures for protection against wage loss during sickness, and (b) to develop voluntary insurance for medical care in conjunction with group practice, with hospital service and with the related measures recommended on the preceding pages. They are of the opinion that the difficulties of these plans can be controlled by a combination of professional and community effort, and that these plans hold the promise of steady extension in scope of service and in proportion of the population served. These members believe that the various payment plans (aside from compulsory insurance) if fully carried out, would: (1) Largely solve the problem of hospital costs which constitute about 50 percent of the average family expenditure for the care of sickness; (2) provide adequately for many rural areas in which serious deficiencies of facilities exist at present; (3) make more nearly adequate provision than exists at present for the indigent and for the care of certain diseases of public importance; and (4) provide, through voluntary cooperative insurance * * * medical service to a majority of the 70,000,000 people living in industrial communities and in cities." [1]

The years since 1932 have witnessed:

1. A great growth in voluntary insurance both for hospitalization and for medical services.

2. State experimentation with compulsory health insurance in Rhode Island and California.

3. A growing willingness on the part of practitioners to cooperate in the development of prepayment plans and other devices to enable patients who so desire to regularize their payments for medical care.

4. A profound change in the amount and distribution of the earnings of the American people. This change greatly reduces the number who cannot afford adequate medical care if they desire to purchase it.

The experience of the United States since 1932 seems to have demonstrated the wisdom of these recommendations of the majority of the members of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care. It would seem unwise at this time to substitute for these developments a system of compulsory health insurance by national law which would have the unfortunate tendency to freeze policies and eventually retard medical progress.

The import of these conclusions and recommendations to the work of the committee is apparent. Although the Brookings Institution has raised serious questions as to the necessity and practicability of governmental expansion in the field of medical and other health services by the imposition of a national, compulsory system, the Institution has outlined certain functional areas in which problems exist and which should receive full recognition in the course of the committee's consideration of the problem. The Brookings report fills a gap heretofore existing in the evidence available to the committee; it represents a concise and fundamental contribution which bears directly on the basic issues involved in the consideration of proposed health legislation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the considerations outlined hereinabove, it is the opinion of the committee that continued study of health problems, and proposed legislation relating thereto, is prerequisite to the formulation of basic recommendations in this field. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare therefore unanimously report Senate Resolution 249 without amendment and recommend its approval.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition to the foregoing report which accompanied the resolution for the continuing study of these national health problems, it seems to me fitting at this point in my remarks to add a summary of all the bills by number and title, reported to and passed by the Senate of the Eightieth Congress up to and including June 15, 1948. In this summary we have set forth the scope and objectives of the various measures so passed.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF HEALTH BILLS PASSED BY SECOND SESSION, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

1. S. 1454: Amending the Public Health Service Act in regard to matters of personnel and administration. The provisions of this bill were necessary in order to aid the Public Health Service in overcoming its personnel problems. The bill provides for revision of its promotion system and modifies the authority of the Service to make original appointments at advanced grades. It also authorizes expenditures necessary for keeping its commissioned officers trained in the latest developments in medical and related scientific and public-health fields. Through passage of the bill and its subsequent enactment into law, Congress has placed the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service on a parity with the Army and the Navy as regards rates of pay and of promotion and other personnel matters.

2. S. 176 and H. R. 6726: Providing for the creation of a National Institute of Dental Research. The committee reported and the Senate approved S. 176 during the first session of the Eightieth Congress. H. R. 6726, passed by the House, contained the same major provisions of S. 176 except for improvements made necessary owing to the lapse of time between passage of the two bills and exclusion of provisions for construction of physical laboratory facilities. The Senate amended the bill by adding the stricken provisions providing research facilities, and it was accepted in that form by the House. The bill establishes in the Public Health Service a National Institute of Dental Research for the purpose of improving the dental health of the people through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases and conditions. The bill also provides that grants may be made to other public and private agencies in order to assist and foster such researches and other activities. It also provides for training of personnel in matters relating to dental diseases and conditions. It calls for the coordination of all such research and activities and the useful application of their results with a view to the development and prompt use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of dental diseases. There is a vast backlog of needed dental care. This backlog far exceeds the man-hours of available dental skill that can be devoted to meeting it. Only by finding new and improved techniques of prevention and treatment through research can we hope greatly to improve the dental health of the Nation within the foreseeable future.

3. S. 2215: Providing for the creation in the Public Health Service of a National Heart Institute. This bill, passed by both Houses of Congress during this session of the Eightieth Congress, provides for research and control relating to diseases of the heart and circulation. The purpose of the measure is to improve the health of the people through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the causes, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the heart and circulation, and to assist and foster such researches and other activities by public and private agencies, and to promote the coordination of all such researches and the useful application of their results. The bill also provides for training technicians and physicians in matters relating to heart diseases, and it calls for assistance to States and other agencies in promoting the use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart diseases. The basic facts concerning the incidence of diseases of the heart and circulation present a clear-cut problem of serious proportions. The fact that deaths from cardiovascular diseases have accounted for more than one of every three deaths in the United States each year for the last decade, ranking first among the causes of death, indicates the serious nature of the problem. Passage of S. 2215 gives full recognition to the problem and places needed emphasis on research and control in diseases of the heart and circulation.

4. S. 1969: Amending the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 to provide for the training of Filipinos in public-health methods. This bill authorizes an extension of the time during which Filipinos may be trained in this country in public-health methods. This measure is important to the administration of public-health services in the Philippine Islands as a part of the reconstruction program.

5. S. 2341: Authorizing an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. This bill provides authorization of adequate funds for operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for research in tropical diseases. This public-service institution, established in 1928, provides laboratory facilities located in the Tropics and conducts research and control activities in tropical diseases in the Republic of Panama.

6. H. R. 4114: Amending the Public Health Service Act to permit expenditures for operating purposes of the Public Health Service. The bill incorporated into basic law certain

[1] Medical Care for the American People, the final report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, October 31, 1932, p. 130.

authority previously authorized annually in the appropriations for the Public Health Service. Passage of the bill clarifies the basic authority of the Public Health Service and strengthens the Public Health Service Act.

7. H. R. 6339: Amending the Hospital Survey and Construction Act so as to restore to eligibility to participate in Federal grants for hospital construction those States which would cease to be eligible because of their inability to comply with provisions of the act on July 1, 1948. This bill enables any State to participate under the program after July 1, 1948, if and when such State enacts appropriate enabling legislation.

8. H. R. 6289: Providing for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients in St. Elizabeths Hospital. This bill authorizes residents of the District of Columbia to be admitted and treated at St. Elizabeths Hospital on a voluntary basis. Passage of the measure represents a progressive step in procedures governing the treatment of patients in mental health institutions.

9. Senate Resolution 249: Providing authorization for the subcommittee on health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition to the report and summary I have presented, I would finally like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the bill providing for the setting up of a National Science Foundation, which passed both the Senate and House last year, and which was vetoed by the President, was reintroduced early this year, and, in an amended form to meet some of the President's objections, was duly passed by the Senate on May 5 and sent to the House. This measure is still pending in the House, and it is my sincere hope that before Congress adjourns it may become law.

The science bill is designed to aid research in the basic sciences, and among the basic sciences the medical sciences are included, and therefore it is of vital importance in the consideration of our national health.

In closing these few remarks as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I want to pay a special tribute to the interest and diligence of the members of the subcommittee with whom it has been a great honor and privilege to work. The committee is composed of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], besides myself as chairman.

I also wish to pay special tribute to all the Members of the Senate who contributed to the development of the National Science Foundation bill, and particularly to those who joined with me, first, in the introduction of the bills introduced in both the first and second sessions of the Congress, and then in following through the difficult negotiations to iron out the differences and arrive at common conclusions. This group included the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I wish particularly to express my appreciation for the cooperation given by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

INCREASES OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 percent, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

(a) has a wife but no child living, $30;

(b) has a wife and one child living, $50;

(c) has a wife and two children living, $65;

(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $80;

(e) has no wife but one child living, $20;

(f) has no wife but two children living, $35;

(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $50;

(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $25 for each parent so dependent.

(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 percent, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

SEC. 2. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

SEC. 3. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and veterans' regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

Also to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASE IN RATES OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN WIDOWS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the following rates of compensation are hereby established for surviving widows, children, and dependent parents of deceased veterans of World War I or World War II whose deaths are the result of service in such wars, or the results of contingencies provided for in the United States Code, title 38, sections 501a, 501a–1, and paragraph 4, part VII, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended:

Widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $115, with $20 for each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, $50 with $20 for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $75; dependent mother and father, $40 each.

SEC. 2. Such compensation shall not be diminished by reason of other benefits allowed by other provisions of law.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or veterans' regulation, for the purpose of payment of compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, one parent whose annual income does not exceed $1,800, or two parents whose annual income does not exceed $3,000, shall be deemed to be dependent. In determining annual income any payments made by a parent for expense of last illness of the veteran and such expense of burial of the veteran as exceeds the amount of the allowance authorized by Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, shall be excluded and any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered nor shall life-insurance payments from any other source, including income therefrom in an amount less than $3,000 received in any 1 year, be considered.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on the first day of the second month following the date of its enactment: *Provided*, That no compensation shall be reduced or discontinued by the enactment of this act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY conferees on the part of the Senate.

BOARDS OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL AND MILITARY ACADEMIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 239) to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy

and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there shall be appointed on or before the last day of every year a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 2. Each Board shall be constituted as follows:

(a) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee;

(b) Three other Members of the Senate to be appointed by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(c) The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee;

(d) Four other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(e) Six persons to be appointed by the President. The first Board to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall, with respect to the nine Presidential appointees, consist of two persons appointed to serve for a period of 1 year, two persons appointed to serve for a period of 2 years, and two persons appointed to serve for a period of 3 years. Two Presidential appointees shall be appointed to each subsequent Board to serve for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 3. In case of the death or resignation of a member of a Board during the term for which such member was appointed, a successor shall be appointed for the unexpired portion of the term. Such successor shall be appointed by the official, or his successor, who appointed the member who died or resigned.

SEC. 4. Each Board shall visit the respective Academy for which it is appointed once annually in April, and each Board or the individual members thereof may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, make such other visits on matters pertaining to the duties of the Board, or for purposes of consulting with the respective Superintendents of the Academies, as the Board or its members may determine to be desirable.

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of each Board to inquire into the state of morale and discipline, curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy concerned which the Board may decide to consider.

(b) Each Board shall, within 60 days after the meeting designated as the annual visit, submit a written annual report to the President regarding its action as such Board, together with its views and recommendations pertaining to the Academy concerned. Any report based on a visit other than the annual visit shall be submitted by the originator or originators thereof to the President within 60 days after approval of said report by at least a majority of the members of the Board.

(c) Each Board is authorized to call into consultation upon prior approval of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Army, as the case may be, such advisers as it may deem necessary or advisable to effectuate the duties imposed upon it by the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Each member of each Board shall receive not more than $5 per day and be reimbursed under Government travel regulations for actual expenses of travel while performing duties as a member of either Board.

(b) Advisers called for consultation by either Board in connection with the business of the Board shall be compensated in the same manner as members of the Boards in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 7. That part of the act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes", which relates to the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy (39 Stat. 608) and reads as follows: "From and after the passage of this act there shall be appointed every year, in the following manner, a Board of Visitors, to visit the Academy, the date of the annual visit of the board aforesaid to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy: Seven persons shall be appointed by the President and four Senators and five Members of the House of Representatives shall be designated as visitors by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, in the month of January of each year. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives shall be ex officio members of said board.

"Each member of said Board shall receive while engaged upon duties as a member of the Board not to exceed $5 a day and actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. (a) So much of the provision of the act of August 9, 1912, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," which provides as follows: "*Provided*, That the act approved May 28, 1908, be amended and reenacted so as to read as follows: That hereafter the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy shall consist of five members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and seven members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen thereof; the members so appointed shall visit the Military Academy annually at such time as the chairman of said committees shall appoint, and the members from each of said committees may visit said Academy together or separately as the said committees may elect during the session of Congress; and the Superintendent of the Academy and the members of the Board of Visitors shall be notified of such date by the chairmen of the said committees. The expenses of the members of the Board shall be their actual expenses while engaged upon their duties as members of said Board not to exceed $5 per day and their actual expenses of travel by the shortest mail routes" is hereby repealed.

(b) The act of May 17, 1928, entitled "An act to provide for the membership of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 597), is hereby repealed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the amendments of the House are technical in character. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATION RIDERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States persists in its irresponsible, pernicious, and objectionable practice of attaching riders to appropriation bills. The veto message of the President of the United States, which was overridden yesterday by the Congress, is discussed in an important editorial published in the Washington Post of today. I hope every Senator will read the editorial because sooner or later it seems to me the Congress of the United States must begin to follow a consistent policy of legislation, which the appropriations committees have not been doing for some time in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATION RIDERS

It was high time for a President of the United States to challenge, through his veto power, the pernicious practice of tacking legislative riders onto appropriation bills. If there was politics in Mr. Truman's message returning the billion-dollar social-security measure, it was politics of the best sort: it served to dramatize for the country an issue far greater than the issue involved in the provision of funds for an important Federal agency. The action of Congress in overriding the veto roughshod was politics of the worst sort; it was dictated more by a desire for adjournment than by any consideration of the national interest.

One need not even take into account the merits of the legislation which Congress attached to the social-security appropriation to agree with President Truman that it is not "in the interest of good government that legislation of such importance should be enacted in such a manner." It was enacted, as he said, "entirely without reference to or hearing by the legislative committees concerned with such matters." And what is even more disquieting is the plain fact that it was enacted designedly in such a way as to make extremely difficult, if not actually to nullify, exercise of the President's constitutionally conferred veto power. It took rare courage as well as statesmanship for Mr. Truman to run the hazard of leaving the Social Security Administration without funds.

What Mr. Truman did was, as he called it, "unusual," but it was not unprecedented. In 1879 and 1880, during the administration of Rutherford B. Hayes, an attempt was made by Congress to impose its will on the President through just this technique of appending legislation to a vital appropriation. President Hayes denounced it as involving "a radical, dangerous, and unconstitutional change in the character of our institutions," destroying the constitutional distribution of powers among the coordinate branches of the Government. He had this to say on the subject:

"To say that a majority of either or both of the Houses of Congress may insist on the approval of a bill under the penalty of stopping all of the operations of the Government, for want of the necessary supplies, is to deny to the Executive that share of the legislative power which is plainly conferred by the second section of the seventh article of the Constitution. It strikes from the Constitution the qualified negative of the President."

In the controversy of that time, President Hayes persisted in vetoing the obnoxious bills until his opponents on the Hill, who could not manage to muster the votes necessary to override him, were at last compelled to yield and separate the appropriations from the riders. President Truman, unfortunately, has not had such support even from the members of his own party. But it is not impossible that he will win it from the country if Congress continues to behave so irresponsibly. Taking the fight between himself and Congress to the people, he is justified in saying, at least on this particular issue, that he has done, as he put it, his "damnedest." And this is something the people of the United States are prone to respect.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for himself and his colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] to Senate bill 2318.

Mr. COOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. COOPER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarthy	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Cordon	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	White
Feazel	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Flanders	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	
Gurney	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to propose a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow, June 18, 1948, the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order 1504. I might state that that is the calendar number where we left off when the oleomargarine bill was under consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does that mean that the calendar will not be called today?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The reason I make the request now is that several Senators have asked me when the calendar is to be called. It was my idea not to have a call of the calendar until we conclude consideration of the farm legislation. It now appears that there will be considerable debate and discussion of the pending bill. I felt that Senators would like to know definitely when the calendar will be called.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, would the Senator mind repeating his request? I was engaged in conversation.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow, June 18, 1948, the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 1504. That is the bill following the oleomargarine bill, where we left off the last time the calendar was called.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under that order would a motion be in order to proceed to the consideration of a bill if objection were lodged against it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would not.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make a further announcement. It is our intention to remain in session tonight until as late an hour as necessary to conclude consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what will be done with appropriation bills?

Mr. WHERRY. As fast as appropriation bills are ready, I shall ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to help us out in getting them passed so that they may go to conference.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If I may have the attention of the acting majority leader, I did not object a moment ago when the decision was being made to wait until tomorrow for a call of the calendar. However, I think we should understand that if we wait until tomorow to call the calendar, there is hardly any possibility that there could be a conference in case of disagreement between the two Houses on any measure passed on the call of the calendar. I am very much interested in a certain bill, with respect to which there may be disagreement between the two Houses on the Senate committee recommendation. I have heard other Senators make the same point. I wonder if we could not reconsider that decision and find some time during today to call the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, so that there will be a possibility of conference in case of disagreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the constructive observation made by the Senator from Florida; but of course his argument would also apply to the farm bill. I have taken this question up with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has been most patient about displacing the farm bill for other legislation.

The difficulty arose because we did not complete the call of the calendar when it was called day before yesterday. In the meantime we have considered a number of privileged matters. We are now back on the farm bill. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Florida did not make objection. If the distinguished Senator will allow us to proceed, I am sure that conferences can be arranged, and that there will be an opportunity for the conferees to report back, even though we must remain in session late Saturday night. I am sure that bills which go to conference will have a chance.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if we could not leave it to the discretion of the able acting majority leader to take up the calendar before the close of this day, after the disposition of the farm bill, if there is an opportunity. I mention that for this reason: I am told that in case of disagreement a long time is required, in the present state of congestion in the Printing Office, to get the printed reports necessary to make a conference possible. So we would at least have the intervening hours in which the Printing Office could prepare the necessary papers in case of disagreement between the two Houses.

Mr. WHERRY. I took that question up with the Printing Office. While we might gain a little time, yet very little time would be gained if we were to call the calendar late tonight. It is my definite opinion that unless a miracle happens, consideration of the agricultural program will continue until pretty late tonight. If the bill should go over, it will be temporarily displaced under the unanimous-consent order. I believe that is about as fair a compromise as we could get between the distinguished Senator from Vermont and Senators who are interested in other bills on the calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not have in mind a call of the calendar preceding consideration of the farm bill; but I did want the acting majority leader not to commit himself and the Senate to the assumption that there would not be a call of the calendar if the situation permitted it during the day.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is better to have a set time. Then Senators may know when the calendar will be called. Furthermore, only bills which meet the approval of the Senate will be passed. One Senator may object to a bill, which will cause the bill to go over. A bill which passes the Senate unanimously should not have much difficulty in conference. I believe that the print-

ing item would be a minor consideration, even if the call of the calendar could not be reached this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make a further observation. Yesterday I talked with the clerk of one of the House committees. He told me about the congestion in the Printing Office. He stated that there could not possibly be a conference on a disagreement between the two Houses unless a certain number of hours intervened, so that the Printing Office would have an opportunity to print the reports.

Mr. WHERRY. I am just as sure as I am of anything that consideration of the farm bill will not be concluded until late this evening. So far as conferences are concerned, I think they would be held tomorrow morning in any event. The Senator has offered a very constructive criticism in connection with the matter of printing. However, I believe that if we are permitted to proceed we can accomplish the purpose for which the calendar is called; and I believe that most of the conferees will cooperate in every way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a matter of no great moment to me when the calendar is called; but I am sure the Senator is taking into consideration the fact that if the calendar is not called before tomorrow morning, it will mean the death of any Senate bill on the calendar, whereas if the calendar were called today, there might be a chance of its enactment.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator say that it would mean the death of any Senate bill on the calendar?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would mean the death of any Senate bill to which there was the slightest objection, if the calendar were not called until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. We shall encounter that difficulty whenever it is called. I am quite satisfied that if we proceed under this order, consideration of bills on the calendar will be as greatly expedited as though we had a call of the calendar tonight.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I suggest that if we proceed with the business before the Senate, we shall probably have time to work on the calendar before the day is over.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I know that many Senators are busy today in committees, and I cannot expect that too many will be present at all times during the discussion of my amendment. However, I hope that Senators who come from tobacco-producing States will remain, while my distinguished colleague [Mr. BARKLEY] and I discuss this amendment.

The amendment proposed by my colleague and myself reads as follows:

(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas are in effect shall be 90 percent of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year.

The effect of the amendment is to remove tobacco from the list of commodities which will be subject to the price-support table found on page 79 of the pending bill, which table has been characterized as a flexible or moving price-support plan, in which the level of support afforded to a specific commodity varies, and to give tobacco a definite, fixed support price equal to 90 percent of its parity price.

I know that this amendment will provoke, very naturally and rightfully, certion questions. It will be asked, Why should tobacco be treated differently than other agricultural commodities? Why should tobacco be guaranteed a fixed, firm support price equal to 90 percent of its parity price, when the support price of other commodities ranges between 60 and 90 percent of parity?

Mr. President, my colleague and I ask—and I know we shall be joined by others who are familiar with the problems of tobacco—that this amendment to the pending bill be adopted because the conditions under which tobacco is produced, its limited use as a raw, unprocessed product, and—and this is most important—the conditions under which it must be marketed, operate to make its sale entirely different from that of every other agricultural commodity.

It is my contention, and one which I believe is supported by the facts, that the unusual conditions under which tobacco is produced and marketed, when coupled—and this is the most important fact in the argument—with the usually limited field of buyers, operate to give a dominant bargaining position to the limited field of buyers representing the major tobacco companies, and to deprive the producer of tobacco of a free market, in the sense that a market is enjoyed by the producers of other agricultural commodities. We contend that in this limited market, the buyer pays a price which is not necessarily or always related to the law of supply and demand, but is fixed by the maximum amount the buyers must pay to get the tobacco, which in reality is the support price. For this reason we argue that the support price should be fixed at 90 percent of parity. If it means a lower percentage, prices will decline as the support price declines.

Mr. President, tobacco is a cash crop. A year's labor, nearly all of which is hand labor once the seed is sowed in the tobacco bed, is required to cultivate and market the crop. I doubt that Senators who do not live in tobacco-producing States realize that it takes a year, and sometimes more than a year, to cultivate a crop of tobacco from the time the seed is sowed in the tobacco bed, until the tobacco is sold upon the market.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has long been a common saying in the tobacco-growing areas that it takes 13 months out of every 12 to grow a crop of tobacco.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; it is very true that there is a common saying in our State that it takes 13 months out of every 12 to produce a tobacco crop. In the production of a tobacco crop, practically every process is by hand labor—hard, back-breaking labor.

Due to the peculiar characteristics of tobacco, it must be sold in the year in which it is produced. Other crops can be held waiting for a good market; but tobacco must be sold in a short marketing season of 3 or 4 months, in the year in which it is produced. This is true because of inadequate marketing facilities and because the tobacco would deteriorate substantially.

Moreover—again different from other crops—tobacco cannot be marketed except as tobacco. The producer of corn or wheat can market his crop by feeding it to cattle or hogs, but the tobacco producer must sell his crop as tobacco, and nothing else.

Furthermore, when the tobacco grower is ready to sell his crop, he cannot take it to his county seat and find there several buyers, but he must take it to the place where a tobacco warehouse is located, and there it must be auctioned and sold in a strange language—familiar to you from radio programs—to one of a limited group of tobacco buyers, representing the large tobacco companies.

Unless the representatives of the tobacco companies are there, the tobacco producer cannot sell his crop. In Kentucky and other tobacco-producing States warehouses are not built merely to accommodate the producers of tobacco; they cannot be built unless prior to their building there is an agreement, or a strong reason to believe that the large tobacco companies will send their representatives to the market. Tobacco warehouses have been built in my State and, I am sure, in other States, for the purpose of accommodating the tobacco producers of the section, and then never used, because representatives of the large tobacco companies would not send their buyers to the new warehouse.

The tobacco farmer must take his crop to the place where the representatives of the great tobacco manufacturers of tobacco will come to buy his crop. Unless the representatives are there, the tobacco farmer cannot sell his tobacco. The farmer who has spent a year in back-breaking toil to produce a crop of tobacco, which is his cash crop and his principal source of income, and who has hauled it, 50 to 100 miles to a warehouse, knows that he must sell his tobacco to one of the few buyers, or else lose his year's labor. Can it be doubted that the buyers know that the farmer must sell or lose the work of a year?

I do not wish to base my argument upon unjustified criticism or attack upon the great tobacco companies who are the principal buyers; they perform a valuable service. Nevertheless I must emphasize the dominant position they hold in the tobacco market against the single producer of tobacco. In 1941 the buying methods of the several large tobacco companies were subjected to inquiry in an action brought by the Department of Justice alleging violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. In that prosecution, the defendants—the American Tobacco Co., the Liggett & Myers

Tobacco Co., the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., American Suppliers, and certain subsidiaries—were charged with having conspired to violate the Antitrust Act. The defendants were convicted in the United States District Court in Kentucky; the case was appealed to the circuit court of appeals, where it was affirmed, and in 1945 the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the action of the lower courts in finding these companies guilty of conspiring to monopolize in the tobacco field. The opinion of the Supreme Court, rendered by Mr. Justice Burton, contains a table which demonstrates the dominating position of these great tobacco companies as purchasers of tobacco. There are listed nine companies that are the principal purchasers of tobacco at the markets which I have described. I quote from the opinion in the case of *American Tobacco Co.* v. *United States* (66 S. Ct. 1125), respecting the table:

> The first table shows that, although American, Liggett, and Reynolds gradually dropped in their percentage of the national domestic cigarette production from 90.7 percent in 1931 to 73.3 percent, 71 percent, and 68 percent, respectively, in 1937, 1938, and 1939, they have accounted at all times for more than 68 percent, and usually for more than 75 percent, of the national production. The balance of the cigarette production has come from six other companies.

The point I make is that the thousands of small tobacco growers in the tobacco-producing States, arriving at the warehouses with their tobacco, find there as the only purchasers of their tobacco, three representatives of three great companies, representing at least 68 to 75 percent of the cigarette industry, and sometimes a few others. One count of the indictment in the case to which I have referred stated in part as follows:

> Said unlawful monopolization has had the effects, among others, of permitting a few companies to attain control of a bottleneck in a great industry—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. STENNIS. I desire to raise the point of order that it is impossible for a Member of the Senate who is trying to hear and understand the argument being presented by the Senator from Kentucky, and who is seated within 12 or 14 feet of the speaker, to hear and understand what is said. I do not want to be personal, but persons at the rear of the Senate Chamber who are presumed to have the privilege of the floor are abusing that privilege by conversing, not only to my disturbance but also to the disturbance of other Senators. I desire to raise a most serious point of order, that the membership of the Senate are entitled to sit under conditions which enable them to follow the debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's point is well taken. Those at the rear of the Chamber will either be seated or retire. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my good friend the Senator from Mississippi. Repeating, the indictment, in part, stated:

> Said unlawful monopolization has had the effects, among others, of permitting a few companies to attain control of a bottleneck in a great industry, through which a major farm commodity on which several million are dependent, must pass on its way through the hands of jobbers to retailers, to the many millions who use tobacco products * * * of enabling those few companies to abuse their resulting strategic and dominant position by making the income of growers of leaf tobacco lower than it would otherwise have been.

I do not say or imply that these tobacco-products companies are now in violation of the antitrust laws as they were held to be at that time. I merely emphasize that nothing has happened since that time to equalize the bargaining position of the sellers with the buyers. I point out that in a market of this kind, limited as it is to a few powerful buyers, each of whom cannot fail to be familiar with the practices of the others, the effects described in the opinion of the Supreme Court would be substantially the same, without any agreement or conspiracy among the buyers.

I should like to ask those who are interested in other crops, such as corn, wheat, and cotton, What would they think if the thousands of people who produce those crops were forced and required to sell them to nine companies? Would they believe that they had a free market? Would an individual producer in some remote section of our farming sections have equal bargaining power with their representatives? If it can be visualized that the thousands of small producers of tobacco must channel their crops through this bottleneck, dominated by a few powerful companies, it should not be difficult to see that a tobacco market is not a free market in the common sense of the term.

I urge the opinion, which is one shared by my constituents, who know every phase of tobacco growing, buying, and selling, that the Federal Government offers through its parity and support-price program the only substantial assurance the tobacco growers have that they will receive a reasonable price for their product. I realize it is difficult for Members of the Senate who do do not live in tobacco-producing States and who are not familiar with tobacco to understand this problem. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is made up of the sincerest and most sympathetic friends of agriculture I have ever talked to in my life, yet they would be required to admit that the tobacco problem is unfamiliar to them.

Tobacco buyers know that to supply their needs they must bid at least as high as the support level. By the same token they need not bid prices substantially above the support level. The net result is that the price paid to a producer will follow the support price.

I may be asked whether I have proof that this situation obtains. I think there is proof. I point first to the close relationship of actual prices paid to farmers to support prices during the past 2 years.

In 1947 the average price received by burley tobacco growers was 48.3 cents a pound, which was 20 percent in excess of the support price of 40.3 cents. In 1946 the average price was 39.7 cents a pound, or 15 percent above the support level of 33.5 cents a pound. I wonder how many other farm commodities have been selling so relatively close to their support levels of 90 percent of parity. I do not think there are many.

A second evidence that the price which the representatives of the large tobacco companies pay to the farmer is tied closely to the support price is indicated by the failure of tobacco to reflect in like degree to other farm products the inflationary influences of the past few years, which brought wide advances in practically every other farm product.

The average price received for the 1947 crop by growers of burley tobacco, which variety is a major component in the manufacture of cigarettes, was 48.3 cents a pound, or only 18 percent more than the price of 39.4 cents paid for the 1945 crop, the last crop sold under OPA price control. It is unnecessary for me to remind the Senate of advances of 50 to 100 percent and more in prices of other farm commodities over the past 2 years. This small increase in price was given to growers in the face of unprecedented demand for tobacco products.

Sales of cigarettes have increased almost uninterruptedly over a period of years. Between 1920 and 1930 cigarette sales nearly doubled, from 67,000,000,000 to 119,000,000,000. Between 1930 and 1940 sales rose about 60 percent, to 191,000,000,000. On top of this prodigious growth, sales more than doubled again during World War II to reach 414,000,000,000 in 1945. A glance at the sales of the leading tobacco companies will show that they have had the major share of the benefits of this spectacular record of industry growth. Certainly this unprecedented demand has not been reflected in an increase in price paid to the men and women who harvest a crop whose production requires 12 months.

Out of the total value of consumer expenditures for tobacco products the Federal Government and State governments take, in taxes, 43 percent; the producer takes 15½ percent; the remainder goes to the great tobacco companies. If the Senate will remember that sufficient tobacco to manufacture 414,000,000,000 cigarettes and other tobacco products must go from thousands of producers through a bottleneck of buyers representing from 6 to 10 major tobacco companies, it will have a clear understanding of the dominating influence of the buyers, which brings about in part this disparity between producer and processor.

We assert that the support price should be maintained at 90 percent of parity in order to give the individual grower some equality of bargaining power against the buyer. It may be asked, and rightfully so, if fixing the support at 90 percent will result in higher prices to the consumer. I do not believe it will. I am informed by the burley growers of my State that manufactured tobacco products are priced almost without reference to the cost of leaf tobacco. Statistics given me by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are eloquent proof of that position.

In 1947 the retail value of 1 pound of tobacco converted into manufactured product was $2.51. The farm value of 1 pound of tobacco was 39½ cents. The farmer's share in the pound of manufac-

tured tobacco was 16.3 percent. These figures are those of a year when 90-percent parity was in effect, and its maintenance certainly should not increase consumer prices.

Another question which will be asked is, "Will the maintenance of a 90-percent support price for tobacco make it probable that at some time in the future the Commodity Credit Corporation will be required to take in loans large quantities of tobacco and make large outlays of money?" I point out, first, that the demand for and sale of tobacco are not diminishing; they are expanding at home. As Europe recovers there will undoubtedly be a revival of large tobacco exports. Before the war a large volume of tobacco was exported which represented a considerable proportion of the total production of tobacco. I think it is reasonable to believe that as conditions improve foreign demand will increase. The expanding consumption of tobacco products at home and abroad makes overproduction unlikely.

In 1939, 22 percent of the flue-cured tobacco was exported; 39 percent of fire-cured dark tobacco was exported; 2½ percent of burley tobacco was exported.

Tobacco is now, and has been for several years, under an effective quota system which limits production. If tobacco were not under a quota system and there were a high support price, it would be probable that overproduction would follow, resulting in a heavy financial burden upon the Government. But I point out that for several years there have been effective marketing quotas for tobacco which have limited the production of individual tobacco growers and prevented overproduction.

The committee report states as follows:

> It has been demonstrated that fixed price supports for farm products without reference to supplies of products, have encouraged the producer to continue to expand production without regard for the demand for his products.

That comment could not apply to tobacco, because its production is limited by quotas which are fixed with regard to supply and demand. If there should be overproduction this year, or any year, the marketing quota can and should be reduced and the penalties applied by the bill to noncooperators would become effective to prevent overproduction. The best evidence of the effectiveness of the quota system in limiting production is found in its record. It has been in effect since 1938, with the exception of the year 1939. At present there is a comparatively small amount of tobacco in loan. During 3 of the 8 years in which it has been in effect the tobacco manufacturers absorbed the entire burley crop requiring no recourse whatever to Government loans. In 3 of the remaining 5 years amounts ranging from 1.6 percent to 6.2 percent of the crop went under loans, which were rapidly liquidated, with no loans in the immediately succeeding year. In 1947 only 5.1 percent of the crop went under loan, and this amount should be absorbed by the market during 1948. In only 1 year, 1946, was any substantial proportion of the burley crop taken under loan. It was 133,000,000 pounds, or 21 percent of the crop.

Mr. President, sometimes when the question of the effectiveness of the quota system is raised, it is argued that in the year to which I have just referred it was necessary to take 21 percent of the crop in loan. But during the war tobacco growers had been encouraged to expand production, to supply the needs of our armed forces, and of our allies. It was the inducement to produce tobacco extended by the Government during the war years that resulted in the overproduction in 1946.

About 50 percent of the large takings of 1946 has been sold under the quota system with actually no loss. With tight acreage control, a safeguard is provided against the necessity of large support buying at any time except under extraordinary conditions such as those caused by war or collapse of export markets, which cannot be anticipated.

It is true that the collapse of export markets, upon which certain types of tobacco depend, resulted in accumulation of these varieties. At present 335,000,000 pounds of these types, costing $127,000,000, are held under loan. But the size of these accumulations has little reference to the percentage of parity at which support was provided. Government loans on these export varieties would have been necessary at any support price. The exercise of quota control, however, combined with revival of exports, will correct this situation in time.

Mr. President, I should like to address myself for a few moments to the importance of tobacco, to the economy of many States. It is of vital importance to the tobacco-producing States. The total value of the crop in 1946 was $1,045,633,000. I do not have the figures for 1947, but I know the value was much larger in that year.

In 1946 its value, in terms of percentage of the total cash farm income of eight of the largest producing States, was as follows: North Carolina, 58 percent; Kentucky, 36 percent; South Carolina, 26 percent; Connecticut, 20 percent; Virginia, 18 percent; Tennessee, 13 percent; Georgia, 12 percent

I should like to have inserted in the RECORD a statement giving the names of the States, the total cash farm income, the value of the tobacco, and the percentage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

State	Total cash farm income	Tobacco	Percent
North Carolina	$753,193,000	$436,761,000	58
Kentucky	439,366,000	159,512,000	36
South Carolina	316,493,000	83,697,000	26
Connecticut	126,475,000	25,663,000	20
Virginia	360,600,000	63,022,000	18
Tennessee	399,579,000	52,844,000	13
Georgia	408,106,000	48,493,000	12

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is well known that tobacco is one of the great revenue producers of the Nation. Federal and State tax receipts from tobacco in 1947 amounted to $1,482,535,000. I point out that that is larger than the total price paid to the farmers in 1946. The Federal tax receipts increased, from the year 1939 to 1947, from $608,000,000 plus to $1,237,000,000. State tax receipts increased, from 1939 to 1947, from $58,000,000 plus to more than $244,000,000. I send to the desk a statement of Federal and State tax receipts from tobacco and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal tax receipts from tobacco products

Fiscal years:	
1939	$608,518,000
1941	698,065,000
1943	923,853,000
1946	1,165,519,000
1947	1,237,768,000

State tax receipts from tobacco products

Years ending June 30:	
1939	$58,970,000
1941	106,294,000
1943	140,761,000
1945	145,451,000
1946	199,392,000
1947	244,767,000
Total Federal and State tax receipts 1947	1,482,535,000

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I repeat, the percentage of Federal and State taxes of the total consumer expenditure for tobacco products represents approximately 43 percent of the consumer expenditures. I repeat, also, that out of these great consumer expenditures the producer's share is only 15.6 percent.

I should like to say that Senators from States whose agricultural economy is based upon corn or wheat or cotton know the importance of maintaining the price stability of those products. Similarly, the economy of my State and of other tobacco-producing States depends upon the price stability of tobacco. Tobacco is the great cash crop of those States. Sales are made in the late fall and winter and the farmer receives his money at a time when it is needed for the payment of taxes, interest, and debts. There is no other crop in those States which can take its place.

The farms are of small size. The average farm in Kentucky contains about 80 acres. It follows that it is not possible to engage in large grazing operations, or in the production of corn, wheat, or cotton upon a farm of that size.

The farming of these comparatively small farms is based upon tobacco production. Last year tobacco sales represented 52 percent of the farm income of my State.

If tobacco prices are driven down it is not usually possible to shift from tobacco to some other crop in an effort to recoup income lost when tobacco prices are reduced. Farmers can not shift from one type of tobacco to another type. I believe there are 28 types of tobacco, and the soil conditions of a particular State or a particular section of a State are suited for the growing of one or two types of tobacco. It is not possible, or at least profitable, to shift from flue-cured to burley, or from burley to fire-cured tobacco, or dark air-cured tobacco. Each type is related to the qualities of the soil.

Now, Mr. President, this amendment which I offer should be agreed to.

First. Because the growing and marketing conditions of tobacco are peculiarly different from those of other crops.

Second. The amendment should be agreed to because the market of tobacco growers is limited, and dominated by powerful buyers.

Third. These powerful, dominant buyers are able to fix a price, not based upon demand, but upon the support price which we create.

Fourth. I point out that the adoption of the amendment will not increase consumer prices.

Fifth. The record of Government loans on tobacco indicates that the quota system has worked, and that support for tobacco at 90 percent of parity has not imposed heavy financial burdens upon the Federal Government.

Finally, I insist that the tobacco quota system is itself a control of overproduction, and the flexible support system is not needed to control tobacco production. Upon this ground my colleague Senator BARKLEY and I are justified in asking that the amendment be adopted.

Before I close I should like to say that for some weeks I have been discussing tobacco problems with the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. The committee afforded the tobacco growers and industry every opportunity to present their case. Growers from my State and other States presented the case so clearly to the committee that the committee incorporated in the bill practically every provision other than 90-percent support which the growers requested.

The committee, its able chairman, Senator CAPPER, the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] deserve great credit.

I have been very much interested in the long-range farm bill. I believe that this is the time for Congress to enact legislation which will assure a permanent farm program and stability of income for the farmers of the Nation. I am sure that the committee and the Members of the Senate will take into consideration the peculiar and unusual position of tobacco. I now ask the Senate to adopt the amendment which I have offered, guaranteeing to tobacco growers a permanent support price of 90 percent of parity.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; and

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for himself and his colleague [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I presume the proponents of the amendment would have the right to conclude the argument upon it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thought probably the senior Senator from Kentucky desired to speak now. I can very quickly give the reasons why the amendment should not be adopted, and if the Senator from Kentucky so desires, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. AIKEN. Needless to say I am opposed to the amendment. The junior Senator from Kentucky has given quite a severe indictment against the monopoly control of the tobacco buying. I believe I can agree with most of what he said on that subject, because when I was a small boy my father always raised tobacco, and I know how completely the tobacco producers were at the mercy of the tobacco buyers. The committee had that in mind when writing the bill.

I am somewhat surprised over the amendment which the Senators from Kentucky have offered, because the support had under S. 2318 is already more favorable to tobacco than any other commodity. I would not have been surprised if some Senator had perhaps criticized the committee for writing a bill to provide as high a level of support as we have provided. The reason we have done so is that we know how completely the tobacco grower is at the mercy of the buyers, and particularly foreign government monopolies. England and France can knock the props out from under the price of tobacco in the United States any time they see fit to do so. For that reason I have been willing to maintain a high level of support for tobacco. That does not mean that we guarantee cost-plus in any way. But tobacco is one commodity, and wool is another commodity, which will receive somewhat higher support prices under the bill than they are receiving under the present law.

I should like to point out that in the bill we changed the parity formula, and as a result of changing the parity formula the parity price of burley tobacco, which for the 1947 crop is 44.8 cents a pound under the present formula method of computing parity, would increase to 48.8 cents a pound under the proposed formula.

Under the present law the 1947 crop of burley tobacco is supported at 90 percent of 44.8 cents a pound, which is 40.32 cents a pound.

Under Senate bill 2318 it would be supported at 84 percent of 48.8 cents a pound, or 41 cents a pound. Therefore the pending bill would provide a level of support of 41 cents a pound for burley tobacco. It gives about the same increase also to flue-cured tobacco.

Flue-cured and burley tobacco are two farm commodities which will fare better under the pending bill than they fare under the present law. I think that next year the support level will increase still further, and possibly for 2 or 3 years; but in the long run, of course, tobacco will have to assume its relationship to other agricultural commodities. It may stay high for many years. It may stay high for 20 years. No one can foresee that. But for the next 2 or 3 years the support price for burley tobacco, for flue-cured tobacco, for fire-cured tobacco, and I think all kinds of tobacco, will be a little higher than under the present law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in saying that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is the A amendment which seeks to make mandatory a 90 percent of parity price at the beginning of the marketing year?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. The amendment requests special privilege for a single agricultural commodity.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly the point I want to raise. Why should the Senate undertake to adopt amendments of this kind which select particular commodities and give them preference over every other commodity in the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate should not adopt any such amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, if this is to be done for tobacco it will be the beginning of more or less of a substitution of the Steagall theory of price support for all basic and nonbasic commodities on a 90-percent mandatory provision, which is right in the teeth of the long-range program which the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. AIKEN. It would mean the start of the break-down of the program before the program got under way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not the effect of the amendment be to place tobacco on a special list so that it would not be necessary to take into consideration the amount of tobacco on hand, as must be done in connection with other commodities?

Mr. AIKEN. It would leave no restrictions other than those which are in force today.

Mr. FERGUSON. And there would not be a lowering and a raising of the support price compared to parity if the amendment went into effect. The support price would stay at one point.

Mr. AIKEN. As compared to parity.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the proposed amendment it would remain at 90 percent of parity. And let me point out that any special privilege given a single commodity would mean that something would have to be taken away from some other commodity under the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. That would be true because of the cost that may be involved. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. I think tobacco is entitled to some special consideration because the price is governed so largely by foreign government monopolies, and domestic buyers are no slouches when it comes to organizing to hold the price down. What the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] said about that is exactly correct. For that reason the tobacco producers are entitled to a good support level. They would receive a splendid support level under Senate bill 2318, and the support would continue for some years into the future under the provisions of the act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to consume the time of the Senate, but I am joint author, with my colleague, of this amendment, and I am very much interested in seeing it adopted.

My colleague has given a graphic picture of the process of producing tobacco, which does not apply to any other crop. I do not know whether he was actually raised in a tobacco patch. I was. From the time when I could shoulder an ax or pull one end of a cross-cut saw, my father took me to the woods and we cleared the land which we proposed to cultivate in tobacco the following summer.

I have facetiously referred to the old saying in the tobacco section that it requires 13 months out of every 12 to grow a crop of tobacco. That grows out of this situation: The farmer who is going to produce tobacco must, early in the winter, make what is called a plant bed. That is a bed in the earth, produced by the burning of logs, brush, or wood in some form, so as to kill all vegetation and plant life which might choke the growth of the tender tobacco plant when the seed is finally sown and the plant comes up through the ground. That requires the clearing of land. It requires the laying off of a bed, the size of which the farmer himself determines. When I was a boy on the farm it required the piling of logs, augmented by brush from trees, and the building of fires to burn out the vegetation. It required the pulverization of the soil by hoe, rake, pick, and every other utensil that would break up the ground into very fine particles.

Then the seed must be sown. Before the seed come up, canvas must be put over it so that insects and bugs will not eat the plants after they have come up through the ground. Then the plants must be pulled one by one from the plant bed and transferred to the field. In the meantime the soil of the field must be carefully prepared by the same process of pulverization, except that there is no fire to kill out the vegetation which might compete with the growth of the tobacco plant.

When there is a rainy season, or when the ground is moistened, at the proper time the plants are drawn from the bed by hand and are set out into the field by hand. A horse-drawn vehicle has been invented by which tobacco may be planted a row or two at a time. There is a little attachment permitting the soil to be moistened at the time the tobacco is planted, so that it will not suffer from dry weather. However, the average farmer does not possess that sort of equipment.

The plant must then be hoed by hand. It must be plowed with a team and plow. Every process, every step taken in the production of tobacco, is a hand process. There is no machinery by which it can be handled like wheat. There is no machinery like the cotton picker, by which it can be harvested. There is no machinery corresponding to the corn planter.

The tobacco must be cut by hand, each stalk by itself. The stalk is split with a knife, and it is then cut off and hung up. If it is a burley crop, it is hung in the field or in an open barn where it is cured by air. If it is dark fired, it is hung in a barn, packed as closely as possible so as to retain the smoke and heat, and it must be cured by a fire built under the tobacco as it hangs in the barn for several days. It frequently requires an all-night process of watching the fire and the tobacco for a week or 10 days until it is cured. If it is flue-cured tobacco, it requires the same process of firing, but the smoke and heat go through the flue, and the tobacco is cured in that way. There is no machinery by which tobacco can be successfully produced. So it is really a hand-grown, hand-cultivated, hand-processed crop from beginning to end.

When it is hung in the barn and has been cured either by air or fire, or by the flue-cured process, which is really a fire process, it must be stripped. Every leaf of tobacco must be pulled from the stalk by hand. There is no machinery by which that can be done. The leaves are tied together in what is called a "hand," which is made up from 6 to 10 leaves, with the butt ends together. Then they are wrapped with another leaf which has been folded into a little wrapper about as wide as my two fingers. Then it is bulked and hung back in the barn until dried out. In dry weather, frequently it is bulked down in the barn or warehouse so that it may retain its moisture in bulk, thereafter to be hauled to market. It is frequently prized into a hogshead. All this is a long process. It is very difficult. That is what gives rise to the expression that 13 months out of every 12 are required to grow a crop of tobacco and market it.

All my life I have been familiar with the growth and marketing of tobacco. My father was a farmer, largely a tobacco farmer. I have seen the process by which sales take place. I can remember the time when tobacco buyers, representing the companies which were processing or rehandling tobacco, or speculating in tobacco, would send their men around on horseback to every barn and take samples out of the barn and make an offer for the tobacco. The situation finally reached the point where the territory was divided, so that no competitor went into a given territory to compete with someone else. When the buyer came along and sampled the crop and offered the farmer a certain price, if he did not take that price no other buyer would come around. The buyers had an arrangement under which they would not go across the road to buy a farmer's tobacco if it were in the territory of a competitor to whom that farm had been allocated. All the farms in the territory or county were allocated.

That gave rise to the organization of farmers to hold their tobacco, if possible, until they could get a decent price. It has given rise to the organization of cooperative marketing associations.

No doubt Senators have heard the auction system exemplified over the radio. The tobacco auctioneer or chanter goes through the tobacco warehouses looking at one basket and another, and offering a price which no one can understand until the tobacco is knocked down, and the producer is informed by a slip of paper how much he gets. The farmer cannot understand the chant of the auctioneer. I cannot imitate it. I would not attempt to do so. A few years ago there was a Member in the House of Representatives from Kentucky who could imitate it.

Senators will remember the final wind-up of the auctioneer on the radio program, in which various prices are announced, none of which can be understood. Finally the tobacco is knocked down, and the announcer says, "Sold, American." The Member of the House to whom I refer imitated the chant, and finally wound up by saying, "Stolen by American." That was his interpretation of the chant, and that is frequently the case.

I am giving these facts because tobacco occupies an entirely different status from that of any other crop in America. The production and marketing of tobacco is all hand work, from beginning to end. Unless the farmer belongs to a cooperative, and the cooperative is able to take the tobacco and hold it until either the big corporations—the Big Four—are willing to buy it, or the Government will make a loan upon it to enable the cooperative representing the farmers to hold it, he has no voice in the price which he receives for his crop. That has been one of the great troubles in regard to tobacco; it applies to other crops also, but not to such an extent to many others as it does to tobacco, because the market for tobacco has always, in spite of indictments and convictions, been restricted, and it is now restricted. The farmer has no real voice in that market. Of course, he can refuse to sell the tobacco, but he is not guaranteed that he ever will be able to sell it again or will be able to get a better price for it, unless he is a member of a cooperative, which can hold his tobacco for a better price. There is one cooperative for the burley tobacco producers, one for the dark-fired tobacco producers, and perhaps one for the flue-cured producers.

It has been said that we are asking a special privilege for tobacco. It may be true, but what we are asking for tobacco is that the status quo for it be preserved; in other words, 90 percent of parity. The parity price may be a fluctuating figure from 1 year to another because it depends entirely on the fluctuations in the prices farmers have to pay for what they buy.

I say to my friend the Senator from Illinois that if the tax is taken off tobacco, and if tobacco is put on the same basis as wheat, corn, and other products, then we shall take our chances in

the market. But today tobacco is taxed, as my colleague has shown. From tobacco taxes $1,400,000,000 goes into the Treasury of the United States and to some of the States. That is more than the farmers get for the entire crop they grow, even after all the labor they devote to growing it, as has been described here.

So, inasmuch as tobacco is a great revenue producer for the Treasury of the United States, and is the only crop that pays such taxes, we believe tobacco should receive the treatment we provide for in the amendment. Of course, all of us realize that tobacco is a luxury, in a sense, and we so regard it, but to the American farmer who digs it out of the ground it is not a luxury; to him it is a necessity.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to my able friend the Senator from Kentucky that the only point I raised a moment ago in respect to this amendment to the committee amendment is that it does place tobacco upon a preferred list, so far as the provision for 90 per cent of parity is concerned. Tobacco is not on such a list at the present time. Under the pending measure, tobacco, corn, wheat, and all other basic commodities are on the same basis, so far as the guaranty of a certain percentage of parity is concerned. If the amendment now proposed is made a part of the bill which is enacted into law, the result will definitely be to give to tobacco a preferred status as compared to other commodities. That is the only point I make.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator from Illinois has said about that matter. But we are seeking to preserve the status quo in respect to tobacco, because today the support price is 90 per cent of parity, and that parity is a fluctuating figure.

According to the table in the bill—which is about as inexplicable and as difficult to understand as a table of logarithms in a book of mathematics—no farmer could determine what he would be able to receive as the support price.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I make in connection with the position I took a moment ago is that if we accept the proposed amendment, we shall begin to strike out the provisions of the bill in piecemeal fashion. On the other hand, I understand that later the Senator from Georgia will offer an amendment which will seek to displace this bill with a bill which is on all fours with the law under which we are now operating; and of course that bill will include tobacco and other commodities.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the substitute to be proposed by the Senator from Georgia is practically the House bill, which will extend for 2 years the present arrangement of support prices.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that will include tobacco and other commodities on the basis of the present support-price figures.

We are asking for the adoption as a part of this bill of this amendment affecting tobacco because we genuinely feel that the tobacco producers should receive such treatment in view of the peculiar situation of tobacco, and since it has been singled out from among all the agricultural commodities in the United States for heavy taxation, which bears down on the price received by the producers, because the buyers say, "We cannot give you more than this, inasmuch as we have to pay an enormous tax," and there is even a tax 18 cents a pound on the tobacco in the loose leaf, tobacco which has not already been processed and that is three times as much as the growers of that particular type of tobacco got for it in years gone by.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The only reason I asked the Senator to yield is that he referred to a table in the bill which gives some explanation of how the parity figure is reached. That table is to be found on page 79 of the bill. The only reason why the table is set forth in the bill is in order to give specific information as to what parity prices would be paid, depending upon the carry-over or the surplus of a certain commodity.

For instance, if we were to take 70 percent of a given commodity—that is, 70 percent of 100 percent production—the result would be 90 percent parity; but if the carry-over plus the production of the commodity for the year resulted in a figure of 130 percent of a normal crop, then the parity would be only 60 percent of the so-called 100 percent. The only reason why the scale or the schedule has been set forth in the bill is in order to permit anyone to realize, as he looks at the bill, that what the bill contemplates and attempts to do is to bring about an increase of production in the case of a crop that is in short supply, and a decrease of acreage in the case of a crop that is in long supply. In that manner we would have a flexible arrangement which would encourage self-control in the field, and not necessarily have to require the exercise of control of acreage by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we already have a quota system, which has been in effect and is in effect now, under the present Agricultural Adjustment Act and the parity system and the support prices. We have a quota system which really is an acreage system designed to prevent the creation of surpluses beyond the amount that can reasonably be absorbed by the market from year to year; and it has worked successfully. The farmers have been satisfied with it. Because they have been satisfied with it, they have voted by more than two-thirds, which the law requires—in fact, they have even voted by as high as 90 percent—to retain the quota system, because it has been successful, and they are in favor of it because it helps them and keeps down the unnecessary unsalable surpluses of their crops.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the difficulties and hardships of the American tobacco grower. I was at Owensboro, Ky., a few years ago, and I went into an auction house where they were selling tobacco which had been brought in by the various farmers and carried there and put into what they call baskets, and graded; and the buyers were walking up and down between the baskets and were bidding on them by the chanting system to which I referred a moment ago. One farmer had brought in a load of tobacco. He turned it over to the warehouse. When he sold it and paid the warehouse charges and paid the commissions on that load of tobacco, he owed the warehouseman 50 cents. He went into the warehouseman's office, and the warehouseman said to him, "You owe me 50 cents. After getting all you got for the tobacco and paying all your charges, you still owe me half a dollar." For a whole year's work which he had put into tobacco and sold, he owed the warehouseman a half a dollar. When he was told of the deficit, he said, "I haven't got a half dollar with me; in fact, I haven't got a half a dollar anywhere." "Well," the warehouseman said, "Just bring me a chicken tomorrow and I will accept that in full payment for the half dollar you owe me." So the next day the farmer came into the office with two chickens. The warehouseman said, "I only asked you to bring one chicken. Why did you bring two?" "Well," he said, "I brought another load of tobacco today, and I thought I might as well pay you with this chicken, because I am sure the same result will come about." That really is a true story. It sounds ridiculous, but it is the truth, because I happened to be in the town and in the warehouse where this had taken place.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In what year was that?

Mr. BARKLEY. That was about 7 or 8 years ago.

Mr. THYE. I was going to say that in the Middle West, though we were not engaged in the production of tobacco, we experienced something similar to that in connection with livestock and grain commodity prices. I have known of sheep and cattle being shipped to market, and, when all the expenses were paid, there was a deficit.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that.

Mr. THYE. I do not know that chickens were used to pay the deficit. Those were in the depression years, which the Senator and I so well remember, and I pray God we shall have the intelligence as Members of this legislative body to enact the type of legislation that will prevent a condition that calls upon American producers to accept such a price that he must bring in a chicken with which to settle the deficit resulting from the attempt to market his product. That idea is embodied in the pending legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Minnesota, and I have been one of the most active men in both Houses of Congress since I have been here in trying to promote legislation to prevent that very thing. I voted for the McNary-Haugen bill when it was passed.

Mr. THYE. I compliment the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I voted for and advocated every agricultural measure that gave any hope whatever of rescuing American agriculture from any such situation as that. I know that what I have said about tobacco also was true of wheat and corn, and that people in the West were burning corn as fuel rather than accept the price offered for it. The same is true of wheat and other things. Cattle were down to 3 and 4 cents a pound, and hogs were down to 3 and 4 cents a pound—less than the cost of producing them. I am familiar with all that. I am in favor of an over-all long-term agricultural bill. I doubt very much if we are going to get one at this session, because I do not know what the House is going to do. The House committee has not even considered it, and I am told they are not going to. It may be necessary to extend the present situation for 2 years. We will meet that problem when we get to it. But I do say that if we seek here to preserve tobacco on its present support basis rather than have a flexible sliding scale running from 60 to 90 percent, which no farmer can ever figure out for himself——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the bill tobacco cannot go below 84 percent, and the new parity program raises the parity price of tobacco so that 84 percent of the new parity price amounts to just a bit more than 90 percent of the present parity price.

Mr. BARKLEY. That all depends.

Mr. AIKEN. No, these are the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics, and that is all it depends on.

Mr. BARKLEY. The growers of tobacco do not believe that this over-all bill which, in effect, includes tobacco with all other crops is the same as what they now have. They can depend upon what they now have. They know what it is. Moreover, they know that they want to keep the quota system by which they may keep down the unsalable surplus, which has to be figured in on the parity or the support price.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator perhaps is not aware of an amendment which was added to the bill providing that the quota system shall be retained regardless of the supply until such time as the growers themselves vote it out of existence. So they cannot lose by the quota system unless they want to lose by it. They cannot get less for their products. We have come as near to fixing a 90 percent support for tobacco as it is possible to do without violating all the ethics of legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. We do not think we are violating any of the ethics of legislation by the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. No; I do not think anyone is violating the ethics of legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe we are, when we ask that special circumstances be taken into consideration in regard to the production and sale of tobacco and the taxation of tobacco. If the tax is taken off, we will go along with wheat and corn and cotton and rice and everything else.

Mr. AIKEN. How much more money would the grower receive if the tax were removed?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know. The buyer would be robbed of the excuse which he has always utilized in driving down the price to the farmer, the excuse that he is required to pay a heavy tax on tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. I am old enough to know that tobacco buyers were tobacco buyers just the same before we had the taxes, or before the taxes were so large.

Mr. BARKLEY. But they could not use that as an excuse. They could not use the Federal Government as an excuse for driving down the price of tobacco. Every time we have increased the Federal tax on tobacco the buyers have used that as an additional reason for not being able to pay more for tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator, when we find a tobacco buyer without an excuse, we shall find him losing his job.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be, but we do not want to multiply his excuses.

Mr. AIKEN. But this is not a question of the iniquities of tobacco buyers. It is a question of a support price for tobacco. The producers of all types of tobacco are given just a little better support under the Senate bill 2318 than they would receive under a 90-percent support of the old parity price.

Mr. BARKLEY. They do not think so, I may say to my friend from Vermont, and I do not think so.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question that. I know people have told different stories. I know both Senators from Kentucky have tried to tell them the story "as is," and some of them came here and got the story from the committee itself, but I know they have been confused. I think they have been deliberately confused, though I am not——

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not exactly sure what the Senator means by "as is." I do not think they have been deliberately confused. I have no way of knowing whether somebody has deliberately confused them, but I know the anxiety and uncertainty that exists. I know that the protests which have come to me have come from actual producers and not from the rehandlers or warehousemen or buyers, or from anybody other than the farmers themselves, who dig the tobacco out of the ground; and they are very intelligent men.

Mr. AIKEN. I questioned one of the witnesses. I may say the principal witness who testified for the group of tobacco growers before the committee called me up after we reported the bill and thanked me and the committee for having been so fair to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the committee, I want to say in all fairness, improved the bill as it affected tobacco; there is no question about that. The tobacco growers asked, I think, for about five changes in the bill; three were made. We thank the Senator and the committee for that concession; but if there had not been some improvement made, an intolerable situation would have been created. I do not think the Senator from Vermont himself realized at the time he introduced the original bill the effect it would have upon the tobacco growers of the country.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator readily went some distance in correcting the original bill, but we contend he did not go far enough.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Kentucky think the burley tobacco growers would be better off if they received 90 percent of the present parity price than they would be under the pending bill? And does the Senator from Kentucky think the tobacco growers would be better off if quotas had to be voted every year?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course they would not.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have now a 3-year period for quotas. It was 1 year, and we changed it to 3.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the pending measure, we might have a 30-year period, so long as conditions remain so drastically different.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not questioning the time for quotas. This not only affects burley tobacco, but it affects dark-fired tobacco and all other types of tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe the American tobacco grower would be better off, better satisfied, and, in the long run, better served by a definite figure of 90 percent of parity, whatever that parity might be, than under a fluctuating rate from 60 to 90, because it is bound to fluctuate below 90 oftener than it is to fluctuate up to 90.

Mr. AIKEN. If I may ask the Senator another question, does he know of any tobacco growers, outside the State of Kentucky, who are protesting against the situation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not acquainted with tobacco growers outside the State of Kentucky.

Mr. AIKEN. I would say that so far as the committee knows, there are no protests of any nature from other States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the Senator has in his State, which is a great tobacco-producing State, anything like the situation which is becoming more and more a threat to the tobacco growers in my State of Florida, that is to say, the farmers try to get enough graders to come and grade the product, and then the Government will say, "We will not send graders there for any length of time unless there are enough buyers from the big companies to buy the crop." Then the farmers get after the buyers, and they say, "We will come if the graders are there." It is like the old western statute which was passed by a State legislature and which provided that when two trains meet neither shall stop until the other has passed.

That represents the progress which has been made in connection with the situation. I do not know whether anything can be done about it, but it seems

to me that it should be made clear that there should be enough graders at every market to accommodate the farmers who have their tobacco there; and if the buyers enter into some kind of an agreement, or in some way or other deny a fair market to the tobacco growers, it is time for the Government to step in and see if there cannot be a fair market provided for the tobacco growers.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have had the same experience as that to which the Senator from Florida has referred with regard to buyers and graders. During the war there was a shortage of graders, because many graders who qualified for grading tobacco went into the service. Year before last there was a shortage of approximately 25 in the number of graders available. The Department of Agriculture did the best it could to allocate those graders over the different sections, according to the season, for the marketing of tobacco. But there was a shortage. The buyers did say, and now say, what the Senator has said. But there has been some improvement. They always say they will not send buyers in unless there are graders there. But there is now an association of buyers which meets and decides where markets are to be opened.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. Last year we brought the matter to the attention of the Department of Justice and asked for an inquiry, because the association decided, as the Senator has said, where they wanted the markets to be opened.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know of one situation in my State in which farmers had to haul their tobacco 110 miles to the nearest market. We tried to open a market within a reasonable distance, so that the farmers would not have to travel halfway across the State in order to find a market. The Department of Agriculture was able to send a number of graders into the section and open a market. Even then some of the buyers among the "big four," as we call them, refused to come in. Others said, "We will send buyers if the other fellow will." But the other fellow would not. The result was that the farmers did not have a fair market. Notwithstanding court decisions, indictments, and Department investigations—regardless of all that, the buyers find ways in which to deny farmers the facilities to which they are entitled in order to market their tobacco within a reasonable distance and with a reasonable amount of competition.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I brought the matter up because I wanted the RECORD to show attention to the matter by the Senate. I hope the Department of Agriculture will regard this discussion today, and that if they feel legislation is necessary to protect the tobacco growers who are prevented from having a market because of such conspiracies as have been mentioned, they will recommend legislation to correct the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no complaint to make against the Department of Agriculture, or against the tobacco section of that Department.

Mr. PEPPER. Neither have I.

Mr. BARKLEY. But they have no power to compel anyone to go to a market, even when they have sent the graders there. All they can do is to try to exercise some influence by persuasion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the facts as presented by the able Senator from Kentucky do not show a real violation of the antitrust law and that, therefore, the proper remedy is one of prosecution rather than passing a new law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not necessarily. Of course, to prove conspiracy is a difficult thing. The Department of Justice brought a lawsuit in Lexington, Ky., against four or five companies. They were indicted and were fined heavily. I am not sure whether anyone was imprisoned as a result of the trial.

Mr. COOPER. They were all fined.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did they pay the fines?

Mr. BARKLEY. They paid the fines. The Department of Justice has been in process of investigating whether these new methods constitute a violation of law. But it is a long, tedious process to gather evidence against a great combination——

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or to try to bring an indictment under the antitrust law. But, regardless of that, I think it is a problem which should address itself to legislation to see if we can find some way in which we can protect the farmers.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator wholeheartedly. I think that if the Attorney General finds they are exercising new methods of applying monopolistic control he should give us the facts so that we can consider new legislation with which to attack the problem.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know to what extent the Attorney General has been able to gather facts to submit to Congress, but I know the matter has been investigated. I think that when the Department of Justice can make concrete recommendations to the Congress it will be done.

Mr. COOPER. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Michigan suggests that there should be a prosecution if the facts are as we have stated. To support an indictment of conspiracy an actual agreement to violate the law must be shown. I have in no way implied that any tobacco company is today violating the law, and have no reason to so believe, but nevertheless the dominating position of the tobacco companies still influences and affects the price paid growers. There are about 10 companies whose buyers purchase practically all of the tobacco sold. These companies have been in business for years. Each knows that the farmer must sell his tobacco to one of them. Each knows the farmer cannot keep his tobacco another year and that if he does not sell to one of them, he cannot sell at all. It does not make much difference whether or not they make agreements.

I should like to ask my colleague, who has had much more legislative experience than I, whether he knows of any other agricultural commodity whose value represents over a billion dollars and whose sale is limited to 8 or 10 companies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know of any other agricultural commodity, whether cotton, corn, wheat, rice, potatoes, or any other product, that is marketed under the restrictions and restraints which surround the marketing of tobacco.

Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the floor longer. I hope, for the reasons which my colleague and I have offered, and others we could offer by trespassing too long on the time of the Senate, that the amendment will be agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF TWO POLITICAL PARTIES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, because I am trying to present in chronological order the records to which I shall refer, I respectfully ask that I be not interrupted until I have completed my presentation, at which time I shall be glad to yield if Senators desire to have me do so.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I happen to know something of the nature of the remarks the Senator is about to make, I know they are most important, and that every Senator should hear them. Would the Senator be willing to yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. A large number of Senators are now at lunch.

Mr. THYE. I raise a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the suggestion, but I prefer not to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland declines to yield.

Mr. THYE. My only reason for raising the point is that we were told by the majority leader here this morning that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] had stood by and stood aside for legislation that had come before the Senate for several days, and he asked the Members of the Senate if they would not please permit the Senator from Vermont to proceed with his farm legislation until it was completed today. I am alarmed, as I look at the chart the Senator from Maryland has had placed before the Senate, on which I read "Airplane expansion, etc., April 3, 1939," and from that date on. If the Senator's remarks relate to agriculture or the farm bill, then I withdraw my parliamentary point or objection, but if not, I hope the Senator from Maryland will permit the agriculture legislation to be considered in the Senate for the remainder of the afternoon, or until such time as we can take action on the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. I refuse to yield. I may say that if the Senator from Minnesota had not interrupted me I probably would have been well on toward half through what I have to say, and what I shall say I deem of importance,

and it is not long. I shall begin again at the beginning and hope that I will not take too much of the Senate's time.

Within the next 5 months the people of the United States will select a President, Vice President, the Members of the House of Representatives, and approximately one-third of the United States Senate, who will begin their terms of office in January 1949.

In order that the record of the two parties in the Congress—that of the Democratic Party and that of the Republican Party—may be available in concise form for our citizens, I have had prepared the votes of the Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and the House by political parties on major legislation which has come before the Congress for decision from January 1, 1939, to date, insofar as that record deals primarily with international relations, preparation for war and war itself, and matters which are more or less related to the international field.

I shall present this record without partisan comment insofar as I can. I shall name the law, describe it briefly, and set forth the dates upon which the Senate and House voted thereon, and the result of the vote by parties.

The first vote was on April 13, 1939, on H. R. 3791, in the Seventy-sixth Congress. That bill provided for more national defense by increasing the number of serviceable airplanes to 6,000, exclusive of those awaiting salvage and authorized $300,000,000 therefore; it likewise provided for civilian flying schools and for the inclusion of 1,000 Reserve officers in the Regular Army other than the Air Corps and 3,000 to the Air Corps, and so forth. The vote upon this measure was as follows:

Airplane expansion, etc., Apr. 3, 1939

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	57	3	233	1
Republican	17	4	130	14

Next, construction of additional Coast Guard cutters and seaplanes, June 2, 1939:

	Senate [1]	House	
		Yea	Nay
Democratic		190	12
Republican		62	79

[1] No record vote.

Next was acquisition of strategic and critical materials, June 7, 1939:

	Senate		House [1]
	Yea	Nay	
Democratic	48	1	
Republican	4	12	

[1] No record vote.

Next was the repeal and rewriting of certain provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1935, which are briefly explained as follows:

Public Resolution 54 (H. J. Res. 306), Seventy-sixth Congress, the Neutrality Act, repealed and rewrote the provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1935, as amended (U. S. C. Supp. IV, 22; 245a–245i), and repealed the Spanish Embargo Act (50 Stat. 3). However, such repeal did not affect the validity of proclamation No. 2237, of May 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 1834), or certificates of registration or licenses. The act provided:

Whenever the President or Congress shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens, he shall issue a proclamation naming the belligerent states involved, and it shall thereafter be unlawful ($1,000 fine, 5 years' imprisonment, or both): (1) To export, or attempt to or cause to be exported, arms, or ammunition to any such state; (2) for any person ($50,000 fine, 5 years' imprisonment, or both) to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds or securities of, or make a loan or extend credit to, any such state, political subdivision, or agent thereof (however, if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect our commercial interests, he may except normal peacetime commercial transactions, but he must make public every 90 days all such exceptions); (3) to export or transport, or to attempt to or cause to be exported or transported, any articles or materials to any such state (except under regulations prescribed by the President), until all interest therein shall have been transferred to some foreign government or national; and (4) to solicit or receive any contribution for or on behalf of any such state (except medical aid, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, subject to approval of the President). No citizen shall travel on any vessel of any belligerent state except at his own risk. The foregoing provisions shall not apply to American republics.

Upon similar findings, the President may place restrictions on the use by submarines or armed merchant vessels of a belligerent state of the ports and territorial waters of the United States, and he may require foreign or domestic vessels, believed about to carry fuel, men, munitions, or supplies to a belligerent ship, to give bond not to make such deliveries.

The act continued the National Munitions Control Board and required (a) munition makers, and so forth, to register with the Board—registration fee, $100; (b) importers and exporters to obtain licenses for shipment of munitions. Applicants for a license shall set forth a description of such exports, with credit or payment terms. The Board shall make an annual report to Congress upon questions connected with the control of trade in munitions of war, including a list of all persons required to register or obtain licenses. Whenever the President finds that there exists a state of war between foreign states, the Board shall make public all information herein provided and make a similar report each 90 days.

The vote on this was as follows:

Neutrality Act of 1939, Nov. 4, 1939

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	24	12	191	35
Republican	8	15	8	150

The next was to build up the Navy and Navy aircraft, as follows—Public Law 629 (H. R. 8026) Seventy-sixth Congress:

It increased by 167,000 tons the authorized composition of the Navy in under-age vessels as established by the act of May 17, 1938 (52 Stat. 401), making the increased category totals as follows: Aircraft carriers, 254,500 tons; cruisers, 479,024 tons; and submarines, 102,956 tons.

It increased the number of naval airplanes to 4,500 and the number of nonrigid lighter-than-air craft to 18 and authorized the President to acquire or to construct 75,000 tons of auxiliary vessels.

The vote upon it was as follows:

Increases size of Navy, increases naval aircraft, June 14, 1940

	Senate [1]	House	
		Yea	Nay
Democratic		195	6
Republican		110	28

[1] No record vote.

The next is facilities to expedite the national defense, July 31, 1940:

	Senate [1]	House	
		Yea	Nay
Democratic		209	0
Republican		52	93

[1] No record vote.

Following that was the ordering of Army Reserve components, and so forth, into active military service, August 27, 1940:

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	49	4	213	6
Republican	20	2	124	27

Next was the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, September 16, 1940:

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	50	17	211	33
Republican	8	10	52	112

That was the Draft Act passed in 1940, which prepared the country for the induction of new men.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot yield until I conclude my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

After this, there was the lend-lease bill, Public Law 11 (H. R. 1776), Seventy-seventh Congress.

Lend-lease bill: For the benefit of any foreign nation whose defense the President deems vital to the United States he may authorize any Government department or agency—to the extent to which funds are available or contracts are authorized by Congress—to manufacture or

procure, to the extent to which funds are made available therefor or contracts are authorized by Congress, defense articles; to lend, lease, and so forth, defense articles of a value not exceeding $1,300,000,000, and only after consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army or the Chief of Naval Operations—value is to be determined by heads of departments concerned, and defense articles procured from funds hereafter appropriated shall not be disposed of under this authority—to outfit, inspect, repair, to the extent to which funds are made available therefor or contracts are authorized by Congress, defense articles; to communicate any defense information concerning defense articles loaned, leased, and so forth; and to release for export defense articles upon conditions deemed satisfactory by him. The powers so conferred shall not be exercised after June 30, 1943, or after the passage of a concurrent resolution of both Houses before that date, except that the terms of contracts entered into before July 1, 1943, may be extended to July 1, 1946.

It also authorized the Secretaries of War and Navy to acquire arms, munitions, and implements of war produced in such countries designated above whenever the President deems such acquisition necessary to the national defense.

This act shall not be construed as authorization for the convoying of vessels by United States naval vessels, nor for the entering of American vessels into a combat area in violation of the Neutrality Act of 1939.

The President shall report to Congress the operations under this act at least once every 90 days. Nothing in this act shall be construed to change existing law relating to the use of the land and naval forces; except insofar as such use relates to the manufacture, procurement, and repair of defense articles, the communication of information, and other noncombatant purposes enumerated.

The voting was as follows:

Lend-Lease Act, Mar. 11, 1941

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	49	13	236	25
Republican	10	17	24	135

Next taken up was the lend-lease appropriation, March 27, 1941, Public Law 23 (H. R. 4050), Seventy-seventh Congress.

Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941: To enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act the following is appropriated: $1,343,000,000 for ordnance; $2,054,000,000 for aircraft; $362,000,000 for tanks, trucks, and so forth; $629,000,000 for vessels; $260,000,000 for miscellaneous military equipment and supplies; $752,000,000 for facilities and equipment for the production of defense articles; $1,350,000,000 for agricultural, industrial, and other commodities; $200,000,000 for testing, repairing, reconditioning and so forth, defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States; $40,000,000 for necessary services and expenses not specified; and $10,000,000 for administrative expenses. In all, $7,000,000,000 to remain available until June 30, 1943.

The vote was as follows:

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	49	3	231	6
Republican	17	5	104	45

Next acted upon was the ship seizure bill, Public Law 101 (H. R. 4466), Seventy-seventh Congress.

Empowered the President to purchase or requisition any foreign vessel lying idle in United States waters which is necessary to national defense. Authorized the Martime Commission to charter any vessel to private operators; to provide insurance and reinsurance; to repair, reconstruct, or recondition any vessel; to pay a fair price for vessels purchased.

It authorized the Secretary of Commerce to waive compliance with law relating to masters, officers, crew, and crew accommodations.

The vote was as follows:

Ship-seizure bill, June 6, 1941

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	48	4	212	19
Republican	10	15	51	101

When the Selective Service Act was passed the bill contained the provision that it would be the law until 1945. It also contained the provision that those who were drafted into the armed services were to have one full year's training. The first class of inductees became available for the armed services about November 1940. This class would thus have completed its full year's training and be eligible for discharge in November 1941, according to the original Selective Service Act.

The Military Establishment recommended in July 1941 that when the first year of training had expired the law be amended so as to keep those who would have served their year in the service indefinitely. After hearings the matter came before the Congress for a vote. Various propositions were offered to keep those who had completed a year's training in the services; first for an additional 6 months, then a proposal to keep them in the service for an additional 12 months, and finally a proposal to keep them in training for an additional 18 months. These three propositions were acted upon only in the Senate. The vote on the 12 months' extension was as follows:

12-month extension of selective service, Aug. 6, 1941

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	11	39
Republican	10	10

The next vote was as follows:

18-month extension of selective service, Aug. 7, 1941

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	37	14
Republican	4	13

With the 18 months' extension adopted by the Senate, the measure then came up for final passage in the Senate, with the following result:

Extension of selective service, passage Aug. 7, 1941

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	38	16
Republican	7	13

When the measure went to the House of Representatives, the first record vote there upon it was on a motion to recommit. Upon that motion the vote was as follows:

Extension of selective service—vote to recommit, Aug. 12, 1941

	House	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	54	193
Republican	132	22

The vote to recommit having failed for lack of a majority, the matter then came up for final passage in the House with the following result:

Extension of selective service, passage Aug. 12, 1941

	House	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	182	65
Republican	21	133

The House, however, did adopt certain amendments to the bill as it was passed by the Senate. Thus, as the final House version was in some respects different from the final Senate version of this bill, the matter next went to a conference of the two Houses, where the disagreements on certain provisions were reconciled and adjusted. When the matter came out of conference, the provision to extend the year's training, which many men

were just completing, for an additional 18 months remained in the bill, and with other disagreements reconciled, the matter was referred by the conference back to each House for final adoption. There was no record vote on the conference report on the extension of selective service in the House. The final vote in the Senate was upon the adoption of the conference report, providing for the extension of selective service. The vote was as follows:

Extension of selective service—adoption of conference report, Aug. 14, 1941

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	31	9
Republican	6	9

The next bill to be acted upon was the Property Seizure Act, to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States, and the vote, just a few weeks before Pearl Harbor, was as follows:

Property Seizure Act, Oct. 16, 1941

	Senate [1]	House	
		Yea	Nay
Democratic		215	10
Republican		25	123

[1] No record vote.

Following this, there was Public Law 282 (H. R. 5788), Seventy-seventh Congress, the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1942, which appropriated $5,985,000,000; $1,190,000,000 for ordnance, $685,000,000 for aeronautical materials, $385,000,000 for armored equipment, $850,000,000 for vessels, $155,000,000 for military and naval equipment, $375,000,000 for acquisition and operation of manufacturing facilities, and so forth, $1,875,000,000 for agricultural, industrial, and other commodities, $175,000,000 for testing, repairing, and so forth, of defense articles, $285,000,000 for necessary services and expenses in carrying the Lend-Lease Act, and $10,000,000 for administrative expenses.

The vote on this was as follows:

Second supplemental defense appropriation, second lend-lease appropriation, Oct. 28, 1941

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	43	4	229	8
Republican	15	8	97	56

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. As I said in the beginning, I prefer not to yield until I finish the chronological outline.

Mr. TOBEY. The statute of limitations has run against these things.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming up to date. The chronological outline runs right up to this minute. This is a 10-year record, as I stated in the beginning. The statute of limitations never is outlawed while the American people can go to the polls.

Next was the repeal of the Neutrality Act (Public Law 294 (H. J. Res. 237)) Seventy-seventh Congress:

That section 2 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (relating to commerce with states engaged in armed conflict), and section 3 of such act (relating to combat areas) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (relating to the arming of American vessels) is hereby repealed; and during the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, the President is authorized, through such agency as he may designate, to arm, or to permit or cause to be armed, any American vessel as defined in such act. The provisions of section 16 of the Criminal Code (relating to bonds from armed vessels on clearing) shall not apply to any such vessel.

The vote on this was as follows:

Repeal of the Neutrality Act of 1939, Nov. 17, 1941

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	43	15	219	21
Republican	6	21	39	113

Three weeks later, the Japs made their sneak attack on Pearl Harbor and the United States quickly declared war on the Axis Powers and became one of the active belligerents in the world struggle.

As the war drew to a victorious close in 1945, the United States took a leading part in preparing for the war's aftermath. Meetings were held, attended by representatives of the leading nations of the world, seeking to prepare in advance for the financial, economic, and political rehabilitation of the nations of the earth, when war should finally end. Following the surrender in Europe and before the Japanese surrender in Asia, the Bretton Woods Agreement Act came before the Congress for action. This act dealt primarily with the creation of an agency intended to strengthen world financial and currency systems. The vote upon this measure was as follows:

Bretton Woods Agreement Act, July 31, 1945

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	41	2	205	0
Republican	19	14	138	18

Following the surrender of the Japanese in 1945, another great agency came to the fore upon which much preliminary work had been done. This agency was known as the United Nations, and in the idealism which it espoused, the hopes of a great many people for the future of mankind were reposed. This agency, representing the nations of the earth, except the defeated countries, banded together to solve the world's problems without recourse to the battlefield.

On December 20, 1945, the question came up in Congress as to whether the United States, which had taken the lead in the creation of the UN, should become a participating member of it. The vote upon this question was as follows:

United Nations Participation Act of 1945, Dec. 20, 1945

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	41	1	193	0
Republican	23	0	150	14

In July 1946, the proposition was laid before the Congress as to whether or not a loan should be made to Great Britain, involving several billion dollars. After full discussion and debate in both Houses, the bill providing for the loan was adopted, the vote thereon being as follows:

Loan to Great Britain, July 15, 1946

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	29	15	111	5
Republican	17	18	70	61

The Republican Party divided. In the Senate the majority of the Republicans were against the loan to Great Britain, and in the House the majority of the Republicans were for it.

During the early part of 1947, the next matter to come up dealing with foreign affairs was whether or not this country would give aid to Greece and Turkey. In Greece civil war had been going on, and Turkey was reported to be near economic collapse. Much of the civil war in Greece was stated to have its chief support from countries dominated by Russia and by Russia herself to aid the Communists in Greece then engaged in trying to overthrow the Greek Government by force. It was likewise stated that Turkey might collapse unless given some immediate support and thus might fall into the hands of Communist-dictated countries, in which event not only would the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal be threatened with further encirclement, but access to the great oil fields to the east thereof might be denied to the United States and other foreign countries. It was stated that if this occurred our own supply of oil might prove insufficient to carry the Nation through a period of great emergency. The matter came to a vote, with the following result:

Aid to Greece and Turkey, May 22, 1947

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	22	7	160	13
Republican	35	16	127	94

The next great question to come before the Congress dealing with international matters was whether or not the

Marshall plan proposed by our Government for the economic assistance of the 16 democratic countries of western Europe should be adopted. The bill authorizing this assistance involving many billions of dollars, came before the Congress for a vote on April 3, 1948, with the following results:

Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Apr. 3, 1948

	Senate		House	
	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
Democratic	38	4	171	61
Republican	31	13	158	11

Prior to that time, however, on March 12, the Taft amendment reducing funds for this foreign assistance from $5,300,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 was voted upon by the Senate, as follows:

Taft amendment (Foreign Assistance Act of 1948) to reduce the funds from five and three-tenths billions to four billions, Mar. 12, 1948

	Senate	
	Yea	Nay
Democratic	8	32
Republican	23	24

The above record of the political parties deals only with the Democratic and Republican vote in the Congress. It does not record or present the votes of those alined with other parties, such as the American Labor, Farmer-Labor, and the like.

When a man who has held public office presents himself to the people for reelection or for election to some other office he is bound more or less by three principal considerations: First, his own vote and record on matters that have come before him and upon which he has been recorded; second, the vote and record of the party to which he adheres, and its position on public questions which have been decided by legislative bodies; third, what the party to which he belongs proposes to do on policies, measures, and propositions which are currently, or likely to be, before the people for consideration.

In the above tabulation and record, individual votes, of course, are not shown. Only the party vote is shown on major international and semi-international questions that have come before the Congress in the last 10 years.

I have had this record prepared, for it tends to form a general pattern of the basic cleavage, in many respects, between the major decisions of the Democrats and Republicans in the fields covered.

At this particular time in the affairs of our own Nation, when men are to be elected to high office, it may be of help to those who wish to use the past as at least a partial yardstick to guide them in voting for candidates to pass on the measures now pending or likely to be presented for determination.

Mr. President, I have tried to present this tabulation without argument for or against the vote on any particular measure, in as nonpartisan a way as I could, but simply to compile the facts for the consideration of the Congress and the country.

Now I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the same spirit with which the Senator from Maryland has presented these most enlightening records for the information of the American public—information which it certainly is entitled to have—I should like to place in the RECORD at this point a tabulation dealing with a matter which as vitally affects our international affairs as do any of the measures the Senator from Maryland has mentioned.

I have in mind the record of the two parties on the reciprocal trade agreements program, on which the Senate voted just the other day, and to which the statute of limitations does not apply. I believe I do not see the Senator from New Hampshire in the Chamber at the moment, but I could not help but be reminded that in some experience with the law in New Mexico I have never heard the statute of limitations raised except by those who are the most guilty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator reads the tabulation, I should like to add a sentence for the purpose of clarification, namely, that the record I have prepared and have presented here today, for obvious reasons is not current. It does not include the votes, as I recall, from the 1st of May, or sometime in May, to date, because matters have been in such a state of flux on many of these questions that I did not have time to get the last minute news on them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall now read a tabulation appearing in an article relative to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1948. Mr. Richard L. Stout wrote the article, which is entitled "Tariff Trends—An Intimate Message From Washington." Let me say I am sure Mr. Stout carefully checked the figures. The tabulation appearing in the body of his article is as follows:

The Hull trade program has come before Congress five separate times with its original enactment and four continuations. Here is the Senate vote on these five occasions:

1934: Democrats for, 54; against, 5; Republicans for, 5; against, 28.

1937: Democrats for, 56; against, 9; Republicans for, 0; against, 14.

1940: Democrats for, 41; against, 15; Republicans for, 0; against, 20.

1943: Democrats for, 41; against, 8; Republicans for, 18; against 14.

1945: Democrats for, 38; against, 5; Republicans for, 15; against, 16.

Here is the similar House record:

1934: Democrats for, 269; against, 11; Republicans for, 2; against, 99.

1937: Democrats for, 278; against, 11; Republicans for, 3; against, 81.

1940: Democrats for, 212; against, 20; Republicans for, 5; against, 146.

1943: Democrats for, 193; against, 3; Republicans for, 163; against, 26.

1945: Democrats for, 205; against, 12; Republicans for, 33; against, 140.

Mr. President, just this week the Senate had three very significant votes on amendments to the same act. Those amendments were prepared and submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The first amendment provided for a 3-year extension of the act without amendment; the second provided for a 2-year extension of the act without amendment; and the third provided for a 1-year extension of the act without amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have the votes on those three amendments included at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the votes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Barkley 3-year amendment: Democrats for, 40; against, 1. Republicans for, 1; against, 47.

Barkley 2-year amendment: Democrats for, 40; against, 1. Republicans for, 2; against, 46.

Barkley 1-year amendment: Democrats for, 40; against, 1. Republicans for, 3; against, 45.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very worth-while contribution to the statistics of the polemics on which democracy rests. As he has done, so I have tried to present the data to the Senate without any desire to criticize either party or any individual for the votes cast, but simply so there will be in one place a factual record which will speak for itself. Obviously it will please some and will displease others, in every case.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Maryland has performed a most worthy service, but I did not want his remarks to conclude without inserting the statistics for the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 16 and 23 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 40 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of

Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disability who have dependents, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. MATHEWS, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. MATHEWS, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States Naval Hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements; and

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 2028. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2912. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army;

H. R. 3479. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army;

H. R. 4984. An act to provide for the maintaining of the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the brigade of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines; and

H. R. 6709. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York a perpetual easement in, over, and upon a twenty-nine one-hundredths acre parcel of land at New York naval shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; and

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6136. An act to amend the act to encourage travel in the United States, approved July 19, 1940;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act; and

H. R. 6868. An act to amend section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, with respect to widows of certain deceased Coast Guard personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Subsequently, Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6860) to amend the Federal Airport Act, reported it without amendment.

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 6439. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans;

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments; to the Committee on Finance.

Subsequently, Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance, to which were referred the foregoing joint resolutions, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon, as follows: House Joint Resolution 428, Report No. 1745; and House Joint Resolution 429, Report No. 1746.

H. R. 5555. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5715. An act to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; and

H. R. 6695. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of ten professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5807. An act to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948; and

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6772, making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6 and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 37, 38, 39, 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$360,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$209,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$585,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$132,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,965,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,207,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$69,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$305,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,532,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,208,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,012,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,046,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,087,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,611,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The Committee of Conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 16, 23 and 40.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
E. V. ROBERTSON,
M. E. TYDINGS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6772, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 17, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate No. 16 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concurred therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 40 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 112. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee within the Navy; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 40.

The motion was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE TO OKALOOSA COUNTY (FLA.) OF A PORTION OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 3735, to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary

of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, subject to the limitations and conditions hereinafter enumerated and such others as he may prescribe, to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all or any part of that portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, extending one mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Florida, except for a strip of land six hundred feet wide (three hundred feet east and three hundred feet west from center line of road leading to radar site "Dick"), extending from Highway 98 to the mean low water level of the Gulf of Mexico, and two miles west from said bridge, and to all or any part of that portion of said Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass (consisting of two small islands), said property being under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. Such conveyance shall be made upon payment by said county of a sum which shall be 50 per centum of the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale regardless of its former character or use, as determined by the Secretary, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said island, prior to its conveyance to the United States, as the Secretary shall determine to be fair and equitable"; and the Senate agree to the same.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
CHARLES R. CLASON,
CHARLES H. ELSTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 4071, to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment on page 2 of the bill.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
CLYDE M. REED,
E. H. MOORE,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
LEONARD W. HALL,
ROBERT HALE,
WILLIAM J. MILLER,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CHANGE THE NAME OF POTHOLES DAM TO O'SULLIVAN DAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam, which were, in line 3, strike out "South Coulee" and insert "Potholes"; in line 7, strike out "South Coulee" and insert "Potholes," and to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam."

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMENTS BY FEDERAL JUDGES TO JURIES—ADDRESS BY B. M. McKELWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has come to my attention through my friend, former Senator John A. Danaher, a very interesting statement made some time ago by the distinguished editor of the Washington Evening Star, Mr. B. M. McKelway. In the statement Mr. McKelway discusses, from the standpoint of a layman, the controversy as to whether or not a judge should instruct jurors in Federal courts. It is a very interesting address.

Mr. McKelway has explored the problem of the balance on the Federal judiciary also, showing that through the years the Democratic administration has been in power the very few Republicans who have been appointed. This is a matter which has engaged the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and particularly my attention, during the Eightieth Congress. I believe Mr. McKelway's comments will be of interest to lawyers and laymen alike, whether or not they agree with his conclusions. We lawyers have a tendency to get into a rut, and it is a very healthy experience to get the expression of a keen layman on the important subject of checks and balances in the judicial system, because that question dates away back to the time of King John, when the King himself was supreme and when his subjects required of him and got from him a proviso that a man should be judged by his peers. The question is as to what that means.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. McKelway's address be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chief Justice, honorable judges, ladies, and gentlemen, Dr. Samuel Johnson's observation about the woman preacher is somehow applicable to the position in which I find myself today, with this assignment to elucidate the topic: "Should a judge be permitted to comment on the evidence in instructing a jury?"

Dr. Johnson said the woman preacher reminded him of a dog walking on its hind legs. The question was not whether the woman preached well. The remarkable thing was that she did it at all.

As a layman, I beg your indulgence and throw myself on your mercy. I am in the situation common to all the laymen with whom you come in professional contact. In other words, I am in trouble. What can an uninformed layman do with a subject which seems to baffle even the judges?

I accepted the invitation to participate in this discussion, however, with obedient alacrity. A judge extended the invitation and centuries of Anglo Saxon discipline under law have made it instinctive, on the part of a layman, to jump when the judge speaks.

My acceptance did lead me into some reflective speculation as to the motives which might be involved in having a layman present and speaking in this group.

And against the layman's wishful thinking to the contrary, the anecdote concerning Gen. Ulysses S. Grant rudely intruded itself—the story of the staff member who, otherwise unassigned, was always on hand for meetings of the staff. General Grant explained that there was a good reason for having him there. For if this man, General Grant said, could understand what was being talked about, then anybody could understand it. If the judges and the lawyers ever wish to bring their colloquies out into the open, so to speak, it might be a good idea to find out if an ordinary layman can understand what they are talking about.

The subject under examination here today, as Justice Holtzoff has told us, has been under more or less continuous discussion in the United States for 150 years. It became an issue in North Carolina when there were only three judges serving the people of that new Commonwealth. Even in those early days the woods were full of lawyers and they outnumbered the judges.

The lawyers were able to change the common-law rules brought over from the old country regarding the judge's right and even his duty to comment on the evidence. As the tide of civilization swept westward the lawyers, moving with the tide and still outnumbering the judges, got the change written into the statutes of most of the States. And here we are, today, still debating it. It is an interesting anomaly that, while it is the layman's interests which are mostly at stake, the debate is restricted almost entirely to the lawyers and the judges.

It is time that laymen began to participate in the discussion. But I fear that most laymen are like the lady juror, one of several jury members whom I requested one of our reporters to interview. His question was, "Madame, would you mind telling me whether you think a judge should or should not comment to the jury on the evidence?"

"Mister," she replied, "I ain't never give it no thought."

Neither had I. I had never "give" it no thought. But the more thought I gave it,

and the more references I consulted as to what others had thought, the more interested I became and the more anxious I became that other laymen should learn to know something about the two sides to this controversy.

I believe my own would be the reaction of any layman who, through his jury service or otherwise, gives some attention to the machinery which handles the business of the courts. That is why I am a believer in the movement, with which Chief Justice Laws has identified himself, of bringing more laymen into the discussion of possible methods of improving the administration of justice. There is an adage that "familiarity breeds contempt." But if there is an exception to prove that rule, surely it applies in the case of the layman's familiarity with the processes of justice. Far from inviting his contempt, it is my belief that familiarity with the functioning of his courts would kindle within the layman more of that reverent regard for the majesty of undefiled justice which I believe to be the common attribute of good men who are learned in the law.

I was interested in the answer of jurors, serving in a criminal and in a civil case under trial in the district court in Washington, in response to this question, "Do you think that the judge should or should not comment on the evidence?"

The replies seem to follow a pattern. But I shall read them to you, temporarily withholding my own comment on the evidence they present.

Civil-case jurors:

Retired male Government employee, "I think it is very helpful."

Male Government employee, "It helps to clarify things."

Woman Government employee, "I do like to have the judge make his comment, within limitations. A slight summary. And just what is expected of the jury."

Male Government employee: "I think he should say something about the evidence. I was pleased by the way the judge told us about what the law meant. I think the jury should be instructed as to what procedure to follow in the jury room. In our case, it was chaos after we began deliberating on the verdict because a couple of men wanted to explain their views in detail. I would like instructions on how the poll should be taken. I believe they should give us some kind of printed instructions about how we are supposed to proceed."

Male real estate and insurance broker: "I think the judge should be more explicit. There were several questions involved and the jury didn't know what to do. When there are legal terms, the judge should explain them. The judges know what the legal terms mean. But they are new to us. We don't understand some of them."

Male auditor, Bureau of Internal Revenue: "I have never served on but one case. I think some comment from the judge on the evidence is necessary. Of course, it should be impartial."

Woman juror: "Mister, I ain't never give it no thought."

Male inspector of engineering materials for the Government: "I think the judge should give us instructions in the case, stating them clearly and in an unbiased way."

Woman Government clerk: "I think it is a great help for the judge to comment on some of the evidence. He knows the law and everything like that. He should comment both for and against. It seems to me there were little leads from the judge, to sort of direct your thinking."

Housewife: "I don't think he should favor either side. I think he should give an impartial résumé."

Male Government statistician: "I think that the judge, having the knowledge of law he has, should instruct the jury as to what should be considered as evidence. I think he should give, in his charge, the meat of the evidence."

Criminal-case jurors:

Male Government engineer: "If I don't understand the case, I would like for the judge to give me instructions on it. I think it is necessary for the judge to give general instructions on evidence, impartially."

Male assembly clerk for electrical supply company: "I think the judge should give us some advice as to how to go about it."

Male receptionist with a furniture company: "That is a hard question. I think it is necessary for the judge to give general instructions on the evidence, impartially."

Male Government clerk: "I approve of his commenting on the evidence as it is presented."

Order dispatcher for electric company: "I think it helps a jury to have the judge instruct them as to what they can do and what they can't do. I think it is a good thing for him to comment on the evidence. He makes it clearer."

Radio repairman: "On some of the evidence, actually, it might be necessary for him to comment. He should explain what the indictment is and what the law is. I think if he talks too much he will put too much weight on one side or the other."

Automobile mechanic: "The evidence would be understood better if he commented on it. I think the judge would make it more clear by commenting on it. I would like for the judge to outline the law in the case."

Machinist: "I think the judge ought to give us advice on the evidence."

Male Government research clerk: "A lot of times we don't know what it means after we get in the jury room. I mean the indictment. We didn't know what one meant."

Assistant group chief, Government Printing Office: "I think it is a good point, having the judge comment on the evidence. We are laymen and often it is very confusing. We ought to be allowed to take notes. There should be paper and pencil issued, so we can take notes. When the judge comments on the evidence, I don't think he should let us know, by the way he stresses things, and raises or lowers his voice, what he may think of the case."

Our first conclusion, from the evidence presented by these jurors, is that our juries, in Washington, are overweighted by Government employees. But we are all overweighted by Government employees. That may be dismissed, therefore, as irrelevant—though not immaterial.

Our second conclusion is that the juro. who were questioned did not have a very profound understanding of the significance of the question. I wonder, as a layman, how often jurors fail to understand the significance of questions during a trial. Is it not the duty of a judge to assure himself that the jury does understand the significance of the questions and the answers?

But our third and most important conclusion is that here, in these spot answers, hurriedly given by 21 jury men and women fresh from their experience in the courtroom, you find the thread which forms the basic fabric of the topic under discussion here today.

We find all the jurors leaning heavily on what the judge says. Without this guidance from the one man in the court on whose advice they feel they can rely, there is the dread of misunderstanding the facts concerning which the juror is desperately anxious to base a fair judgment.

And along with all this there is that shrewd, American awareness, shown by some of these jurors, of the possibility that the judge himself might be partial—and that a condition of his right to comment on the evidence is the impartiality of his comment.

You note that one juror touched on a point which, I find, runs through much of the literature on this subject. This juror expressed the opinion that the judge, in commenting on the evidence, should not let the jury know, "by the way he stresses things, and raises or lowers his voice," what he may think of the case.

That, of course, is a well-known method of conveying, to the jury, exactly what the judge does think of the case. I heard, not long ago, a highly respected member of the bench, a scholarly exponent of the noblest principles of justice, repeat for my edification, in pantomime and by modulations of the human voice, his comment on the evidence to a recent jury. He used, and most effectively, his shoulders, his hands, his eyebrows, his eyes, and the level of his voice. By such means he pleaded the case with such convincing eloquence that I found myself siding with him completely on the point he wished to make in relation to the evidence.

He had commented in that fashion to the jury because he believed so profoundly that by doing it he was serving the ends of justice.

I am not passing on the substance of what he conveyed to the jury. But I am calling attention once more to that juror, the 1 out of 21 whom we questioned, who had noticed—from his brief experience in court—that "by the way he stresses things and raises or lowers his voice" in commenting on the evidence a judge can tell the jury what he thinks of the case.

There, of course, in the hands of a judge who is without conscience or is motivated by some purpose not related to the ends of justice, lies a danger.

But in the juror's instinctive doubt as to the propriety of what the judge might do, lies a strong safeguard against that danger.

If the jury system possesses the merits which most of us are inclined to acknowledge, surely it must be strong enough to resist the undue influence of an occasional unprincipled judge. Otherwise, our juries are made of putty. While I have heard criticism of the jury system, most vigorously asserted by the lawyer who has just lost a case, I have never heard jurors criticized on the ground that they are spineless.

In my lay opinion, the more that the judge can do to assure a lay jury's comprehension of the facts which affect a fair judgment of the issue; the more guides that he can furnish, out of the wisdom of his experience and his knowledge of the laws of human nature, the more apt we are to have just verdicts from the jury. On the other hand, the more rigid the rules which gag a judge in his relationship with the jury, the greater the danger that justice will miscarry.

I have read cases where Federal judges were caught far off base in their comments on the evidence, such comment being a reflection on the attitude of the judge himself, rather than the rule which sanctioned his comment. But in reading some of the cases where State judges have been reversed for trespassing on ground forbidden to them, I have been impressed by what seemed to me to be the benefits to the jury of the comment for which the judge was held to be in error. As to a law that supposes that justice is best served by keeping the judge silent while some smart lawyer pulls the wool over the eyes of the jury, I agree with Mr. Bumble: "If the law supposes that, the law is an ass."

I believe it is correct to say that our Federal judiciary, which operates under a broader latitude than is permitted in most of the States, has achieved a more impressive reputation for even-handed justice than many of our State courts. I also believe that any attempt to interfere by legislation with the freedom these judges enjoy, in working for an impartial judgment by the jury on the pertinent facts, would be a step backward, just as the removal of such legislation in some of the States is considered a step forward.

I wonder if the matter does not boil down, in the end, to the amount of confidence we

have in our judges. I find from my conversations with lawyer friends that there are some of them who, agreeing in principle with the advantages of judicial comment on the evidence as a means of clarifying the jury's understanding, are not willing to accept application of this principle in the case of some judges.

I am inclined to believe that if all State judges were chosen for life or for periods sufficiently long to insure for them something of the cloistered status of our Federal judges, the rules on comment in the State courts might more rapidly conform to those in the Federal courts. The latitude we permit our judges is at least a partial reflection of our confidence in the judges.

Prohibitions against comment on the evidence in State courts may have been based originally on some fear of judicial tyranny. But there is such a thing as tyranny at the hands of the people, swayed by momentary passions from which many of our State courts are not very well insulated. It is not difficult to understand the factors which may undermine confidence in judges who are forced, at intervals, to leave the bench and go into the hustings and appeal, not only to the intelligence but to the emotions, of the voters who decide their fate.

Of the three branches of our Government, our Federal judiciary enjoys the greatest confidence of the people because of the tradition of its isolation from politics.

That, at least, is the tradition which we cherish as a principle.

But is that tradition well served by the tendency to appoint to the Federal bench only those who wear the party label of the party in power?

I say only those. Here is the record of the appointments to the Federal bench in the continental United States since 1933:

Supreme Court, 9 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, 8 Democrats and 1 Republican.

The 10 circuit courts, 46 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, 3 Democrats and no Republicans.

Court of Customs, 6 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

Court of Claims, 4 Democrats and no Republicans.

District courts in the United States, 146 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

The total comes to 222 Democrats and 9 Republicans. Of the judges appointed since 1933 and now sitting as members of the Federal judiciary in the continental United States, 191 of them are Democrats and 6 are Republicans.

I understand the practical realities of politics, under which Federal judicial appointments have been regarded for many years as the plums of the party in power. I do not think that a party label should assume any great importance in considering a man for the Federal bench whose temperamental and intellectual qualities fit him for that high responsibility.

What I am talking about is the confidence we enjoy, as a tradition, in the nonpolitical complexion of the Federal judiciary and the supreme importance of maintaining that confidence in the minds of the laymen.

And as a layman I submit that the tradition suffers some injury when we find that 222 out of the 231 Federal judges appointed since 1933 have been Democrats, that of this group only 6 out of the 197 now sitting are Republicans.

You remember the preacher who was praying for rain during a drought. As he was about to close his prayer, he remembered what happened to his bottom land during a spring freshet. And he added: "But, Lord, please be reasonable."

With that plea, to the powers that be and are to be, I bring to a close this layman's comment.

DEFENSE OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S INTEGRITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article appearing in the June 2 issue of the Kansas City Star, entitled "Truman Integrity Defended in Review of Milligan Book." This review is written by Mr. Jerome Walsh, a prominent member of the Missouri Bar who was requested to review this book by the Missouri Bar Review, official publication of the Missouri Bar Association. I shall not discuss the article itself, but I should like to read these brief paragraphs:

In his reflections on the fortunes of life and politics, he returns again and again to the subject of "luck." Mr. Truman was "lucky"; he has been the "luckiest of men." Not-so-old-timers in Missouri will have little difficulty in recalling Mr. Milligan's well-nigh suicidal despair in running a poor and undistinguished third, behind Truman and Lloyd Stark, in the race for Senator in the 1940 Democratic primary.

He can reflect—

Referring again to the author—

that with half-truths, distortions, gossip, inference, indirection, hearsay, and outright untruth, he has impeached the character of Missouri's first President, a man about whose character few Democrats in Jackson County have ever said an unkind word, a man to whom even the Republican Kansas City Star accords respect and good will.

That ends the quotation. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN INTEGRITY DEFENDED IN REVIEW OF MILLIGAN BOOK—FOLLOWING RECAPITULATION OF THE PENDERGAST STORY, TECHNIQUE OF CONDEMNATION BY INFERENCE IS USED TO CAST FALSE SUSPICION ON THE PRESIDENT, SAYS JEROME WALSH

(This is a review by Jerome Walsh of The Inside Story of the Pendergast Machine by the Man Who Smashed It (formerly Missouri Waltz), by Maurice M. Milligan. The book was published by Charles Scribner's Sons in April. The review appears in the May issue of the Kansas City Bar Bulletin. Walsh, a lawyer here, was a candidate in 1946 for the Democratic nomination for Representative in the Congress from Jackson County's Fifth District.)

Mr. Milligan's book is of special interest to members of the Missouri bar, not alone because it retells the story of the crack-up of one of the most potent political machines in the history of the Republic but because a Missourian of stature is stood up and counted in its pages.

Indeed, it is this last aspect which has given the book a wide sale, which attracted prior to publication a flurry of excited newspaper comment and stimulated some planners of campaign strategy to a pitch of anticipation and delight.

A THOROUGH DOCUMENTATION

The activities of few bosses have been as thoroughly documented as have those of Pendergast. In Tom's Town, William M. Reddig told the story recently and well. Mr. Milligan's book, almost altogether derivative, recooks the same cabbage. It is hardly a scoop.

But Mr. Milligan's book is something more than the story of the Pendergast dynasty. It is primarily an assault upon the integrity and reputation of the President of the United States, a Missourian who happened to live in Jackson County during the period of machine rule.

It is an assault, furthermore, that is being delivered in an election year, when campaign material, however factual, brings premium prices and when those willing to author it may expect to obtain a full measure of acclaim from the organization and newspaper apparatus of the party opposed to the President in power.

For the first 212 pages, then, the Milligan book is the standard recapitulation of the Pendergast story, a compendium of old newspaper clippings, photographs, and Milligan musings and speeches, none of which are either very startling or reflect any insight more profound than the newspaper editorials of the time.

"SEEN SAID BEFORE"

In these pages, Mr. Milligan informs us that, like Calvin Coolidge's preacher, he is against sin; he is against gambling, vote frauds, dope, and, presumably, whisky. Although opposition to these ills has been expressed occasionally before, three-fourths of Missouri Waltz is devoted to conveying the impression that Milligan discovered them all, personally.

The reader musing through the rather turgid prose of these early pages may well tend to wonder why all the fuss and feathers. It is the last 60 pages, however, that give him a run for his money.

For it is in these pages that an effort is made to link Harry Truman with every species of sin that flourished during the regime of Pendergast. He is linked by inference, never directly. He knew Pendergast personally; his start in politics was at the suggestion of Tom's nephew, Jim; he received the support of the Pendergast organization in his campaigns for county judge and for the United States Senate.

He must be assumed, therefore, to be party to every nefarious and venal deed that the henchmen of Pendergast perpetrated, from Johnny Lazia to Matthew S. Murray, from Jimmy Needles to Edward Schneider.

QUALIFIES AN ATTACK

Ghosts were voted by the thousands by Pendergast lieutenants, who, jostling each other for power and influence, sought the boss' favor by returning fantastic majorities in their precincts. If ghost votes were cast for Mr. Truman, he personally was involved in the conspiracy. No, Mr. Milligan never goes quite that far.

Indeed, the final section of the book—the fireworks section entitled "An Evil Heritage"—begins with a statement made by Milligan in 1944, when in answer to a reporter's inquiry, he said:

"At no time (during the investigation conducted by the district attorney's office) did the finger of suspicion ever point in the direction of Senator Truman."

To the thousands of Jackson Countians who have known Harry Truman since his boyhood, this statement is both pompous and superfluous, although Mr. Milligan indicates that he should be credited with a a gracious and courteous gesture in making it.

AIMED AT THE VOTER

But despite this flat statement that Mr. Truman was never involved in the machine's depredations—and the utter absence of any evidence linking him with a single dubious deed in those years of universal corruption—the entire weight of the book is an effort to establish in the mind of the voting reader the suspicion that the involvement was no less real for being indirect.

Thus, Milligan threads the name of the President through accounts of the bloody municipal election of 1934. The name of the President crops up next door to mentions of Pendergast's concrete company; it appears in the same paragraph with the names of Charles Carollo, Otto P. Higgins, John Pryor, and others who wound up with prison terms.

By inference and juxtaposition, Mr. Truman is brought to emerge as some kind of vague partner of convicted traffickers in political corruption. Never, however, are direct statements made to this effect. It is by indirection—one of the cheapest devices in the textbook of scurrility—that Mr. Milligan attains his ends.

SUSPICION BY INFERENCE

His technique is never to lay these sins directly at the President's door, but to lay them at the door of the man down the street and then to brand the President for living in the general neighborhood.

It is inconceivable that as an attorney and a member of this State's bar, Mr. Milligan would permit the introduction of evidence of this quality either in a court of law or in the court of his own thinking. Indeed, his wholesale use of it violates some of the basic principles of jurisprudence.

It was to eliminate this kind of base gossip and hearsay, rumor, and innuendo arising from personal rancor, that the rules of evidence were developed to become such a proud and integral part of our common-law heritage.

Apply the gossip technique to anyone. Apply it even to Mr. Milligan, since he, apparently, sanctions its use and vilifies a President with it. For example, the story has made the rounds for years that following the release from prison of Tom Pendergast, Mr. Milligan paid a personal nighttime visit to the boss' Kansas City home, where the erstwhile satrap was living alone, aged and friendless.

BRUISES FROM A SLUR

I have not the slightest idea as to whether there is a word of truth in this story. Yet, here is the alleged fact of the visit, set up in cold type and, as thus set, it is a suggestion that will, of course, bring aches to the Milligan bones and call forth, no doubt, a hurried and sanctimonious denial, suggesting, as it does, that the nocturnal visit was for some sinister purpose.

I have no wish to bring groans from Mr. Milligan or to bruise in any way the well-muscled Milligan ego. Yet let him consider carefully, as he smarts under the heedless and callous aspersion, admitted under his very own rules of evidence, that innuendo and hearsay can rot out the good name of any man alive, even a Maurice Milligan with his screen of old newspaper clippings and his protective toga of the Milligan myth.

Boiled down, then, the whole book is predicated upon the assumption that anyone who knew Pendergast, anyone who received the support of the Pendergast organization in attaining elective office, must somehow share personal responsibility for every act of crime and boodle that was committed during the Pendergast regime.

SUPPORT BY PENDERGAST

Let those who are willing to accept this thesis apply it consistently. Let them apply it to Lloyd C. Stark, hailed far and wide as Missouri's clean-up Governor, who broke with Pendergast but who, prior to the break, sought and was elected to office by Pendergast's organized support.

Let them apply it to James A. Reed, whose lifetime of office-holding was made possible by votes delivered by the Pendergast organization.

Let them apply it to great and honorable judges of our courts, to Senator Harry B. Hawes, to Bennett Champ Clark, to Mr. Milligan's own respected brother, Jacob L. (Tuck) Milligan, who, running for Congressman-at-Large in 1932, was willingly helped to office by Kansas City votes—some of which, no doubt, were ectoplasm, but none of which are repudiated by the author.

No word can be said in defense of bossism. It is the kind of hidden sore, however, which is revealed in its true dimensions only when some monstrous cataclysm, such as the Kansas City collapse, bursts upon public notice.

ACCEPTED IN BEST CIRCLES

Pendergast himself moved among the business and professional men of his city as an accepted and respected equal, whose handshake and nod was a flattering unction to chamber of commerce presidents, newspaper publishers, professional and commercial leaders of all kinds, whose attendance at church and intoning of the ritual was punctilious and sincere.

The hands of these sturdy gentry, pillars of society, were lifted high in horror when the extent of civil corruption became manifest following Pendergast's departure for Leavenworth. Yet, by Milligan's standards, these hands were soiled, too; they had touched the hand of Pendergast and had received favors from the boss and his satellites.

To say that Harry Truman had the support of the Pendergast organization in his campaign for public office is to say simply that without organized support it is impossible to get elected even to the office of constable in our American democracy.

LOOK TO THE MACHINES

The late President Roosevelt, whom even Mr. Milligan seems to revere, freely and openly solicited the strength of the Hague, Kelly-Nash, and Pendergast organizations.

For the previous decade or so, Republican leaders had contested for the favor of the Vare-Pew organization in Pennsylvania. McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt had their Mark Hanna and Boise Penrose. Even Lincoln, saint that he was, strove to maintain friendly relations with the vote-purveying pharaohs of his party.

To say that any of these men became thereby tools or serfs of these organizations is to lapse into Milliganis, a mental ailment marked by double talk and an excessive display of piety upon the part of the afflicted.

Only a native of Jackson County can fully appreciate the often uproarious unconscious burlesque that marks this book.

Only a native of Jackson County could recall with what splendid fire Milligan—the archangelic foe of bossism—openly endorsed the Pendergast-supported candidate for mayor of Kansas City in 1946, the ebullient Robert K. Ryland, who, be it said to his credit, scorned to attempt to hide his allegiance. Surely, this act of Milligan's constitutes a paradox that should discredit his book up and down the land.

DEFEATED BY MR. TRUMAN

But, of course, it is for a definite purpose that Mr. Milligan is so ineffably lofty. If there is a single continuing theme in this book other than the author's profound respect for Maurice M. Milligan, it is his bitterness at Harry Truman, a bitterness almost pathological in its intensity.

In his reflections on the fortunes of life and politics, he returns again and again to the subject of luck. Mr. Truman was lucky; he has been the luckiest of men. Not-so-old timers in Missouri will have little difficulty recalling Mr. Milligan's well-nigh suicidal despair in running a poor and undistinguished third, behind Truman and Lloyd Stark, in the race for Senator in the 1940 Democratic primary.

That the voters of Missouri should thus repudiate him, choosing in his stead another Missouri country boy whom he had always regarded as a rival, was a disappointment of a kind that better men than Maurice Milligan have found bitter to swallow. Yet, in this book, he has found a special balm for his wounds, and the acclaim accorded it by the Republican press, hot for campaign documents, must fall musically on his ears.

He can reflect that with half-truths, distortions, gossip, inference, indirection, hearsay, and outright untruth, he has impeached the character of Missouri's first President, a man about whose character few Democrats in Jackson County have ever said an unkind word, a man to whom even the Republican Kansas City Star accords respect and good will.

SLAUGHTER PURGE CITED

"My observance of boss rule, renewing and flourishing under countenance from a President of the United States and his executive assistants, has dictated the writing of this book." Thus does Mr. Milligan begin an account of the primary election of 1946, when the President sought the aid of the Democrats of the county in defeating Congressman Roger C. Slaughter, a Democrat.

Everybody knows that Slaughter had opposed the bulk of measures submitted to Congress by the President, a condition peculiarly embarrassing to Mr. Truman in view of the fact that Slaughter hailed from his home county.

Mr. Truman's request that the voters of Jackson County defeat Slaughter is hailed by Milligan as an act very nearly tantamount to high treason. Yet there is plenty of precedent for this participation by a President in a local election. The late Mr. Roosevelt attempted it unsuccessfully almost a score of times. So did Woodrow Wilson, who stumped the country asking the defeat of opponents of the League of Nations. Other examples could be cited.

DEFEAT WAS ESSENTIAL

In this writer's view, the elimination of Slaughter from Congress was essential to the President's program. I agree that the question of who would become Slaughter's successor was a secondary matter. I myself was one of the candidates, and in the heat of the race the rumor became widespread that if I withdrew I would receive huge rewards.

However, for personal reasons, I made the difficult decision to stay in and fight it out—and lost. Here occurs another of Mr. Milligan's bitter inferences, namely, that somehow Mr. Truman must take personal responsibility for the vote frauds that developed in this contest.

The duties of a President are manifold. Someone should point out to Milligan that they do not yet include the personal supervision of local elections.

Mr. Milligan spends pages making appointment as United States district attorney appear to be the net result of the most intensive screening of numerous candidates by the Attorney General of the United States. I think I can comment on this section from personal experience. In 1932 Senator-elect Bennett Champ Clark graciously proffered me his recommendation for appointment as United States attorney—an offer then equal to actual appointment. Personal reasons caused me to decline.

REASON FOR SUPPORT

During the 13 months between this offer and Mr. Milligan's ascension, Clark endeavored with might and main to secure the appointment of Carl L. Ristine, whom the Attorney General of the United States, Homer Cummings, opposed, thus finding himself on this issue in complete accord with Pendergast. Mr. Milligan simply was not in the running. His only claim on Clark, without whose support he had no chance, was Clark's affection for Mr. Milligan's brother, Tuck, who on the basis of that affection, was himself endeavoring with might and main to secure Milligan's appointment.

The situation remained static until Clark, finally seeing his support of Ristine to be hopeless, made a deal with Cummings whereby Milligan, the lesser horn of this political dilemma, was finally given the post, but only on condition that Ristine receive, as he ultimately did, an appointment as Assistant

Attorney General at compensation substantially exceeding Milligan's.

The most glaringly misleading treatment of the facts by Milligan is that concerning the Union Station massacre and his participation in the investigation of that crime. As a constant spectator of the Kansas City scene, I read with awe Mr. Milligan's account of his participation in the massacre affair which occurred June 16, 1933. At the time, Mr. Milligan, not yet appointed, was still residing in Ray County and, like the rest of us, learned of the crime through the press—in his case, doubtless through the columns of the Ray County News or the Cooperative Farmer. The vagaries of politics had not yet launched him on either a political or a literary career. After the Clark-Cummings compromise, another of Missouri's famous compromises, resulting in his appointment, he assumed the duties of his office at a time when this case was already 9 months old.

JOIN IN SOLVING CASE

From his account, one would think that J. Edgar Hoover had vacated his office and could not be encouraged to resume it. Until, of course, he heard of Milligan's appointment, after which they joined together and, with Hoover in a minor role, proceeded to crack the Kansas City massacre.

At page 132 he says, "My office asked for the return of Adam Richetti to Kansas City to stand trial for participation in the Union Station massacre." Mr. Milligan is confused. He sent no capias, for Richetti was brought back on a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum and taken by Milligan before a Federal grand jury where he failed to break Richetti. Following this waterhaul, Richetti was handed as good riddance to the Missouri authorities.

Mr. Milligan says: "Richetti was brought to trial, convicted, and duly executed, paying his debt to society for his part in the Union Station massacre." Either Mr. Milligan is employing his standard method of inference and wants his readers to believe that it was he who prosecuted and personally hanged Richetti, or, if he is not doing so, surely he will not object to my pointing out, for the mere sake of historical accuracy, that he had no part in Richetti's prosecution and execution and that the same was accomplished solely by the State courts.

TENACITY IS LAUDED

But full and complete credit must be given Milligan for the tenacity he exhibited in taking on the Pendergast octopus. The let-well-enough-alone type of man and mind might have taken an easier course. However, for cleaning up the vote situation in Kansas City, credit should be accorded the new permanent registration law enacted by the legislature in 1937. Credit certainly has to be given in large measure to his two capable assistants who many times carried on the fight when Mr. Milligan was elsewhere.

Randall W. Wilson, a courtroom strategist of rare ability, did practically all of the heavy duty trial work. Sam C. Blair, now judge of the circuit court for the fourteenth judicial district circuit, in his brilliantly unique manner briefed the law, drafted the indictments, mapped the strategy and supplied the brain power that sparked the Milligan rise to fame.

In addition, Mr. Milligan is entitled to complete recognition for the part he played in the T. J. Pendergast income-tax prosecution. He sent Mr. Pendergast to the penitentiary, but the great gap in this book, and I think it is a gap in Milligan's record, is his recounting of the capitulation of McCormack, who finally informed on Pendergast and made his conviction possible.

This capitulation came, says the author, only after he had threatened officials of the various fire-insurance companies which furnished the bribe money by representing that he had the means to embarrass them if they did not force McCormack to inform. Thereupon, they speedily pressed McCormack to tell his story.

QUESTION ON MOTIVE

What Milligan actually said to these men, and on the basis of what, the book leaves entirely to conjecture. But it also leaves something else—and that is this question: What strong motive did Milligan appeal to in these men to work on McCormack so as to avoid for themselves embarrassment? The clear import is that he had facts enough to make them sweat if they refused to help him make Pendergast sweat.

Actually, one wonders on the basis of Milligan's own peculiar application of the rules of evidence, if he should not have gone on with his prosecutions instead of stopping cold on Pendergast. In any case, and whatever the unrevealed facts are, he has left himself, these officials, his record, and his book, in a position which, to say the least, is equivocal.

In this connection, Mr. Milligan says that on the morning of the Pendergast plea he refusd to release to the press copies of a written statement of facts he was to present to the court "until I had seen the defendant enter the courtroom and heard with my own ears the plea of guilty."

It is true, as he relates, "I presented my findings of fraud and tax evasion at the request of Judge Otis * * *" and that he "eschewed oratory and dramatics" in doing so.

A LENGTHY STATEMENT

His statements in this respect are the facts, but in doing so, he put on an unheard of performance by a lawyer in a case of that or any other magnitude. He read that statement to the court! It was some 15 pages in length, and had been prepared and written for him by Sam Blair. Lawyers of parts just don't do that. Milligan rarely, if ever, said anything in the courtroom extemporaneously and relied exclusively on Blair for the preparation of his arguments to juries and statements to the courts which, if he did not actually read, he had beforehand committed to memory.

This book offers a sketchy refresher course of the Kansas City story, but to either the literature or the trustworthy record of our time it adds nothing but its own vainglory.

THE RIZLEY-MOORE BILL AND THE ACTIVITIES OF LELAND OLDS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, continued shortages of fuel oil in the New England and North Atlantic States are almost certain. The ability of the domestic oil industry to supply the military petroleum requirements has been seriously impaired. In my opinion, these domestic and military shortages will necessarily result from the defeat of House bill 4051, commonly referred to as the Rizley-Moore gas bill, by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which previously had passed the House by a vote of 4 to 1. This legislation has been the object of a well-planned and well-executed propaganda program of the Red element in the United States under the leadership of Leland Olds of the Federal Power Commission. It has been the victim of the gullibility and dishonesty of a few politicians and of the misunderstanding of some Members of the Congress who have not had the time or opportunity to study the issues involved.

The Natural Gas Act, as originally passed, provides that the Federal Power Commission shall regulate the interstate transportation of natural gas and the sale thereof for resale for ultimate consumption. The Power Commission, however, under the leadership of Leland Olds, former Chairman of the Commission and a long-time member, has expanded the jurisdiction of the Commission to regulate the production and gathering of gas in the field contrary to the plain language of the Natural Gas Act, which excludes "the production and gathering of gas" from the jurisdiction of the Commission. A New Deal court has sustained the Commission. Such policy has caused the natural gas pipeline companies serving large consuming areas to cease exploration for gas reserves, and has caused independent producers to refuse to sell gas to interstate pipe lines except at substantially increased prices and subject to the condition that if the Commission regulates the transaction in any way, the contract of sale is void and the seller may discontinue the delivery of gas. This state of affairs has almost terminated the building of any further interstate pipe lines from the southwestern gas fields to the consuming areas of the North and East.

It means that the 165,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of known gas reserves of the Southwest, which is equivalent to about 27,500,000,000 barrels of oil on a fuel heating basis, will not be made available to relieve the fuel-oil shortage suffered by the people of New England and the North Atlantic States during the past several winters. These reserves of gas, likewise, will not be available to relieve the strain on the fuel-oil demand for industrial and military uses.

The interstate pipe lines are now paying as high as 12 cents for gas in the field because of the Federal Power Commission's policy. This is well over 100 percent increase since the establishment of the Commission's policy. It is taking about $150,000,000 a year out of the pockets of the consumers as extra tribute to the Power Commission policy.

The bill which was killed by the Senate committee would have amended the Natural Gas Act clearly to exclude the Commission from asserting jurisdiction over the activities of producing and gathering natural gas and the facilities used for such purpose. The amendment would have released the gas reserves of the Southwest for sale and transportation to the suffering consumers of the North and East. The plentiful supply of gas thus made available would have made competition keen, and the price of gas to consumers would have, as a natural consequence, gone down, as is always the case when any commodity is made plentiful. The people and the military forces have been denied this additional supply of petroleum products because of the activity of Leland Olds of the Power Commission.

I think the people of this country are entitled to know just who Leland Olds is. Prior to Mr. Olds' appointment to the Federal Power Commission, he was an associate editor of the Federated Press. The Federated Press was a Communist organization for the purpose of gathering and feeding news and propaganda to other Communist publications, including the Daily Worker. Other coeditors

of the Federated Press were Carl Haessler, an outstanding and notorious member of the Communist Party in America, who has a record of conviction for the evasion of the draft laws during World War I. The executive board of the Federated Press at and during the time Mr. Olds was a writer and coeditor included such active Communists as Earl Browder and William Z. Foster and John W. Edelman. The Federated Press was represented in Washington by Laurence Todd, who at the same time represented the Tass Agency, the official press organization of the Soviet Union. Over a period of 10 years the Daily Worker carried a column under the byline of Leland Olds, condemning the capitalistic system.

During these years as coeditor of the Federated Press, Leland Olds was a recipient of grants and awards of money from the American Fund for Public Service, commonly known as the Garland Fund. The Garland Fund was set up in 1922 by young and rich Charles Garland, and was dedicated to the advancement of communistic-front organizations in America.

In 1925, Mr. Olds was awarded $3,640 from the fund. In 1926, he received another award of $3,000. In 1928, he received a gift of $3,600 from the fund. During the same time, the Federated Press received grants totaling $76,000. The Daily Worker was also a recipient of advances from the Garland Fund. The communistic magazine known as the New Masses, was founded in the United States with the financial aid of the Garland Fund. During this period, Earl Browder and William Z. Foster as members of the executive board of the Federated Press were Mr. Olds' bosses.

In 1938, Leland Olds was temporary chairman of, and made the keynote speech to, the American Labor Party at its national convention in New York on October 3 of that year. In this speech Mr. Olds asked the question:

How can I escape war and find peace?

He concluded with:

The old parties—

That means the Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party—

cannot answer this fundamental question of the people because their organizations are still based upon selfishness.

According to the New York Times of October 4 of that year, Mr. Olds in this keynote speech also said:

The Labor Party was born because the President could not count upon the machinery of his own party to support his efforts.

According to the Times, Mr. Olds also said:

Millions of men and women knew that neither the Republican nor Democratic Parties could be depended upon to enable Franklin Delano Roosevelt to continue to lead the Nation into the promised land of security, equality, love, and peace. The Labor Party is the response to the political awakening that is shaking the foundations of the old political machines which, while giving lip service in their platforms to the needs of the people, were in reality willing tools of the financial power that ruled America and made its democracy a sham.

In view of Mr. Olds' philosophy and his previous official connections with communism, it is not strange that he has used his office as a member of the Federal Power Commission to hinder the industrial development of this country and impede the efforts of the oil industry to supply the domestic and military petroleum requirements. It is not strange that he has enlisted the aid of left-wing columnists and radio commentators.

The purpose of Mr. Olds' effort to defeat the bill is to continue to impose his devastating philosophies upon the American people as a member of the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Olds has filed a report with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate and has testified before one of its subcommittees that he believes the gas reserves of the Southwest should be locked up and that the population of the North and East should be forced to move to these areas as a matter of social advancement, in order to use these gas reserves for industrial purposes. He has stated that he does not believe that gas should be permitted to be competitive with coal and oil. Mr. Olds has said, as a step in effectuating a managed economy in this country, the Commission should determine where, when, and for what purposes gas may be used. Mr. Draper, the fourth member of the present Commission, has gone along with Mr. Olds because of his subservient position to those who backed his nomination. Mr. Olds also had the support and help of the President of the United States in propagandizing the public and defeating the gas amendment.

Two members of the Commission, Mr. Wimberly and Mr. Smith, filed a report with the committee disagreeing with the Olds philosophy and have urged upon the Senate Committee that the Natural Gas Act should be amended in order to relieve the fuel shortages of the North and East.

Mr. President, I have made this statement concerning the proposed gas amendment, known as the Rizley-Moore bill (H. R. 4051), and the activities of Leland Olds, in order that the attention of the Members of Congress and the public may be focused upon the character of individuals who still hold important positions of trust and responsibility in this government.

IMPORTANCE OF AN ADEQUATE MILITARY MANPOWER ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I request a quorum call, I want to make a short statement in regard to another matter. It is not my intention to indulge in any partisan argument with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I am perfectly willing to let his speech speak for itself, but I may say that if the Senator from Maryland were on the floor at this time, I am sure he would agree with me that in this critical hour of America's history there must be no partisan difference of any nature whatsoever on the question of protecting the security of the Nation. Reading the newspapers today and listening to conversations in the cloakroom raise a question as to whether in the hours immediately ahead, before adjournment Saturday night, we may be confronted with a holding-up process by way of a filibuster in connection with a military manpower bill. Speaking only for myself, Mr. President, but, I feel, also for a great majority of this body on both sides of the aisle and a great majority of the American people, so far as I am concerned I shall take the position that we should remain here, no matter how many days it may require, until we pass a military manpower bill that will protect the security of the Nation in this great hour of crisis. I am convinced that if, as the result of any parliamentary maneuvering we adjourn without the passage of such a bill, such action would be heard the globe around. It would carry with it some serious implications as to our intention and power to enforce the peace.

I want to say this as one who proposed what he believed to be some reasonable amendments to the draft bill when it was before the Senate. The Senate took action which resulted in the adoption of some and the defeat of some of my amendments. I shall take the same position I should take if I were a member of the conference committee considering the bill. The Senate by majority vote having spoken, I would defend the bill as passed by the Senate. Hence, I serve notice here and now that, as one Member of the Senate, I shall support any attempt to prevent prolonged debate in the nature of a filibuster on manpower legislation in the Senate of the United States between now and adjournment. In fact, I shall take the position that we must remain in session until we break any such parliamentary maneuver as that if it should develop.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stennis
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Thye
Dworshak	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Umstead
Ecton	Malone	Vandenberg
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
Green	Morse	Williams
Gurney	Murray	Wilson
Hatch	Myers	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on behalf of himself and his colleague, the senior

Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. COOPER and Mr. BARKLEY asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota, the Senator from Kansas, and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

The Senator from California is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would vote "nay."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are necessarily absent on official business.

I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—41

Baldwin	Holland	O'Conor
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Revercomb
Connally	McClellan	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	McFarland	Russell
Downey	McKellar	Smith
Eastland	McMahon	Sparkman
Ecton	Magnuson	Stennis
Fulbright	Malone	Stewart
Hatch	Maybank	Taylor
Hayden	Moore	Tydings
Hill	Murray	Umstead
Hoey	Myers	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Dworshak	Langer
Ball	Ellender	Lucas
Brewster	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bricker	Flanders	Martin
Bridges	Green	Millikin
Brooks	Gurney	Morse
Butler	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Cain	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Cordon	Ives	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Taft
Thomas, Okla.	Wherry	Wilson
Thye	White	Young
Vandenberg	Wiley	
Watkins	Williams	

NOT VOTING—15

Buck	George	McGrath
Bushfield	Jenner	Reed
Byrd	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Feazel	McCarran	Wagner

So the amendment of Mr. COOPER, on behalf of himself and Mr. BARKLEY, to the committee agreement, was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER in the chair). The question is on the motion by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. AIKEN. On this motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from Masschusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are necessarily absent on official business.

I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—42

Baldwin	Hoey	O'Conor
Barkley	Holland	O'Daniel
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Connally	Kilgore	Revercomb
Cooper	McClellan	Robertson, Va.
Downey	McFarland	Russell
Eastland	McKellar	Smith
Ecton	McMahon	Sparkman
Fulbright	Magnuson	Stennis
Green	Malone	Stewart
Hatch	Maybank	Taylor
Hayden	Murray	Tydings
Hill	Myers	Umstead

NAYS—38

Aiken	Ferguson	Saltonstall
Ball	Flanders	Taft
Brewster	Gurney	Thomas, Okla.
Bricker	Hawkes	Thye
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Tobey
Brooks	Ives	Vandenberg
Buck	Kem	Watkins
Butler	Langer	Wherry
Cain	Lucas	Wiley
Cordon	McCarthy	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Wilson
Dworshak	Morse	Young
Ellender	Robertson, Wyo.	

NOT VOTING—16

Bushfield	Knowland	Reed
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
Feazel	McGrath	White
George	Martin	
Jenner	Moore	

So Mr. BARKLEY's motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the vote which has just been cast. I realize that this vote, giving special privilege to a single agricultural commodity, and possibly to be followed by votes which will give special privilege to other commodities, may be the start of the break-down of this bill. It is very apparent that many Members of the Senate are not in a mood to enact any long-range legislation on this subject.

I think it is a most ridiculous spectacle for the President of the United States to be traveling thousands of miles around the country advocating the enactment of this bill, as he did by name in Los Angeles only the other evening, and then have only three or four members of his own party support him in the Senate. I think it is a sorry spectacle to see a great party disintegrate to that extent, to see how little regard they have for the opinions of their leader.

I should like to call attention to what those votes mean. I suppose the Senators who supported the amendment expect that Congress is merely going to pass the stopgap bill of the House of Representatives, and it is possible that may be done. Let us see what that would mean. Let us see what would happen to citrus fruits, for instance. Under the stopgap bill, a few millions of dollars will be available for the purchase of citrus fruits. However, under this bill there would be between $300,000,000 and $400,000,000 available for the purchase of fruits and vegetables and other nonbasic commodities to support the price, if necessary.

The House bill extends the support price for wool for only 1 year, and that is meaningless. The Senate bill, which we are asked to vote on, and on which the members of the committee have worked for months, in trying to put it into shape and get it ready for passage, would give perpetual price support to wool.

Mr. President, I think it is just too bad that while the President of the United States is traveling over the country advocating a long-range farm program that his party here in Congress is doing everything within its power to prevent any program for the benefit of the farmers of the United States from being enacted.

I wish to say that there is one group that will be very happy over the defeat of a long-range farm program bill, and that is the group of men whose names appeared in the newspapers this morning as being indicted for failure to register as lobbyists. I know what interests certain persons have in killing this bill, and I know the opposition that has labored against it in the Cotton States. Let me state what happened. Some of the men whose names were in the newspapers this morning have been very interested in this bill—one of them, at least. If this bill passed, it would temporarily reduce the parity price of cotton. In the long run, it is the best bill the cotton growers of the country have ever had offered to them. But what would happen if this bill passed?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. No; I decline to yield now.

Mr. President, what would happen, I repeat, if this bill passed? The result would be that the speculators who have bought futures in cotton would take a licking. So they are going to be extremely happy as a result of this vote, which starts toward breaking down this long-range agricultural program bill on which we have worked for months and months, and which ought to become law, and for which the farmers of the United States have been hoping for more than 10 years.

I wish to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] who voted for this measure.

Mr. President, political tactics have been practiced here, which may sacrifice the general welfare of the farmers of the United States for years to come.

The stopgap bill will not support the wool growers to any appreciable extent. It will not help the citrus fruit growers or the apple growers. The citrus fruit growers of Florida can look forward again to getting from 5 to 15 cents a box for their grapefruit next winter, whereas if the Senate bill passed they should get a decent price.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. Now let them say what they like.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to offer two brief amendments in the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself and then I shall be glad to yield the floor. The amendments are offered to page 82 of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I want to know whether the Senator will yield to me for a moment. I should like to comment——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I regretfully decline to yield, because I have declined to yield to Senators on the other side of the aisle.

I should like to complete my statement, and then yield the floor.

Mr. President, in the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself, I offer the two technical amendments to section 302, on page 82 of the bill. I understand that the amendments are acceptable to the Senator from Vermont, who is in charge of the bill. So I offer the amendments at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts offer the amendments en bloc?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, they are offered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 82, line 3, after the word "determined," it is proposed to insert: "by the Secretary after reasonable public notice and public hearing with records of said hearing and a finding thereon by said Secretary available to the public."

On page 82, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "in the national interest" and insert "in the interest of national security."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, which are to be considered en bloc.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the business before the Senate be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been stated, and it will be stated again.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, which are to be considered en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I simply state that these are technical amendments to make sure that before the Secretary of Agriculture undertakes to exercise certain powers given him by this section, there shall be a public hearing, and that notice of such public hearing and of his findings shall be given before he exercises that power.

The second amendment changes the words "in the national interest" to the words "in the interest of national security."

I understand that the amendments are acceptable to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], with whom I have discussed them.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. THYE, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at the moment. I desire to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, and I will not yield at the moment.

Mr. President, I am sorry that the usually calm and self-possessed Senator from Vermont has permitted himself to become overexcited as a result of the adoption of the amendment upon which the Senate just voted. I am especially sorry he took advantage of the adoption of the amendment to inject politics into the consideration of the over-all agricultural legislation. I am sure that when the Senator finds a calmer moment, which he will do, he will not feel that the Senator from Kentucky and his colleague who sits on the other side of the aisle were playing politics when we offered the amendment or that the Senate was playing politics when it adopted it, or that it destroys the bill, or that it is inimical to the interests of any other grower or of any other crop or of any other product of any kind in the United States.

It is true the President has recommended long-range agricultural legislation, and he may have endorsed yesterday or any other day, in principle, the legislation which the Senate is now considering. But certainly the President of the United States by any endorsement he might give to this legislation did not expect us to take it without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" or without any amendments to it; otherwise the amendments already adopted and accepted by the Senator from Vermont would vitiate the legislation according to that standard.

Mr. President, we argued the amendment in good faith. We presented the facts with respect to the special situation which surrounds tobacco and which everyone recognizes. The adoption of an amendment on that one subject had no effect whatever on any other product, any other crop, or any other part of the United States from an agricultural or economic standpoint. I do not know what the chances may be of securing over-all legislation. If there is a defeat of over-all legislation it will not take place in this body as the result of the adoption of the amendment just voted on.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does he mean he is opposed to the amendment which is to be offered by the Senator from Georgia, which would defeat a long-range program?

Mr. BARKLEY. If I am convinced when the time comes to vote on that amendment that we cannot obtain long-range legislation, I shall vote for it, because it will be necessary to extend the present law beyond the 31st of December, in order to have any price support at all.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will yield further, I might say that perhaps I was wrong in not pointing out to the Senators on the other side, before they voted, just what they were doing to their States in helping to break down a long-range

program. I supposed they all knew what they were doing. If they did not, they misunderstood.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure that those who voted against the amendment at least thought they knew what they were doing.

Mr. AIKEN. I also assume that both Senators from Kentucky knew what they were doing when they offered the amendment which has now been adopted, which actually reduces the support on tobacco if S. 2318 is not enacted.

Mr. BARKLEY. We were taking our chances on that.

Mr. AIKEN. I desire to say, too, for the benefit of both Senators from Maryland that the long-range bill would increase the parity price of Maryland tobacco approximately 16 or 18 cents a pound.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not suppose any Senator representing a tobacco-growing State would weep very copious tears if an increase in the price of his product were vouchsafed by reason of legislation. What I wanted to say was that if the legislation providing an over-all program is not enacted, it will not be on account of the amendment the Senate has just adopted; it will be for other reasons. The fact that the legislation is only brought here now, at the end of the session, may have made some contribution to the inability of the two Houses to get together on it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the legislation has been here for 6 weeks.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee in the House has not considered the legislation, and I am advised will not consider it at this session.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in all fairness?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. First, I should like to say the legislation was brought to the Senate on the 15th of May. Next, I should like to say that, regardless of what the House does now, the House committee had an appropriation of $25,000 made available to them last fall that they started and took their first step in the direction of long-range agricultural legislation before the Senate committee started; and that the House committee held considerably more hearings than did the Senate committee. I am sure most members of the House committee are familiar with the legislation which we are acting upon here now, and would be ready to act upon it on short notice if it came to the floor of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know, but I am told by members of the House committee they will not consider the legislation without holding further hearings. We know the difficulty which will be encountered concerning this bill if we adjourn Saturday. I have done what I could to cooperate with the majority in bringing about an adjournment, because I think if we sit here until after the convention, or if we sit here between the conventions, or after the two conventions, the entire time of the Congress will be taken up with political bickering and political legislation and political oratory, and I do not want that to be brought about. I want to finish what we can finish and adjourn the Congress, and I have tried my best to cooperate with the leaders on the other side to bring about an adjournment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would permit me to say that the House committee started holding their hearings on the long-range program before the Senate committee began. We had a joint hearing of the committees to hear the Secretary of Agriculture. The House has held more hearings than the Senate, and admittedly they may not have been as fruitful.

Mr. BARKLEY. Be that as it may, this is Thursday before the contemplated adjournment on Saturday. They have not reported any proposed legislation of this character, and I am advised they will not do so; but that is not our responsibility.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The situation is most regrettable. I frankly say to the senior Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from Kentucky that I have a great respect and admiration for both of them. My reason for asking to be recognized now is not on the basis of criticism. The Senators could offer the amendment, and if they succeeded in having it adopted it would show they had more friends than those of us who opposed the amendment had. I desire to refer to the question now in order that Senators may understand how thoroughly the committee went into the study of the entire subject, and into the development of the thoughts embodied in this particular long-range agricultural bill. The committee held hearings all over the Nation, and came forth with recommendations which are embodied in the bill, as they got them from the producer groups of the Nation.

In order that the senior Senator from Kentucky may fully appreciate how much thought we gave to the matter and how we attempted to be fair in every sense in dealing with all the price structures—and that is why I say it is regrettable that Senators must in a way break it up into little pieces and have special prices in the parity formula for certain commodities, I should like to say to him that if we had wanted to be technical we could have raised the question for the dairy producer in this same manner: During the war years the Congress, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and the marketing organization of the Department of Agriculture agreed that, in order to keep the price of different products down so that the consumer would not have to pay excessive prices, they would pay to the producer a daily feed subsidy payment. They also paid to the processor a subsidy payment. That held the price of milk down to the producer. When we commenced to figure parity, none of us quarreled about having subsidy prices included. We said, "We will take what the producer actually receives per hundred pounds for milk and per pound for butterfat," and if we had wanted to be technical and had asked for special consideration to firm up the price to the producer by use of the subsidy, we would have found that in the case of milk the parity price in the formula would have been, without subsidies figured in, $4.12; with subsidies figured in, $4.35. That would have made a difference of 23 cents higher per hundred pounds.

On butterfat, without subsidies figured in, it would have been 65.2 cents; with subsidies figured in, 69.7 cents; a difference of 4.5 cents per pound of butterfat.

We did not argue the fact that a subsidy had been given the producer. We might have said it was a subsidy to the consumer, rather than to the producer. We took it on the basis of what the farmer had received. That is why it is so regrettable, to me, to see ourselves involved in an argument which might well destroy the chances of the passage of the bill. Furthermore, it gives an opportunity to another group to say, "Give me a special privilege, because you recognized the tobacco people and gave them a special privilege in parity insofar as their commodity is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not care to consume the time of the Senate in arguing and rearguing the merits of the amendment which has been offered. In all our legislation on agriculture we have placed tobacco in a special category because it occupied a special situation. But I shall not go into that. What I want to refute is the idea that because we have adopted one amendment, in the exercise of our judgment, with reference to a product which contributed before the war one-eighth of the entire revenue of the Government, we have destroyed agricultural legislation. There is no excuse for any such red herring to be drawn across the fabric of this legislation because we have adopted one amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to make a brief observation to the able Senator from Vermont who is in charge of the bill, if I may have his attention. I am sure the Senator is conversant with the old adage which says "Whom the gods destroy they first make mad." I am sure the distinguished Senator from Vermont will not succeed in the persuasion of his colleagues as to the merits of his bill by rebuking and reproving those who may happen to vote a certain way. If the able Senator so departs from his usually genial manner of persuasive arguments as to follow that false policy, I think he will share the responsibility for the ill fate which may overtake the measure which he is sponsoring.

Mr. President, we voted a short time ago. I was not aware that it was customary in the Senate for Senators to have to explain to their colleagues the discretion which they employed upon the Senate floor. So far as concerns the advice which was given by the able Senator from Vermont to my colleague and to me, that we would have to explain to our people, I will say that it has been customary for Senators to explain to their own people, but not to feel the necessity of explaining to others. We felt in this matter that there was a justifiable distinction for this particular amendment. We consulted about it, we

thought about it, and we considered the small number of buyers. We were debating a few moments ago the limited market which exists, with almost the power of conspiracy that the few purchasers have over the market, and I felt justified, on account of the peculiar facts pertaining to the matter, in voting for the amendment offered by the able Senators from Kentucky. If I do not err, I think almost every Senator from the tobacco area voted the same way, certainly with no ill will, and, in my case, certainly with no indisposition toward the final passage of the bill itself.

I want to say to my distinguished colleague that I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it is my intention generally to support the bill. I do not intend to support the substitute. But the Senator must make it plain, in my humble judgment, what the bill does, and the strength and merit of it, and by his persuasion and by his argument convince his colleagues, rather than to attempt to intimidate them by his rebuke and stern reproval, which are so out of character with the genial and able Senator from Vermont. I am sure his offense will not be repeated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. He has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have the highest regard and respect for the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and I speak only out of respect for my friend and colleague the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

I have stated repeatedly that I intended to support the pending bill. Before I offered the amendment for myself and my colleague, I notified the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and several of the members of that committee, of my intended action. Last night it was announced that the amendment would be the pending business today and that I would discuss its provisions at 11 o'clock, and ample notice and opportunity was given every Member to study its provisions.

Today, upon the commencement of debate I admitted, as my colleague from Kentucky later admitted, that the amendment did give special consideration to tobacco with respect to support price. In our arguments we presented the reasons which we believed justified its adoption and I can say that we presented the arguments against it. Every Member had an opportunity to make a decision upon the amendment. I can say for myself, and I know I would have the confirmation of other Senators on this side of the aisle, that I did not urge anyone of the majority to vote for the amendment, other than upon its merits. I am sure that those who voted for it did so upon the basis of their conviction as to its merits.

During the course of the debate I said that I would vote for the farm bill so ably advocated by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and I intend to vote for it. I agree with my colleague from Kentucky that the amendment which we presented does not affect adversely the bill. It is fair in its terms, because it deals with a special problem. If the majority—and I speak to my own side—vote for the farm bill, it will be passed. We cannot shift the responsibility to the minority. If we want to vote for the farm bill, we will vote for it, and it will pass.

I simply make this statement out of respect and affection for my colleague and in justice to all of those who supported the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to thank my colleague. I have said all I want to say except that I hope other Senators will not be frightened by the fear which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has sought to inject into their hearts by the adoption of one amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to state for the RECORD the changes in the parity of different types of tobacco which the present law provides and which the present bill would provide. It would increase the parity price of burley and flue-cured tobacco between 3½ and 5 cents a pound. I leave that latitude because the figures I have are for March 15.

It would increase the parity price of Maryland type 32 tobacco approximately 19 cents a pound.

It would increase the parity price of Pennsylvania seed-leaf tobacco approximately 3.6 cents a pound.

It would increase the parity price of Connecticut wrapper tobacco from 98.9 cents a pound to $1.63 a pound, which is almost 60 or 70 percent.

The reason for the lesser change in the flue-cured and burley tobaccos is that some years ago the flue-cured and burley tobacco growers came to Congress and secured a different base period. In S. 2318 we offer a proposal to put tobacco parity prices in the order in which they should be, namely, a slight increase of approximately 10 percent for burley and flue-cured tobacco, an increase of approximately 40 percent for Maryland tobacco, and an increase of 60 to 70 percent for the northern Connecticut-type wrapper tobacco.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Vermont, is it correct or not that the Maryland tobacco farmers have not heretofore shared in any support program?

Mr. AIKEN. The Maryland tobacco farmers' support prices and parity prices have been completely out of line with burley and flue-cured.

Mr. TYDINGS. That was not my question.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether they have ever shared in the support program.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator will find that the Maryland tobacco farmers have not come in under the support program, which has been in effect for a long time, and they are asking for it now only because it has become the settled policy of the country. The point is that they have "taken it on the chin" when times are bad and shared in the prosperity of the country when times were good. This is the first time they have ever been in the support program, so far as I know. I wish to bring out that, therefore, there could not be any decrease in their benefits, because heretofore they have not had any.

Mr. AIKEN. I would say that I think one reason why they have not shared in the support price is because of the inequitable parity price which they have received.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; they asked particularly, when this program was first initiated, to be excluded rather than included under it.

Mr. AIKEN. Then they probably will not be very happy now to get 10 or 12 cents a pound less support than they would under Senate bill 2318.

Mr. TYDINGS. This year, I understand, the price was so low that with the rest of the country receiving the benefits of support prices, they feel they must come in as a matter of self-defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted en bloc by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate that the distinguished Senator from Vermont has labored long and ably upon the pending bill. I appreciate that his desire has imbued him with such confidence in the bill, including all its provisions, that he very probably is acting under his own convictions when he insists upon the Senate passing his bill without dotting any "i's" or crossing any "t's," but I say respectfully to the Senator from Vermont, if he will be kind enough to give attention to what I am saying now, that in my humble judgment he far transcends the bounds of ethics and of proper conduct on the floor of the Senate when he questions the sincerity of conviction and the reliance upon their conscientious convictions of Senators who happen to differ with him and with his judgment upon one phase of the bill.

It so happens, Mr. President, that I am strongly in support of the bill in general. I so advised the distinguished Senator from Vermont only this morning. That did not indicate by any means that I did surrender or that I should surrender my convictions upon every aspect of the bill, and upon each and every amendment which might be proposed to it.

I wish to say briefly to the Senator from Vermont that I have no feeling because of his accusations, because I suspect he has been led astray by his zeal. I join in the expressions given by my able colleague to the effect that the statements by the Senator from Vermont are entirely out of character. I have never heard him heretofore question the good faith or the soundness of conscience of any of his colleagues.

Be that as it may, let me say that in my judgment this bill itself makes distinctions between various branches of agriculture which existed in the judgment

of the committee or a majority of the committee, and which I think are justified. For instance, it makes distinction between basic commodities and nonbasic commodities, and it proceeds to accord different treatment to them. Likewise it makes distinctions between certain other commodities and the wool which was mentioned a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. It makes distinctions between other nonbasic commodities and a certain agricultural commodity, potatoes, covered by an amendment which has been accepted by the committee.

If there are Senators present who, because of their experience, feel that there is yet another distinction which should be made, and stand up here to be counted in order that that distinction may be made in the bill, it is the humble opinion of the junior Senator from Florida that they should not be questioned for the soundness of their conviction merely because they state it and support it by their votes upon the floor of the Senate.

I join my able colleague in saying that, so far as he and I are concerned, we are quite willing to make our report and to render our account to our own constituents whom we represent. But let me say that while we are making our report and rendering our account to that large number of our constituents who happen to be producers of citrus fruit, I think we will be able to say to that considerable number of our people who produce tobacco that we have stood up for them, and for what we regard as their rights, and for equitable treatment for them, just as we have stood up for the larger group who happen to represent the great and growing citrus industry in the State of Florida.

So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, he was born under an orange tree, he has always represented the citrus fruit producers of his State, he represented them in the city of Washington on citrus matters before he became chief executive of his State, the citrus industry has been his first love and major love in agriculture, and he has been very happy to note the treatment accorded to growers of citrus fruit in this bill. He is supporting the bill, and is supporting the treatment which is accorded them under the provisions of the bill.

Notwithstanding that is the fact, he feels that he also owes a duty to those in his State, and to the people elsewhere in the United States, who produce another agricultural commodity, namely, tobacco, and when in his experience and in his judgment he feels they are entitled to the treatment which is proposed by an amendment, he has the right to support that amendment without having his judgment questioned and the sincerity of his convictions assailed by another Senator who knows far less about the tobacco industry than do the Senators from the States where tobacco is produced.

Insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, let me say to the Senator from Vermont that but a few months ago, in common with other Senators from the tobacco belt, I learned of a distressing incident, showing the strangle-hold which a relatively small number of buyers, representing the processors of tobacco, have upon the growers who produce tobacco. In a little town in our State, Jasper, in Hamilton County, there was organized a new market, with the approval of the United States Department of Agriculture, which had placed in that market graders to serve it. It was understood that there would be an adequate number of buyers there, but the buyers chose not to be there, and after a few days' operation, as my distinguished colleague will recall, we were advised that, not because that county had not produced a large volume of tobacco, much more than enough to support a market, not because the United State Department of Agriculture had not sent its graders there, because it had, but merely because the tobacco companies of the United States and elsewhere who have buyers at the markets saw fit, in their sole judgment, not to allow their buyers to come there, that market was closed, and the growers of that community were put to great expense, and a near disaster was visited upon them.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I wish to speak with complete approval of the position taken by both of the distinguished Senators from Kentucky in differentiating the tobacco industry from any other agricultural industry of which I know. Not only is the reference to the buyer situation, which was so ably portrayed by both the distinguished Kentucky Senators, accurate, but their statement on the question of the nonfluctuating volume of tobacco produced is likewise accurate. Under the law now in effect the acreage which is planted to tobacco is controlled under a quota system which has been approved by the growers by an overwhelming percentage, and under which no grower who fails to keep within his quota under his allotment of acreage can have his tobacco supported by the price support system set up by the United States Government. There is not any large fluctuation, therefore, in the amount produced.

I fully and entirely agree with the conclusions stated by the junior and the senior Senators from Kentucky that that situation, bringing about as it does a more or less level production of tobacco, has to be differentiated very greatly from that of other agricultural industries.

Let us take the case of the citrus industry, in which the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and myself are particularly interested, and which I think is equally a cause for concern to the Senators from Texas, from Arizona, from California, and perhaps from other States. Let me remind the distinguished Senator from Vermont that when we are talking about citrus we are talking about a crop which is produced on trees that were planted before the Senator was born, before any of us here in this body were born, because there are citrus trees in the Mediterranean area, for instance, now yielding fruit, which are over 500 years old. There are citrus trees in a grove belonging to my family, planted by my father with his own hands in 1881, and they are yielding more now than they have ever yielded at any time since they were planted. It is simply idle to talk about comparing production of trees like that, and on unlimited acreage, with production in an industry where the annual acreage quota is parceled out, man to man and farm to farm, in all the producing areas.

I am going to close in a moment. I want to say to the Senator from Vermont that I resent with all my being his charge that Senators who do not happen to agree with him are not following the convictions of their own consciences. So far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, if he had not taken this position, if he had not voted for what he thought was equity for his tobacco producers, he could not have followed the Senator from Vermont in his support of the bill as against the substitute measure, the House measure, which I understand is to be presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], because in the judgment of the junior Senator from Florida it is so manifestly clear that unless there is a firm price-support system, not a fluctuating one, in the tobacco field, the tobacco growers are the ones who are going to suffer, and suffer badly. I, for one, without questioning the judgment of the Senator from Vermont and all who agree with him, merely want to say that I do not believe they have sufficiently considered the differences between the tobacco industry and these other great agricultural industries which are covered and protected by the bill.

So far as I am concerned, I would vote for the substitute measure, much as I want this bill and strongly as I will support it, rather than to see a relatively small but important group, so far as our State is concerned, mistreated and placed in such a situation that they can be hurt from year to year and at any time by the machinations of a group of buyers not constituting more in number than the fingers of my two hands.

So, Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Vermont will realize that he has been led too far by his zeal, and will offer apology, as he should, to those whose judgment happens to differ from his, and who have stood up for what they thought was right, and who should not be questioned as to the soundness or sincerity of their convictions by the Senator from Vermont or by anyone else on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I want to say just a word in support of the position taken by the Senator from Vermont, that special amendments like the one just adopted will kill the bill. The whole theory of the long-range farm bill is to get back to a stable peacetime support program, and away from the Steagall Act which provided for wartime supports to encourage great production in the long-range bill.

In the case of corn the support levels are reduced from $1.60 to $1.42 a bushel. In the case of wheat the support levels are reduced from $2.21 to $1.82 a bushel, a drop of 39 cents a bushel. I have accepted this lowered support on the theory that a farmer would much rather

have a permanent support on a fair level rather than high levels for 1 year and probably in the end have no supports at all.

Whenever a crop such as tobacco is singled out for special support higher than other commodities in peacetime, and then lower the supports of all other products of the great Middle West, then I for one will have to vote against this bill and in favor of the House bill if amended. I will not vote to provide special legislation for one agricultural commodity as against all the others.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say in regard to the remarks of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that the Senator from Vermont at no time intended to question the motives of any Senator across the aisle, nor does he question the right of any Senator on either side of the aisle to vote as he thinks he ought to on any question. I was simply making a statement of fact; that is, that the vote to give special legislation to one agricultural commodity in the proposed agricultural program is a vote to start tearing down the entire program itself.

I also wanted to point out to the producers of every State what the effect would be of doing away with Senate bill 2318 and the provisions it contains. I wanted to point out to the citrus growers of Florida that, if that bill is killed and they have to operate only under the stopgap bill, they are going to get only the support they have received this year, which has been totally inadequate, and they will not be able to take advantage of the greatly increased support which Senate bill 2318 would have given to the citrus and the apple growers.

I desire to make one more statement of a fact of which I assume the Senator from Florida was not aware when he voted. If S. 2318 is defeated as a result of the adoption of this amendment, then the level of support to the tobacco growers of Florida and every other State will be lower than it would be under S. 2318. I have already pointed out that Senate bill 2318 provides an increase in the parity price of all types of tobacco, varying from about 10 percent in the case of burley and flue-cured tobacco, up to something like 60 percent in the case of Connecticut seed-leaf tobacco.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I was very sorry to see the political aspects of this vote, only three Members on the Democratic side voting to sustain the committee's position on the long-range program, and only three or four on the Republican side voting against it. We have tried our best to keep this long-range agricultural program out of politics, and we have been successful up to now. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is now on his feet, will agree that at no time has politics entered into the writing of the bill. It is unfortunate that it should creep in at this time. But if it must be a political issue, thank God I am on the right side of it. If the Democrats want to kill the long-range agricultural program, I do not know any reason why any farmer should vote the Democratic ticket this fall. I noticed the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] voting for this amendment, which, if carried further, can only spell disaster to the wool growers of his State. I noticed the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] voting against the amendment and for his sheep growers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am intensely interested in this bill, as the Senator well knows. I am certainly interested in building a long-range agricultural program which will be acceptable to the farmers and the voters of the country.

I should like to know from the Senator what the impact of the amendment which has been adopted will be in relation to the farmers of my section so far as concerns partity prices on corn, wheat, or any other product which is raised. What will be the impact of the amendment upon those commodities?

Mr. AIKEN. When special advantages are given to one commodity, they must necessarily be taken from some other. The wheat growers and corn growers of the Senator's State never have protested in the least against this bill, which reduces the parity prices of their products.

If there is any commodity to which the bill gives special advantages, it is tobacco. I have explained the reason why. The tobacco grower is at the mercy of foreign government monopolies, which can break his prices unless we fix a floor below which they cannot go. So in the bill we have given what amounts to 90 percent parity to the tobacco growers of the country for an indefinite time. That means 90 percent of parity figured according to the present parity formula, or as good support as they are getting now. By the terms of the bill we would give much better support to Maryland tobacco and to the cigar-type tobacco than they now receive.

Mr. WHERRY. If the amendment remains in the bill, a special parity will be granted to tobacco which does not proportionately go to the producers of any other commodities, such as corn and wheat.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. Special additional advantages are given to the one commodity which had the greatest advantage given any commodity in Senate bill 2318.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the amendment which my colleague and I offered, and which the Senate adopted, reduces the parity price for tobacco below what is carried in the bill, how could that possibly affect any other commodity in the United States agricultural picture?

Mr. AIKEN. This is only a start.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, it is not a start.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not unaware of the purposes which exists in the breasts of some in this country to destroy the long-range farm bill. It can be done by one means or another.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator accusing me of trying to do that?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not; but the surest way to destroy any program is to start giving special privileges to this commodity, that commodity, and the other commodity simply because there are votes enough to do it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that statement is totally unfair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are on the regular order. The unfinished business is the agricultural bill. The Senator from Vermont has the floor, and he can yield to whomever he pleases, for any question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is protecting the right of the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The only reason I demanded the regular order was that I wanted to determine to whom the Senator from Vermont would yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the regular order is Senate bill 2318, the long-range farm program bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry if I disturbed my good friend from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I wish to make one observation which I think is pertinent to the colloquy which is in progress. I believe that anyone who understands the bill must agree with the proposition that in the event the bill should be passed as is, with the amendment which was offered by the able Senators from Kentucky, tobacco would receive preferential treatment. Anyone who does not agree with that simply does not understand the bill. There can be no question about it. I am assuming, of course, that no other commodities will come in for preferential treatment, and that the same mandatory 90-percent parity will not be demanded for other commodities.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, let me pay a tribute to the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY]. He has done a great job in behalf of the tobacco amendment. I seriously doubt that my good friend from Kentucky realizes what has been done by the adoption of this amendment. I say that with the utmost sincerity.

It so happens that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Illinois were members of the subcommittee which helped to write the bill. We went all over the country and held hearings. We tried to keep the issue as nonpartisan as possible, and we succeeded. Yet, strange as it may seem,

we were the only three members on this side who voted against the amendment.

I did so knowing that once we permit one commodity to have preferential treatment under the bill, as has been done in the case of tobacco, then there is no reason why I should not offer an amendment to give the corn producers of my State the same kind of treatment. There is no reason why the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] should not offer an amendment to do the same for the wheat producers of his State. So we shall go down the line of basic and nonbasic commodities, and give them all preferential treatment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What was it that happened yesterday with respect to potatoes? Something was done in regard to potatoes, putting them in a special classification. Some preference, priority, or favor was granted in the case of potatoes. I do not know just what it was, but it seems to have affected the situation so far as the author of the substitute is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Vermont can explain what happened to potatoes, if anything. I was not in the Chamber at the time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether it happened on the floor or not.

Mr. LUCAS. I am speaking now about a basic commodity which has been under the Agricultural Adjustment Act from the very beginning, namely, tobacco. The corn producers and the wheat producers have taken a terrific lacing in this bill, so far as the reduction of parity is concerned. However, I believe that the farmers in my section have vision enough to look far down the road on this agricultural program. They are attempting to get a stable program. We know that prices cannot continue high forever. What we shall do, if we are not careful, is to fool around and get no program at all—not even a continuation of the support prices they have had. That is what some folks want. I do not refer to the Senator from Kentucky, but there are some who want to kill the farm program and go back to 1938, or even farther back than that, if they can. I undertake to say that this attempt on the part of the Senator from Vermont and others who worked for months on the farm bill with the Department of Agriculture and with all segments of agriculture and other interested groups in this country represents a pretty good approach to a long-range farm program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the hard work and the sincere effort devoted to the solution of this problem by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator does.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have great respect for that committee, and I have been sympathetic with it. The tobacco grower has occupied a special situation in the Agricultural Adjustment Act all along.

Mr. LUCAS. Not on the question of parity.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was given a different base period, because of the conditions which exist in the tobacco industry.

Mr. LUCAS. He was entitled to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the bill was originally introduced, it was utterly impossible for tobacco to live on an equitable basis under it. The tobacco growers from all over the country came to Washington and went before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and asked for five changes in the provisions of the bill as originally introduced by the Senator from Vermont. Three of those changes were made. Two of the changes were not made. Now because my colleague and I have submitted an amendment asking for a fourth change, which was requested by the tobacco growers, are we to be castigated and accused of not knowing what we are doing, simply because we have asked for what the tobacco growers have asked for? They know more about what they need than anyone else does. Because we in the Senate vote to adopt as a part of the bill what the tobacco growers ask for, I do not think we should be held up to contumely and ridicule for doing what they ask for. We are trying to represent them in a fair way.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not castigating the Senator from Kentucky, and I do not expect to do so. I complimented him.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said I did not know what I was doing.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I said the Senator did not know what he was doing if he contends that tobacco has no preferential treatment, providing the bill is adopted as is, with the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it would seem that the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont do not agree. The Senator from Illinois says we have given tobacco special treatment by this amendment. The Senator from Vermont says that we have injured tobacco by the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me repeat that it is impossible to take a basic commodity such as tobacco and make it mandatory that it shall receive 90 percent of parity, regardless of how much is produced, and then say that corn and wheat shall receive from 60 percent to 90 percent of parity, depending on the amounts that are produced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator does not contend that the parity price of tobacco will have the slightest effect on corn or wheat.

Mr. LUCAS. No; but that is not the point. The Senator does not want to reach the point, it seems.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Illinois mean that after we adopt the tobacco amendment, we have to adopt amendments for corn and wheat?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. That does not follow.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what will follow. Now that tobacco is to have 90 percent of parity, it will be only fair to provide 90 percent of parity for corn and wheat, which is exactly what is provided under the Steagall amendment. Under it there is provision for practically 90 percent of parity for all basic commodities—and now that must be done under this bill, once the tobacco amendment has been adopted, if Senators wish to be fair. But if we make such a provision in this bill for all basic commodities, then we go back to the arrangement to which the Senator does not want to go.

I do not want to destroy the long-range farm program, but under the circumstances that will be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is perhaps a waste of time to talk further about what we have done, but it seems that other Senators are not willing to drop the subject. So I say that all we are doing is what has been done all along with respect to tobacco, because tobacco occupies a special situation which is not recognized in this bill without the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. In the bill we recognize tobacco as being a commodity which needs special treatment. As the Senator has ably pointed out, tobacco gets a better deal under this bill. But I do not seem to be able to make myself understood.

I am saying that when one commodity is set aside and treated specially, and when the producers of that commodity are told, "We will give you 90 percent of parity, and we will guarantee it to you," but when the wheat growers and corn growers and the producers of other basic commodities and the producers of nonbasic commodities are told that they will not get that much, but will get a lower support price, depending on the amount of the commodity produced and the amount of the carry-over, then it is obvious that equal treatment is not provided. Certainly I cannot see that it is. If it is, then my name is not SCOTT LUCAS.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say with respect to the amendment just adopted that the amendment guarantees the tobacco grower 90 percent forever or for as long as the amendment remains on the statute books. Senate bill 2318 guarantees tobacco, in a sense, preferential treatment which would amount to a slightly higher support level for the next 2 or 3 years than the support level which will be available to tobacco growers under the present support-price program. However, there is no knowledge but what that might drop in future years. The Senator from Kentucky wants tobacco to be guaranteed 90 percent of parity forever. Certainly that is unfair to the producers of other commodities.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky realize—inasmuch as I think he said he was not familiar with the potato amendment—that what the potato producers asked for was to be put in the 60-to-90-percent-of-parity class. So there was no discrimination at all in their favor. They are to have only the same provision that the producers of wheat, corn, and so forth will have.

Mr. BARKLEY. What was the status of the potato growers until that provision was adopted?

Mr. BREWSTER. They had been outside the provision allowing from 60 percent to 90 percent of parity; they had been under the Steagall amendment provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose they wished to get 90 percent of parity.

Mr. BREWSTER. The potato producers had it all the time, under the Steagall amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. But that was to expire, I believe.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, on December 30.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think I have no more to say, except to stand by what I have said: namely, that the amendment just adopted is harmful, and may mean the destruction of the long-range farm program. If the program is destroyed, those responsible for destroying it should be held accountable for their actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the two amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, which are to be considered en bloc.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished and affable Senator from Vermont has twice honored me this afternoon with a reference to me in the castigation he has delivered against those who did not agree with him upon the last amendment. I hope he will not be angry with me throughout the day. I hope his sentiments will not last out the day, if indeed they last through the day.

It seems to me that the debate we have listened to since the vote on the motion to lay on the table was taken is a demonstration of the correctness of the rules of procedure in the Senate. I should like to read to the Senator from Vermont the rule which I think he has slightly, at least, violated today.

Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont spoke with such virility and in such a tone of voice that all of us listened to him. I know that I am not in the passion he was in, but I hope he will accord me the courtesy of listening to me now.

I was pointing out to the Senator from Vermont that when he delivered his rebuke to the Members of this body who voted to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the tobacco amendment was adopted, he was speaking in such a timbre of voice that everyone here listened to him, and I hope he will listen to me for just a moment while I say to him that I believe the debate which has taken place here illustrates the sound judgment of those who wrote the rules of debate under which the Senate is supposed to proceed. I doubt very much whether the Senator from Vermont had this rule in mind when he accused those of us who voted with the Senators from Kentucky of voting against our consciences.

This is the rule of debate, and is a part of rule XIX:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that when he said, as he did upon this floor a few moments ago, that those of us who voted in support of the motion of the Senators from Kentucky were voting against our consciences and for purely political motives, he was violating that rule. I forgive the Senator that violation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator, just when did the Senator from Vermont say the Senator from Wyoming was voting against his conscience?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator in his statement—and the RECORD would show it I am sure—was speaking in such fashion that he probably does not remember his words now.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wyoming remember them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator designates those who voted this way as having voted from mere political motives and against convictions.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont accused the senior Senator from Wyoming twice of having voted against the wool growers of Wyoming.

Mr. AIKEN. I think he voted against their interests.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is entitled to that opinion, but the RECORD shows the vote that was cast was a vote on a tobacco amendment. That can be a vote against the wool growers or against the growers of any other commodity, only if the Senator from Vermont intends to attempt to punish Senators who did not agree with him.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wyoming contend that when all but three Democrats vote on one side of a question and all but three Republicans vote on the other side, the question is wholly nonpolitical?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator I can never judge what the political motives of Senators may be on a divided vote.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is very astute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very generous. I am merely expressing the hope the Senator's anger will not last out the day. I am pointing out to him that in all legislation, a vote in favor of one agricultural commodity is not a vote against another, unless the Senator in charge of the bill feels so deeply about it that he will attempt to punish the growers of another commodity because of the vote the Senate has cast, evidently not in the manner he desired.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what the Senator from Wyoming means by punishment, but if the bill is defeated by a vote of all but three of the Democrats, the Senator from Vermont will do everything within his power to defeat the election of a Democratic administration this fall. If that is punishment, the Senator will have to make the most of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Vermont intend to do that, anyway?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Vermont my belief is, regardless of what may be the decision of the Congress upon the pending bill, and regardless of the vote of any Democratic Member of this body upon the bill, the Senator from Vermont will be supporting the Republican ticket. I certainly do not cast my vote here upon the bill or upon any amendment to it in the hope of inducing the Senator from Vermont to support the Democratic ticket.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course the nonpolitical attitude of the Senator from Wyoming is well known. I am sure nobody in the country would accuse him of being politically minded. I certainly do not accuse him of casting his vote from political motives. I am sure he voted according to the dictates of his conscience, just as did the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Oklahoma, and the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. There must be consciences enough to go around on the other side of the aisle. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad the Senator has finally made that acknowledgment. As I say, I hope he will not continue to hold his resentment against us to such an extent that he will vote against another commodity should an amendment be offered by one of those who did not vote with him.

Of course, I have no reason for giving any explanation whatever for any vote I may cast here to any other Member of the body. I am content to make my explanations of my votes to my own constituents. But I may say to the Senator from Vermont, that on numerous occasions he has indicated his belief in certain economic principles in which I also believe. The Senator has indicated on numerous occasions that he is an opponent of monopolies and restraints of trade and the great concentration of economic power which has made it necessary for us to have farm legislation. The Senator from Vermont knows very well that the industrial powers of this country have, on occasion after occasion, in year after year, denied to the agricultural group the equal break to which they are entitled. I am ready to compliment the Senator from Vermont here or anywhere and every day for the great fight he is making on behalf of agriculture, but I am sure he knows, as I know, there is probably no agricultural commodity produced in the United States which is more the victim of monopolistic control than is tobacco. I may add my explanation to the Senator, though I need not make it, that I voted with the Senator from Kentucky because I believed the tobacco processors have a stranglehold upon that agricultural product.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe the tobacco processors can keep a stranglehold upon the tobacco growers under the provisions of Senate bill 2318? Does he believe the bill treats the tobacco growers unfairly?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, not at all; I did not say so.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator voted against its provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quarreling with us because some of us

voted against what he is pleased to call special treatment for tobacco. I justify my vote to the Senator and to anybody else who may be interested, upon the ground that I believe the situation is such that the tobacco growers are entitled to the consideration given in the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should merely like to make this comment: The Senator from Arizona does not come from a tobacco-growing State, nor does the junior Senator from Arizona use tobacco. Therefore, the junior Senator from Arizona was not trying to get a smoke out of the vote. But I may say that the votes of some of us have created more smoke than I have seen created by tobacco for a long time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am content to say that the process of legislation is always a process of give and take, and eventually of compromise. Nobody ever gets what he would like to get, particularly upon a difficult and detailed bill, such as the one under consideration, which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I want to make it clear to the acting chairman of the committee and to all the members of the committee who have participated in the work upon the pending measure that I am appreciative of the labors they have performed. I hope their work will be crowned with success. I shall vote to support the bill, but I hope that the members of the committee will not adopt a defeatist attitude and act as though the adoption of a single amendment by a majority vote of the Senate will result in killing the legislation. It need not kill it. One vote upon one amendment will not decide the fate of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], which are being considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let us now test the issue. I offer the following amendment:

On page 81, line 8, I propose to insert, after the word "pounds" and before the period the words "of shorn wool."

That is a simple amendment intended to make it clear, which I think it was intended to be, that the 360,000,000 pounds of wool referred to in subparagraph (c) of section 302 is shorn wool. Wool is a commodity the production of which in the United States historically has been far less than the consumption. In only one year in the entire recent history of this industry has the United States produced more wool than it has consumed. That was in the depth of the depression.

The average percentage of domestic production of the amount consumed in the United States is less than 50 percent. In recent years the production of wool has been steadily declining, but the basis for wool was established in a year when the price of wool was the lowest in its history, and the result has been that, although the average price of all agricultural commodities has increased 146.9 percent, the price of wool has increased only 12.1 percent.

There are two types of wool—shorn wool and pulled wool. Pulled wool is only a comparatively small part of the total.

The average production of wool has been approximately 400,000,000 pounds. In 1932 it was 442,000,000 pounds. In 1933 it was 438,000,000 pounds. In 1936 it was 419,000,000 pounds. In 1940 it went up to 434,000,000 pounds. It fell off in 1947 to 310,000,000 pounds.

So that, as a matter of making an adjustment to fit the facts, I am urging this amendment so it will be made sure that the purpose of the bill is to support the price of wool at not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of its parity price of January 1, so as to maintain an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool, which is less than 33⅓ percent of the entire consumption of wool in the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, may I add to the words of my colleague and point out what I think is very important, that while the production of wool in the United States has decreased, the consumption has increased to a very great extent. At the time the production of wool in the United States was 450,000,000 pounds, which was referred to by my colleague, consumption was approximately 600,000,000 pounds, making it necessary to import approximately 150,000,000 pounds. During the war the consumption of wool increased to more than 1,000,000,000 pounds. While it was anticipated that that increase would drop with the end of hostilities, that has not proved to be the case. As a matter of fact, the consumption of wool today in the United States is approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds, and production is probably not more than 300,000,000 pounds. Anticipating the importation of approximately 700,000,000 pounds of wool each year, it is very necessary that the domestic wool grower should be given every possible encouragement on a long-term basis to bring the production up at least to what it was some years ago, when it reached the figure of 450,000,000 pounds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have a table which shows the production of wool on a grease basis, the consumption, and the percentage that the domestic production is of the total consumption for the years 1918 to 1947. This table bears out what the Senator has just stated, that consumption has been increasing in the United States. For example, in 1934 the consumption in the United States was 381,400,000 pounds. That was the only year in the whole period when production exceeded consumption, which was in the depression period. Since that time consumption has been gradually rising, until in 1941, for the first time, it exceeded 1,000,000,000 pounds. The record in 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 has been well over 1,000,000,000 pounds.

I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wool shorn and wool pulled from domestic fleeces in the United States, and the annual mill consumption of apparel shorn and pulled wools, 1918–47

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Production (grease basis)	Consumption (apparel class) grease basis	Percent domestic production is of total consumption
1918	296.0	676.0	43.8
1919	318.4	563.7	56.5
1920	293.8	510.9	57.5
1921	290.2	597.4	48.6
1922	270.4	640.4	42.2
1923	272.7	603.1	45.2
1924	282.0	518.0	54.4
1925	300.0	525.2	57.1
1926	318.9	524.1	60.8
1927	339.5	551.1	61.6
1928	366.7	511.9	71.6
1929	382.3	554.7	68.9
1930	414.0	447.9	92.4
1931	442.4	545.2	81.1
1932	418.1	439.8	95.0
1933	438.4	572.2	76.6
1934	429.4	381.4	112.6
1935	427.5	748.4	57.1
1936	[1]419.4	666.4	62.9
1937	[1]422.3	579.5	72.9
1938	[1]424.4	514.0	82.6
1939	[1]426.2	673.8	63.2
1940	[1]434.0	683.3	63.5
1941	[1]453.3	1,011.8	44.8
1942	[1]455.0	1,101.6	41.3
1943	[1]444.0	1,134.3	39.1
1944	[1]411.8	1,055.9	39.0
1945	[1]378.4	1,057.9	35.8
1946	[1]341.7	1,122.5	30.4
1947 [2]	310.1	915.0	33.9

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary, estimated.
Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say in regard to wool and the amendment which has been offered, that the committee considered that the wool situation, not only in the United States, but in the entire world, is approaching the crisis stage. There is an acute and growing shortage. Production in the United States has been constantly dropping, until last year it dropped to approximately 308,000,000 pounds of both pulled and shorn wool. The indications are—and the Senators from Wyoming will correct me if I am wrong—that it will drop below that figure this year. The committee felt that encouragement should be given to the wool industry, in the interests of national security. Not only did the growers advocate it, but representatives of the wool trade appeared this year with the growers and advocated a substantial support level for the price of wool. The committee felt, in choosing 360,000,000 pounds as the amount which should be produced in this country, we were taking a 10-year average production, and it appears to the committee that it will take several years to reach that total production.

In the bill the Secretary is instructed to support the price of wool at such level as will encourage production of 360,000,000 pounds. Inasmuch as the production at present is only 300,000,000 pounds, it would appear necessary to guarantee a

90-percent support price in order to approach that amount of wool production, even over a period of several years. We felt we were generous. If we had felt that 400,000,000 pounds should be the goal, we would have put it in, but we realized that the question of production exceeding 300,000,00 pounds would not arise for many years.

In regard to the stopgap bill which has been passed by the House, so far as I can see, it affords no lasting protection to the wool grower. It extends the present support price of 42.6 cents a pound until June 30, 1950. Senate bill 2318 would result in a support level of something over 46 cents a pound,, which would probably increase about 2 cents for next year.

What I wish to point out is that the House extends the present support level on wool until June 30, 1950. That means that the support level on wool is extended for 2 years for Texas, Arizona, and Oklahoma wool, because the growers in those States can get the wool to the market by June 30, but the wool produced up in the mountains of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho, would get support for only 1 year, and that would undoubtedly be a year of high prices, when they will not need it, because they cannot get the sheep shorn and the wool to market by the last of June. So, so far as the House bill goes, it is utterly worthless to the wool growers, in my opinion. Perhaps I should not say "utterly worthless," it might conceivably be of benefit to the southern wool growers in the year 1950.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to say that I quite agree that the bill which is now before the Senate is far superior to the mere continuing measure passed by the House, and I certainly hope that it is the bill which will prevail. I believe what the Senator has said is true of the wool growers not only, but of the producers of all agricultural commodities affected by the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Wyoming evidently understands the difference between the two bills very well, and realizes that one gives long-time protection to the wool grower and a long-time support level, and that the other gives practically nothing at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The other would operate just as a stopgap bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I should like to say, in connection with the subject under discussion, namely, the great necessity of a long-range program, that the cause of the reduction in the production of wool over the years from 450,000,000 pounds to less than 300,000,000 this year is that the sheep which grow the wool have been reduced in number from some 51,000,000 to probably around 30,000,000, and it is necessary to have a long-range program to encourage the sheepman, the wool grower, to increase his flocks up to 50,000,000 again in order to get the full production of wool in this country, and in doing so to enable the proper use to be made of the range in the western part of the country for the grazing of sheep.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absense of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarthy	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Cordon	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	White
Feazel	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Flanders	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	
Gurney	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming that the amendment will make no difference in the support price of wool. It simply sets a little higher objective as the ultimate production, which would amount to probably 40,000,000 pounds a year more. Personally I do not find the amendment objectionable. I have no right to speak for the committee, because it has not voted on the amendment, but, so far as I am concerned, it is not an objectionable amendment, and will not result in any increase, or change in fact, in the support level of the price of wool.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives which will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 4435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the administrator, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill. A similar bill is on the Senate Calendar, Order No. 1508, Senate bill 2466. Objection was made to the Senate bill when it was reached on the calendar by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The Senator's objection has been met by the preparation of two amendments which I propose to offer to the House bill. In the interest of expedition of the matter I hope the Senate will pass the House bill with the amendments, and that it may go to conference immediately. I ask for immediate consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, would the Senator from Maine explain what the bill provides?

Mr. BREWSTER. The bill provides for the acquisition of rights in order to permit our airports to function more efficiently. It is a routine bill. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] objected to certain words in the bill, and he and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] have agreed on the language of the amendments which I now offer to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 4, after the word "airspace", it is proposed to insert "immediately adjacent thereto and needed in connection therewith."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 11, after the word "Congress" and before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That in the case of condemnations of easements through or other interests in airspace, in fixing condemnation awards, consideration may be given to the reasonable probable future use of the underlying land."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4435) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 2466 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the good things this Congress has done was to pass the bill creating a National Heart Institute. Congress thereby joined with the millions of Americans who are insisting that an effective attack be launched on heart disease—America's No. 1 killer.

But, Mr. President, the Congress has not yet appropriated the funds needed if the Heart Institute is to become a reality. Unless we do so before adjourning we will be guilty of inadvertently perpetrating a fraud on the public. The people know we have passed the heart bill. They think it means something. Let us be sure, before we adjourn, that it does mean something.

I am confident that my colleagues, the members of the Appropriations Committee, fully intend to take the necessary action to make available such funds as the National Heart Institute can use effectively. I am mentioning the matter merely to preclude any possibility of its being overlooked by reason of the great pressure of work now confronting us and the haste at which we are moving.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to include in the record at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent and pertinent editorial from the New York Times of June 16. And in this connection too I want to inform the Members of the Senate of the results of a just-completed Gallup poll on this subject. I am informed that 80 percent of the American people have indicated that they are willing to pay increased taxes if that is necessary to finance an appropriation of $100,000,000 to fight heart disease. I am sure that the Institute will need but a tenth of that amount. And I am sure that we will want to appropriate it. Let us make sure we do not forget.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY FOR HEART ILLS

Both Houses of Congress have passed a bill which would establish a National Heart Institute to combat diseases of the heart and circulatory system through research, the training of physicians, and other means. Even if the President signs the measure, which harmonizes with his views on social security, we have no more than a declaration of good intentions in the absence of a specific appropriation. Fifteen million dollars is needed at once to do for heart diseases what is now being done for infantile paralysis and cancer. If Congress provides the money before it adjourns 9,000,000 who know that they have heart trouble will soon receive better medical care and the lives of 600,000 graver cases will be extended.

Because they account for most deaths, diseases of the heart should long ago have been more systematically studied than they are. Our negligence must be attributed chiefly to lack of funds. This year the United States Public Health Service can spend less than $1,000,000 on diseases of the heart and the circulatory system, unless Congress comes to the rescue. The Biblical accusation that the life of a sheep is apparently worth more than that of a man seems to be justified when we learn that the Department of Agriculture will spend nearly $30,000,000 this year on animal and plant diseases, and that 10 times more is to be spent on hoof-and-mouth disease in cattle, black spot in chickens, and even thrips on gladiola than on diseases of the human heart.

Assuming that the President will sign the National Heart Institute bill, Congress should provide immediately the $15,000,000 required for research, better hospital facilities (there are only 200 beds for cardiac cases in research clinics and only 909 special beds for cardiac convalescents), and for special courses that physicians wish to take. Less than $3,000,000 in private and Government funds is available, a pathetically inadequate sum when we consider that, as the average age of the population rises there will be more reports of deaths from heart failure, and that 60,000,000, most of whom have slight heart defects of some kind and who are unaware of their condition, may be laid low at any moment. There is no question that the public will approve a congressional appropriation which cannot but promote the physical and economic welfare of nearly a third of the population.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter in behalf of the long-range farm legislation, written to me by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
June 14, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I have been concerned for some time over the long-range farm legislation which has been before the Senate for several months. As you know, I am a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee which drafted this legislation after extensive hearings last fall. The subcommittee, as well as the whole Agriculture Committee, has spent a considerable amount of time in studying this matter. The Aiken bill, S. 2318, is truly a bipartisan attempt to deal with the long-range problems confronting American agriculture.

Since the bill was reported to the Senate last month I have been worried that action would not be taken on it. The late date which we have now reached compels me to beseech you to do everything possible to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. I understand the House of Representatives has already passed stopgap price-support legislation. This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. I feel that now is the time for the Congress to do something about the problems of our farmers. The Senate Agriculture Subcommittee studied this problem very carefully. Testimony was obtained from approximately 300 witnesses in all sections of the United States, as well as from farm leaders and officials of the Department of Agriculture here in Washington. We think we have a good bill. This view is shared by Republicans and Democrats alike. It simply does not seem right to me that this Congress should neglect our farmers, and I do not believe that the problems of American agriculture should become the basis for political bartering in an election year. The whole matter of long-time farm legislation is too vital for that. I do not want to see the American farmer subjected to this sort of thing. I do not believe that the stopgap legislation is enough, as this simply delays action on this vital matter for another year and will allow the entire subject of long-time farm legislation to become an issue in the fall political campaign. There have already been indications that it will. It has been said that now is not the time to enact a long-range farm program because of inflated prices and abnormal farm conditions. I think now is the time to consider this problem, because for once in history the farmer is receiving an equal share of the national income. I want to see him continue to enjoy this prosperity and favorable position in the economy pattern. Adoption of the long-range farm program as outlined in the Aiken bill will go a long way toward accomplishing this. If you will inspect the parity and price-support provisions of this measure, you will note that provision is made for adjustments in the support-price scale as conditions vary; hence, every assurance is given that prices will not be supported on too high a level. The 10-year moving average accomplishes this.

I sincerely hope that, as Republican leader of the Senate, you will give this matter the highest priority so that an arrangement may be worked out with the House of Representatives to give the farmers the best possible long-range farm program in the short time remaining.

Sincerely yours,

HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire at this time to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, provided all the amendments to the committee amendment have been considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that there are any further amendments, except those proposed by the Senator from Georgia, which are printed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall offer those at a later time.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know of any others.

Mr. RUSSELL. I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment. I do not ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, offered by the Senator from Georgia, will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment to the amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed through any instrumentality or agency within or under the

direction of the Department of Agriculture, by loans, purchases, or other operations—

(a) To support prices received by producers of cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts marketed before June 30, 1950, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which the crop is harvested. The price support authorized by this subsection shall be made available as follows:

(1) To cooperators at the rate of 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

(2) To noncooperators at the rate of 60 percent of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

All provisions of law applicable with respect to loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall, insofar as they are consistent with the provisions of this subsection, be applicable with respect to loans or other price-support operations authorized under this subsection, and the provisions of Public Law 163, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall continue in effect.

(b) To support until June 30, 1950, a price to producers of commodities with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture by public announcement pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended, requested an expansion of production of not less than 60 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor nor more than the level at which such commodity was supported in 1948, except that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this subsection if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for the commodities referred to in (a) hereof. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

(c) Sections 1 and 3 of the act approved August 5, 1947 (Public Law 380, 80th Cong.), are amended by striking out in each section the date "December 31, 1948" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1950."

(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsecs. (a), (b), and (c) hereof) shall be carried out so as to bring the price and income of the producers of other agricultural commodities not covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c) to a fair parity relationship with the commodities included under subsections (a), (b), and (c) to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the commodities covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c). In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

SEC. 2. From any funds available to the Department of Agriculture or any agency operating under its direction for price support operations or for the disposal of agricultural commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to use such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigations and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modifications to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

SEC. 4. Section 8 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 6, sec. 590h (a)), is amended (a) by striking out "January 1, 1949" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1950"; and (b) striking out "December 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1949."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1945 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1950."

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that sections 3 and 5 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

Also to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Georgia, I should like to offer an amendment to the substitute. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. One page 3, line 1, of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, after the word "hogs", it is proposed to insert "ducks."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said that the tobacco amendment has played ducks and drakes with his bill, and has already accepted the duck amendment to the committee amendment, I shall accept the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I thank the able Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 1, of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, after the word "chickens", it

is proposed to insert "(including broilers)".

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment is agreeable to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no question about a broiler being a chicken, so I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I trust that the substitute may be considered in an atmosphere of calmness, and without the spirit of recrimination which was in evidence earlier in the day.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the Senator from Georgia that I shall be calm.

Mr. RUSSELL. Without the substitute being read in full, I will state that it embodies a bill which has passed the House, known as the Hope bill, for the temporary extension of the agricultural program, to which has been added language extending the soil-conservation privilege to the States to set up State programs for a period of 2 years, as well as an extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of 2 years.

Mr. President, I believe in the committee system of the Senate. I realize that no parliamentary body can function effectively save through the work which is done by committees. I am always most reluctant to undertake to offer any substitute for a measure which has received careful study and scrutiny on the part of a standing committee of this body. I would not do so now, Mr. President, were I not convinced that it is necessary to make sure that the Congress does not adjourn and go home without any farm program, leaving chaos in the field of agriculture on every farm in the United States, unless we adopt the substitute which has been proposed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As I have read the Senator's amendment, primarily it would continue the legislation enacted as a wartime measure to increase the production of certain commodities which were essential during the war period. Does not the Senator's amendment propose a continuation of wartime legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is absolutely correct. The reason I say that the long-range program is a short-sighted program and should not be adopted by the Congress is that it is sought to throw us back prior to the war years. Today we are faced with a demand for agricultural commodities which is equal to any that was ever made upon the farmers of the Nation during the war years. We have a European recovery program for which billions of dollars are being appropriated, and the farmers of the United States are being called upon to feed the world. Yet we see this bill brought in by the committee, undertaking to throw us back to the period of decreased production, and to remove any incentive whatever to the American farmer to produce the food and fiber which are absolutely essential if the Marshall plan is to succeed.

No stronger argument could be made for the substitute than that it recognizes, as the committee bill does not, that the demand on the American farmer will continue for at least a period of five more years.

One of the fatal weaknesses of the committee bill, as I see it, in addition to its complexities and ambiguities, is the fact that it undertakes to throw agricultural production in this country back to prewar years. Not only do the demands from Europe on the American farmer make it essential that we carry on a program of increased production, but the American people are today eating 18 percent more food than they were eating before the war. Yet the committee bill would have us go back to the prewar period——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit me to finish the sentence I shall be glad to yield. The committee bill would have us go back to the prewar period, when we were undertaking to stifle rather than encourage production.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator says that the committee bill proposes to throw agriculture back to the prewar period. The committee bill does no such thing; and the Senator, I am sure, is quite well aware of the fact that it does not, because it does not affect the parity price, or the 90 percent of parity, until such time as there are actual surpluses in the commodity, and when surpluses occur, the price factor comes in, and the relationship of the carry-over will have its reflex effect in a decrease in the parities paid. If the Senator thinks that he and all other producers can go on indefinitely accumulating surpluses in any agricultural commodities, and still have parity figured at 90 percent indefinitely, I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that public opinion will not follow him, even if that be his idea, because the consumer would be compelled to support by taxation a parity payment even when surpluses would make it almost impossible to obtain Treasury appropriations to finance such a program. I think the Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know of no such thing, and neither does the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to have the Senator point out where we have any great surplus of agricultural commodities at the present time.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say again to the Senator, when the surpluses occur, then the flexible support price will be figured in. But until there are surpluses the parity will remain at 90 percent. When there are great surpluses, then, of course, it will be desirable to reduce the parity price, in order to have greater production in other fields of commodities, rather than to pile surplus upon surplus in one commodity.

That is why the support-price arrangement was conceived and developed, namely, in order to have a stable economy in agriculture, and not encourage high production in certain commodities merely because mechanically they can be produced easily and readily and often very cheaply.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator admits there is no surplus at the present time. He says that the Aiken bill contains provision for a flexible loan value so that if a surplus accumulates it will fast disappear.

I say the farmers of the United States are not simple enough to produce if there is likely to be a surplus, if they know the loan value of their commodity is to be reduced. The farmers of the United States will understand how the pending bill will operate. Why have they broken all records of production in the past? It is because they knew they were protected in their production.

But now, with these so-called flexible, escalator loan values running up and down, what farmer will take the risk of producing more bountiful crops of any kind? The farmers certainly will decrease their production. The committee bill is sure to cause decreased production in the United States at a time when our requirements and demands are greater than they ever have been in the past.

I have heard Senators argue time and again that the American people would not stand for these parity values. Mr. President, the present parity values are not hurting the consuming public in the slightest degree. Practically every commodity which would be under the parity values provided by this bill is selling above parity today. So the consuming public is not being hurt; not only is the public not being hurt, but it is being helped—in that the commodity Credit Corporation has earned in excess of $100,000,000 in dealing with these commodities in a way which the Senator says will cause the American people to kill any farm support.

Mr. President, if farm support is killed, it will be because those in this body who claim to represent the farmers and who declare their undying allegiance and love of the farmers in campaign years, do not have the courage to stand by the farmer and see that he is recognized as an American citizen and is entitled to a square deal, along with every other citizen of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Question came up as to whether the American public would stand for taxation to maintain a farm program at parity. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not a fact that one of the few great prophecies made by the Republican Party, and for which the Republican Party took credit 2 years ago, was that enormous profits would be made by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the able management of Mr. C. C. Smith; and I ask if it is not

also correct that more than $100,000,000 was made for the taxpayers by the Commodity Credit Corporation alone, under the direction of Mr. C. C. Smith.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is no question of that, and I am sure the Senator from Minnesota is aware of it.

I have just stated that the Commodity Credit Corporation made a profit of more than $100,000,000 in dealing with the present parity system which this bill proposes to reduce—and at a time when we are crying for more production from the American farmer.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In speaking about the profits made by the Commodity Credit Corporation, in order that we may understand that the Government is not making money through one of its corporations or agencies, and in order that the public may know definitely in what manner the Commodity Credit Corporation made a net profit of $138,505,000, it should be pointed out that it was because the Commodity Credit Corporation happened to have a large inventory of cotton and corn at the outset of the war; and because of war demands and war needs and wartime inflation, profits accumulated as a result of the sale of what the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand prior to the war or at the outset and during the first years of the war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we still have a period of inflation as great as that which occurred during the war. Indeed, it is now much greater than it was then. Certainly, for that reason to say that the farmer has caused inflation of the economy, when he is subject not only to all the vicissitudes of inflation, but also to all the ravages of insects and crop disease, does not make sense. Certainly the farmer is entitled to the protection of existing law, which is what will be provided if the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator spoke of fluctuation. That is exactly what this bill provides, namely, fluctuation between 60 percent and 90 percent of parity, which will result in enriching the gamblers in commodities. If Senators think there was an investigation of this subject a few years ago, they should wait, if the committee bill is enacted, and see what will happen as a result of the developments in October and November next year, for not only will the gamblers estimate the crops, but they will undertake to estimate the surpluses; and then there will really be speculation and gambling, if that is what is desired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not propose by my vote to submit the farmers to that hazard.

Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not leveling any attack at the committee bill. My statements were provoked by the questions asked by the Senator from Minnesota.

I do not think the question before the Senate at this time is between the Aiken bill and the House bill. As I view the situation, the question is between the House bill and nothing; because if we do not pass the House bill, but, instead, pass the Aiken bill and send it to conference, knowing that the House committee has held long and extended hearings on this entire question, and that the House has decided that due to the unnatural conditions which obtain in the American economy we should carry on with the wartime legislation for the time being, it is obvious that the House will not readily yield to our position. We know that after the House has considered this matter thoroughly from all angles, it will not readily yield and accept this radical innovation in agricultural legislation.

Much has been said of the great study which has been given this matter by the Senate committee. As a Member of the Senate who is proud of this body, I always support the Senate committees if I may consistently do so. But, Mr. President, the House committee also gave this subject study. The House committee also traveled the length and breadth of the land, and the House committee held hearings and examined any number of witnesses. The House committee reached the conclusion that, because of the great uncertainties which exist today and the great demands on the American farmer to increase his production, and also due to the uncertainties of the financial situation in the United States, it would be the part of wisdom to continue the existing law for a period of 18 months; and in this case I heartily subscribe. I take that position because of the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for whom I have the greatest affection, who stated here the other evening, in effect, that it was a case of having either the committee bill or nothing, so far as the continuation of farm legislation was concerned.

Mr. President, for my part, I will not be bound by a choice between nothing and the committee bill, or the Aiken bill, when I know that the Senate can continue the present farm program for 18 months merely by adopting the substitute proposed by me, which already has been passed by the House of Representatives.

So, with me, it is a choice between the House bill or nothing; and when that choice is presented to me, I am glad to seize upon the House bill in order that the farm program will be protected for the next 18 months, the Commodity Credit Corporation extended for a period of 2 years, and the provisions of the Soil Conservation Act preserved, rather than to take the adamant position that the other branch of Congress must yield to this new bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. What the Senator has just said disturbs me. I am not on the committee, and I am very anxious, as is the Senator from Georgia, that some farm legislation be enacted. But the Senator has just stated that the Senator from Vermont says it is a choice between his bill and nothing. The Senator from Georgia has told us that in his considered judgment it is a choice between continuation of the present support plan and nothing. If both the distinguished Senators are correct, we may wind up in this session by having a choice between two nothings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the whole matter is in the lap of the Senate at the present time. If the Senate wishes to assure beyond peradventure that the present farm program will be continued unimpaired and in full effect for 18 months, the Senate can adopt the substitute, and the program will be continued.

Mr. President, I hear a great deal about a long-range program, and I am all in favor of having a long-range and permanent farm program. I do not believe we shall ever have a permanent farm program in the sense that any one bill we may pass in one year will apply to any condition that might arise in agriculture over a period of 3 or 4 years. Any program that we call a permanent program we shall be compelled to amend from time to time. But certainly under the circumstances that confront us today it is not the part of wisdom to cut down the loan rates, to reduce the parity values of every farm commodity which is produced in the country, because when that is done, production will be discouraged at the very time that the entire world is looking to the United States of America for food and fiber to enable them to exist and to have wearing apparel. No one can escape the conviction that the reduction in the parity price, the reduction in the loan value, will discourage production on American farms.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. A few minutes ago the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] secured acceptance by the Senator from Georgia of a certain amendment affecting broilers and ducks. However, the amendment at the desk reads in terms, not of the substitute bill of the Senator from Georgia, but the substitute bill of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], which was withdrawn. I should like to have a correction made, so the amendment will relate to the correct bill. If the Senator will permit me, we can combine the Ives-Williams amendment and the Morse amendment, the latter involving the words "and other poultry," which was accepted yesterday afteroon on the Aiken bill, and add it to the Russell substitute bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be permitted to insert the words as suggested by the Senator from Oregon at the proper place in the substitute. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. MORSE. That is satisfactory. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I want to say first we are confronted here with a condition, not a theory. We are within 3 days of the end of the session. Is it wise to gamble with a matter which is important not only to the farmer but to the Nation and to the world, to gamble with a new and revolutionary bill of this kind? I submit, with all respect that the bill is far too complicated and too far reaching to be considered under conditions existing in the Senate today. It is a type of bill that should be given the undivided attention of the Senate for a period of a week or 10 days to enable

all Members of the Senate to familiarize themselves with the complete change in our farm program which it proposes. Here we have it before us, when the Senate is under unprecedented pressure, when the bill will be discussed for 20 or 30 minutes and then be laid aside for a veto message. The minds of Senators will then be directed to the veto message until its consideration is concluded; we return to the farm bill and undertake to explain another paragraph of the bill, and then there will come in another conference report, and the farm bill will be laid aside again. I say in all fairness—and it is no reflection on the Senate, because we would be miracle men if it were otherwise—that very few Members of the Senate thoroughly understand the pending bill and realize its full import. I have had some little experience in the past with agricultural legislation. I was not privileged to be a member of the committee and to attend the hearings and to see the bill written up, but I have undertaken to read the bill on two different occasions. Mr. President, I assert without fear of successful contradiction that it is as involved and complicated a piece of legislation as has ever been submitted to the Senate. It would require not hours but days and weeks of study fully to recognize all the implications of the measure.

I am sure Senators do not realize all that is in the bill. We have heard a discussion here of tobacco and tobacco parity and the various phases of the 10-year moving average, and of the new parity program. But very little consideration has been given to the complete reorganization of the Department of Agriculture that is carried in the bill, and the great powers that are vested in whoever may be the Secretary of Agriculture under the terms of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know that the Secretary of Agriculture agrees with the reorganization program?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Secretary of Agriculture, or any man whoever hoped to be Secretary of Agriculture, did not agree with the reorganization program, he should be shot because it vests the greatest powers in him that any Cabinet member has ever possessed. But if the Congress lightly deals out these powers and deprives itself of authority over appropriations, I think we would be plain stupid.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I do not read the bill the same way the Senator does. The truth of the matter is the powers of the Secretary, in comparison with those he has now, are reduced under this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will find where the Secretary of Agriculture has power to allot the appropriation——

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will show me in the bill where we give him more power, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do it, if the English language means anything. In title 1, page 49, if the Senator will look he will find where the Secretary of Agriculture is directed by the bill to "establish an agency to be known as the 'Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement,' to exercise all functions of the Secretary and of the various bureaus within the Department of Agriculture which, (1) prior to the enactment of this act, were assigned to" various branches of the Department as it exists at present, "or (2) the Secretary deems to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement or to those aspects of programs of the Department of Agriculture which require direct dealings by the Department with farmers."

That language gives the Secretary the power himself to say which bureaus within the Department shall do that.

We fought here for weeks over a bill giving the President of the United States power to reorganize the departments of the Government, and we required him to come back to the Congress before his reorganization order should become effective. When he submitted his reorganization orders, the Congress knocked about half of them in the head. But in this bill we give the Secretary of Agriculture power to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, and he does not have to report to the Congress or anyone else. It is just as clear as it can possibly be. Of course, the Secretary of Agriculture would be in favor of it. There has never been any Cabinet member who has ever possessed one-half the power that would be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture under the terms of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Where would the Senator vest that power?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would keep it in the Congress of the United States. I am urging the Senate not to insist upon the passage of this bill, but to give Congress time to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. The Congress is not the creature of the Department of Agriculture; the Department of Agriculture is the creature of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. That was the argument made all the way through in connection with the tariff policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Illinois can find any consolation in that analogy, let him lave his soul in it and enjoy it, because there is no analogy whatever between this bill and the establishment of a tariff policy. I am surprised that the Senator would resort to such an argument.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised at the Senator from Georgia for making that kind of an argument, when he voted last week on a similar proposition.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no similarity at all, and no one but the Senator from Illinois would think there was any similarity.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the Senator's opinion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only does the bill give the Secretary power to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, but it also gives him other powers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I maintain that instead of giving the Secretary authority to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, the bill directs the Secretary to reorganize it and tells him how he shall do it. I do not think that is any additional grant of power. It is a restriction on the power of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Vermont can find any limitation in the language on page 49, line 24, which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer agencies which he deems to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement, or to those aspects of programs of the Department of Agriculture which require direct dealing by the Department with farmers, I should like to know what the limitation is. It seems to me it leaves the powers of the Secretary wide open as to those agencies.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will read further, paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) state how the duties of the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture are to be divided.

Mr. RUSSELL. It excepts certain agencies, but I have never before known Congress to give any Cabinet member power to select each bureau in his department and say whether it is related to a particular program.

I also want to point out that in section 102 (a) there is no question that the permanent power is given the Secretary to allot the appropriations made by Congress. Heretofore, in the consideration of appropriation bills, the Secretary has been required to submit budget estimates, minute in detail, as to how each dollar was to be expended, and Congress decided whether it would appropriate this item or that item for approximately 1,850 activities of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Georgia point out any place in the bill where the Secretary will be absolved of the necessity of making reports and pointing out what he wants the money for when he comes before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. He is not absolved, but after he receives the money he can allot it as he pleases.

Mr. AIKEN. Can he not do that at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; he cannot. He cannot allot money in that way. But this bill would give him authority to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. No; only as he transfers certain functions from one agency to another under the direction in the bill. What this bill does is to abolish two agencies within the Department of Agriculture and instruct the Secretary to establish one to take the place of the two. The reason for that—and it is being done at the request of the Department of Agriculture—is that things have not always been harmonious between the two agencies, although they have not quite arrived at a very acute stage as yet. It appears that those two agencies, dealing with the problem of soil improvement, should be united at the national level. It will make for more efficiency and more economy in government, in my opinion, and result in the expenditure of a larger percentage of appropriations made by Congress on the actual work for which the money was appropriated.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the bill should ever become law, I would devoutly share the hope that the Senator from Vermont is correct, but I find absolutely nothing in the bill which would justify that hope.

Mr. AIKEN. I am saying it for the record.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but I was reading the Senator's bill. The Senator has said for the record that there was nothing in it to permit the Secretary to allot appropriations, and I shall therefore read section 102 (a) of the bill, on page 52——

Mr. AIKEN. Before the Senator begins reading, I do not have the amended copy of the bill before me at the moment, but I call his attention to the fact that the words "heretofore or", in line 3, have been stricken out, so that any sums hereafter appropriated——

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I would not worry much about the money that has been heretofore appropriated. It would read this way:

Any sums hereafter appropriated, other than as grants-in-aid—

I ask the Senators to listen to this, because it is an important matter—

and available for functions which the Secretary determines to be functions required by section 101 (a) of this act to be exercised through the Extension Service and cooperating agencies in the several States and in the Territory of Hawaii, to the extent that such funds are available at the time the Secretary makes such determination, and (B) any sums appropriated specifically for functions covered by section 101 (a), shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations as the additional sums appropriated under the act entitled—

And then it quotes the title of the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Act.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary has to allocate these funds according to an act of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. I am coming, now, to paragraph (2) on page 53 of the bill:

The remainder of the sums so appropriated—

That is, when he gets away from that which the Congress has specifically appropriated—

and available in each fiscal year shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii, without any requirement that equal sums be provided from any other sources, in the same proportions as the sums appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to section 23 of the act entitled—

That being the general research act.

I assert that the Secretary can move agencies and, under this bill, he has a great deal of control over the funds. The same thing is true of section 104.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary can utilize funds only in accordance with the regulations laid down by Congress. Either the principal sums or the remainders have to be appropriated pursuant to law. He has no additional powers there.

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly seems to me that he has, when he has the power, under section 101, to determine which of the agencies he deems to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement or to those aspects of programs of the Department of Agriculture which require direct dealings by the Department with farmers, and so forth. If he has no authority to transfer bureaus under that language, I do not know what the language means.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the able Senator from Georgia believe there should be a consolidation of the soil-conservation program and the agricultural-conservation program into a single program and agency, as suggested under section 101?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I think there should be a consolidation. I am not sure that the provision in section 101 is the best way to do it, however, because I think it is vague and indefinite.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator feels that should be done, whom would he delegate as the appropriate administrative agency or authority to carry out that reorganization?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not delegate it at all. That is the point I have been making all the way through, that I am opposed to the delegation of the power to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator would keep it right here in the Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. I most certainly would.

Mr. LUCAS. And have the rules and standards prescribed by Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. We have gone very far afield in the delegation of power to the executive branch of the Government in the past few years, but this is the first time, to my knowledge, that such substantial power has been proposed to be delegated to a Cabinet officer without at least requiring a report back to the Congress as to what he had done. The bill does not even require a report. When we have delegated the power to the President to reorganize the departments, we have made provision for a report to Congress and provision for veto if Congress desired, but under this bill we are asked to delegate power to the Secretary of Agriculture to reorganize the department. The bill does contain some standards, but the standards are not sufficiently far-reaching. I think the Congress should take time to work out a permanent agricultural program on which the Congress would legislate, not one the Secretary of Agriculture would legislate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows how difficult that is, and he knows we have tried it times without number. When the Congress tried to reorganize some department it never did succeed. In the final analysis, we have to delegate the power to someone along the line to do the work. Congress has not the time to do it, and Congress cannot do it. I can agree with the Senator that whoever would do the work should perhaps make a report to Congress, but here is a situation in which we are trying to coordinate agencies in the Department of Agriculture under one separate agency, yet the Senator makes an argument that that should not be done, as provided in this bill, but that the Congress should do it itself. If the position of the Senator should prevail there would never be any reorganization of the executive departments of the Government so long as he and I were in the Congress, because Congress cannot do it, and the Senator knows Congress has not the time to do it.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a very harsh indictment of the parliamentary system to say that the Congress does not have the capacity to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. I can go even further than that. If the Senator thinks it is a severe and harsh indictment, let me say that I have never seen Congress yet appoint a committee to reorganize any part of the executive branch that did any constructive work on it and brought back a report. They have talked about it and used it as an argument when there was a desire to kill some proposal, but I have never seen any constructive, actual work done by a committee of Congress that has accomplished anything in the way of reorganizing the executive departments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not intend to stress this particular phase of the pending bill, and would not have done so had not the Senator from Illinois challenged me to show where the bill delegated any power to the Secretary of Agriculture. I answered with the flat statement that the bill delegated too much power to the Secretary of Agriculture, and I was going to pass on to the Senator from Illinois the challenge to show it did not delegate power. Now the Senator from Illinois takes the position that the power which is delegated is necessary to be delegated.

Mr. LUCAS. The bill gives the Secretary no more power than he has at the present time, except power to reshuffle a few clerks in the department under his jurisdiction at the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does more than reshuffle a few clerks. I recognize the difficulty in passing a reorganization act, because I have been a Member of the Senate about as long as the Senator from Illinois has, and I have seen these bills come up time and again, and I would not dispute that the Congress cannot reorganize all the departments of the Government at one time, in one bill. For that reason I have consistently voted for bills to delegate to the President of the United States power to reorganize the executive departments. But I have never voted for a bill giving the President authority to reorganize as he saw fit, and in all the reorganization bills Congress has never granted such power to a President. It was not granted to President Roosevelt; it was not granted to President Truman. We have granted them power to propose reorganization plans, but we have always retained a veto power in the Congress. To my knowledge this is the first time it has been proposed that Congress should delegate carte blanche power to a Cabinet officer to shuffle around a hundred or two hundred bureaus as he sees fit without being required to submit a report to Congress so that it may see what he has done in the matter. I do not intend to vote for any such power as that. I did not intend to labor the point, however.

If our legislative system is no good, Congress should be the last to admit it and we should at least leave it to those outside Congress to say we are incapable. I submit that if Congress has the time to perfect a long-range bill, we can adopt a long-range program that will bring about what is so much desired. That is incidental to my main argument, however, and I did not intend to go into it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator was about through with that aspect of the discussion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To clarify the matter in my own mind, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Let us assume this is a good bill, but in the situation as it now exists, do I understand correctly it is the Senator's belief that, even though we pass the bill as is, he does not think there is assurance that the House will accept it, and therefore he thinks we will have no bill at all? Is that the point the Senator makes?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have stated heretofore that in my opinion the issue was between the substitute bill or no bill, because if the committee bill passes, it has been stated the House would not go into it without hearings, and frankly I would not blame them for not accepting such a complicated bill as this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who stated that?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is against the rules of the Senate to quote any Member of the House of Representatives on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Several Members of the House have told me that they had ample time to consider this bill if it is substituted for their bill and goes to conference. It is just a question which Member of the House one is talking to. I know some Members of the House who are insistent on a stop-gap program only. I know other Members who are equally anxious to have a long-range program adopted. I cannot see that any time would be lost by the adoption of the long-range bill and putting it into conference with the House. We certainly cannot accept the House bill as it is if we want to save the Commodity Credit Corporation after July 1. We must go to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. The substitute I have offered provides for a continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator think it would not be necessary to go to conference?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment the House would accept the substitute bill with the amendments, without the slightest question.

Mr. AIKEN. There is some reason to believe that the House would accept the Senate long-range bill if they had a chance to vote on it, as they certainly will have, if we put it in very good shape, as I think will be done.

I admit I became impetuous this afternoon, and if I said anything which hurt the feelings of any Senator I am truly sorry for it. The tobacco amendment, while very disappointing to me, does not spoil the bill completely. The wool amendment which was adopted will have no effect upon the bill, so far as I know.

I am very anxious to have the House have an opportunity to vote on the long-range bill in the event we do not agree in conference. We would make every effort to do that first, in any event. I feel that this bill would have a very good chance of passing the House. So let us send them the best bill possible, let us get the best possible bill we can. We have no time to lose in adopting a long-range bill. It is true prices are generally high now, and carry-overs are small. That is just the time to get a good bill on the statute books.

Let me point out that word has come to me from the Department of Agriculture that since January 1 exports of agricultural commodities to other parts of the world have been 15 percent below the exports of agricultural commodities in the previous year. We are going to have increased stocks, we are going to have increased supplies of grain. Before we know it, if I read conditions correctly, only a major calamity, such as a drought, will prevent us having a surplus supply of grain. So we have written into the bill provisos which make it more profitable to feed those grains. I will not go into the bill because the Senator, I am sure, knows what I mean. But a good, long-range bill enacted at this session is not hopeless.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may, I should like to pursue this matter further, because I do not understand thoroughly what goes on in the parliamentary situation which exists at the end of a session, as the Senator from Georgia does. Let us assume we pass the bill tonight, and that it goes to the House tomorrow. Both Houses must agree on the conference report before we adjourn Saturday night; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what bothers me. It seems to me it ought to be possible to ascertain which of the views expressed by the two Senators is correct. I am speaking along the line the Senator from New Mexico followed a moment ago. There are two very distinguished Members of the Senate, each one giving us a more or less opposite view of what will happen if we adopt one form of bill or the other. That is something which concerns me deeply, because it would be disastrous if we should end up with no bill at all. I do not know how we can resolve the situation, although perhaps it would be possible to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure some bill will be enacted. Personally I think we would get a good long-range bill sooner if we did not pass a stop-gap measure, because if we were to do so there would be a tendency to let the matter slide again next year, and then we will again find ourselves in another election year; whereas if we do not have any bill at all we would have to do something the first of next January. I do not anticipate any such condition as that coming about. I feel that when we get together with the House conferees we can reach a fair agreement. Those who will be on the conference committee of the Senate have twice met with several Representatives who will be on the conference committee of the House. I think we all understand our problem. I think it is unfortunate that the House has concentrated its study to one feature of agriculture, which is the land-use policy, whereas the Senate has concentrated on a support-price program. The Senate committee felt that a support-price program should come first, in order to insure our farmers against a collapse which we know can come suddenly. I do not look for a collapse in the immediate future, but we never can tell. As I said the other day, the time to patch a roof is when the sun is shining so the roof will be ready when the rains come. I hope we can take the bill to conference with the House conferees, and I feel sure that we can work out a much better bill than the House is offering us now, and, perhaps than the bill which we have here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish I could share the belief expressed by the Senator from Vermont, but the bare facts simply do not bear out his statement. If we accept the bill already passed by the House there cannot be any question about having a continuation of the program. If we pass the Aiken bill it will mean throwing the whole matter into the lap of chance as to whether we will ever get a law or not.

Mr. AIKEN. May I point out that if we accept as it is the bill passed by the House there is no question that we will have to spend from fifty to seventy-five million dollars, or more, during the next year to buy eggs which we do not need in this country. There will be no question but that the wool growers of Texas will get a support price for 2 years, and the wool growers of Montana will get a support price for only 1 year. There are a few other deficiencies in the bill which should be ironed out. If we send the Senate bill to conference, then we will have all the material of both the House and the Senate bills before the conferees for consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator has made a statement about eggs. The Senator, I believe, stated now that we would lose from fifty to sixty million dollars on eggs if the House bill were to be passed. He has come down some $40,000,000 since night before last, when he said we would lose $100,000,000 on eggs. I was surprised to hear that statement, because I had never heard of any great loss on eggs. Therefore, I checked with the Commodity Credit Corporation to find out about the egg losses.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator has the same figures I have. They will show that since 1944 the Commodity Credit Corporation has bought, through the support-price program, about $161,000,000 worth of eggs, and has also made purchases of four-hundred-and-some-odd million dollars' worth of eggs, I suppose largely for overseas shipments. Those are eggs which we are not likely to need. I do not think we are going to be exporting eggs by the hundred million dollars' worth from now on. I agree with the Senator that it has not all been a total loss, but we have had to buy, if my memory serves me correctly, since 1944, $161,000,000 worth of eggs to support the price of eggs at 90 percent of parity,

which is continued during the next year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much loss was there?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been a loss over the entire program, as I understand, of approximately $18,000,000. The Corporation has dealt in hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of eggs.

Mr. AIKEN. It is difficult to tell what the loss is, because so many of the eggs have been used for cooperative purposes, such as European relief.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator from Georgia tell me why milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs were picked out to be supported at 90 percent of parity?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not know exactly why that was done. I have before me the report of the House committee, which I can read if the Senator desires. I believe it deals at some length with that subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to know why these particular products were selected.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can tell the Senator why I am in favor of support of those products. I do not know why the House is in favor of support for them. I am in favor of support for them for the same reason that I am inclined to favor the most attractive features of the Aiken bill, and that is because the parity base heretofore of dairy products and of meat has been unfair to the producers of those commodities, and it has been below a fair parity price for meat and some other commodities. I would favor support of the products in question because it would give them a more equitable treatment under the terms of the bill. The reason so many are supporting the Aiken bill is because it is fairer to the meat producers and to the dairy products producers than is the existing law.

Mr. LUCAS. The present price of pork is up to 90 percent of parity. The Senator's amendment provides that "milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price." How can the Senator justify support of the four products I have just mentioned? There will be no way of controlling the number of chickens produced or controlling the amount of eggs produced. Broilers have been added, and every other kind of chicken is included.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator speaking of my taking in milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs, as well as broilers, when the Senate has voted to include innumerable amendments in the long-range-farm-program bill? The bill has been rewritten on the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia is not answering my question. I think he should answer it because it is tremendously important to find out just why we have to guarantee the prices on these four products.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator read the items again?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, I will. The Senator will find the language on the top of page 3 of his amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I mean the commodities.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the language, beginning at the bottom of page 2 of the Senator's amendment:

> Except that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 percent of parity or comparable price.

I can understand how Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, should be supported. That is the 1948 crop. It comes in late perhaps. But it is a little difficult for me to understand how the Senator can support these other four products, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs, and guarantee 90 percent of parity price.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator know what parity is for butterfat, which is a product of milk?

Mr. LUCAS. That does not have anything to do with the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. It should have, because I am pointing out the significance. As of March 15, 1948, the parity for butterfat was 65 cents a pound. Under the 10-year average of the Aiken bill the butterfat formula is 65.2 cents a pound. So the two measures go hand in hand so far as the two products are concerned. The Senator having been a member of the committee, I assumed that he would have known that.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator assumes many things when he wants to get away from the real point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I gave the Senator the facts.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know why the Senator should continuously castigate me and indirectly infer that I do not know anything about this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that the Senator was trying to help me by asking the question he just asked. I know that he is attempting to assist me in my explanation of the substitute.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is tremendously important to find out the facts. I propose to offer an amendment to the Senator's amendment——

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked the Senator what the parity price was under this bill, and he said he did not know.

Mr. LUCAS. It does not make any difference to me what the parity price is. The Senator from Illinois is not in favor of guaranteeing the price of any commodity, regardless of what the parity price is, at 90 percent, when other commodities, basic and nonbasic, have a sliding scale up to 90 percent of parity. There is a reason for it. If the Senator wants to know the real reason, he can go back to the House of Representatives and he will find that there was plenty of logrolling between the milk and dairy producers and the egg producers, in order to get 90 percent of parity.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may be true; but the strange fact remains that under the bill of which the Senator from Illinois is a co-author, the parity price on butterfat, which is the base of milk products, is higher than it is in this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course it is higher, but it is flexible. Tomorrow, or next year it may not be higher; but the Senator would guarantee 90 percent. There is no flexibility in his formula. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course there is not; and that is why I am opposed to the Senator's bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to explain the parity figures. I think he has read them correctly; but in figuring the parity prices for milk products and butter under Senate bill 2318 the Bureau of Agricultural Economics failed to include the subsidy which was paid to the dairy farmers during the war. That resulted in bringing down the parity price of butter and milk very considerably. It is my opinion that in figuring the parity price for dairy products under Senate bill 2318, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics should include the subsidy which was paid directly to the farmer. I do not believe that it should include the subsidy which was paid directly to the processor, because there is no way of telling how much of it went back to the farmer. But that is the reason why the figures which the Senator reads for parity for dairy products under Senate bill 2318 are so low. I do not know what the actual parity would be. I believe that the figures which the Senator has, show that the parity price of milk would increase from about $3.80 to $4 if we adopted the proposed parity formula. But if the subsidy were included, as it should be, in computing parity under the new formula, the parity price for milk would be about $4.36 a hundred. It would add materially. In other words, the dairy farmer was penalized because part of his price was received in the form of a subsidy, and the Department of Agriculture, in computing parity under the proposed formula, failed to include the amount which was paid him as a subsidy.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator from Vermont is correct. I have always felt that dairy products and meat were entitled to some new basis for their parity formula. They have been discriminated against heretofore.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. But this bill corrects the discrimination.

The Senator from Illinois says that there was logrolling in the House committee. Some of the House Members felt that the Senator from Illinois had undertaken to outbid them in this bill, because he would increase the parity price of dairy products considerably above the level which obtained under the old system.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Senator include cattle?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. There is not much difference with respect to cattle.

The Senator from Vermont will bear me out when I say that there would be very little difference in the parity price of meat. It would be lower under the

House bill and under the old program than it would be under the new bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The parity price would be higher under the bill of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not seem to make myself clear to the Senator from Georgia. What I am objecting to is guaranteeing a 90-percent parity price for any commodity, which is what the Senator would do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course I would.

Mr. LUCAS. It does not make any difference how many eggs are produced in this country; the Government must support the price. If it costs the Government $100,000,000, we must go to 90 percent of parity on eggs. If the Government loses $100,000,000 on chickens, it does not make any difference. There is no limitation on the number of eggs or chickens that can be produced, and the Government must stand the loss, regardless of what it is. The Senator will not disagree.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Illinois makes a very fine attack on the whole agricultural system. We are not going to have any farm program that is worth a tinker's damn to the farmers in keeping up prices that will not occasionally run into losses on some commodities. If the Senator wants to bring the parity loans down to 40 percent, we shall not have any losses, but the program will not be worth a thing to the farmer because it will not support his prices.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator talks about destroying the farm program. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that this kind of an amendment is the very thing which will ultimately destroy the farm program in public opinion. We cannot continue to do what we are doing at the present time under the 90-percent-of-parity formula, supporting the parity formula for potatoes, chickens, and eggs, and having the Government go in the red to the tune of millions of dollars, without ultimately losing the support of the American public for any farm program in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator point out where the losses have been incurred?

Mr. LUCAS. We lost on potatoes. We lost on eggs last year.

Mr. RUSSELL. On the over-all program we made more than $200,000,000. Of course the Senator can point to a few Irish potatoes or eggs, with respect to which we lost money; but on the over-all program the Commodity Credit Corporation made more than $200,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that that is exactly what happened; but as the Senator from Vermont pointed out a moment ago, if we continue with the 90-percent guarantee, some of these days we shall get a wheat crop or a cotton crop which will result in a surplus which will attack the Treasury of the United States to the point where we shall not have any farm program thereafter, just as surely as I am standing on this floor. That is why the Senator from Illinois has been working all this time trying to get something that is basic and fundamental on the statute books rather than a continuation of the temporary support program, attempting to give to the farmer everything that we can possibly give him. We have not lost anything up to this time; but just as surely as we get a surplus, if we ever get what we had back in 1932 or 1933, under this kind of program ultimately there will not be enough money in the Treasury to take care of the losses. If we continue to paint the picture to the American public that we are supporting a program of this kind, to the degree that regardless of what any individual produces in the way of eggs, chickens, potatoes, or what not, we will take care of him and support prices, finally, I do not care how much we make, we shall destroy the faith and confidence of the people in the farm program.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are limitations on what can be produced. This bill does not permit unlimited production. Neither does the basic law under which the program operates. Even with the acreage we have had, there has been excess production of a few commodities. But in looking at a little pile of potatoes which cost the Government a few thousand dollars we lose sight of the wonderful achievements of the American farmer and the incentive provided by the present system. We are not yet out of the woods of the war. Senators argue eloquently about the cold war, and the necessity of carrying out the Marshall plan. We must feed and clothe the people of Europe. The demands for production on the American farmer are as great today as they were during the war. Yet it is proposed to strike down the program which has successfully brought about this great production, in the name of a long-range program and in the name of saving the taxpayer, when up until now the taxpayer has not been hurt, and he will not be hurt by an 18-month extension of the present program to give us an opportunity to study a long-range program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that the Senator from Georgia will agree that no one is better qualified to speak on the effect of the various programs on the farmer than is the farmer himself. During the course of the hearings which the Senate committee conducted on the pending bill there appeared before the committee the Secretary of Agriculture, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the master of the National Grange, the Washington representative of the Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and a representative of the Farmers Union. They all appeared before the committee and advocated a sliding scale of supports based upon a modernized parity which, in turn, was based upon a 10-year moving average. We had the unanimous support of the farm organizations for what we propose today, namely, to modernize the parity formula so as to bring the various agricultural commodities into proper relationship to each other, and then to support the price of the various commodities on a sliding scale, and I believe most of them suggested 60 to 90 percent for the basic and more important commodities.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have heard the Senator from Vermont make that statement at least once or perhaps twice in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; it is in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps I have heard the Senator say that three times. I am not prepared to challenge it, because I was not on the committee. Let me ask a question: Were the 30 or 40 amendments which the Senator has accepted to the bill explained to the witnesses who testified and spoke as the Senator from Vermont has indicated?

Mr. AIKEN. Probably 30 amendments have been adopted to the bill, but I can explain how that happened. After the bill was all ready and was reported, it was submitted to the Department of Agriculture, so that the Department might go over the bill with a fine-tooth comb and find out where "t's" were not crossed and "i's" were not dotted, and might suggest amendments which would make the bill operate more smoothly.

I wish to say that in connection with the 3-page bill which the Senator from Georgia is offering as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment—leaving out the section 22 amendment—after the House committee reported that bill, it reported 13 other amendments besides those which were adopted on the floor. So I think we have less amendments per page in our bill than there are in the House bill or the Senator's substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is getting away from his argument that the Senate should take this bill—in other words, the committee amendment—without question because it has been approved by the farm leaders, for it seems that the Senator rewrote his bill after it was said to please the farm leaders.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senate should accept this bill, on which the committee has worked for more than 9 months. If we were to wait for each Member of Congress to work out this bill in the same way the committee has worked it out, I am sure we never would be ready to vote on a long-range farm program.

If the Senate did not have confidence in its Committee on Agriculture, I think the Senate should not have given it an appropriation and should not have instructed it to do this work, which we now have presented to the Senate in the form of a bill. It is technical work; it is complicated work. If I had not been working with it for 9 months, I know I would not understand much that is in the bill.

I do not think it is a perfect bill. No doubt we shall have to amend it within 2 years, and probably within 1 year, after it is enacted into law, because experience will develop weaknesses in it, just as

experience develops weaknesses in any other long, complicated bill. But this bill is the best we can do, and I do not know how we could improve upon it, even if we were to work for a few weeks longer.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TYDINGS, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not mind yielding for questions, but I do not like Senators to intersperse long speeches in my remarks.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me on the point just made by the Senator from Vermont——

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well; I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. On the point just made by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. President, let me say that it is true that the witnesses to whom he referred endorsed the principle of a long-range farm program; but the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, offered numerous and serious objections to the bill as drawn. Mr. Kline, of the Farm Bureau Federation, presented 10 pages of testimony suggesting changes. Mr. Goss, of the National Grange, offered numerous suggestions. Mr. Charles Holman, of the Milk Producers Association, offered numerous suggestions. Someone representing the peanut industry offered numerous suggestions. All through the nearly 500 pages of testimony—and it was not easy to analyze, because there was no index and no table of contents, when the hearings were published, and we simply had to dig into the testimony as best we could—there were so many suggestions and so many criticisms that finally the committee simply struck out every line of the 46 pages of the original bill, and framed another bill. But, after framing another bill and after debate had started on it, the committee brought in 10 pages of amendments—10 pages of amendments to a 50-page bill, which means about a 20-percent change. Even then, I may not have counted all the amendments. There have been numerous amendments, such as those relating to chickens, potatoes——

Mr. AIKEN. And ducks and other fowl.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. So we have reached the point where the committee has abandoned the first bill, and has brought out another bill, and then has proposed changes amounting to at least 20 percent in the second bill, and then has added numerous other changes.

Frankly, although I am trying to find out what has been done, I do not know what is in the bill now.

Mr. AIKEN. Could the Senator suggest a better way?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I think a much better way would be to adopt, as a temporary measure, the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia, and continue the support program. Certainly in a few months or in a year if the Senator thinks the support price is too high, he can bring in a long-range bill, which we shall have time to study and understand.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator point out one section of the bill to which the Department of Agriculture objects?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There are numerous pages of testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, of course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator asks the question, will he yield in order that I may propound a unanimous-consent request in regard to a time for voting?

Mr. TYDINGS. The matter I have in mind will not delay the presentation of such a request.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to delay the Senator, of course.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall take only 2 minutes or so. I have waited some time to get the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; excuse me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether it is a fact that the acceptance of his substitute is the pending question, also whether it would be in order to offer a small amendment, in the nature of a perfecting amendment, to the substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. An amendment either large or small would be in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. With the permission of the Senator from Georgia, I should like to offer a 5-line amendment to his amendment. The amendment I offer deals only with Maryland tobacco. I believe it provides for less than is provided by the Senate bill; but as the Representative in Congress from the tobacco section of my State says, this is an amendment which would have been put in the House bill if the circumstances had permitted its consideration there.

I should like to offer it at this time as a perfecting amendment to the substitute, so that, regardless of whether either the substitute or the committee amendment is adopted by the Senate, the tobacco situation will be taken care of.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the fact that the Senator's perfecting amendment to my amendment provides for less than the treatment accorded by the Senate bill will not influence the vote of the Senator from Maryland on this measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. My perfecting amendment to the Senator's amendment provides less, but only slightly less.

Mr. President, to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in Mr. RUSSELL'S amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

Except that for the purpose of computing the parity price for Maryland tobacco the base period shall be the period August 1936 to July 1941 in lieu of the period August 1919 to July 1929.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to my amendment establishes a parity figure below that contained in the committee amendment, the so-called Aiken bill, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. TYDINGS. I took the amendment to the Senator from Vermont, and he himself told me that I would be better off under his bill than under the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as it would be perfected by the amendment I have now offered to it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think there is no question about that, although I am not sure what the parity price under the amendment would be.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, before the Senator from Georgia accepts the amendment to his substitute, I should like to know what the parity base will be under the substitute as thus perfected. If we accept one parity base for Maryland tobacco and another parity base for Virginia tobacco, and a different base period——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, heretofore Maryland tobacco has had no base period for its parity except 1909–14.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; and my amendment would simply put the treatment accorded to Maryland tobacco in line with the treatment accorded to Kentucky tobacco, North Carolina tobacco, and Virginia tobacco.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Of course, I am glad to have Maryland tobacco receive treatment that is in line with the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not made a profound study of the matter, but I am advised by those who know that this amendment to the Senator's substitute amendment will put Maryland tobacco in a position comparable to that of burley tobacco and flue-cured tobacco.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I continue to be disturbed about the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves in view of the lateness of the hour, and the question of whether we are going to have any farm legislation at this session. I have a suggestion to make to the two contending forces, if such they be. While I know that ordinarily parliamentary rules would not permit it, yet it could be done by unanimous consent. My suggestion would be——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will permit me to interrupt him, I attempted a couple of minutes ago to propound a unanimous-consent request. At that time the distinguished Senator from Maryland said he would like to continue. I told him I would wait, and I think I stated that when he concluded we should have a quorum call.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I may finish my suggestion first, it will take but a moment. I was going to suggest, if Senators could not agree, that under a unanimous-consent agreement we let the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia pass as a separate bill and vote on the Aiken bill, sending them both to the House.

Mr. AIKEN. No, absolutely no. That would be the end of the long-range program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am afraid that is a confession.

Mr. WHERRY. Now, let me try.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Would there be a possibility of arranging an hour, at which time we could vote on the substitute and on any amendments that might be offered to it, and then proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill as amended?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not even made the request. I am making an inquiry.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely suggest that I certainly intend to speak on the robbery of the cotton farmer.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to cut off any Senator at all; that is not the thought, but I should like to suggest an hour for a vote. I would suggest any time—8 o'clock, 9 o'clock, or 10 o'clock. If Senators would merely indicate when they think they may conclude, I would make a proposition to Members of the Senate first on the substitute or any amendments offered thereto, which could be gotten out of the way. If the substitute carries there would be no more votes; if it does not carry, we can begin voting and finally vote on the bill. I would be glad to make it any hour. I will suggest any hour that is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Georgia or the Senator from South Carolina, and the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska I will agree to any hour that my distinguished friend from Georgia agrees to.

Mr. WHERRY. Fine. Now we are making headway.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I doubt that. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know how many Senators might desire to speak on the substitute. I know the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] wishes to speak, and the senior Senator from South Carolina wishes to speak. I want to expedite the sessions of the Senate in every way I possibly can. I have undertaken to do it on every occasion.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. It is very fine.

Mr. RUSSELL. But I think this is without any question the most important bill we shall have before the Senate during the remainder of the session. I would not know now what time to fix for a vote, in view of the limited knowledge I have of the number of Senators who may wish to address themselves to the subject.

Mr. WHERRY. I have respect for the Senator from Georgia, and I may say there is not a Member of the Senate who has cooperated more wholeheartedly with the junior Senator from Nebraska in working out unanimous consent requests than has the Senator from Georgia, or the Senator from South Carolina. I would respectfully ask Senators to take an inventory on the possibilities. This is the first time I have made a suggestion. We do not always get an agreement on the first request. I ask Senators to analyze the situation, and if they feel that later on, within as short a time as possible, they can agree upon a time, I shall be glad to submit the request. I thank the Senator for his consideration.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield in that connection?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There are certain phases affecting the prospects for agreeing on the general program which I should like to discuss in connection with what I think would be the wisdom of accepting now the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia. I am convinced from what House Members tell me—and I am pretty close to them, having served with them for 14 years—that the proposal of the Senator from Georgia is all they are going to take. May I ask the distinguished acting majority leader when he wants to cut down on the time some of us may desire to take?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to cut down the time of any Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. What does the Senator plan to bring up next tonight?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is a rather difficult question to answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. BALDWIN and several other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely remind the Senate that we are getting to the closing moments of the session. There are several pieces of legislation which are very important. For one thing, the conference report on the Interior Appropriation bill will probably be ready by 8:30 or 9 o'clock.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How about oleomargarine? That would be a good bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator from Arkansas say something? [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I had best decline to yield further at this time and proceed with my remarks. I decline to yield further. I have been on the floor for more than an hour, and have not been able to occupy to exceed 30 minutes of my own time, so I want to wind up my remarks.

Mr. President, I have undertaken to deal with two phases of the question; first, the fact that it is necessary to adopt the pending substitute if we are to have any assurance whatever that we shall not be deprived of a farm program after the last of December this year. In the second place, I have undertaken to show that the reorganization feature of the pending bill bestows too great legislative powers upon the Secretary of Agriculture.

My third objection to the bill is the fact that it is complicated and so confused as a result of the amendments which have been adopted, and because of the complete change it proposes in the parity program, that it is a lawyer's or a professor's dream. It is so complicated that only a lawyer of great experience in agricultural legislation or a professor who had dealt with matters of agricultural economy could hope possibly to understand it. We are told we should modernize parity. I believe the bill constitutes a revision of the present parity program. As I stated a few moments ago, I know that the present formula is unfair to meat, dairy products, cottonseed, and other commodities, for that matter. But I submit that the 10-year moving average is not a modern basis for computing a parity program.

During 7 of the 10 years, the Nation has been at war. We had ceilings on many agricultural commodities, which held down the prices of those commodities. In the case of other agricultural products we subsidized them and their production, running their values up to 250 or 300 percent of parity. Yet the pending bill proposes to lump them all together and strike an average under the guise of modernizing the parity formula in accordance with present-day conditions.

Any modernization of the parity formula, Mr. President, should be based upon a free market, not upon the restraints and controls of a war period or the encouragement lent to certain commodities during a war period. The so-called modernization is unfair to a great many commodities which were held down by controls during the war. It gives an undue advantage to others which were puffed up through subsidization to where they brought from 250 to 300 percent of parity.

Mr. President, the old parity farm program is at least understood at the present time. It permits every commodity to stand on its own legs. It does not depend upon the fluctuations of any other commodity. The proposed 10-year moving average, in my opinion—and I regret that my opinion is in conflict with that of so many experts on agriculture—is violative of plain common sense. We have the great basic commodities, wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, but other commodities are brought in through the proposed 10-year moving average. Here is the parity line. One commodity will be 5 percent above parity, and another will drop 10 percent below. If we raise the one below parity we increase the one above parity just as much as we raise the one below parity. Because of the way the formula is weighted, a commodity such as flaxseed oil, of which a very small

amount is produced in this country, in spite of the fact that we have expended millions of dollars to encourage its production, would have just as much weight under the parity formula and would affect the price of all other agricultural commodities as much as would wheat, cotton, corn, and dairy products.

I submit that it is absolutely absurd to consider that a commodity such as grapefruit, important though it is, could when it fluctuates, change the price of wheat, as would be the case under the 10-year moving average.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation is that the committee bill is still open for amendment, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair can answer that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to send to the desk three amendments which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the period on which the formula rests is not a normal period. In establishing the old parity period, an earnest study was made to find the time when all the segments of American business, industry, and finance were on a comparable basis. We finally found it in the period from 1909 to 1914, inclusive. That is the period on which parity was based. Of course the parity period changes with the passing years. Seven of the 10 years on which the parity period is based by the pending bill were war years, when the prices of some commodities were depressed by controls and the prices of other commodities were encouraged to advance through the payment of subsidies.

Mr. President, it is not, I submit, a fair exchange. A 10-year moving average, in my opinion, is not the proper way to go about a revision of the parity program. The basic idea of the committee bill may be sound. I am frank to say that I do not thoroughly understand its approach to the problem, and I am convinced from the debate which has taken place on the floor that I am far from being the only Member of the Senate who does not understand it. There have been times when even those who should have the most intimate knowledge of it were not completely informed.

I say, again, Mr. President, that those who desire to do so can take the responsibility for pulling down the prices of wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, or rice, as this bill would pull them down. The bill makes a substantial reduction in the parity prices of those commodities, and of a great many more. Not only does it bring down the parity price—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If no legislation on the subject is passed at all, would the present law as to parities remain in force?

Mr. RUSSELL. The present law fixing parity would remain in force, but we would not have the loan values that my amendment seeks to continue. The parity program would be the same, but commodity loans that provide a floor for farm prices would not be in existence.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, we would have a law but would have no money to carry it out?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. The farmer could not get price support for his commodities.

So, Mr. President, not only does the bill reduce the parity price, but it reduces the loan value of the great basic commodities from 90 to 75 percent. There are those who say that the farmer is anxious to have his loan rate reduced. Those who wish to do so can delude themselves with that idea. I do not propose, by my vote, to bring about a reduction of 25 percent in the amount available for loans for farmers on these great basic commodities, as this bill proposes to do. The bill, if enacted, will undoubtedly bring about a great reduction in farm income. It will deprive the farmer of the benefit of a loan at a time when he needs it the most.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that some farmers want the loan rate reduced?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said that a great many farmers and farm organizations are supporting his bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is there anything to prevent farmers from borrowing less money than the maximum?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing to prevent that at all.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did the Senator from Georgia ever hear of a farmer borrowing less than the maximum?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, and I do not think I ever shall.

Mr. President, I am opposed to discouraging production, as this bill will do. It will fail the farmer in his hour of need, when there are surpluses and prices have been beaten down. It will decrease the value of the farmer's commodities.

I shall not commit myself to any program of this kind, in this shotgun fashion, in the closing hours of the Congress, when our minds are absorbed in innumerable details regarding other legislation. That is no reflection on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have a great regard for the membership of that committee. I am proud of the fact that at one time I served as a member of that committee, and would be a member of it today, but for the fact that reorganization made it impossible for me to continue as a member of it. But, Mr. President, a committee of the Senate has to be an advisory body to the Senate. Merely because we appropriated a few thousand dollars to enable the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make a study, I, as one Senator, am not bound to accept the recommendation which the committee imposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I regret that I have not been able to be present all the time the Senator from Georgia has been discussing the subject. I know he is well informed in regard to this question. He spent years in studying farm problems. Am I correct in my information that the aid to citrus fruit growers would be substantially the same under the continuation of the present program as under the terms of the new bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is any question about that. The benefits of the citrus producers would be substantially the same.

Mr. McFARLAND. How about potatoes?

Mr. RUSSELL. The same with potatoes. Under the substitute the benefits would be greater as to wheat, corn, and cotton.

Mr. McFARLAND. In Arizona we are interested in a great many of these products, but we are very substantially interested in the cotton program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Cotton, of course, would fare much better, and so would wheat and corn. The basic commodities would fare much better under the substitute amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. In Arizon we are interested also in potatoes.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the case of potatoes there is no substantial difference.

Mr. McFARLAND. We grow grain in Arizona. As I understand the Senator, we would fare much better under the old program with reference to grain.

Mr. RUSSELL. The wheat parity is reduced by the committee bill, and the loan would be reduced in times of surplus.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, to sum up, we have not the time to give this bill the study to which it is entitled. I favor a long-range agricultural program, but it should not be adopted in such a way as to discourage production at a time when the American farmer is still being called upon to produce not only for our consumption at home, but to feed and clothe the world.

This bill would eventually reduce the farm income of the country. It would deny the farmer the benefits of legislation which has been enacted for him over a long period of years. To adopt the substitute which I propose would enable us to wind up the discussion of farm legislation for the time being without gambling on the fate of the complicated committee bill in a conference between the two Houses. We could come back at the next session of Congress and start early in the session, without the pressures of the present time, and work out a fair and equitable long-range farm program which would do violence to no farmer or group of farmers, or the consuming public of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On June 10, 1948:

S. 825. An act for the relief of Ern Wright;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irma M. Pierce and Charles Z. Pierce;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves;

S. 1486. An act to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service;

S. 1588. An act for the relief of E. W. Strong;

S. 1729. An act for the relief of Gudrun Emma Ericsson;

S. 1886. An act for the relief of William M. Looney; and

S. 2277. An act to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities for use as public parks, recreational areas, and historic-monument sites, and for other purposes.

On June 11, 1948:

S. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to amend section 303 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

On June 12, 1948:

S. 1641. An act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Air Force, Regular Navy, and Marine Corps, and in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

S. 1941. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land.

On June 14, 1948:

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution providing for appropriate observance of the two-hundreth anniversary of the founding of Washington and Lee University.

On June 15, 1948:

S. 1987. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; and

S. 2137. An act to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes.

ACCEPTANCE OF CONSTITUTION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION INSTRUMENT OF AMENDMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 117, providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

"(a) such sums, not to exceed $1,091,739 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, as apportioned by the International Labour Conference in accordance with Article 13 (c) of the Constitution of the Organization; and

"(b) such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 per annum, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

"(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

"(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

"SEC. 3. No person shall serve as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

And the House agree to the same.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DONALD L. JACKSON,
FRANKLIN J. MALONEY,
WIRT COURTNEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

REPORT ON VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, from June 1 through June 4 a series of hearings on the Voice of America programs were held jointly by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, under my chairmanship, and the investigations subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan. These hearings were held pursuant to a resolution offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana authorizing an investigation of the radio-broadcast operations of the State Department under Public Law 402. As you know, prior to the introduction of the resolution, the Senator from Indiana called to the attention of the Senate certain objectionable material contained in a program called Know North America which was sponsored by the Voice of America.

The immediate purpose of these first hearings was to determine the responsibility for the criticized broadcasts, to the end that the vitally important service that should be rendered by the Voice of American program be strengthened and protected against future mistakes or misuse.

The investigation to date and hearings so far conducted establish the fact that a great deal of the material in the Know North America series was erroneous and in very bad taste. The excerpts quoted by the Senator from Indiana were representative of many other equally untrue and ill-chosen passages.

The single, predominate conclusion resulting from the investigation so far made is that foreign broadcasts sponsored and financed by the United States Government must be made on a quality basis. Our Government cannot continue to be responsible for disseminating trash. Neither the Congress nor the public will tolerate preventable mistakes which have the grave effect of holding the United States up to calumny and ridicule. The series of programs called Know North America were a serious blunder which tended to destroy any value which the other South American broadcasts may have had. Instead of promoting a better understanding of the United States in other countries and increasing mutual understanding, this series of broadcasts presented a false picture of the United tates to the detriment of the United States.

The final and unmistakable responsibility for this blunder rests with the Department of State. It not only failed adequately to supervise the contents of these programs in a reasonable manner, but it also failed to make even a cursory check to determine if the policies of the Government were being carried out. No check was made prior to, during or after the broadcasts to prevent this or similar blunders.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My recollection is that the Appropriations Committee last year, in acting upon appropriations for the Department of State, deducted from that Department's estimates the

sums which were recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of supervision. Moreover, the law, as passed, distinctly instructed the State Department to abandon these broadcasts under the supervision of the State Department, and required that they should be carried on by private companies. When the Congress tells the Department of State it may not conduct its own programs, that the work must be delegated to private companies, and then takes away the money with which to employ the personnel to supervise the programs, it is very difficult for me to understand why the Department of State should be held responsible. It is true that these programs were not supervised, but the operation of the State Department was hamstrung by the action of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the distinguished Senator that we shall continue our hearings and bring out all the facts. Although the funds of the State Department were reduced, I do not think the State Department or the National Broadcasting Co. have adequately carried out their responsibility.

An important collateral responsibility for the failure of these programs rests with the National Broadcasting Co. Its employees failed to appreciate their grave obligation to produce a program that would bring credit to the United States. The fact that the National Broadcasting Co. may have thought that the State Department was monitoring these programs does not excuse their failure adequately to check on the contents thereof over a long period of time. The attempt on the part of both the State Department and the National Broadcasting Co. to advance, if not as a cause at least as an excuse, the thought that there was a divided responsibility under the provisions of the legislation does not stand analysis. What actually existed was a dual responsibility which, if it had been exercised properly by both, should have doubled the supervision and have greatly lessened the possibility of such previous errors. The position taken that the criticized passages were only a small portion of the entire program and that the scripts in their entirety were of good quality is not, even if true, a material factor since one false or incorrect statement may ruin the entire effect of the program and undo all the good which may have been done by other broadcasts.

The firm purpose of the Voice of America program is to present the truth about the United States in terms understandable to the particular country to which the information is directed. This is a vitally important service that must be continued at this critical time. Congress has made it clear on many occasions that an honest, accurate and fair appraisal of our democracy and of our people presented in an enlightened and intelligent manner is the most effective way to compete with the perversions of Soviet propaganda. We want to stress again as we have done in the past that the responsibility—the complete responsibility for carrying out the will of Congress in an intelligent and enlightened manner rests with the State Department. No confusion in this regard should exist and this is especially true insofar as it relates to present and future broadcasts.

It should be clearly understood that the remarks I have just made are not intended as a condemnation of the whole Voice of America program. The idea and the general policies laid down by the Congress are sound. It is my hope that the blunders which have already occurred should not be magnified out of proper proportion because of the inexcusable administrative blunders in this instance.

On the other hand it would be equally unwise to minimize the errors of the past by blandly concluding that mistakes are bound to happen. Therefore our immediate recommendation is this: Those who accept the responsibility for speaking for America must be made to feel this responsibility. Those who accept the responsibility for speaking for America must be made to know that the stakes are high and that their blunders hold our country up to ridicule and disgrace. Our committees have stressed this recommendation to the State Department and we have their assurance that this will be done. We have the assurance of the State Department that enlightened and vigorous care will be given to qualify production in the field of radio broadcasts.

I desire to make it clear that the committees place no part of the blame for this unfortunate occurrence on Secretary Allen. The incidents subject to criticism occurred prior to his assuming his duties on March 30 as head of the Information Service. We are confident that under his able leadership these errors will be corrected.

It is the considered judgment of the two committees that the continuation of our investigation is essential. For this reason we will not file a report at this time but will continue an investigation and study of the Voice of America. At a future time we plan to file a joint report which will summarize the work done by the committees and we hope will report a great many vitally needed improvements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, speaking as chairman of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I wish to state that our subcommittee is in agreement with the views and recommendations made by the Senator from New Jersey concerning the Voice of America broadcasts. The problems of adequately and intelligently portraying the story of the American way of life to foreign radio audiences is of utmost importance. Radio broadcasts to other peoples of the world sponsored by our Government must not contain half-truths, untruths, or worthless or silly information. The American public and the Congress has a right to expect that these broadcasts will be presented in an intelligent and enlightened manner. It is inexcusable for the State Department and the private broadcasting companies, with a large grant of public funds available to produce inferior programs.

I am firmly convinced that these overseas broadcasts must be programs of the highest quality. There appears to be too much stress placed on quantity; very little on quality. If such quality cannot be obtained in our broadcasts, they will likely do more harm than good. However, I am convinced of the necessity for such a program, if it is administered properly.

In order that we may be certain that in the future these broadcasts will be handled in an intelligent manner, I believe that the matter should receive the continued surveillance by the Congress. The need for continuing our investigation is demonstrated by examples of other broadcasts which went out over the air in Voice of America programs. Representatives of the National Broadcasting Co. and the State Department attempted to point out that this particular series of Know North America broadcasts was a single instance of bad judgment. That does not appear to be the case. Our staff, after examining transcripts of other State Department broadcasts, found that in another series of programs there was one on the city of Rochester, N. Y. This program portrayed the visit of a tourist to the city of Rochester. The narrator discussed the various aspects of Rochester, N. Y., and suddenly, about halfway through the program, he discovered that they were passing the Mayo Clinic.

I am sure that the present occupant of the chair [Mr. THYE] would know that the famous Mayo Clinic was in Rochester, Minn., and not in Rochester, N. Y., but the narrator portrayed it as being in Rochester, N. Y.

Thereafter, they carried out an elaborate reenactment of a scene of entering the Mayo Clinic and inspecting the buildings and watching the work of the clinic. This scene at the Mayo Clinic is supposed to have taken place in Rochester, N. Y. I cannot comprehend that responsible people, in a program which attempts to accurately portray the United States, could have made such a factual blunder.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was this script written by the staff of the broadcasting company?

Mr. FERGUSON. By the staff of the broadcasting company.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And it was not supervised by the State Department?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. In another program designed for European consumption we found that there was a regular gossip column type of broadcast concerning Hollywood. Recently this program broadcast a detailed description of a Hollywood wedding ceremony and the expensive wedding party of an oft-married movie star and the equally oft-married spouse. It is difficult to understand how a detailed description of such a lavish and expensive affair could promote better understanding of, or good will for, the United States.

Mr. President, these two additional cases merely illustrate the need for a continuing investigation. It is, therefore, the conclusion of both committees that we should continue to investigate and

study other programs which are being beamed overseas. We will attempt to find out whether these programs are actually reaching the peoples to whom they are directed, and whether they have the intended effect on the listeners. Furthermore, we shall continue to examine the quality of these broadcasts and, if need be, shall report further to the Senate.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, before undertaking to discuss either the Aiken long-range bill or the Russell substitute for temporary support prices, I wish to make a few general observations on the problems confronting farmers and those dependent upon agriculture for a living, who constitute about one-fifth of our entire population.

I wish to give to the Senate the estimate of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics about probable prices for this year and probable prices for next year, because I hope that what I have to say on that subject will have some bearing upon whether or not we should proceed at this late hour in the session, and with so little opportunity to know what is in this long-range program, and how it will affect our farmers.

Mr. President, what we do in the way of a long-range program, if it should be adopted by the Congress, will have a very vital effect, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has just said, upon the future of agriculture in this Nation.

In driving Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden the angel with the flaming sword announced to them a fundamental principle of future life for all mankind: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Notwithstanding our remarkable progress in the physical sciences there is no alchemy by which man's three essential needs—food, clothing, and shelter—can be produced without labor. Either we sweat or someone sweats for us if we are to eat bread. The progress of civilization has been characterized by an effort to solve that problem either through the invention of labor-saving devices or the shifting of the burden to the shoulders of others.

Of all human needs food is the most essential. There has never been a period of recorded history in which many people did not go hungry and in which some did not die from starvation. In the Far East, hunger has been a perpetual problem. In the land of Goshen, normally flowing with milk and honey, famine during seven lean years was averted only by the prophetic vision of Joseph. In his African Game Trails, Teddy Roosevelt tells about natives falling on some wild animal he had killed and making a hearty meal of "blood and guts." And an ancient prophet of conservation tells us that the sands of the desert have covered once proud cities which nurtured a race that was unmindful of the good earth that fed it.

Western Europe to which we and a large portion of the world are indebted for the Christian religion, a system of law based upon reason and justice, literature, art, and science—in a word what we regard as modern civilization, has failed for several centuries to produce a food supply adequate for its needs. Domestic production has been supplemented by imports from colonial possessions and by the exchange of industrial products for food.

Many factors enter into our greatness, not the least of which has been our ability to produce not only an adequate food supply for ourselves but likewise a surplus for export to others. If the time ever comes when we shall be unable to feed ourselves it will be the harbinger of the day when we shall cease to be the most powerful Nation in the world.

During my 31 years of public service, which commenced in the State senate in January, 1916, my chief ambition and my major objective have been to make some contribution in Virginia and in the Nation to the preservation of our soil and our renewable natural resources and the reestablishment of farming as a satisfying as well as remunerative manner of life. As a State legislator I worked for improved roads that would take our farmers out of the mud, and for rural schools that would release the vigorous minds of rural children from the bondage of ignorance. I supported tax reforms that lifted State taxation from farm lands and transferred the burden of building and maintaining farm roads from the localities to the State. For 10 years as a member of the Tax Committee of the House of Representatives I worked for tax legislation that would give due recognition to the fact that for 100 years the per capita cash income of the farm group was far below that of the nonfarm group. And during my 15 years of service in the Congress I have supported the entire legislative program of the Farm Bureau Federation including the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program to recapture foreign markets for our surplus tobacco, cotton, wheat, apples, and to a lesser degree other farm products, lost to us by an international trade war started by the enactment in 1930 of the Smoot-Hawley protective tariff. And for 12 years as chairman of the House Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation I endeavored to convince some 20,000,000 sportsmen in the United States that the future of hunting and fishing was definitely linked to the conservation of our fields and forests. During that period I insisted that the CCC camps and the Soil Conservation Service include the conservation of wildlife resources in their programs of conserving timber and land, as a means of bringing the farm group and the nonfarm group closer together and improving the recreational opportunities of both.

Since 1939 the net income of farmers, before taxes and before living cost rises are deducted, has increased 83 percent. That is a greater increase than has been enjoyed by any other single group in the Nation, and has given rise to the charge that farm prices are unreasonably high and constitute a major factor in the current inflation equation. The charge is not well founded. Between 1930 and 1939 the farm dollar was exchanged for the industrial dollar at a discount, leading some to believe that they had a vested right to purchase their food below the cost of production. Farm prices have risen more than other prices but they started in 1939 at a much lower level. Notwithstanding recent gains, the current per capita net income of our farmers is only 46 percent of that of the nonfarm group, and the purchasing power of the nonfarm group is above the prewar level of 1939. Our Nation is now consuming 12 percent more food than in 1939 and is consuming better food. If consumption of food at present prices was at the level of 1939 the percentage of the average income spent for that purpose would be 3 percent less than it was in the 1930–39 period. And the nonfarm group may have forgotten but our farmers will never forget that in the depression year of 1932 the net cash income of our farmers was only 23 percent of that of the nonfarm group. Nor will they forget that between May 1920 and January 1922 the cash income of farmers fell 60 percent. During the 1930 to 1938 depression thousands of farmers lost their land completely in foreclosure sales, while other thousands were able to retain their land by the sale of the fertility of its topsoil.

That is a situation which from the standpoint of future national defense as well as economic stability must not be permitted to recur. One-third of our topsoil is gone—exhausted or washed away—and we have an average of only 6 inches left. Our population will continue to increase and those now acquainted with the advantages of good food will always want it. We, plus Canada and Argentina, are the only three nations in the world with a surplus of food grain for export, and there will always be an export demand. Last but not least, the claim made by Thomas Jefferson more than 100 years ago, that our democracy can best be preserved through the preservation of the economic independence of our farmers, was never truer than it is today.

The depression which commenced in 1930 and lasted 8 years should have demonstrated to our industrial workers the extent to which full employment for them was dependent upon the purchasing power of the one-fifth of our population dependent upon agriculture. Sixty millions are now employed in industry and their output is 90 percent above the prewar level. In the years that lie ahead exports totaling not less than $10,000,000,000 and sustained purchasing power of the farm group will be required to furnish employment for 60,000,000 industrial workers.

In the Bible there are recorded prophecies which came true 600 years after they were made. If there be any living man who can prophesy with assurance what will happen even 6 months from now I do not know him. The best that any of us can do is to make a well-informed guess. Since those who work in our Bureau of Agricultural Economics are better informed than I on factors that

will influence the future of agriculture I shall give the Senate today its guess on the current outlook. Senators will, of course, observe that in making its guess the Bureau inserts an abundance of ifs, buts, and other qualifications.

The Bureau anticipates that the level of farm prices for 1948 will be about the same as the record level of 1947 and that income from farming will show only a slight decline, but both will be increasingly subject to fluctuations resulting from uncertainties in the foreign situation.

Employment, production, and incomes, which underlie domestic demand, set peacetime records in 1947 and only a sharp break, which is not expected now, could cause a big drop in domestic demand for farm products within the next year. But the possible results of inflationary pressure must not be overlooked. With prices continuing to rise and speculation increasing, our economy would become increasingly sensitive to shocks from such sources as shortages of basic materials, work stoppages, shifts in consumer spending and sudden changes in foreign balance. If these resulted in a further price boom followed by a reaction, the farmer would be a principal sufferer, just as he was after World War I. Farm product prices fall fast while interest on indebtedness, taxes, and many other elements entering into the cost of farming drop more slowly when a collapse occurs.

Foreign needs for American raw materials, including farm products, remain so critical that United States exports in 1949 will be limited almost entirely by the supply of dollars available.

We must remember that in 1946 the United States exports were more than $8,000,000,000 in excess of our imports. Even after deducting $3,000,000,000 of exports paid for by direct grants of public or private United States aid, that meant that foreign nations had to draw on their current earnings or reserves to the extent of more than $5,000,000,000 to pay for our export balance.

During 1947 we were exporting at the rate of $11,000,000,000 a year in excess of our imports. United States merchandise exports, particularly agricultural products, have declined this year from the 1947 record level. The value of agricultural exports in the first quarter of 1948 was lower than in any quarter of 1947 and about 13 percent below the 1947 quarterly average of $983,000,000. The European recovery program will tend to support agricultural exports during the remainder of 1948 but may not maintain them at first-quarter levels.

Foreign purchasers probably will not earn exchange much faster next year than in 1947 and their holdings of dollar assets and gold to make up the balance continue to be reduced. So, except to the extent that we find ways of increasing our import trade, the measure of our exports in 1949 will be largely the amount of Marshall-plan aid that is authorized.

The influence of this situation on farm-product prices is evident when we consider that in 1946 the physical quantity of our agricultural exports was about two and a half times the 1940 level and the value was nearly five times the 1935–39 average. In 1947 the quantity was 5 percent above 1946 and higher prices made the value still higher. This year, however, the quantity is substantially lower to date and if current prospects for crop production abroad are realized, foreign takings of United States farm products will be reduced perhaps 15 to 20 percent below last year's record of $3,900,000,000.

Wheat exports, which accounted for about one-third of the total value of agricultural exports in 1947, will be considerably less than last year's record but exports of cotton, tobacco, and fruits, which declined last year, are likely to be increased.

Before the war, cotton and tobacco made up about two-thirds of the value of our agricultural exports and food the rest. Since the war, the proportions have been reversed. The action of Britain in stopping exports of American tobacco last year to save dollars gave us a sample of how seriously the market for nonfood products may be affected by policies adopted by foreign countries in meeting their exchange problems.

Considering the outlook from a price angle, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics says there should be little change from 1947 levels in 1948 and prices should remain high enough generally to assure farmers a profitable return for a maximum production. At the same time the agency predicts that prices paid by farmers will average as high or higher in 1948 than in 1947 so that the parity ratio will remain about the same.

Here is the price picture, as the Bureau sees it, for some specific classes of farm products in 1948:

Livestock and meats: Total cash receipts to farmers for sales of meat animals probably will be a record or near-record despite prospect that total marketings will be the smallest since 1942.

Dairy products: Average prices about the same or higher than in 1947.

Poultry and eggs: At least as high average prices for eggs in 1948 as in 1947. Prices of turkeys and chickens will tend to remain strong because of shorter meat supplies and high consumer incomes.

Oils and fats: European demand will remain strong because poor crops have increased food needs and fats and oils are fairly inexpensive sources of calories. Prices in the United States will remain high as long as these conditions continue. Prices to farmers for the 1947 peanut crop were the highest in 37 years of record, due largely to the export demand for oils. Some decline is expected but levels would have to drop about 50 percent to reach support levels and such a drop is regarded as unlikely to occur within the next few months.

With respect to wheat, corn, and feed grain it is likely that prices in 1948–49 will continue well above support levels.

Fruits: Prices in 1948 probably will be about the same as in 1947 although demand may be slightly weaker.

Potatoes: Demand in 1948 probably will be about as strong as in 1947. Prices early this year were higher than last winter and exceeded support prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is making a most able and excellent address on the agricultural situation, and there are so few Senators present to listen to him that I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the Senator's permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Suggestion is made of the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Chavez	McCarthy	Taylor
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thye
Cordon	McGrath	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	White
Feazel	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Flanders	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murray	Young
Green	Myers	
Gurney	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, today we have heard much discussion about tobacco. Before the war, exports of flue-cured tobacco were half of production; in 1946–47, they were nearly 40 percent of a record crop. Reduced exports are to be expected, because of exchange problems, but this may be offset to some extent by domestic use which is expected to continue at peak levels. Cigarette manufacture will set a record. Because of the large production of flue-cured tobacco for the last 2 years, stocks have increased, and in view of prospects for demand, supplies would have been excessive in 1948–49 if production had not been cut substantially. Supplies of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco also are larger than a year ago, and would have been burdensome if reduction of allotments had not assured lower production in 1948.

Without undertaking to prophesy price trends for next year, I do wish to endorse several factors mentioned by the Bureau as having a possible influence thereon. That the farmer would be a principal sufferer if the present boom should turn next year into a deflation

is undoubtedly true. Using wholesale prices for 1926 as 100, wholesale prices advanced 27 percent more in 6 years after the commencement of World War I than in a similar period since the commencement of World War II. The former inflation was followed by a deflation which was most injurious to our farmers. With $110,000,000,000 of currency and bank check money in the hands of consumers no one can accurately predict at what exact point enough consumers would be priced out of the market to end the current boom. We know that the margin between purchasing power and prices is rapidly narrowing. The best antidote for our inflation is increased production, especially in such items as steel, coal, fertilizer, automobiles, electrical appliances and housing.

For the long pull with respect to export markets for farm products, the 102 multilateral trade agreements signed last year at the Geneva Trade Conference is an encouraging trend for the American farmer, notwithstanding the fact that the scheduled tariff reductions in many of them will not become immediately effective, although our reductions in the 15 agreements to which we are a party became immediately effective.

In this connection I would like to reiterate the view I expressed in connection with the recent discussion of extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act as to the vital importance of this program to our economy.

To a large extent modern wars have been trade wars. If it be true, and I believe it is, that economic chaos is the spawning bed for communism and that desperate men are willing to exchange ballots for bread, what contribution to a lasting peace would be our help in the economic rehabilitation of the countries of western Europe if after rehabilitation we refuse to trade with them? In two disastrous world wars we have found that war is indivisible. Most of us are convinced that peace is indivisible; that the economic welfare of democracy elsewhere in the world is of major concern to us; and that President Roosevelt was right when he said in 1937: "Our frontier is on the Rhine."

While export markets are available to industry and agriculture alike and particularly valuable to such farm crops as tobacco and cotton, it must be borne in mind that our domestic market has been and always will be our principal market. Any worth-while farm program, therefore, must have as its major objective appropriate adjustments to the domestic market. It is already apparent, for instance, that we are producing more tobacco and more peanuts than we can profitably sell. Some of the land now devoted to those crops must be shifted to other types of production. On the assumption that domestic prices will fall before production costs go down more efficient use must be made of machinery, gas engines, and electric power. I do not know the current figures but a few years ago the average farm in Virginia contained only 50 acres. The owner of such a farm cannot afford to buy and operate the machinery he needs.

Agriculture has become industrialized and to successfully compete, the modern farmer must have modern equipment. I am told, for instance, that 34 years ago 32 minutes of man-labor were required to produce a bushel of corn. Today, only 6 minutes. This tremendous saving in time has been brought about mostly by improved power machinery, plus the improved varieties of seed, disease control, and better use of fertilizers. But from 1913 to 1915 only 29 percent of the cost of corn production was cash outlay. Today it is 68 percent. Tractors, machinery, fuel oil, and the necessary reserve for depreciation on machinery make up 33 percent of the cost of producing corn today as compared with only 6 percent some 20 years ago.

During the past quarter of a century the problems of farm production have to a large extent been solved. We have not achieved the ultimate in efficient farm production because some do not apply known principles, others cannot finance the purchase of necessary equipment, and still others do not yet enjoy the benefit of rural electrification. But the farm problem which has not been solved and which merits our best attention and best efforts is how to make farming a more satisfactory manner of life, how to combine with the vigor and independence of farm life the social and cultural advantages of city life. For more than half a century the trend has been away from the farm to the big industrial centers. Agriculture is so vital to the future of this Nation that we cannot afford to keep losing our brightest and most energetic boys and girls because farm life is distasteful to them. Farm families must have more money to invest in better housing and in the amenities of life. Work on the farm for the boy, work in the home for the girl, need not be ill-paid drudgery. We must seek to develop in rural sections better elementary schools and make available to farm boys and girls in secondary schools and in colleges training in the arts and sciences of modern life as well as in scientific agriculture. We must give support to Ruritan Clubs which seek to develop the social activities and the community spirit of their respective neighborhoods.

In these several ways we can lay foundation stones for the perpetuity of our democracy. We start with the fact that every farmer knows that there is no substitute for work. We start with the fact that every farmer believes in a system of private enterprise under which superior brains, character, and energy may expect a superior reward. It is not an eleemosynary system nor one that guarantees anyone anything. Communism guarantees the essentials of food, clothing, and shelter, but delivers those essentials at a low level and at the price of chains and slavery. Our farmers know that our system of private enterprise is one in which they may take some hard knocks, but in doing so they build strength, character, and self-reliance, and over and above all else they are free. The best collateral for the loans we have made in the past and the loans we shall make in the future to the British people is that they love personal freedom. The best monument that we can build to the memory of those who died in two world wars for our freedom will be to make farming in America a satisfying manner of life. "Let us never forget," said Daniel Webster, "that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization."

Of course, Mr. President, entertaining the sentiments I have expressed on the general problems involved in farming and in agriculture generally, I believe in a long-range program, but I regret very much, with all due deference to the distinguished Senators who are sponsoring the Aiken bill, that I do not feel prepared to vote tonight on that bill, because, frankly, I do not know what is in it. I have studied the hearings, but the hearings were on a different bill. There were about 500 pages of hearings, and nearly all the witnesses had some suggestions or some criticisms to make of the first bill which was introduced. That bill was completely eliminated, and we have another bill of 96 pages. So far as I know, there have been no hearings on it, and I am sure the bill has not been sent over the country for study and comment, because I have not heard or received any comment from anyone in Virginia about what is in the new bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator speaks of the new farm bill. Is the Senator speaking of the Aiken bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Of the new Aiken bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that we are required to pass a farm bill providing for acreage reduction due to the policy of the Republican Party in enacting the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, raising the tariff barriers so high that foreign countries could not get dollar exchange with which to purchase American farm products? The Republicanism tariff policy, which has impoverished American agriculture, which has drained off the wealth from American agriculture and siphoned it into eastern industrial areas, is what caused this bill to be brought forth. Because of those tariff walls foreign countries do not have exchange with which to buy the food and fiber they need.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I have taken some time this evening—I hope not too much time—in discussing that very problem, and in undertaking to demonstrate that for 100 years the per capita income of the farm group has been lower than that of the nonfarm group, and that foreign markets have always been essential to our farmers because we produce more than we consume. I called attention to the fact that 40 percent of our cotton at one time was exported, from 40 to 50 percent of our tobacco, 20 percent of our apples, from 10

to 15 percent of our wheat. We have always needed the foreign markets, and of course if in the long run we do not receive imports from other countries from which they can obtain dollar exchange, they cannot buy from us. Our exports are running at the present time $5,000,000,000 more than our imports, and those exports are being financed to no small extent by loans and gifts. We know we cannot keep that up indefinitely. But I did want to say before I ended—and I have already spoken longer than I had planned to speak—just a word or two as to why I preferred action at this time on the Russell substitute to action on the new and amended Aiken bill.

As I said, the amended Aiken bill may be a wonderfully fine bill, but the first bill was certainly not a good one. I pointed out that practically all the witnesses criticized it, and the committee abandoned it in toto. Then after the proponents had brought out the new bill, on which there was no testimony, they themselves have offered 10 pages of amendments—I counted, I believe, 47 amendments in the 10 pages; I might have missed some—and I could not help but think, when the distinguished Senator from Vermont was reminding us on the Democratic side that a Democratic President had just praised his bill in a speech made in California, that while he was doing so the President's Secretary of Agriculture was pleading with the Senator from Vermont to make changes in his bill, and, as I understood him yesterday, most of these 47 changes were made at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture because he was not satisfied with the form in which the bill was drawn.

So, Mr. President, there is my problem. A bill consisting of 96 pages has been brought before the Senate. When debate began on it 10 pages of amendments to the bill were adopted. Then when Senators on the floor indicated they were not satisfied, the sponsors of the bill accepted an amendment relating to potatoes, another amendment relating to apples, another relating to chickens, and the Senate adopted an amendment affecting tobacco, and, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] says, an amendment dealing with ducks was put in the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Dead ducks.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I had overlooked that amendment. I guarantee, however, that with the possible exception of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who drew both bills, and who agreed to the various amendments, and who prepared other amendments, there is not another Member of this distinguished body who could stand on the floor tonight and without reference to numerous notes tell us what is now in the bill and what it means. I note, for instance, the bill starts off in the first part of it to abolish all local committees of the Production and Marketing Association. It is proposed to combine production and marketing with soil conservation and have an entirely new setup. That might be wise; I do not say it is not wise; I merely say that I am not prepared to vote, in effect, in the dark on taking a step such as that. There are 2,500 individuals in the production and marketing units of Virginia who handle acreage control, price support, and things of that kind. We have soil-conservation districts and men who are engaged in that work. We have the Extension Service, and men engaged in that work.

There is one thing I have noticed in the new bill, which apparently is in the right direction, and that is that it provides that in the future all educational work shall be under the supervision and direction of the Extension Service. I think that is a good provision.

I am not condemning the bill, Mr. President, because it would not be fair for me to condemn something I do not understand. I have tried to understand and have a little knowledge of what I am called upon to vote on. If I did not have to vote on the measure one way or another it would be a good thing; but I am obliged to vote, and being obliged to vote I want to say that I prefer to vote for what I know about, and I do know about the existing plan. Under the amendment of the Senator from Georgia that plan is to be continued in substantially its present form for 2 years. Perhaps the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will accept an amendment to make it less than 2 years, because June 30 is not a good time to end a support program. But I do know what that program means, Mr. President. It continues 90 percent of parity for certain basic products and a lower percentage for others.

Mr. President, I have given the Senate the statistics which were furnished me today by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that prices for this year, and so far as it could tell, well into next year, will run about as they are now, and the Bureau cannot anticipate that any major crop will fall below parity. If that be true, and since Congress will reconvene next January, why should we try tonight to adopt a long-range permanent program which we have never had before, which we do not understand, from which we may not be able to get away once we adopt it, and which, as the Senator from Georgia has said, may result, when our farmers are asking for bread, in handing them a stone. The safe, the prudent thing to do is to continue the present support program for the farmers for a limited period, and then when Congress meets next year, if the bill, as amended, is the answer to the farmers' prayer for permanent support for agriculture, we can receive the testimony of experienced witnesses and know what we are doing.

Mr. President, I discussed this matter for a long time with my good friend, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, with whom I served in the House. He told me, "We will not take your Aiken bill." Then I discussed the matter with Representative HOPE, of Kansas, whom I have known for many years, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House. He said, "We will not take your Aiken bill." Then the former chairman of the committee, and now the ranking minority member, Representative JOHN FLANNAGAN, of Virginia, came over to the Senate floor and told me, "The House will not take the Aiken bill." In view of that, does my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont, mean to say to us, "We are going to adjourn Congress without any relief for farmers at all?" The House will not take this bill. Will the Senator from Vermont, in view of that situation, say, "We are not going to take the House bill," thus winding up in a deadlock and leaving the farmers between the upper and the nether millstones? I hope that is not the Senator's position.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the House will not take the Senator's bill, in view of the fact that there are so many Members of this body who want to help the farmers, but do not want to take a leap in the dark, I hope the Senator will join with us in putting through in the present session the House provision for a temporary continuance of the support program, and let us leave alone the long-range program which may come up for action next January.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for any questions he may wish to propound.

Mr. WHERRY. There was some discussion a while ago with reference to what the Senate might take up next. I am not sure why that question was asked, but I should like to say that, if it makes any difference in the matter of obtaining unanimous consent, I should like to propound to the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure the following question: If they feel that ample debate has been had on the pending bill, or can be had by a certain hour—and I would suggest not later than 8 o'clock—can we then conclude the debate, and begin voting on the pending amendment in the nature of a substitute, and any amendments thereto which are germane, and then proceed to vote on final passage? Do the proponents and opponents of the measure feel that such an agreement can be entered into?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Since I was the one who made the request, and since the Senator from Nebraska says he does not know why I made it, I should like an opportunity to explain why I made it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska to propound some questions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to submit my unanimous-consent request, I think we shall not have to argue. I shall be glad to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that, immediately following the vote on all the amendments and the bill now under discussion, if we can agree on an hour, the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1387, Senate bill 2589, which is a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission. The idea is that it would expedite matters if we could take up this other legis-

lation tonight. I do not want to cut off debate. If there are Senators who feel that we should continue the debate on the pending bill, I would not want to shut off debate at all. But I feel that if the proponents and the opponents could agree on an hour—say 8 o'clock, or whatever hour is reasonable, if it is early enough—we could then proceed immediately to take up the Atomic Energy Commission bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the distinguished acting majority leader and to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that I am in thorough agreement with their desire to bring up the Atomic Energy Commission bill. I have a long speech on oleomargarine, in addition to my extemporaneous speech on cotton, which I shall be glad to place in the RECORD. In deference to my good friends from Nebraska and Iowa I do not wish to delay the proceedings.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the Senator's cooperation.

Let me now submit a suggestion to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Calendar No. 1387, Senate bill 2589, is a bill to provide for the extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission. Consideration of that bill would be a part of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there is on the calendar Senate bill 1949, a bill providing for an increased salary payment to postal employees. I believe that the bill has great merit. I should like to have the assurance of my distinguished friend from Nebraska that we can get some action on that bill before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I had the floor, and I yielded to my friend from Nebraska. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut stated that there was a bill on the calendar providing for an increased salary payment to postal employees. That bill provides for more than a salary increase for postal employees, does it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. I believe not. Senate bill 1949 provides for an increase in salary payment to postal employees.

Mr. MAYBANK. Postal employees only?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in thorough accord with the wish of my friend from Connecticut. However, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is the sponsor of a bill in behalf of navy yard workers. There are also other bills of that nature which should have consideration.

Mr. BALDWIN. I concur in the statement of the Senator from South Carolina. I believe that all the salary-increase bills should be considered before we adjourn.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, they should be.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in this position: If we are to adjourn on Saturday, we cannot guarantee which bills will receive consideration. However, I think I can assure the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that that is one of the pieces of legislation which will be brought before the Senate in time to get action in both Houses. I cannot guarantee that. I cannot guarantee anything. We can expedite the business of the Senate if we can obtain unanimous-consent agreements and reach a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not understand what time had been suggested.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not suggest a definite time. I had in mind perhaps 7:20, 7:30, or 8 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is now 25 minutes past 7. We could not very well turn the clock back. I would agree to vote on the substitute and conclude the debate thereon by 8:30, the time to be evenly divided. But there are three amendments which I intend to propose; and in the event the substitute should not be accepted, I should like to have 3 or 4 minutes briefly to explain those amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure there will be no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to vote on all pending amendments at 8:30?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had reserved the right to object. I want to understand exactly what I am agreeing to before I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me to suggest a unanimous-consent agreement which I think is in keeping with his wishes?

I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 8:30 the Senate proceed to vote on the pending question, which is the substitute for the committee amendment; and that thereafter the Senate proceed to vote on any amendments which are germane to the bill. I am satisfied that the distinguished Senator from Georgia will have no difficulty in obtaining 5 minutes on each amendment to explain his amendments so that Senators may know what they are voting upon. Then we can proceed to a final vote on the bill.

After a final vote on the bill has been had, a part of the unanimous-consent request is that the unfinished business be made Senate bill 2589, Calendar 1387, a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it would be agreeable to vote at 8:30 on the pending substitute, with the understanding that the three amendments which I intend to propose shall not be debated for longer than 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Vermont. At the conclusion of the vote on the amendments the Senate would vote on final passage of the bill, and would then proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2589, Calendar 1387, the bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I would agree to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to limit amendments to those which are germane to the subject matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under my suggestion, no amendments would be offered save the three to which I refer, which have already been printed and are lying on the table.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I make the further request that no amendments which are not germane shall be offered to the Atomic Energy Commission bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let us not get so far out that I do not know what I am doing. I have no objection to that request.

Mr. MAYBANK. I submit the request, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. I have an amendment which I should like to present. May I have 5 minutes to discuss it?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. If a rule as to germaneness of amendments is to be adopted, I should like to modify it to this extent, that any amendment which may be proposed may be debated for not longer than 10 minutes, the time to be divided equally between the author of the amendment and the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have a number of amendments to present to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me suggest that if the time is evenly divided, there will be half an hour for each side.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the vote this afternoon, it is very possible that the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be accepted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I decline to yield further. The Senator from Illinois has suggested that the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois might make possible the acceptance of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be adopted, because it would benefit the cotton farmers, the cotton ginners, the cotton buyers, the cotton workers, and everyone except the New Orleans and New York Cotton Exchanges and the Chicago Board of Trade.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I am trying to ascertain the request which has been made by the distinguished acting majority leader. As I understand, the request applies to amendments to the substitute amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. The unanimous-consent request is to vote on the substitute at 8:30, and thereafter to allow 10 minutes for each amendment which may be proposed to the bill, and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inform the Senator from Nebraska that if the substitute amendment is adopted, that will preclude the offering of any other amendment, inasmuch as then there will be a substitute bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Chair is entirely correct. For that reason I stated in my unanimous-consent request that in the event the substitute amendment be rejected, the rule as to amendments will apply.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I so amend my request, certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to vote on the substitute amendment at 8:30 p. m.?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I may agree to the request, because I think it is proper. But I wish to state, as I started to say a moment ago, that in view of the vote which was had this afernoon on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, it seems to me there is a possibility that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment might prevail. Mr. President, I have some amendments which perhaps the Senator from Georgia will agree to; they are amendments which I believe would help his substitute amendment. That is what I wish to discuss. Even at this late hour I do not wish to be barred from discussing those amendments, because it seems to me that the matters to which they relate are important.

We have heard a great deal about what is contained in the so-called Aiken bill, but we have not heard very much about what is contained in the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if that is the case, there is no possibility of obtaining a unanimous-consent agreement, I assume. I assumed that if the substitute amendment were adopted, that would bring all these matters to an end. However, if the Senator from Illinois wishes to have more than 10 minutes on each of his amendments——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it might not take me more than 10 minutes on all of my amendments, but I wish to be able to discuss them with the Senator from Georgia when I have an opportunity to obtain recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, let me make another request. I ask Senators please to be patient, for I am trying to expedite the handling of this matter. Will the Senator from Georgia agree to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, if it is modified so as to provide for a vote at 9 o'clock, so that it will be agreed that the vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be had at 9 o'clock, and that between now and then the amendments to the substitute may be offered? At that time we certainly should be able to vote on the substitute if it is amended.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me propound a further inquiry. Is it the intention of the acting majority leader to have the Senate take up the atomic-energy bill tonight and conclude action on it tonight?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have action on it concluded tonight, if possible; but if not, we would make it the unfinished business, and carry it over until tomorrow.

Of course we have already arranged to begin to call the calendar when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well, Mr. President; if the Senator is agreeable to having the vote taken one-half an hour later than the time first proposed in the requested agreement, I shall have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I submit the request as it has been stated by the Senator from Georgia, except to have the hour for voting 9 o'clock instead of 8:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request as now presented?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the agreement. I assume that the time will be equally divided.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. As I understand, the situation under the agreement, we shall have half an hour and the other side will have half an hour on the amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time will be divided equally between now and 9 o'clock, and that at least 30 minutes will be allowed to the Senator from Illinois for his amendments, and that that time also will be equally divided.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, we have half an hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

REPEAL OF THE OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with the oleomargarine situation, I have prepared somewhat lengthy remarks, and I now ask consent to have them printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the Eightieth Congress seems bent on proving once again that in this democracy the will of the people does not always prevail and even the will of an overwhelming majority of Congress can be thwarted by a few.

The people have made it abundantly clear that they want the Federal antimargarine laws repealed. I do not refer merely to the Gallup poll which showed that 69 percent of the people of this country favor repeal while only 15 percent oppose it and which also revealed that a majority of the farmers of this country favor repeal. I refer to the thousands of letters from housewives and workingmen and merchants—from individuals all over the United States—which, week after week and day after day, have poured into the offices of Members of the Senate and the House asking that these discriminatory laws be removed from the statute books. I refer to the testimony in the House and Senate hearings on this subject by official representatives of organizations of wholesale and retail grocers, settlement houses, hospitals, farmers, veterans, labor, women's groups, consumers, and many others—all overwhelmingly in favor of repeal. I refer to hundreds of editorials from newspapers in every State in the Union, weeklies and dailies, large and small which, regardless of whether they are conservative or liberal, Republican or Democrat, have united in demanding an end to these vicious laws.

Congress has made its attitude abundantly clear, too. Nearly 2 months ago, the House passed H. R. 2245, sponsored by my distinguished fellow South Carolinian, Representative MENDEL RIVERS, the bill to repeal all the Federal taxes and license fees on margarine, by a vote of 260 to 106. During the very thorough debate in the House on this issue more than a dozen amendments were offered which would have modified or diluted the repeal measure. Every one of them was voted down. The House had, earlier, demonstrated its attitude when 218 Members took the rare step of signing a petition to discharge one of their most respected committees—the Agriculture Committee—from further consideration of H. R. 2245 after that committee had followed its traditional practice of tabling all margarine tax repeal measures.

Republicans and Democrats, northerners, westerners, and southerners, representatives from States with large dairy interests as well as those from States with cotton and soybean interests, and representatives from large urban and small-town areas, too, all joined to make the position of the House unmistakably clear—the House of Representatives wants these antimargarine laws repealed.

When the bill came to the Senate this body was so zealous for repeal that it overruled its distinguished President and by a vote of 47 to 30 referred H. R. 2245 to the Senate Finance Committee in order that the measure might have prompt consideration there so that we might be able to act on it before this Congress adjourned. The Finance Committee held full hearings on H. R. 2245. Both sides had every opportunity to state their positions, clearly and fairly. And what was the result?

The Senate Finance Committee reported H. R. 2245 favorably, with one strengthening amendment. The vote was 12 to 0. I want to emphasize that point, for as you know, there are Members on the Finance Committee from States with large dairy interests, and yet there was not one single vote on that committee against the antimargarine laws.

The attitude of the whole Senate on this issue was further demonstrated on Tuesday of this week when this body voted 57 to 26 to bring up H. R. 2245 for consideration.

I think the record shows convincingly that for every Member of the Eightieth Congress who favors retention of the Federal antimargarine laws there are two or more who favor repeal. I do not believe that even the most avid supporter of the butter lobby's position would deny that statement.

Yes, the people favor repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws—overwhelmingly. The Eightieth Congress favors repeal of the Fed-

eral antimargarine laws—overwhelmingly. And yet—it would appear—those laws are not going to be repealed.

Why? I think we are entitled to ask that question and I think the people of this country are entitled to an answer.

We are told that the Senate doesn't have time to consider the question, that Congress must adjourn this week.

I am not satisfied with that answer and I don't think the people of this country will be satisfied with it.

This is legislation by the clock and it is the wrong way to legislate. The leadership of the Congress should be reminded that we are the servants of the people and not independent entrepreneurs. We are, to state it bluntly, hired to represent the people here and to carry on their business here. We have an obligation to the people who sent us here to finish our job before we quit.

I do not delude myself that what I say now will change the minds of the GOP leadership. If they decree it, I suppose we shall quit this week without action on H. R. 2245 and other important matters. And apparently they are determined to decree it.

But even if we quit this week there is no proper reason for not considering H. R. 2245. I know that there are Members who have threatened to filibuster this bill. But these same Members are among those most eager to adjourn Saturday night. Let them talk then, until the one desire—to quit—overcomes the other—to defeat by talk—this margarine tax repeal measure. We will at least learn then how strongly these Members believe in the absolute necessity of quitting now whether the business of the Senate is completed or not.

I don't believe there is any such necessity, although I am as eager as anyone here to go home. But I don't want to leave until we finish our job. And one of our jobs is to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws.

It is said that there are more important measures to consider than H. R. 2245. In one sense that may be true. Europe will not go hungry, Government bureaus will not be deprived of funds, our foreign trade will not suffer—if we fail to act on H. R. 2245. But the importance of this measure should not be minimized. This is not just a bill to remove a few Federal taxes and license fees. That is not insignificant in itself, but it is only a part—the smaller part—of the real issue.

That issue is one of principle and of justice—and it strikes at the fundamental concepts upon which this country was founded and upon which, with a few unfortunate deviations, it has flourished for 160 years. How many tributes have been paid to our free-enterprise system during all these years! How many glowing tales of achievement under a system of free American markets where initiative and skill were justly rewarded and where the economic privileges and royal franchises of European oligarchies were no more! Our proudest boast from childhood has been that we Americans believed in fair play.

But for margarine—for the industry, for the farmers who grow the ingredients of margarine, for the hundreds of thousands of wholesale and retail merchants who sell it, enterprise has not been free. Margarine has entered the market shackled and restricted. The initiative and skill which produced margarine, and has steadily improved it, has been impeded at every step. Butter, its competitor, has been granted economic advantages unique in our Federal legislative history. And "fair play" has been only a mockery as far as margarine is concerned.

No other American product is discriminated against by the Federal Government in this way. For a hundred years before 1886, when the first Federal antimargarine law was enacted, we had avoided the economic sins of our European forebears. We had never before erected an internal tariff against one American product for the alleged protection of another. Indeed, one of the chief differences—one of the great progressive improvements of the constitutional system over the earlier Articles of Confederation—was that it opened the way for free trade within the 13 States. No longer could Virginia impose import duties on the products of Massachusetts or Pennsylvania on those of the Carolinas. Largely as a result of this free internal trade system, greater economic and industrial progress was achieved in this country in a few generations than had ever been achieved before in the long history of man.

It is little wonder then that those who proposed the first Federal antimargarine law proposed in 1886 were apologetic on this point. They admitted, in the words of Senator Miller of New York—who sponsored that measure in the Senate—that this was "a new species of legislation" in this country.

Mr. President, it was a "new species" and it was a shameful one for it had as its frank and avowed purpose—admitted freely over and over again—the crippling or the destruction of one legitimate American industry for the benefit of another and competing American industry. I could fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with these admissions of the butter lobby and its spokesmen as to the true purpose of the antimargarine laws. But I shall not take the time. It is all there for you to see in the RECORD. I shall mention only a few samples. Senator Miller said that he wanted the bill to protect the dairy industry of New York and he wanted it even if it went so far as to "exterminate the rival industry, if necessary." Other Congressmen repeated this view. In 1902, when the original law was amended to place a prohibitive 10 cents a pound tax on artificially colored margarine, the testimony of the butter interests before the House Agriculture Committee was so shockingly barefaced on this point that it provoked the chairman of that committee, Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, and six other members, to issue a minority report in which they said:

"We do not believe that Congress ought to ruin one American industry to benefit another. And that is just the object sought by these men by their own confession. * * * The minority believes it to be class legislation of the most pronounced kind and it would establish a precedent which, if followed, would create monopolies, destroy competition, and militate against the public good."

In 1932, when—the earlier laws having failed to destroy the margarine industry—the butter interests secured another amendment applying the 10 cents per pound tax to naturally colored yellow margarine, Senator Townsend, who led the fight for that amendment in the Senate, admitted what none can doubt: "The record of the proceedings of Congress," he said, "will convince any reader that the intent of the enactment was to protect the dairy interests."

That is still the intent of the antimargarine laws. It has not changed one iota. As late as 1941 the Dairy Record, a magazine representing the dairy industry, said: "The dairy industry * * * must never rest until the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine have been outlawed in this country." And testimony of the butter interests in the recent Senate hearings included a demand from John Brandt, president of the Land O' Lakes Creameries, for an increase in the taxes of margarine. "That," said Mr. Brandt, "is the only way to do the job."

I suggest that the job is already being done on the American people and the American economic system. It is not a pretty job. It smells to high heaven. As A. L. M. Wiggins, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, told the Finance Committee, these laws are not revenue laws or even regulatory laws. They are "punitive instruments."

This is the situation, then, beyond quibble or question: 62 years ago Congress passed legislation designed to protect one American industry at the expense of another—to give an advantage in the competitive market to butter over margarine. This punitive legislation has survived until today—penalizing one domestic industry for the benefit of another, one group of American farmers for the advantage of another, one group of consumers—the low income group—while another group—those who can afford butter—was left untouched.

I doubt that there is anything that Congress could do today more important than removing this odious precedent, this gross corruption of our basic principles, from our statute books. If this precedent were followed, cotton could with justification demand discriminatory taxes on rayon; leather could rightfully ask for punitive taxes on plastics; lard could justify a claim to similar protection from shortening, and so on, almost without end. If it were followed we would soon find ourselves back in the chaotic economy of the days of the Articles of Confederation or of some of the European states in more recent times. We would Balkanize our economic system.

Now, not next year, is the time to remove this dangerous precedent from our laws. This is primarily a question of principle and of our devotion to the ideals of government and economics to which we pay such constant lip service. The excuses that have been given for not acting now on this issue merely lend credence to the charge of insincerity. We can prove our sincerity only by repealing these laws.

I referred to the statement of the Under Secretary of the Treasury that the antimargarine laws were "punitive instruments." This, it appears, has been the view of the Treasury Department, which is charged with their enforcement, for many years.

Whom do they punish, Mr. President? They punish the 5,000,000 American farm people who grow cotton—and whose cottonseed is, in many cases, their only unmortgaged crop. The discriminatory burdens on margarine are burdens on these needy farmers and their families, for margarine is the largest and most favorable market for their cottonseed oil.

During 1947, 53 percent of all the fats and oils used in margarine came from cottonseed. Thirty-two percent, almost one-third of all the cottonseed oil produced, went into margarine. During the first 4 months of 1948 margarine has consumed approximately 40 percent of the available cottonseed oil.

No one can say how much more margarine would be sold or how much more cottonseed oil would be used by the margarine industry, if the antimargarine laws were repealed. But we can all agree that it would be considerable.

Every day, therefore, that we delay action on H. R. 2245 we deprive these needy people of their rightful access to a free market.

Who else is affected by these punitive laws? I think it would be far easier to say who is not—if there are any who have escaped? Certainly, the 600,000 farmers who grow soybeans—and their families—are directly harmed by the antimargarine laws. For margarine constitutes the second largest market for soybean oil. During 1947, according to official Government statistics, 37 percent of all fats and oils used in margarine came from soybeans. Soybean farmers and their families were able to buy more of the good things of life because this market existed in margarine but they were deprived of part of their

rightful return from their crops by the discriminatory burdens imposed upon margarine by the Federal Government. How much more the margarine market would mean in cash income to these farmers if these burdens were removed is again a matter of conjecture, but we know that it would probably be significant.

These taxes and license fees imposed on margarine are particularly punitive with regard to wholesale and retail food dealers. Less than 1 retail food unit in 2 in this country handles any margarine at all and only 1 in 100 handles yellow margarine. The reason is simple: The retail dealer must pay an annual license fee of $6 a year in order to sell uncolored margarine; if he sells yellow margarine he must pay $48 a year. In addition, he must keep records and file reports and comply with various burdensome regulations on the handling and sale of the product—all under penalty of heavy fine or imprisonment for violations.

The burdens are multiplied for the wholesaler who handles margarine. He must pay an annual license fee of $200 to sell the uncolored product; $480, if he sells yellow margarine and there is a multitudinous list of regulations with which he must comply. Testimony before the Senate Finance Committee revealed that it costs the average wholesale establishment between $60 and $100 a month for clerical help alone to keep abreast of margarine law requirements. There are 11 separate reports which must be made every month by the wholesaler under oath. There are, in addition, seven separate records which must be kept available for inspection at all times. There is a fine of $50 to $500 or imprisonment for 30 days to 6 months for each violation of the requirements as to any of these 18 records and reports. The wonder is not that so few wholesalers handle margarine under these conditions but that any at all can be found to brave the mass of license fees, records, reports, and threatened penalties imposed for the sole purpose of restricting, crippling, and punishing the margarine industry.

Who else is victimized by these "punitive instruments"—the antimargarine laws? The American people—or at least the 80 percent of them that, according to a recent survey, now use some margarine. Thirty million American families are consumers of margarine. Many of these are recent converts having abandoned butter when it skyrocketed in price. Some of them use only a little margarine. By far the largest consumption is by low-income people who cannot afford butter—even for special occasions. Since the taxes imposed upon margarine are inevitably passed on to consumers, their burden falls heaviest upon those who are least able to bear it. But the burden is not limited to the amount of the taxes and license fees. This is only a small part of it.

The contribution of the antimargarine laws to the high cost of living has been most damaging to the American people in their effect on competition within the industry. The taxes, license fees and regulations imposed on margarine have resulted in restricting its manufacture and distribution. They have discouraged the investment of new capital in the margarine industry and at every level, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, they have restricted competition. Such restriction, of course, tends to keep prices higher. Again, it is the consumer—especially the low-income consumer—who pays.

Repeal of the antimargarine laws would, in the long run, increase competition within the margarine industry and would inevitably tend to bring about reduced prices to consumers.

But the burden on consumers is by no means wholly economic. The antimargarine taxes and license fees are levied on the health of the people, too. No one—unless he is completely blind to the truth—questions the nutritional values of margarine today. It is comparable in every way to high quality butter. The expert testimony from nutritional experts, medical groups, laboratory scientists, and others is overwhelming on this point. And yet the antimargarine laws prevent margarine from filling the table fat needs of the American people—needs which butter cannot fill. Twenty years ago, in 1927, the combined consumption of butter and margarine in the United States was 20.4 pounds per person. Last year it was 16.2 pounds per person, which means that on an average the American people got 4 pounds less table fat last year than in 1927. But even the 1927 level was low from a desirable nutritional standard. The Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics recommended an annual per capita consumption of butter alone of 35 pounds as "an adequate diet at moderate cost." And yet, despite increasing margarine consumption in recent years, the table-fat deficit in the diet of the American people is rapidly growing. The reason is not hard to find. Butter production dropped nearly one-third between 1936 and 1946. Margarine, because of the restrictions imposed upon it by law, could not fill the gap. Yet the gap should be filled if we are to achieve our health goals as a people.

This Congress, if it adjourns without passing H. R. 2245, will be prolonging this nutritional deficit. It will be preventing the margarine industry from properly filling the vital health needs of millions of our people—especially among the low-income groups.

There are special groups of less fortunate people who are particularly affected by the antimargarine laws: the sick in hospitals, the aged in old-folks homes, the children in orphanages, and all others in institutions of this kind. The Federal antimargarine laws impose a tax of $600 per year on restaurants, boarding houses, hospitals, and all other institutions, not publicly owned, which mix yellow coloring into margarine. Under the law they are regarded as manufacturers. As a result, many of these institutions, operating on a limited budget in this inflationary period, have been serving bread dry or with an occasional bit of apple butter or jelly to sick and unfortunate people. Most of these institutions cannot afford to buy butter and, due to the Federal antimargarine laws, they do not buy margarine, either. It is understandable then why the American Hospital Association, representing 4,000 hospitals and 85 percent of the Nation's general-hospital beds, and the National Federation of Settlements, representing 211 settlement houses in 25 States, suggested repeal so strongly in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee.

Yes, the antimargarine laws are punitive laws—they punish the millions of American farmers in 44 States who grow the ingredients of margarine. They punish the hundreds of thousands of wholesale and retail merchants who either handle or would otherwise handle margarine. And they punish the American people who consume margarine—more than a hundred million of them—the sick and the well, the very old and the orphans.

I should like for the apologists for these laws and those who are demanding that Congress adjourn before it acts to repeal them to tell us just what crime any of these groups have committed to deserve the punishment of these punitive laws. I think we would discover that in this case, the punishment does not fit the crime or the perpetrators of the crime. For the guilty are not the cotton or soybean farmers or the distributors of margarine or the American people. The crime was committed by those who enacted this vicious, un-American legislation, and it is being committed today by those who seek to retain it.

Today the butter lobby and those who struggle to maintain the antimargarine laws have lost their best weapon—the lack of knowledge of the American people as to the issues involved. Since the Fiftieth Congress enacted the first antimargarine laws nearly a hundred bills have been introduced for their modification or repeal. Not one of those bills ever reached the floor of the House or Senate. For the most part the debate on the issues was restricted to the cloistered confines of committee rooms—and even there only a handful ever reached the hearing stage.

In 1917, in 1944, and again this year—margarine amendments were introduced in the Senate to the general revenue bills. I am proud that I had a part in those efforts in 1944 and March 1948. I introduced amendments on both occasions. I believe those earlier efforts paved the way for the progress we have made this session. The amendments were beaten chiefly, I think the record will show, not on their merits but because it was contended that they were not germane to the revenue bills. Of course, all of us who voted for those amendments would have preferred a clear-cut decision on the margarine issue without connecting it with the revenue bills, but we could not obtain consideration by the Senate of such bills. We still cannot obtain that consideration.

But one thing we have gained as a result of this year's campaign to repeal these laws. The debate in both House and Senate, the full hearings by committees, the hard-fought but sure progress of the repeal bill has been thoroughly publicized at every step by press and radio. The American people have learned the true facts for the first time about the antimargarine laws. Congress, too, has had a better opportunity to ascertain the merits of the case.

"Give the people light and they will find their own way"—the masthead of a great newspaper chain reads. The people have gotten the light at last on margarine, and so has Congress. The only problem is to persuade Congress to find its way to repeal the antimargarine laws.

The results of this popular education must be dismaying to the butter lobby. They have lost the votes and they have lost the arguments. All that is left to them now is delay.

In conclusion, I want again to urge this Eightieth Congress to act now to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws. This is not a new issue. Margarine has been waiting for 62 years for justice. I cannot accept the idea that injustice must be endured longer simply because it is venerable. That is all the more reason to put an end to it as soon as possible.

Nor, as we have seen, is this a trivial issue. It strikes at the heart of our economic concepts and political principles.

And once again, I urge this Congress to finish its job before it quits. The American people have a right to expect that.

If we adjourn now, without acting on the bill to repeal the antimargarine laws, do not console yourselves with the delusion that the people will forget or will not care. Do not for a moment doubt that those thousands upon thousands of individuals who have written this Congress demanding repeal will be indifferent. The American housewife has a good memory and she knows what she wants—she wants this bill passed. And she wants it passed now. Nor will those newspaper editors—hundreds of them in every State in the Union—who have fought so earnestly for the repeal of the antimargarine laws let inaction on our part pass unnoticed. They will all remember what we do here now on this bill—and they will still remember in November.

Justice is never a small thing—never a thing that can be put off or delayed with

impunity. It has been denied the margarine industry and those who grow the ingredients of margarine and consume margarine for more than half a century. I call on the leadership of the Senate to call up the bill to repeal the antimargarine laws—to call it up now—and to put an end once and for all time to this disgraceful blot on our legislative history.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am very happy to have this opportunity to address the Senate while the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is in the chair and presiding, because the Senator from Minnesota was one of the members of the committee, together with my good friends the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and others, who chose Columbia, S. C., as the place at which to hold the cotton hearings. We were delighted to have the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, together with the other members of the committee, there with us last fall. I wish to state how grateful I was that the cotton hearings were held in my State, and that the witnesses from North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and other States attended those hearings. I also wish to say that, as all of us know, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who now occupies the chair, well understood the views of the farmers and others in our section of the country in regard to the matters there under consideration, as did the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the distinguished Senator from South Carolina desire to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; in view of the limited time, I would not wish to have the Senator do so, although I appreciate his thoughtfulness. As the Senator knows, I have submitted for printing in the RECORD the speech I had intended to make.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish to say that the Senator from South Carolina is a very distinguished cotton expert, who probably knows more about the cotton business and the problems of the cotton farmer than does any other Member of this body. I know the Senator will make a very able speech, and one which will be most informative, and one from which great value will come to the cotton growers of the country. So I hoped the distinguished Senator would permit me to have a quorum call, so that a large number of his colleagues could hear him speak.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator; but in view of the limited time, although I appreciate the thoughfulness of my distinguished friend, I shall proceed now.

Mr. President, I was raised with cotton. I have planted cotton; I have ginned cotton, I have exported cotton, as the Senator from Mississippi well knows; and I was a member of a firm that perhaps knows more about cotton than does anyone else in this city, including the Department of Agriculture, except Will Clayton, and he left yesterday.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, let me say that what the Senator has said is entirely true. Certainly the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has accomplished more for the cotton growers of his State and of the South than has any other person who has sat in the Senate. The Senator from South Carolina and the late Senator Bankhead are two of the ablest agricultural statesmen who ever sat in this body. The Senator from South Carolina has a very distinguished record, and I know that his service here has been of great benefit to the farmers of the South. I certainly congratulate him; and I shall stay here to hear his speech, because I know he will make a worth-while contribution to this discussion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say that the late Senator Bankhead and I for years served on the Banking and Currency Committee, and in those days we wrote many laws. I always admired and revered him. We talked together about many things. As the Senator from Mississippi has indicated, Senator Bankhead consulted me about some things.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss the cotton situation. I do not wish it thought for a moment that I am opposed to this agricultural bill because of cotton alone. I appreciate and understand what the distinguished Senator from Vermont went through in the course of the long hearings which were held throughout the country last year, along with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who now occupies the chair, and the other members of the subcommittee. I am grateful for all they have done, and I appreciate it. I am not here to—perhaps I may say fly-blow any bill; that is not my purpose. However, in view of the fact that it is expected that the Congress will adjourn on Saturday, certainly there is in this bill too much that has not yet been considered—and certainly many parts of the bill should be thoroughly considered before allowing it to pass hastily.

I thoroughly agree with what my distinguished friend the Senator from Georgia said in his colloquy with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who now is presiding; he described the bill as a measure to reduce production. I really believe that. I do not know the wheat situation as the distinguished Presiding Officer knows it; I do not know the dairy situation as the distinguished Senator from Vermont knows it; but I do know the cotton situation.

I have great respect for the Secretary of Agriculture. He is a career man, having come up the hard way. He deserves full credit. However, if he approved the reduction in cotton parity from 90 to 75 percent, then he would approve wide-open gambling in the United States, and everybody running a gambling house ought to open a bucket shop at the crossroads in Carolina, Mississippi, Georgia, and Oklahoma.

Mr. President, there are more than 50 grades of cotton. There are more than 50 different staples. It is possible to have a surplus in one while having a deficit in the other. I know, of course, that parity is based on Middling fifteen-sixteenths Scotland. Everybody knows that, and everybody knows how parity is established. But the fluctuations between Middling inch, inch and a sixteenth, inch and a quarter, and what we call buzz-fuzz cotton, five-eighths or seven-eighths cotton, will bring only terrible headaches and problems that the Department of Agriculture could never solve. Cotton grading, cotton ginning, cotton stippling is an art for which the Department of Agriculture through its appropriations does not have sufficient money to employ adequate personnel.

The large firms in New York and New Orleans—I have no unkind remarks for them—estimate the cotton crop. Mr. President, do you know what is to be done under the pending bill? They estimate the cotton crop in August, September, and October, creating fluctuations in the market that keep the cotton world going round, that keep the market going up and down. Under the pending bill they would be in a position to make an estimate of surplus under the law that will change parity on cotton from 90 percent to 75 percent. In other words, the big firms in this country are being given the right under the law to say what the surplus of cotton may be or the surplus of wheat or any other commodity. Mr. President, you know more about wheat than I do. I know cotton. I was raised with cotton.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am listening with great attention, as I always do when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina addresses himself to any agricultural question, particularly as it pertains to any phase of cotton from the time it is planted, through every stage of its development, the ginning, the marketing, the milling, and the exporting, because, as the Senator says, he has spent his life in that business.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all I have ever done.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is recognized here as being probably the greatest expert in the Congress for many years on that question. The Senator must know that if the bill will affect the speculation and the estimates to which he refers, with respect to cotton, with which he is so familiar, its effect will also be felt on other commodities.

Mr. MAYBANK. I certainly agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are all handled in a similar way.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. While the Senator is an expert on cotton and is more intimately informed as to it, his experience with cotton would be very helpful in arriving at a firm conclusion as to the effect it would have on other commodities of other farmers.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Having planted cotton, having grown it, having financed the growing of it, having bought and sold cotton, and having been also, as the Senator knows, before coming to the Senate, a cotton broker, I know what the bill would do. It would open the door wide between 75 percent and 90 percent. Who is to determine the surplus? The Department of Agriculture? Certainly. They make the crop estimates on wheat, corn, cotton, and other commodities, but the private firms in New York, New Orleans and Chicago—with due respect and appreciation of those cities—make the estimates, and the boys at the cross roads go down to the bucket shop and come out with empty pockets. The poor farmer is taken for a ride.

I have been in the Senate since 1941. I was on the committee which considered the commodity credit bill. I was on the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency with the late John Bankhead. I knew the Steagall-Bankhead group, I worked with them. I say, Mr. President, we have done pretty well. Through the Commodity Credit Corporation we have made, to this time, about $200,000,000 on commodities. Of course, the war came along. But do you realize, Mr. President, that in 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944 even with the war, cotton was below parity?

I may be talking too much about cotton. I realize one should not be sectional.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. As a matter of principle, if a farmer is entitled to 75 percent of parity, why is he not entitled to 90 percent? If it is right to give him 75 percent, if we are going into that field, why do we not remove all discrimination against him and place him on an equal basis?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Mississippi is eminently correct. I voted for 95-percent parity, as did the Senator, when former Senator Bankhead brought the bill in here, which was, if I remember right, in 1943.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was one of the authors of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. So was I. We joined in sponsoring the bill. If the farmer is entitled to 75 percent, he is entitled to 90. But, Mr. President, the gamblers will be operating between the 75 percent and the 90 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me finish this sentence please. It opens up the cotton market and also the wheat markets to the gamblers as they were opened up to the gamblers in the twenties.

I saw it. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. A Democratic administration has given the farmers, on basic commodities, a support price of 90 percent parity. Now we are facing a Republican Congress with their age-old animosity and prejudice against the man who tills the soil for a living.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. We see that here the farmer is being taken for a ride. In an election year, his support price is reduced.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, it will be reduced. The price of wheat, corn, cotton, and everything else will be reduced.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The argument is made for the passage of the Aiken bill now, that if we wait it might not be passed, the farmer might not get anything next year, and that in all probability there will be a Republican Congress, a stronger Republican Congress than the present one, and as a result, the whole program will expire and the farmer will get no support price. So we are rushing to give him a half loaf at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the farmer receives no support price, the city dwellers will receive no support; and the farmers support the city dwellers.

Mr. EASTLAND. The facts are as shown by this bill, that the Republican Party is against the farmers. It is for big business, Wall Street, and great monopolies.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator knows that for 2 years we have been supporting only legislation that would benefit big business, and that the man in overalls, in the shop and on the farms, can get no consideration from this Congress, or from a Government controlled by the party which dominates this Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly the one- and two-gallus boys are left at the crossroads. As the Senator from Mississippi well knows, we can see them picking cotton until Christmas time, in order to get what? To get a stick of candy from the corner store.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from South Carolina think we are headed back now, drifting back into economic and political isolation, as we did after the First World War, and that we are confronted with another Republican administration similar to that of Warren G. Harding? Are we not going back to 25-cent cotton and 25-cent wheat, and will not those policies give communism the greatest boost it can receive?

Mr. MAYBANK. I cannot deny the argument of the Senator from Mississippi. If we pass this bill and reduce the cotton farmer's parity from 90 to 75 percent, we are taking 15 percent of his income, which is low enough as it is, in Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Arkansas. The cotton farmer buys the bread and manufactured goods; he works from sunup to sundown and spends his money. When we injure the cotton farmer, we injure the wheat farmer and the corn farmer.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator overlooks this fact, that we have in this country persons of great wealth, who do not have their wealth invested in commodities or in property, but who keep it in cash in order to loan it. Therefore they want low prices, so that their money will be more valuable. That is the group of persons who control the Republican Party.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly. The Senator from Mississippi is correct. I can go into any bank in Mississippi, North Carolina, or South Carolina and borrow 90 percent on a cotton-warehouse receipt.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. We are turning the situation over to the private bankers.

Mr. EASTLAND. This bill will reduce the support prices which a Democratic Administration has given to agriculture to pull it out of the hole. We are getting right back to the days when the county newspapers in Iowa and the Midwest were filled with notices of sales of farms through foreclosure of mortgages.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator a question——

Mr. MAYBANK. May I make one remark before the Senator asks his question? I am appreciative of the Senator's being here. I was happy that he was able to accompany my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to South Carolina to attend the hearing, at which everyone was in favor of 90 percent parity.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina and also the Senator from Mississippi what amendment is being discussed by them?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Russell amendment.

Mr. THYE. I did not understand that.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am sorry the Senator did not understand that.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Minnesota did not want to hear the record of his own party. I see that he is fleeing from the Senate Chamber.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want to repeat that commodity credit under the Bankhead-Steagall bill, which was not passed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but by the Committee on Banking and Currency, saved more than $200,000,000 for the taxpayers. Many expenses were paid outside of that sum. The profits in cotton alone were more than $100,000,000. Had it not been for 90 percent of parity, and had it not been for the production of cotton, General MacArthur's success would not have been as great as it was. I think the Senator from Mississippi will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In all seriousness, I should like to make this statement to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. The solution of the farm problem is in taking down trade barriers and expanding world commerce. There are today millions of hungry people. There are millions of ill-clad people. Those people are willing and able to work and produce the wealth needed in the United States if we would remove the barriers of

trade so that they could buy the surplus production of the United States.

Mr. President, that would be the greatest contribution to world prosperity that could possibly occur.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. But instead of following such a program, we are following a program of acreage-reduction, a program to shut off the production of wealth and, in the last analysis, to spread poverty over the world. Consider the case of Japan. There is a little group of islands in the Pacific Ocean, approximately the size of the State of Montana. Only one-seventh of the area is suitable for cultivation. Seventy-seven million persons live there, under the Japanese flag, without resources. The only chance they have to live is to be able to buy raw materials in the markets of the world, process them in Japan, sell the products thus produced in world markets, and live off the profit that is acquired.

Mr. MAYBANK. They could sell the products to countries in the Pacific, such as Java, Indonesia, and other countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. In other words, they could live from their labor.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. If we do not reduce trade barriers and take goods from Japan, what will Japan do? There is only one thing she can do, and that is to affiliate herself with the nations under the hammer and sickle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say to my friend from Mississippi that we must remove the trade barriers. I do not think it is necessary for Japan to ship anything to this country, under the rule of the Army government. The Senator from Mississippi and I agree that the Japanese should be benefited and helped by this country, so that Japan might, in turn, trade with the Orient, with the Dutch, French, and other colonies. As a matter of fact, Java was the largest purchaser of Japanese textiles before the war. There are 50,000,000 people there. I do not think it is necessary to bring any textiles into the United States, because we have more than we need at the present time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am a cotton grower, but I think we should look beyond self-interest and what will benefit our own people and our own sections. We should look to the welfare of this Nation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 minute. I appreciate what the Senator from Mississippi says, and I feel as he does. I know as well as he does that prior to the war the Japanese were the second largest purchasers of American cotton. In a short period of time they were the largest purchasers, and they helped the farmers by purchasing their cotton.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, first I send to the desk an amendment to the substitute bill offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. This amendment reduces to 1 year the proposed extension of the farm support program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one of the most unpopular things to discuss when a program of this character is before the Senate is how much it will cost the taxpayer. It is impossible to estimate what the pending bill will cost, so I am going to review the costs for the past few years during which a similar program has been in operation.

We find that in recent years, under a similar program, the Government has spent, in the support of American agriculture, $8,573,600,000 for the improvement of soil, soil conservation, triple A payments and other programs. All of this was spent apparently for the purposes of increasing production on the farms.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a chart showing how this money was distributed during recent years.

Mr. President, during the same years in which the Government was spending this $8,500,000,000 to increase the production on the farms, we find that the Government at the same time spent $2,080,300,000 to dispose of surplus agricultural products. In other words, in a support program, to make agriculture more profitable, during this period, the Government spent $2,080,300,000. I have a break-down of that in the chart, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHART No. 1.—*Detailed break-down of totals shown under the headings "Agricultural adjustment, soil and water conservation, and related programs" and "Diversion, distribution, and consumption of agricultural commodities"*

[NOTE.—Amounts for years 1932 to 1948 adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure in the 1949 budget estimates]

[Amounts in millions of dollars]

	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	Grand total
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources						469.0	429.1	494.9	555.1	461.3	494.6	444.5	400.0	302.5	355.7	314.2	228.0	4,948.9
Parity payments								212.6	223.0	211.7	211.7	5.4	170.3					1,036.1
Payments for agricultural adjustment					295.2													295.2
Agricultural adjustment program financed from advances on account of processing taxes (sec. 12 (b), act of May 12, 1933)			428.6	641.5	165.7													1,235.8
Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Administration (sec. 12 (a), act of May 12, 1933)		100.0																100.0
Sugar Act							40.0	54.4	47.9	47.9	47.9	47.4	63.9	52.5	48.4	53.5	55.0	558.8
Soil erosion control program (SCS)	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	6.3	22.6	22.1	21.3	21.3	18.6	25.4	23.8	23.8	29.6	34.5	44.7	39.0	334.4
Land utilization program (title III, Farm Tenant Act)							9.6	12.0	6.3	2.4	2.7	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.6	1.6	41.5
Payments to counties from submarginal land program (permanent)																0.2	0.2	.4
Water conservation and utilization projects (Wheeler-Case Act)										0.5	1.5				1.2	0.7		3.9
Flood control							0.5	7.0	3.0	2.0	1.0					2.1	3.0	18.6
Total agricultural adjustment, soil and water conservation, and related programs	0.4	100.4	428.9	641.8	467.2	491.6	501.3	801.6	858.6	744.4	784.8	522.6	659.3	385.9	441.0	417.0	326.8	8,573.6
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (sec. 32, act of Aug. 24, 1935) (permanent, annual, and reappropriations)					92.1	109.1	125.1	144.0	205.5	235.5	222.5	175.3	97.1	119.3	114.3	100.5	44.0	1,784.3
National school-lunch program:																		
Direct appropriation																6.0		6.0
Expended from sec. 32 funds									[12.4]	[15.3]	[23.1]	[15.3]	[50.0]	[57.5]	[57.5]	75.0	65.0	140.0
Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products, act of May 28, 1934 (Jones-Connally Act)				150.0														150.0
Total diversion, distribution, and consumption of agricultural commodities				150.0	92.1	109.1	125.1	144.0	205.5	235.5	222.5	175.3	97.1	119.3	114.3	181.5	109.0	2,080.3

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, here we have a situation where the Government was spending $8,500,000,000 to increase production and an additional $2,000,000,000 to hold the prices of agricultural commodities up, I find that another Government agency spent $5,519,301,617 in subsidies to hold the prices of agricultural products down. I ask unanimous consent to have the chart showing these figures inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Direct subsidies paid by the Federal Government of the United States, 1937–47: Selected data

[Notes.—Amounts for years 1932 to 1948 adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure in the 1949 budget estimates]

Program	Paying agency	Why subsidized	How subsidized	Paid to—	Total cost to June 30, 1947
Beef production	CCC	To encourage feeding of cattle to heavier weights.	Payment on live weight sold for slaughter of cattle meeting certain requirements as to minimum weight, minimum sale price, and minimum duration of feeding.	Feeder	$36, 904, 458
Beans, dry edible	do	To permit increased grower returns	Payment at specified rates per hundredweight of cleaned beans.	Dealer	12, 965, 533
Cheese, Cheddar	do	To offset cost increases and to encourage greater production.	Purchase and resale at a loss of 3¾ cents per pound	Manufacturer	67, 634, 784
Corn ceiling price adjustment.	do	To induce movement of corn from corn-producing areas to the East and Southeast.	Payment of 5 cents per bushel to sellers of yellow corn who sell in carload lots to feeders or feed producers in the East and Southeast.	Corn seller	1, 535, 679
Dairy production	do	To increase producer returns, thus offsetting increased costs and encouraging greater production.	Payment on deliveries of whole milk and butterfat, differentiated seasonally and, in addition, regionally for whole milk.	Dairy farmer	1, 206, 243, 457
Flaxseed	do	To enable flaxseed importers to use domestic flaxseed and pay support prices for it.	Reimbursement of processors for part of the increased costs.	Processor	393, 704
Fruits for processing	do	To permit increased grower returns and offset increases in processing costs.	Purchase of fruit and resale of civilian quantities at a loss.	Packer	74, 768, 896
Milk, fluid	do	To permit an increase in producer returns and encourage production.	Purchase and resale arrangement on all fluid milk.	Handler	38, 126, 083
Peanut butter	do	To roll back retail prices to September 1942 level.	Payment of 4.5 cents per pound to manufacturer	Manufacturer	19, 557, 589
Peanuts	do	To maintain adequate production at prices in line with other edible oil sources.	Purchase of peanuts and resale to crushers at a loss.	Crushers and shellers	6, 205, 449
Shortening	do	To roll back prices of vegetable shortening.	Payment of 0.4 cent per pound of vegetable oil in standard shortening and 0.2 cent per pound of hydrogenated vegetable shortening.	Manufacturer	1, 916, 284
Soybeans	do	To permit increased grower returns and encourage production of oil.	Purchase of soybeans at support prices and resale at a loss to processors at differentiated prices based on processor efficiency.	Processor	89, 012, 027
Sheep and lamb production.	do	To encourage feeding of lambs to heavier weights and to increase returns to producers.	Payment on live weight sold for slaughter, varying seasonally and by weight classes for lambs. Flat rate per hundredweight on sheep regardless of season or weight class.	Owner at time of sale to slaughterer.	43, 238, 152
Sugar	do	To permit increased grower returns, offset increased shipping, handling, and processing costs, and generally to encourage maximum production.	Purchase of Puerto Rican and Cuban sugar and resale at a loss (or without payment of normal import duty). Direct payments to growers and importers of Hawaiian sugar. Payments, through the processors, to growers of domestic beet and cane. Payments to all processors of sugar beets to offset increased costs, and to marginal processors to cover deficits.	Various levels	118, 119, 168
Vegetables for processing	do	To permit increased grower returns and offset increases in canning costs.	Payment at specified rates per dozen cans of major products.	Canners	86, 369, 626
Vegetables, frozen	do	To permit increased grower returns and offset increases in processing costs.	Payment at specified rates for frozen peas, corn, and snap beans.	Processor	3, 600, 216
Wheat for feed	do	To permit utilization of wheat for feed primarily for dairy cattle in certain feed-shortage areas.	Wheat for feed is sold at feed value equality with corn.	Feeder or feed supplier.	238, 412, 310
Livestock	RFC	To roll back retail meat prices to September 1942 levels, and to permit increased returns to livestock producers.	Payment on live weight slaughtered differentiated by kinds of animals, and in the case of beef grades, deductions made in beef subsidy by the amounts individual slaughterer's live-cattle costs in any given month fall below or exceed costs based on "stabilization range" prices.	Slaughterer	1, 547, 148, 000
Flour	do	To permit increased grower prices, in accordance with minimum legal requirements.	Payment equal to difference in any given month between average actual wheat costs paid by the industry and the average price of wheat reflected by the flour ceiling.	Millers	348, 431, 000
Butter	do	To roll back prices to September 1942 levels.	5 cents per pound payment to creameries	Creameries	181, 618, 000
Copper, lead, and zinc	do	To obtain high-cost output of copper, lead, and zinc without raising ceiling prices on the major part of the output.	Premium prices paid for production above quotas.	Producers	349, 970, 000
Petroleum transportation, compensatory adjustments.	do	To maintain a steady and adequate flow of petroleum and petroleum products to the Atlantic coast area (requiring substitutes for normal tanker transportation) without exceeding existing price ceilings.	Compensation to petroleum companies for extra transportation costs.	Oil companies	353, 232, 000
Maritime operating subsidy.	Maritime Commission.	To compensate United States lines for higher operating costs as compared to foreign lines.	Payments based on differential between foreign and domestic operating costs.	Steamship lines	49, 288, 193
Construction differential subsidy.	do	To compensate for the difference between United States and foreign shipyards in construction costs.	Payments to shipowners based on difference in construction costs between United States and foreign shipyards.	Shipowners	254, 363, 000
Apple freight equalization	CCC				3, 22[illegible], 713
Barley for feed	do				6, 994
Cocoa	do				101, 939
Coffee	do				7, 217, 528
Corn for alcohol	do				4, 400, 000
Corn purchase and shelling	do				3, 619, 664
Corn importation	do				2, 105, 372
Hay for dairymen	do				2, 498, 942
Millfeed price support	do				138, 118
Vegetable oils and meals	do				6, 903, 824
Pear freight equalization	do				142, 237
Phosphate fertilizer	do				89, 344
Pork purchase	do				330
Wheat for alcohol	do				22, 700, 000
Coffee	RFC				51, 849, 000
Miscellaneous RFC subsidies, largely transportation.	do				275, 185, 000
Total					5, 519, 301, 617

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, most of this $5,500,000,000 was spent to hold down the prices of agricultural commodities. There are included in it some subsidy payments which were made to support other industries, but over $4,500,000,000 was spent to hold down the cost of agricultural commodities to the consumer during the period in which the Government was spending through another agency over $2,000,000,000 to hold the prices of the same commodities up.

Another thing that is misleading about this proposal is the argument that if Congress does not pass some kind of an extension measure at this time the farmers are left without any suitable agricultural program. That argument is not true, because in the event no agricultural program shall be passed, there will still be left on the statute books the same programs which were in effect prior to the war; in other words, the Triple A Act will still be in effect, as passed in 1938; the soil-conservation programs will continue; the law which authorized expenditures of section 32 funds—customs receipts—for the support of agricultural products will remain in effect; and when the European recovery program measure was passed, under section 11A we authorized an additional subsidy on agricultural commodities, and that will be in effect for the duration of our foreign-aid program. All of them without any further action whatever on the part of the Congress at this time will remain in effect. Therefore, when it is said that failure of the Congress to act will leave the farmers without any agricultural relief it is without foundation.

The program which we are asked to extend now is the same as that which was passed by Congress in 1941, at the beginning of the war, as a wartime measure; at that time Congress stated that that measure was to last two years after the war ended. As we know, the President of the United States did not declare hostilities over until December 31, 1946. Therefore this program would run for two more years, to give the farmers a chance to adjust themselves, until the end of this year, 1948. In other words, the program dying this year is a program which every farmer in the United States knew was supposed to die 2 years after the war ended, so there was no reversal of policy on the part of Congress.

I believe Congress should adopt a long-range farm program. It would be folly for us ever to place ourselves in a position where we could revert back to the wholesale bankruptcies of farmers similar to what happened in the thirties, but I think it is equally as bad for the farmer to pass legislation which is economically unsound and in the long run will do him more harm than good. The program which is set up under this bill actually guarantees a margin over cost of production thereby encouraging unbalanced production which will inevitably lead to economic collapse. By using the formula under the Aiken bill we find that despite all the confusion of defining parity—a clear definition of which no one can give—after it is all summed up it boils down to the fact that the final answer on the parity price is 150 percent of the last 10-year average.

In other words, if we take the sales price which the farmer has been getting for any farm product for the last 10 years, and add 50 percent to it, we have the parity of that product as defined in the bill. If we take all the farm products and figure them on that basis, we will come within 1 percent of the same result as the committee formula. Therefore, when it is proposed that we support cotton or tobacco or any other commodity at 90 percent of parity what is proposed in effect is that we guarantee to the farmers a support price of that product equal to 35 percent more than the average price of that commodity for the past 10 years.

I say that is economically unsound. If the support price is 75 percent of parity, which is claimed to be the average, we will still be supporting that agricultural product at 12½ percent more than the average market price for the same product during the past 10 years.

The lowest provision in the formula of this bill is that it can go down to 60 percent of parity. In that event we will then be guaranteeing to the farmers 90 percent of the average price they received for that product during the past 10 years, and under no circumstances, if this bill shall be passed, can the support price drop below that figure.

I have heard of many Senators worrying about the cost of living, yet under this bill the support price of beef will be raised 20 percent above the previous support price. Milk will be raised about 4 percent. Cottonseed will be raised $10 a ton. We are only kidding ourselves when we say that the passage of this bill will not have the effect of increasing the cost of living to consumers.

Mr. President, I think the best thing Congress can do, in view of the fact that we are in the closing days of the session, and do not have time to work out a sound program, is to defeat this measure. It is my considered opinion that a farm-support program should never exceed the cost of production. To enact a law which in effect guarantees a margin of profit encourages overproduction and necessitates a continuation of the ridiculous practice of a Government agency actually destroying edible foods in order to stabilize markets.

Furthermore, the enactment of this legislation means the regimentation of the American farms. This is inevitable because of the production and marketing controls required under this planned agricultural program.

Under this bill our farm program can be planned and directed from the minute details of acreage planted and the kind of products and livestock production that farmers can legally produce by a Government agency which will be manned by men who have never operated a farm but learned their farming out of books.

This is not in accordance with our free-enterprise system, and I believe our American farmer would rather retain his freedom and independence.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. In the course of the few remarks I shall make in opposition to the amendment, I propose also to discuss some of the major objectives of the so-called long-range agricultural program.

The Senator from Illinois has reached a very definite and firm conviction that the time has come when the Congress of the United States must enact a farm program which is permanent and stable. We have been operating under the so-called Steagall amendments, which placed support prices under basic and nonbasic products just prior to the time the United States entered into the war. It was primarily a war measure designed to accomplish an enormous production of basic and nonbasic commodities which were essential to the winning of the war. No one can deny that that legislation, which was passed under a Democratic administration, at that time stimulated production and did achieve the objective for which the legislation was enacted.

It is no trick to receive high prices for everything that is produced in the United States in a great emergency. The trouble with a great many people, when thinking of a farm program, is that they forget what has happened to the farmers of this country in the past as a result of huge surpluses of commodities that were piled high and dry in every section of the country with no outlet for those commodities.

The basic reason for the enactment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1935 was the enormous surpluses that we produced in 1931, 1932, and 1933, with no possible chance of disposing of those surplus products at a decent price. The program under which we are operating at the present time has not resulted in the loss of any money. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said this afternoon that the Commodity Credit Corporation can show a profit of around some $200,000,000 on the over-all transactions that we conducted under the operation of the present program.

What I object to in the substitute amendment offered by the able Senator from Georgia is that it seeks to continue to place a support price under certain nonbasic commodities regardless of the amount of surplus that may be produced in the United States. I am thinking about eggs and potatoes; I am thinking about raisins and prunes; I am thinking about citrus fruits and other nonbasic commodities under which, in my opinion, the farm program at the present time cannot justify its activities. It is true that we have lost only a small amount of money compared to the entire investment as a result of this type of support. But I know, and Senators know, and the country knows the sorry spectacle that was presented with respect to potatoes and eggs. That subject has been discussed on the floor of the Senate many times. The average individual who would be compelled to support the farm program cannot understand why we have to do what we are asked to do with respect to some of these nonbasic commodities.

As I said this afternoon, in order to support a farm program we must have the confidence of the taxpayers of America. Every new spectacle of the kind we

have seen in the past has a tendency to defeat the great basic purpose of the farm program which takes care of so many commodities in the United States.

Furthermore, if we continue to guarantee a support price of 90 percent upon nonbasic commodities, I undertake to say that with all the modern machinery we have, with all the farm equipment we have, with all the scientific discoveries that are being made in America at the present time, the time will come when we will have a surplus in many of these basic commodities of which we may not be able to make proper disposition. When that time comes, if it should come, and we have a support price of 90 percent on everything, there is not going to be enough money in the Treasury to pay off, Mr. President.

I am attempting in my limited way to look far ahead respecting this program, and the farmers in my section of the country are looking at this program with vision. They are not stationary out there; they are attempting to look on into the future and to see what may happen to them in 5 or 6 or 7 years from now. If we obtain a permanent, stable farm program on a basis of parity of from 60 to 90 percent, depending upon the crop produced and the carry-over, we will not have any trouble in sustaining a farm program so far as the American people are concerned. On the basic commodities we can, under the law, have quotas and acreage allotments, and in that way control, if necessary, these surpluses, but on the nonbasic commodities there is no control. That is where we shall ultimately get into trouble so far as the expenditure of money is concerned.

The committee worked hard and long on the bill. For years we have been talking about a long-range program. I regret that this bill has not come before the Senate until the last days of the Congress. It certainly has not been the fault of the able Senator from Vermont and his committee, because they have tried hard to get the bill before the Senate so that Members of the Senate might discuss it at length and understand it.

I am satisfied that members of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives are just as familiar with the provisions of this bill as are members of the Senate committee. If this bill can be passed by the Senate tonight and sent to the House of Representatives, I am satisfied that we can get a long-range farm program before this session ends. This Congress should not adjourn, and the farmers of the Midwest are expecting that it will not adjourn, until they get the kind of a farm program that has been laid down in the bill.

The bill is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers' Union, the Grange, and other leading agricultural organizations. While perhaps they have not agreed on all the details with respect to the reorganization plan under title I and title II, so far as the parity formula and the support prices are concerned, that question has been gone over in detail with the leading agricultural men of the country, and they all agree upon the parity formula which has been laid down in the bill.

Mr. President, time moves on. Nothing in this world is static. Unless Members of Congress move with the times in connection with parity, they are not doing their duty, as I see it. The parity formula of 1909 to 1914 is outmoded, and all the experts agree that it is. What we are trying to do is to have a 10-year moving average for the parity formula which will keep us up to date all the time, because as 1948 moves on and out of the picture so far as activity is concerned, the 10-year moving average takes in 1949. That is the only way we can keep the formula up to date.

In order to do that the farmers of the Midwest were willing to make a tremendous sacrifice. My dear friend from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] talks about the cotton farmers being robbed under this bill. The cotton farmers do not lose anything under this bill compared with what the wheat farmers and corn farmers in my section of the country are losing so far as the question of parity is concerned.

We have taken care of that loss in the bill by providing that the decrease may amount to not more than 5 percent each year. It will require wheat producers 4 or 5 years, and corn producers 2 or 3 years, finally to get down to parity under the bill.

Notwithstanding that, we are willing to go along. We know that the dairyman, the poultry raiser, the cattle raiser, and the hog raiser get a better deal. We know that the man who raises peanuts gets a better deal. Other basic and nonbasic commodities—especially nonbasic commodities—are helped as a result of this parity formula. The only thing it does is simply to change the time. The factors and equations, and all the other elements in the present parity formula, remain just the same.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] should be defeated. The Senate should pass the long-range bill tonight and send it to the House. I am satisfied that if Members of the House of Representatives are responsive to the demands of American farmers they will pass a long-range farm program on all fours with what we find in Senate bill 2318.

In conclusion let me say that when this bill goes to the other side of the Capitol and conferees are appointed, I want the Senator from Vermont to understand that the amendment which we adopted this afternoon should be taken out of the bill. We cannot leave that amendment in the bill without giving the tobacco growers preferential treatment. There is no good reason why one group of commodity producers should receive a guaranty of 90 percent of parity, leaving producers of 127 or 128 other basic and nonbasic commodities on a basis of 60 to 90 percent. It is not fair. It is not right. If the bill should come back with that provision in it, the Senator from Illinois could not support the bill.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say upon this important measure. During all the time I have been in the Congress, approximately 13 years in the House and in the Senate, I have been on the Agriculture Committee. I happen to own farm lands on the prairies of Illinois. I know something about the agricultural program and the problems we are up against.

My prayer is that as long as we are a nation we shall never be confronted with what we faced back in 1931, 1932, and 1933. Those were the darkest days in the history of agriculture in all our time as a nation. We have come a long way since that dark hour by reason of constructive and objective legislation. But we are now acting for the moment. We are on a temporary basis; and the sooner the Congress of the United States can get away from this temporary program the better off we shall all be.

It seems all right for the moment to say, "For one more year I am going to get 90 percent of parity on everything I produce. I am not willing to take a chance on a flexible formula over a long period of years. I am going to get my pound of flesh just as long as I can." I sincerely and earnestly fear that the time will come when that kind of a program will fall of its own weight and break down to the point where the American people will not support any farm program at all. I hope the time will never come when there is dissatisfaction to the point where the people of the country will not support a program which is meaningless and futile so far as protecting the American farmer is concerned.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is half an hour left. I do not know whether the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] or the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] wish to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 15 minutes. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has 15 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is very little that I can add to the very clear reasons given by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] for adopting a long-range program now and not being content with a stopgap affair which gives a high level of support to a few commodities. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that if we continue the high level of 90-percent support, which will cost our Government a large amount of money to maintain, the time will not be far distant when the American people will rise up and say they will no longer have any farm price-support program. In my opinion, that would be a catastrophe, because, above all things, we must continue to maintain the production of farm commodities. It is true that probably there will be some surpluses of certain commodities within the next few years; but in the over-all picture we must maintain an adequate production of food and fiber, sufficient to enable our industries to carry on and to supply the consumers of the United States with the commodities they need, at reasonable prices.

The proposal to have a long-range program should not be mistaken as being a proposal to have a grab bag. It should not be mistaken as an attempt to see how much we can get in a short time for the producers of certain commodities. So I think it most unfortunate that the amendment relative to tobacco was adopted today.

Other than that, Mr. President, all I have to say is that at this time, when there are relatively few surpluses in the commodity field, we should develop this long-range program, so that our farmers will be assured that if in the future they produce enough to meet the needs of the country they will not be faced with ruin and bankruptcy, if at some time they happen to produce a little more than is needed. I think the time to develop such a program is now, so that the plan will be ready when needed.

Mr. President, before closing my remarks, I wish to say a few words about the subcommittee which developed the bill which now is before the Senate. I have said before, and I repeat, that I never worked with a more cooperative body of men than the members of the subcommittee and other members of the full committee who helped to develop this plan. The members of the subcommittee were the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. Let me say that all of us worked together. We met with the farm people of the United States. We think we know what the farm people want in the way of a farm program. They are not unreasonable. With few exceptions, they are not asking for more than they are entitled to. They are not asking for cost-plus or even for a guaranty of receiving cost. They ask for a floor which will protect them from ruin if they produce enough to meet the needs of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator from Vermont will agree with me that wherever we went in holding those hearings, the farmers themselves, almost to a man, showed that they understood the farm program almost as well as any member of the subcommittee did. In other words, it was amazing, to me, to discover the number of farmers who are wide awake and know exactly what is going on here in Congress with respect to agricultural legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Illinois never spoke truer words than those. All over the United States the farm people know what is going on. They know farm problems and they know what is needed to maintain a prosperous agriculture and adequate production so that consumers will be supplied with their needs and will not be forced to pay exorbitant prices for their food. Almost everywhere we went we found the farm people very solicitous that the consumers in the cities not be overcharged.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to have the RECORD show at this point that the Senator from Vermont has worked zealously, conscientiously, and well on this program. He has devoted to it practically all his time and energies for almost a year. He has brought forth, I know, under the circumstances, the very best bill he could for the farmers.

Mr. President, not only is the Senator from Vermont highly conscientious, but today he is the agricultural leader of the Nation. I congratulate him for the fine work he has done on this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator very much for his kind words.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that when he refers to this program as the best program which could be obtained, I wish to say that it is the best program which could have been conceived. I should like to say that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who presided over the subcommittee at all its hearings, and who proceeded to get the views of the farmers in regard to the agricultural program, has been able to develop what now is embodied in Senate bill 2318; and I repeat that it is not simply the best program which could be developed under the circumstances, but it is the best possible program which could have been conceived as a long-range program to replace the so-called war emergency legislation which was enacted in the form of the Steagall amendments.

So I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for the splendid job he has done.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not desire to become involved in a partisan discussion on that subject with the Senator from Minnesota. My sole purpose was to compliment the Senator from Vermont.

As the Senate knows, I have a very high regard for the Senator from Vermont. I know he is conscientious. I know he is one of the most able Members of this body. I know he has rendered invaluable service to agriculture, not only from a sectional viewpoint, so far as Vermont is concerned, but from a national viewpoint, for he has had the interests of the entire country at heart. If there is any Member of this body who has the national viewpoint and who attempts to do what is best for all the people of the United States, certainly it is the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I congratulate him, and I am happy to be associated with him in this body.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank both the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Minnesota for the remarks they have made. I appreciate them very much indeed.

Mr. President, I wish to say that this bill seems to have acquired the name of the Aiken bill, but as a matter of fact it is the bill of all those who worked on it. It is no more the Aiken bill than it is the Lucas bill or the Thye bill or the Wilson bill or the Thomas bill or the Ellender bill or the Bushfield bill or the Young bill, or the bill of any of the other Senators who worked on it. It is the committee bill. It is the bill which has been developed as a result of the request which the Senate made of our committee. We have done the job as well as we could. We think we have done a good job, we may as well admit it. No trace of partisanship has entered into our deliberations in connection with the formulation of this bill.

Mr. President, I hope the bill will pass the Senate unanimously tonight, and I hope the Senate will reject any proposed substitutes or further amendments. I do not agree with those who say that the House will not accept the bill. The House certainly will not turn down a long-range farm bill for the United States, when the entire Nation is demanding it. If by any chance the bill should be rejected, I do not wish it to be said that the Senate was responsible for blocking what I think is the best long-range farm program which ever has been presented to this body.

Mr. President, let us pass this bill; let us pass it unanimously, so that we can carry the spirit of nonpartisanship right through to the enactment of the bill.

I have nothing more to say on this subject, Mr. President. I believe the Senator from Georgia has 15 minutes' time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I know of little that can be added to the statement I made in support of the substitute earlier in the day. I wish again to emphasize that the substitute presents the one certain opportunity for the Senate to assure the continuance of a farm program next year without interruption.

A great many bugaboos have been created by the discussion against the substitute. It has been stated it would cost a great deal of money. That charge is not sustained by the facts. The records of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation will show that under the program in existence at the present time, which by the substitute will be continued for a period of 18 months, approximately $200,000,000 has been earned over and above losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The most important thing involved in the entire discussion is the assurance that we shall have a farm bill in operation continuously until the next Congress shall have a fair chance to consider the subject. The committee bill with all its complexities, with its entirely new approach to the problem is understood by few Senators. It has never been applied. It leaves discretion in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture that can cause it to work out in a manner not even envisioned by its own sponsors.

The substitute covers all agricultural commodities.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have only a few minutes, but I will yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, when the able Senator from Georgia said the Secretary could work out a schedule that was not even now anticipated by the authors, or something to that effect, I merely wanted to ask the question: In what manner could the Secretary work out a schedule which has not been conceived by those who have labored in the preparation and in the formulation of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the point I was making was that the bill leaves so much to administration that while the Senator, as he is a member of the committee, may know what the bill contains—and I am willing to concede that he does—yet time and again I have seen the Senate pass bills on the theory they meant one thing, only to find when they reached the administrator that they meant something entirely different.

The bill leaves great discretion in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, not only as to the complete reorganization of the Department, which has scarcely been mentioned in the course of the discussion, but also as to the amount of loans he will allow for the various commodities. He has a great deal of leeway between 60 and 90 percent in some cases, as to the amount of loan that shall be made available to the producers of certain commodities. It is venturing into an entirely new field without, as I insist, adequate consideration, and certainly the other body will have no chance whatever to consider the bill other than to hear it read to them after the conferees agree, if they accept it.

On the other hand, we have a program that has been tried and has proved effective. It is in operation tonight. The farmers of the country understand it; the Members of the Senate know how it is applied; the Department of Agriculture has had experience in dealing with it. It enabled us to produce food and fiber with which to win the greatest war in history. If we continue it in effect, it will enable us to fulfill our commitments under the Marshall plan to the people of Europe. If we pass a new bill, fixing a different standard and destroying the incentives to production, we shall find it necessary perhaps to double the appropriations for the Marshall plan in order to meet the commitments in pounds of food and pounds of clothing promised to those who have joined with us in this great international undertaking to restore stability and preserve democracy on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, the point has been belabored at great length that one of these days, if we continue to extend this small measure of justice to the American farmer, the American people will rise up in their might and strike down any farm bill at all. What are farmers? Are they not, too, citizens of the United States? Are they not, too, American people? I submit that that kind of argument is merely carrying out the old idea that the farmer is a class aside, to himself, and is entitled to scant recognition and should appreciate any crumbs which happen to fall from the congressional table when we are enacting laws for the benefit of all the people.

The idea that the farmer is getting rich is as wild and visionary a thought as has ever been advanced in the Congress. It is impossible for the farmer to get rich when more than 30 percent of the farmers, even today with high prices, have a total income, including the use of the house in which they live, the fuel and the water they use, that amounts only to $600 a year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator made reference to the threat that the American people might strike down the farm program, and that if we undertake to place a floor under farm prices, the American people may at some time rebel against it. I wonder, if they were ever to rebel against such a program, if they would not at the same time rebel against the Government's fixing of prices, minimum wages, and also granting collective-bargaining rights to the laborers in industry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I was just coming to that. Here is a farmer of whom it is said that if he is guaranteed a loan of 29 cents a pound for his cotton, the American people will rise up in their might and deny him any rights whatever and will abolish all legislation for the benefit of the farmer. It has been established beyond any peradventure, and it has never been challenged, that it takes 1 hour of labor at 29 cents an hour to produce 1 pound of cotton; and yet with all the benefits of minimum wages-and-hours and of collective bargaining and an industrial pay roll which has increased threefold since 1940, it is said the farmer is going to be victimized by the American people.

The farmer is an American citizen. Senators on this floor are supposed to represent him as well as all other constituents. If the farmer is injured as a result of continuing the program for a short period of time with the pitiful benefits it accords him, it will be the fault of those on this floor who have been sent here by the votes of the farmers. The farmers of this country, Mr. President, are not asleep. If Senators propose to be intimidated, and if the alleged American people of whom the farmer is not a part undertake to grind under foot those who till the soil I respectfully predict there will be some changes made, and there will be other Senators here who will be willing to see that the farmers enjoy at least a small modicum of the unparalleled prosperity which is now sweeping the country. It is high time that the farmer should be permitted to share in it at least to the extent of 90 percent of parity on his basic commodities. That will be assured by the substitute.

Thirty-seven years have passed since the beginning of the period on which parity is based. In those 37 years, for 11 years only have farm prices been at or above parity. In 26 of those years farm prices have been below parity. More than a third of a century has passed, and the farmer has enjoyed only 11 years of parity. To argue on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, that to enable him to have 90 percent of parity will cause the repeal and the abolition of all farm laws, is, to me, simply not worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. President, whatever else may be said regarding the committee bill, there is no question that it works radical changes, if not revolutionary changes, not only in the Department of Agriculture, but in the farm program. I do not like a policy which provides for tying together in one lump all farm commodities in arriving at parity. It is much more fair to have each commodity stand on its own feet, with the same standard to be applied in fixing the parity price. Under the 10-year moving average, the smallest commodity which is admitted to the list of those to be entitled to the meager benefits of the bill would have as much weight in fixing the parity price as the other commodities, such as dairy products, which represents millions of dollars. It is not sound, right, or fair. I care not how many economists may support the policy, it cannot possibly work out and be a success.

Those Senators who wish, may vote for the committee bill. They may vote for a measure that fails the farmer in his hour of need, because when there is a surplus and his prices are depressed, his loan value is depressed along with it. That is not the proper concept of farm relief legislation. Such legislation should be of benefit to the farmers and be of help to them when they need help. But an entirely opposite philosophy is adopted by the committee bill. Prices go down and the loan value goes down with them, so that the farmer, at the very time when he needs help to enable him to buy the things he needs, to pay his debts, and to keep his children in school, finds that this bill has failed him because it has brought down the loan value in proportion to the surplus which is on hand. Therefore it does not sustain him in his hour of need.

The substitute which I propose contains proper safeguards to see that there is not overproduction. Senators have referred to the fact that there is no protection in the substitute bill against overproduction. It is written into the substitute in two different places that the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to prescribe the regulations under which loans may be advanced.

Mr. President, the Senators who so desire may go home and tell the farmers that they have passed a great farm bill for their relief. But when the farmer finds that his loan values have been reduced 20 percent, I doubt if he will think he has been helped. When he finds that there have been drastic changes in the Department of Agriculture and that the years he has devoted to the study of what constitutes the parity formula have been all for naught and the formula is no longer applicable, I doubt whether the farmer will think he has been greatly benefited.

A number of commodities are afforded no protection whatever by the committee bill. They had protection under the Steagall amendment. They have protection in the substitute bill. The producers of those commodities have no recourse whatever under the committee bill. By the adoption of the substitute bill we shall end any discussion of a farm program in this session of the Congress. We shall put it beyond the power of any man or set of men to kill the farm program in the last days of the session because of the congested condition of the calendar. We shall be able to re-

turn in January and approach the problem in the calm atmosphere of the early days of the legislative session, not when we must be considering what will happen to the draft bill.

Mr. President, the course of wisdom and prudence is for the Senate to adopt the substitute which I have proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to discuss my amendment. I ask that the reading of it be dispensed with. If the Senators will turn to page 51 of the bill it will be found that my amendment strikes out the provision for the abolishment of regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. President, the effect of this amendment would be to retain the regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service for greater economy and greater efficiency in the conservation program. We have made quite a point here about improving efficiency and promoting economy in government. It is most puzzling, therefore, to note that this bill would upset a proven administrative structure that has favorably stood the test of time and considerable study.

I recognize that in some instances over the past years the regional office has been an excessive and expensive feature of administration in other Government programs. I recognize, also, that there are some people who object to regional offices as a matter of general principle, because they do not like the idea. Because one set of regional offices has been bad, however, does not mean that all the rest are bad. If that were true we might as well draft a general provision abolishing all regional offices wherever they exist throughout the Government.

As a matter of fact, the well-run regional office is now generally recognized by businessmen to be a necessary and money-saving device in the conduct of any large nation-wide operation. That is true in government as well as in the business world. The regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service have been among the most efficiently run offices in the Federal Government. To abolish them would increase the cost of carrying on the conservation program and would reduce the efficiency of the program.

The organization of the Soil Conservation Service is established along lines well proven by American business. The pattern is similar to organizations such as insurance companies, public utilities, oil and manufacturing companies, as well as some long-established Federal agencies.

The Soil Conservation Service has Washington, regional, State, and field offices, as do many of the Nation-wide business firms which have their home offices, regional offices, district offices, and dealers.

For example, Mr. Mooch, director of business management for the Chrysler Corp., states that:

> The automobile business is, as a general rule, operated on the same basis by all companies. In our particular case we have 18 regions, each in charge of a regional manager. These are further divided into districts which are in charge of a district manager. It would be a very impractical operation to try to handle all of the detail of our dealer customers from a central office.

Another example is the John Deere Farm Implement Co., a national business firm dealing with farmers and ranchers. K. W. Anderson, manager of product research, Deere & Co., has this to say about their organizational set-up:

> At the present time we have 15 regional branches in the United States, four in Canada and a separate export division. Each is in charge of a general manager. The people of Deere & Co. have adhered to a policy of decentralization since the beginning of its operations over 110 years ago.

The American Bell Telephone Co. is an example of a national public utility. It has a national over-all policy and financial headquarters in New York. Scattered over the country, geographically located, are subsidiary operating companies with complete authority within delineated territorial lines. The Soil Conservation Service organization parallels this organization very closely.

Mr. R. I. Nowell, second vice president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, explains their organization on this basis:

> We have operated under a regional organization since about 1930 when our administrative problems first became complicated. We have 10 regional offices. It would be physically impossible for us at the home office to deal directly with all of these field men. Similarly, a State organization would be much too small and numerous for effective and efficient handling. The overhead involved in a State organization would be prohibitive if men of the desired caliber were employed.

The Federal Reserve System, drawing heavily upon the business judgment of the American bankers, was established for practical administration and efficient operation to flow through 12 strategically located districts or regions.

These and many more business firms have a regional type of organization because it is more economical and efficient. The Soil Conservation Service has a regional organization for similar reasons. According to a statement made by the budget officer of the Department of Agriculture to the House Appropriations Committee during the hearings on the 1948 budget, the Soil Conservation Service has one of the most economical administrative organizations of any bureau in the Department of Agriculture. According to the data presented, 94 percent of the funds of the Soil Conservation Service went to the field for technical assistance and work with the farmer and rancher.

Careful studies indicate clearly that it would cost substantially more to administer the conservation program if it were handled directly through 48 State and 3 Territorial offices rather than through the 7 regional offices now used. In fact, these studies indicate that at least 363 more people would be required in the Washington and State offices to do the work being accomplished under the present regional organization. To abolish these seven regional offices would automatically increase the number of people required to do the work in offices. This, in turn, could result in a reduction of the number of technicians working directly with farmers and ranchers.

In any event, I seriously question the wisdom of including an administrative restriction of this kind in broad, long-range farm legislation. No evidence is shown to support the proposal, and, in my opinion, it should be deleted.

I think it is a mistake to take out the regional offices at this time. I had quite an argument with reference to the matter. I talked myself out of an opportunity of presenting the amendment, because it is approximately 9 o'clock, when a vote will be had. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] knows the story better than I do. I shall not call for a vote upon it, but will ask the Senator from Vermont, in view of the fact that the amendment is not in the House bill, to take it up in conference and do his level best to see that it is brought to the attention of the conferees in the hope that they can work out the best solution possible. I ask the Senator whether he will do that for me.

Mr. AIKEN. I have 2 minutes left, I believe.

The provision of the Senate bill abolishes regional offices of the Soil Conservation Service because only 10 percent of the funds are spent in those offices. While we require the abolishment of the offices, we do not prevent the reestablishment of regional offices where needed, but the committee felt that States as large as Texas or California could well deal with the Washington office.

I shall call the matter to the attention of the conferees as requested by the Senator from Nebraska, and will see that the question has the full consideration of the conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield. I have a half minute left, I think.

Mr. LUCAS. This is one of the matters I had on my program which I overlooked. I want to associate myself with the Senator from Nebraska on this question, because the elimination of the regional offices will increase substantially the size of the State and national offices. In my opinion, it will cause greater expense if we eliminate them, and we shall have less efficiency.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say to the Senator that the matter will be considered by the conferees.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I know the Senator from Vermont is familiar with Public Law 163, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and particularly with section 2 of the act dated July 28, 1945, for which relationship is established between the support prices of fire-cured tobacco and flue-cured tobacco.

Mr. AIKEN. The same relationship will exist under Senate bill 2318.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate under the agreement has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Holland	Russell
Buck	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stennis
Capehart	Kilgore	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wherry
Feazel	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Wilson
Fulbright	Morse	Young
Green	Murray	
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the two Senators from Maryland to the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia accepts the amendment to his amendment. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia as modified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President I have an amendment at the desk which I ask to have stated. It is an amendment to be proposed to the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the word "until" it is proposed to strike out "June 30, 1950", and insert in lieu thereof "December 31, 1949."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia further modifies his substitute by the acceptance of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—27

Barkley	Hatch	Murray
Bricker	Hayden	O'Conor
Buck	Hill	O'Daniel
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Eastland	McClellan	Sparkman
Ecton	McFarland	Stennis
Feazel	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	Maybank	Umstead

NAYS—55

Aiken	Hawkes	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Ball	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brewster	Holland	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Cain	Kem	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thye
Cooper	McCarthy	Tobey
Cordon	McGrath	Vandenberg
Donnell	McMahon	Watkins
Downey	Magnuson	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	Wiley
Ellender	Martin	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Wilson
Flanders	Morse	Young
Green	Myers	
Gurney	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Knowland	Reed
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
George	Moore	White
Jenner	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. RUSSELL's substitute amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the committee amendment, as amended. The committee amendment is still open to amendment.

The Chair would like to state at this point his understanding of the unanimous-consent agreement. The Chair's understanding is that 10 minutes of time is available on each amendment to the committee amendment; 5 minutes being available to the author of an amendment, and 5 minutes to the opposition. General debate has been concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to call up my amendment "K" which has been printed and lies on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, between lines 11 and 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

(1) (A) The "parity price" for any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be—

(i) that price for the commodity which will give to the commodity a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy equivalent to the purchasing power of such commodity in the base period; and which will also reflect current interest payments per acre on farm indebtedness secured by real estate, tax payments per acre on farm real estate, costs of all farm labor (on the basis of the national average and including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), and freight rates, as contrasted with such interest payments, tax payments, farm labor costs, and freight rates during the base period; or

(ii) the alternative parity price for the commodity determined as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph,

whichever is higher. For the purpose of clause (i) of the preceding sentence the base period shall be the period August 1909 to July 1914 in the case of all agricultural commodities except tobacco, the period August 1919 to July 1929 in the case of all kinds of tobacco except burley and flue-cured, and the period August 1934 to July 1939 in the case of burley and flue-cured tobacco.

On page 71, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "(1) (A) The 'parity price'" and insert in lieu thereof "(B) The 'alternative parity price'."

On page 71, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(C)."

On page 72, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "(C)" and insert in lieu thereof "(D)."

On page 72, line 7, before the word "and", it is proposed to insert the following: "costs of all farm labor (on the basis of the national average and including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor)."

On page 2, line 9, after "rates", it is proposed to insert "costs."

On page 72, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "(D)" and insert in lieu thereof "(E)."

Beginning with line 14 on page 72 it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 4 on page 73.

On page 73, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "and (E)."

On page 73, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out "subparagraphs (A) and (E)" and insert in lieu thereof "subparagraph (A)."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Having failed in my effort to get a good bill at one bite, I desire to offer my amendment "K" to undertake to improve the pending bill. The amendment does two things. First, it includes in the parity formula all farm labor. The Senate has had that issue before it heretofore and has voted to include farm labor in the parity formula.

The amendment does another thing. It adopts the original provision of the Aiken bill, as introduced, providing the basis on which farm loans are made. The Aiken bill as originally introduced—and it will be found in the matter that is stricken out—allowed two bases for these loans, one of them being the existing parity formula, and the other being the new parity formula which is established by this bill, whichever is the higher. If Members of the Senate do not desire to have a lower loan rate, this amendment gives them an opportunity to meet their wishes in the Aiken bill, because it provides that the loan rate shall be based upon either the new parity formula established by the bill, about which there has been so much discussion and controversy, or on the old farm parity formula, including farm labor, whichever shall be higher.

I think that is a perfectly fair proposal. I regret that the committee saw fit to strike the provision from the original bill. This amendment proposes to reinstate it. I do not care to attempt to discuss this question in the 5 minutes allowed me, but I do wish to say that if we are to pass this bill we should do what we can to get a fair parity formula while we are at it. Farm labor and the labor of the family on the farm should be taken into account in computing a parity formula. The Senate has voted at least twice in the past to bring that factor into the parity formula. Now that we are adopting a long-range program, one that will be permanent from now on into the endless reaches of eternity, while the opportunity is afforded us, we should correct this error and vote to put farm labor into the parity formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the net effect of this amendment be to increase the cost of labor or decrease it, or will it have any effect whatsoever upon the cost of labor?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not affect the cost of labor. It merely brings that element of cost, whatever it may be, into the computation of the parity formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is it based on an average?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is based upon an average, established by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. They establish every year the average cost of farm labor of certain types.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So they set the price of farm labor.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; they ascertain what has been paid for farm labor. They do not fix the price of farm labor. This is not a price-fixing amendment. It merely brings into the parity formula the element of the cost of labor, just as the cost of what the farmer buys, what he pays in taxes, and the interest on his mortgage are all included in the parity formula.

No one can deny that labor is an essential element in the cost of production of agricultural commodities. This amendment recognizes that fact—not only hired labor, but labor of the farmer's family. If we are to adopt a long-range program, it would be very unfair to the farmers of the Nation to leave out this important element in the cost of production which all farmers have to pay.

Mr. President, I have not the time in 5 minutes to go into this question at any great length; but if the long-range bill is to be approved, this amendment will strengthen it immeasurably. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. This is the most far-reaching amendment any one can imagine, if one really does not understand what is in it. We were told by the Senator from Georgia that we discussed a bill this afternoon with many features in it that were not understood. Here is an amendment which would require a long time to discuss. It is far-reaching and important. It should not under any circumstances be accepted after 10 minutes of debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot yield. I have only 5 minutes.

When the parity formula was enacted by Congress many years ago labor, as one of the factors, was considered by the best minds of agriculture at that time. At that particular moment labor was cheap. If Congress had put labor into the parity formula as one of the factors at that moment, we would have denied the farmer the parity prices he obtained at that time for many years thereafter.

As prices rose and as labor became more costly, and when the element of labor, figured into a parity formula, would give the farmer a better price for his produce, the same individuals who denied labor a place in the formula in the beginning then wanted it. They now want it, in order to give the farmer more money for his products.

Of course labor is an element. No one denies that labor is a factor, but it was not considered in the beginning. We should not consider it now. If the time should ever come when labor would again be cheap, the same group who now want labor included would be saying, "Let us take labor out, because labor is cheap, and the farmer will get more if we take it out." It is a dangerous thing with which to tamper.

Furthermore, it is administratively impossible to do what this amendment would attempt.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I cannot yield. I regret it.

When we talk about including farm operators and members of the family of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, and computing all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor, think what that would do. In discussing hired labor alone in the committee hearings, we discovered it was difficult to determine how such a provision could be administered. Now it is proposed to include everyone in the family in the formula. We never could get around to administering the law in a way that would be efficient and honest. It would be a case of guesswork from beginning to end.

Mr. President, this is no time to tamper with the parity formula, which has worked so well for the American farmer all these years. Practically every important witness, including Mr. Kline, of the American Farm Bureau Federation said, "Leave the parity formula as it is."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I cannot yield. I am sorry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yielded when requested to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have more time. I did not interrupt him. He knows that we are operating under a 5-minute limitation.

Mr. President, if there was ever an amendment which should be voted down, this is the one.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time is exhausted.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "K" offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Ives	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Feazel	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Fulbright	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	
Hatch	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to amendment lettered "K" offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is it in order to request the yeas and nays on this question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to do so, if he wishes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—23

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson, Va.
Connally	McClellan	Russell
Downey	McFarland	Sparkman
Ecton	McKellar	Stewart
Fulbright	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Murray	Umstead
Hill	O'Daniel	

NAYS—59

Aiken	Chavez	Flanders
Baldwin	Cooper	Green
Brewster	Cordon	Gurney
Bricker	Donnell	Hatch
Brooks	Dworshak	Hawkes
Buck	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Butler	Ellender	Hoey
Cain	Feazel	Holland
Capehart	Ferguson	Ives
Kem	Morse	Thye
Kilgore	Myers	Tobey
Langer	O'Conor	Tydings
Lucas	Reed	Vandenberg
McCarthy	Revercomb	Watkins
McGrath	Robertson, Wyo.	Wherry
McMahon	Saltonstall	Wiley
Magnuson	Smith	Williams
Malone	Stennis	Wilson
Martin	Taft	Young
Millikin	Taylor	

NOT VOTING—14

Ball	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Wagner
Capper	McCarran	White
George	Moore	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment lettered "K" to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "J" to the committee amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 72, line 6, after the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "costs of all farm labor (on the basis of the national average and including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor)."

On page 72, in line 9, after "prices", it is propose to insert "costs."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment does not call for a loan value at a high rate of parity or under the 10-year moving average. It is confined solely and exclusively to the question of whether or not the farmer and those engaged in agricultural pursuits shall be allowed some consideration for the tremendously high cost of labor that goes into agricultural production today. The Senate may, if it chooses, vote down my amendments, but the amendments are fair, they are just, and the cost of production is the element that goes into every other commodity sold on the American market today.

Mr. President, I merely want to say a word or two in reply to the Senator from Illinois, who was not kind enough to yield. He said this amendment would disturb the parity formula when the bill of which he is the sponsor wipes out the parity formula we have always known and writes a completely new formula. I am trying to perfect that formula by protecting the farmers and those engaged in agriculture in what they have to pay in farm wages today.

He stated that the amendment was administratively impossible. When we discussed the matter here once before, and the Senator from Illinois was opposing the proposal on the floor, the Senate was dealing with the farm problem more calmly than it is this evening. When the Senator from Illinois rose on that same question, he said it could not possibly be determined what element of wages went into the cost of production in farming and into the parity formula. He then proceeded for the next 15 minutes to read a speech which had been prepared in the Department, which set forth in great detail the exact changes which would be brought about in parity if farm wages were included, and said it would put farm products so high that wages should not be included.

There is nothing administratively impossible about the proposition. It is fair and just and equitable, and I would ask that Senators consider it squarely on its merits.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I regret, Mr. President, I obviously do not in 2 minutes have the time to yield, unless by unanimous consent my time may be extended. If that is not granted, I shall be unable to yield to the able Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish the Chair to put the request to the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator wishes me to yield——

Mr. THYE. No.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. Mr. President, since I have been in the Senate I have been identified in every way I could with an effort to raise the wages of working men and women. I have been identified with every minimum-wage bill with which I could associate myself. In the past, minimum-wage legislation has been restricted to nonagricultural labor, and every time we talk about extending minimum-wage laws to agricultural labor, where the need is greater than it is even in the industrial field, we are told it cannot be done. I know it never will be done unless somehow we find a formula by which the cost of the labor the farmer hires, the money the farmer spends for wages, is included in the price he gets for his commodity; that is, in this instance, into the parity formula.

I say, Mr. President, the need is greatest among farm labor for a decent wage level. We will never get such a level unless the farmer can in some way or other be protected by having included in the price he gets for his commodity in the market place the good wages he pays his working men and women in the field. I believe it is a salutary step forward. It is a principle of equity and fairness to the farmer laborers, to put them on a parity eventually with the industrial labor of the Nation. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THYE. If farm labor were figured in the parity formula under the bill, it would have this effect: During an inflated era, when prices were high, parity would

be raised by the inclusion of farm labor possibly as much as 5 percent. For the effect in a depressed era in agriculture, when prices are low, suppose we go back to the early 1930's. If we then figured the hired farm wage into the parity formula, it would have had a tendency to lower the parity and possibly would have brought parity several points below the actual parity that would have obtained if the farm labor were not figured into the formula.

It was for that reason the economists, the Department of Agriculture, and finally the committee, made the decision that they would accept the formula which did not include farm labor.

I think the able Senator from Georgia will agree that in figuring the formula for parity in the high inflationary prices we have today, we certainly would not want to increase the cost by including farm labor in the parity. But in the event we had a low, depressed condition, a return to agriculture that would be comparable, in other words, to what it was in the early 1930's, we certainly would want every factor to help lift the parity or the price structure of the agricultural economy at that time.

For that reason, I think, Mr. President, if we should adopt the amendment offered by the able Senator from Georgia it would be a mistaken attempt to aid the farmer. I would not do one thing that would injure agriculture in any way.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. The able Senator from Georgia had his moment of time, and I must beg that I be permitted to use my moments of time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yielded to Senators all afternoon.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, each and every member of the committee sat through many, many hours of public hearings on the entire question this past fall and during the winter months of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, and studied every phase of the entire farm program. I know that every committee member who served on that subcommittee, and even the entire Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, will agree with me that every figure we received from the economists was accompanied with advice against writing into the parity formula the cost or hire of labor, including family labor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator has time, will he yield for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. How much time have I left, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can yield now if he will. He has 2 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say what the Senator from Minnesota has said is true, that including the cost of hired labor and family labor in the parity formula would increase the entire price of farm commodities during periods of inflation or periods such as we are going through now, about 5 percent. If, however, the time came when labor became more plentiful and cheap, the effect of including the cost of labor would be to lower the parity prices of farm products below what they would normally be. The committee took this into consideration in fixing the levels of the bill at which farm commodities should be supported. Had we expected that farm labor would be included in the formula, we then would have so arranged the bill that the level of support would have been somewhat lower, but we took into consideration in fixing the level at which farm commodities would be supported the fact that the cost of farm labor or the value of the family labor, which is very difficult indeed to figure, should not be included in the computation of the parity program for farm commodities.

I believe that the bill is very well balanced as it is, and I do not believe it would be advisable to adopt any amendment which would have the effect of raising parity prices on an average of 5 percent.

Tht PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "J" offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

On this amendment I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "nay," if present.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—28

Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Downey	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Ecton	McFarland	Stewart
Ellender	McKellar	Taylor
Feazel	Maybank	Umstead
Fulbright	Murray	
Hayden	O'Daniel	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Hatch	Reed
Baldwin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Brewster	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bricker	Holland	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Taft
Buck	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thye
Cain	Lucas	Tobey
Cooper	McCarthy	Tydings
Cordon	McGrath	Vandenberg
Donnell	McMahon	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Millikin	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young

NOT VOTING—17

Bridges	Jenner	O'Conor
Bushfield	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
Chavez	Magnuson	White
George	Moore	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment lettered "J" was rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment lettered "I," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 72, line 6, after the word "buy" and the comma it is proposed to insert "wages paid hired farm labor," and on page 72, line 9, after the word "prices", insert the word "wages."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the amendment just rejected by the Senate recognized the labor the farmer does on his farm, the labor the farmer's wife does in the field, and the labor his children do on the farm, in computing the parity index. That has now been eliminated by the vote just taken, and is not before the Senate for further consideration. The amendment which is now proposed merely asks that wages paid hired farm labor, in other words, the cash taken out of the farmer's pocket and paid to farm labor, shall be considered in computing the parity formula.

Mr. President, the Senate may vote again that wage costs have nothing to do with costs of production, and should not be considered in what a farmer should receive. I appreciate the fact that the Senate has given me a record vote on the two votes which have heretofore been had. I have learned a bitter lesson in regard to the 5-minute rule by what has transpired up until now. The very able Senator from Minnesota, in discussing the last amendment voted on, said that this was a period when farm wages were high, and that therefore the prices of commodities would be run up too high if we included all farm labor.

Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the bill which the Senator from Minnesota sponsors as a coauthor contains this provision in arriving at what is parity:

> The general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy.

That is in the committee bill. The general level of the prices for what the farmer buys is considered in arriving at the proper parity under the committee bill. The prices of what the farmer buys today are certainly inflated. No one would deny that the cost to the farmer of the things he purchases are approximately what they were in 1940. If they go down, under the parity formula in the pending bill the farmers' parity will go down with them.

Mr. President, this amendment recognizes that farm wages are at an all time high, and that the wages should be considered—this refers to out-of-pocket wages paid by the farmer—in arriving at a proper parity formula.

I submit that the cost of farm wages, the amount the farmer or the ranch owner or the plantation operator reaches in his pocket and pays out to the hands employed on his place, is as much a cost of production as anything else the farmer has to purchase, and that it is unfair and unjust to adopt this long-range program without taking into consideration farm wages actually paid out of pocket by the farmer in the computation of parity.

The amendment would have the effect of increasing parity a little; that is quite true; it might increase parity of wheat 2 or 3 cents a bushel, and corn a like amount. But the bill would lower the parity on wheat by 25 or 30 cents a bushel, it would lower the parity on corn, and would lower the parity on cotton by 4 cents a pound. This small amount should be restored to the parity value because, while Senators may blind themselves to it if they will, what the farmer actually pays out of pocket for labor is just as essentially a part of the parity formula as the purchase of a tractor, or the purchase of a truck, or of any other commodity the farmer may need in the planting or making of his crop.

The Senate has denied the farmer the right to take into consideration his own wages, it has denied him the right to take into consideration the labor of his children in the field with him. I implore the Senate at least to permit him to have recognition in the parity formula, as an element of what constitutes a fair base, the labor cost he pays out of his own pocket.

Mr. President, in the great civilization in which we live today wages have advanced in all lines in the past several years. The level of industrial wages has increased some three or four times. The cost of farm labor has greatly increased. No one complains when there is a slight increase in the price of a commodity. For example, when Mr. Lewis gets a high wage rate for his coal miners, the price of coal rises a few cents a ton, and no one expects anything else. But the farmer is expected to pay the present high wages out of pocket and have the parity held down to an unfair and unjust level.

I say, Mr. President, that if we are to write a long-range farm program, it is unjust, it is unfair, it is unsound and un-American, to eliminate from the program the wages which are actually paid out of pocket by the farmer in computing what is a fair parity for the product which he has for sale.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I will make the question very short. I have voted with the Senator from Illinois on the previous amendments, but I have always believed the wages paid out by a farmer were a farm cost, and I wish the Senator would explain to me what the word "services" in line 5, page 72 means, and why wages paid out in cash are not included under "services."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not propose to discuss that question at all. I propose to answer the Senator from Georgia under the 5-minute rule.

The same arguments made a moment ago in opposition to the other amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia are apropos to the amendment he now offers.

On page 72 of the bill, paragraph (C) reads as follows:

> (C) The "parity index," as of any date, shall be the ratio of (i) the general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy, interest on farm indebtedness secured by farm real estate, and taxes on farm real estate, for the calendar month ending last before such date to (ii) the general level of such prices, rates, and taxes during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

Mr. President, that is the parity formula which has been in existence almost from the very beginning. Yet I recall taxes were added, and that was used as a factor in the consideration of the parity formula.

It is strange that in offering the amendment which was proposed as a complete substitute for the bill offered by the Senator from Vermont the Senator from Georgia did not see fit to change the parity formula. He was content with the amendment he offered without any change in the parity formula whatsoever.

If the Senator was so interested in farm labor as he has contended here all along, it would have been reasonable to have proposed such a change in the parity formula and had it adopted for the period of the next 18 months.

No, Mr. President; the same old argument has been made year after year since the cost of labor has become so high. What we would be doing if we added this as a factor or a part of the equation making up the parity formula would be adding 5 percent to the present parity price. Instead of having a 90-percent parity, we would be giving the farmer a parity of 95 percent.

Mr. President, after all, I undertake to say that the farmers of America are not asking for this change; at least, the farmers of the State whence I come are not asking for it. The farmer is satisfied with the deal he has received under the present parity formula. The farmer of America is better off today than at any time in all his history, under the parity formula we have been operating through the Department of Agriculture all these years. This is no time to change it now, to cause all the administrative confusion which would result from adding the cost of hired labor. I make the same argument I made before against the amendment, and I ask that it be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has expired, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having

been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

On this amendment I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "nay" if present.

I announce further that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would vote "yea," if present, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—29

Barkley	Hayden	Murray
Byrd	Hill	O'Daniel
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	Langer	Russell
Ecton	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McFarland	Stennis
Feazel	McKellar	Stewart
Fulbright	Magnuson	Umstead
Hatch	Maybank	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Gurney	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Ball	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hoey	Smith
Bricker	Holland	Taft
Bridges	Ives	Taylor
Brooks	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Kilgore	Thye
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Cain	McCarthy	Tydings
Capehart	McGrath	Vandenberg
Chavez	McMahon	Watkins
Cooper	Malone	Wherry
Cordon	Martin	Wiley
Donnell	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Morse	Wilson
Flanders	Myers	Young
Green	Reed	

NOT VOTING—14

Bushfield	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McCarran	Wagner
George	Moore	White
Jenner	O'Conor	

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment lettered "I" was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 2, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, line 14, after the period, it is proposed to strike out beginning with the words "The Secretary" and the remaining lines on the page, and to insert the following:

CONSERVATION SURVEY

(d) In order to effectuate the purposes of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall, as rapidly as practicable, make a conservation survey of the Nation's present and potential agricultural lands, and he is authorized to analyze, publish, and distribute information concerning such survey and to provide land use capability maps to landowners and operators applicable to their units of land and to assist them in interpreting and analyzing such maps. On the basis of this conservation survey, maps shall also be prepared delineating those lands suitable for cultivation, those primarily suitable for the production of forests and forest products, those primarily suitable for range livestock production, those primarily suitable for wildlife purposes, and shall specify in addition those lands potentially suitable for intensive agricultural use through irrigation, drainage, clearing, or otherwise, and this survey shall be utilized by all agencies of the Federal Government in the development of agricultural lands within their jurisdiction.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I propose this amendment because we need an accurate inventory of our present agricultural land and our potential agricultural land. We need to know how much land we have. We need to know how much and where our land reserves are that are not now being used. We need to know what their quality is, and what and how much they would produce if it becomes necessary to use them. It is important to know how much land we have. Of the 1,142,000,000 acres of land now in farms in this country, we need to know how much of it is good, how much of it is just fair, and how much of it is poor. We should know its quality and its condition, what conservation measures and other attentions the land needs to maintain its fertility, and its productive capacity while in use.

This is a logical first step in undertaking to assure the Nation of a supply of food, fiber, and other raw materials that can come only from land that is properly used and protected. The survey proposed in this amendment would show the best use for each piece of land and it would indicate the treatment required on each farm in order to prevent erosion damage and to maintain its productivity. It is the only sound basis on which we can develop and direct any long-range agricultural program. It will be valuable for each individual farmer as he works out a soil-conservation program for his own farm and as he plans his own production year after year.

No well managed enterprise, either private or public, would try to conduct its business without this much of an inventory of its basic assets. We are spending a lot of time and hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds on various agricultural programs without an adequate inventory of the land that is basic to every agricultural program. The land is the source of most of the raw material upon which this Nation is dependent. Therefore, we have a need to obtain the essential information about the land as a basis for conserving it and as premise for planning our farm programs.

I have checked with authorities in the Department of Agriculture, and the information that I have received would indicate that it is both possible and feasible to undertake such an inventory and that it could be completed in about 5 years.

Mr. President, because of the lack of time, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the statement I had intended to make be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. WHERRY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What is a conservation survey, and what features are shown? The conservation survey is a detailed record of physical land conditions on each farm. It shows variations in such features as the kind of soil, slope of the land, erosion damage, and present land use. This information is recorded on a map, usually on an aerial photograph, and shows all features of the land that affect its capability for use and its needs for management.

What is a land-use capability map? The land-use capability map is a map that shows what the land can do and what it needs for permanent production. Detailed information obtained in the conservation survey about soil, slope, erosion, and other land features is boiled down into eight classes to show specifically the land suitable for cultivation, grazing, forestry, and wildlife, and the intensity of treatment needed to protect the land.

How much land has been surveyed? Two hundred and seventy-five million acres of land have already been surveyed in this way. Other surveys that have been made will be utilized by supplementing them with additional information in order to make them adequate as a basis for developing farm and ranch conservation plans.

What will be the cost in making such a land inventory? The cost of making this farm-land inventory will be about 5 cents per acre. This cost is less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the value of farm land.

At 5 cents an acre for 1,142,000,000 acres in farms, the cost would be over $57,000,000, but much of the land has already been surveyed—it is estimated that it will cost about $40,000,000 to complete such a survey of all the land in farms.

Who will use the information obtained from the survey? It provides essential information about the land for making farm conservation plans on individual farms and ranches, and will provide it in time to carry out soil-conservation practices with the greatest efficiency.

The survey gives information that is essential in planning a long-range agricultural program. It would serve as a basis for determining the acreages of land suitable for specific uses and the treatment needed to protect the land in those uses.

It will provide information for flood control, drainage, irrigation, and other similar activities.

What does the individual farmer get out of this survey? The farmer gets a map of his farm that shows him the best use for each field and aids him in selecting the practices needed to protect and improve his land. Specifically, the map of each farm that the farmer gets will show field and pasture boundaries, streams, roads, building sites, the eroded or steep lands that are now in cultivation that should be put in grass or trees, the wet areas that can be improved by drainage, the location of waterways, the fields that need terracing and strip cropping, the soils that are best adapted to special crops like alfalfa, tobacco, or peanuts, etc.

What is the difference between a soil survey and a conservation survey? The soil survey classifies and maps soils showing how they differ in color, texture, structure, and other features as they occur in their natural state.

The conservation survey is a practical inventory of the land conditions on a farm-by-farm basis. It shows, in addition to the kind of soil, the amount of slope, the erosion that has occurred, and whether the land is cultivated, is in grass or trees. It provides the necessary information to plan and apply practices and measures to conserve the soil.

What is a land capability map? It is a map of a farm, colored so as to show the different kinds of land; that based on the information from the conservation survey, together with knowledge of the climate, indicates what the land needs, and what it can best produce while in continuous use.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think the amendment should be taken to conference.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have not read the amendment. I have not seen anything before but the heading of it. I should be willing to accept it and take

it to conference with the understanding that it does not bind the Senate conferees if there is something in it which we would otherwise oppose. I do not think there is.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I think the Senator will agree with me and I am satisfied the Senate conferees will agree with me, that the amendment should be included in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The amendment to the committee amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment No. 3 and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

LAND SURVEYS AND DEVELOPMENT TIMETABLE

(e) Prior to the first request for an annual appropriation for purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and submit to the Congress a preliminary land conservation and development timetable showing the current rates and extent of land damage in the United States, the dates practicable for the completion of the conservation survey, and a specification of the land treatment in his opinion deemed necessary, including estimated costs thereof. On completion and analysis of the conservation survey of the Nation's land, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise the land conservation and development timetable accordingly and shall submit it to Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this amendment simply provides a timetable for the conservation program which we have just asked the Senator from Vermont to take to conference. I think it is necessary if we are going into the conservation program. It seems to me that we should not only make an inventory of the land, but should also have some sort of timetable showing us how fast we can proceed with conservation methods. Also there ought to be some idea of whether or not we are going too fast.

Mr. President, in view of the late hour and the limitation on debate to 5 minutes to each side, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I propose a conservation timetable in order that we may begin to apply some real business principles to the conservation job in the United States. Everyone agrees now that we have a conservation job to do and everyone agrees that it ought to be done right. What we have all failed to find out, so far, is just how big the job is—and how much time we have to do it in.

The way we are going now we could go on and on with these soil-conservation programs until doomsday. The way we are going now I cannot tell whether we will have the land of the country conserved by the year 2,000 or by the year 3,000. I am convinced, however, that if we keep up this unbusinesslike approach to the job we shall come face to face with the fact, one of these days, that there is not much land left to conserve.

I am convinced of another thing. The conservation job ahead of us has some size that can be determined. Maybe every last acre in the country needs conservation work. Maybe three-quarters of our land needs the work—or two-thirds. I do not know what the percentage may be, but I am sure there must be one. Only we do not know today the size of the job we are trying to deal with.

We have been going at conservation blindly. We have not only failed so far to find out how big the job is, we have failed to find out how fast we must do the job. I know that if land is wearing out fast, you can't loiter along and take 20 or 30 years to protect it. Any businessman who handled his machinery and equipment that way would be driven to the wall. On the other hand, I am sure that there is much land in the country that is not being damaged very fast. Some of it is not being damaged at all. We do not know how much of our land is being damaged fast; how much is being damaged slowly; or how much is free from damage. This is most unbusinesslike. How can we hope to deal intelligently with this highly important matter if we do not know either the size of the job or how much time we have to do it?

We ought to take steps to find out these facts. Then we ought to provide a conservation program especially designed to meet the needs—doing what needs to be done each year—and then finishing the job.

I am told that we have some preliminary information along this line. I am told that approximately one-quarter of all our cropland is being damaged at a very serious rate. The trained conservationists in the States and in the Federal Government say that this land will suffer permanent damage unless it is given sound conservation treatment within the next 10 to 15 years. They call this a critical rate.

Another quarter of our cropland, I am informed, is being damaged at a slower rate, but still fast enough to cause us grave concern. This land will suffer a permanent loss in its ability to produce unless it is given conservation protection within about 20 years.

Our conservation program should be operated on a schedule. We ought to know how much we need to do each year in order to protect the vital soil resources of the country, and then we ought to do it. With such a schedule—I call it a conservation timetable—we can go ahead with some real assurance that we are dealing effectively with the job. We can proceed with some assurance that the money we are appropriating for soil conservation is actually getting the job done—so much every year.

The conservation job in the United States can be scheduled ahead, just as businessmen schedule their operations ahead. With a conservation timetable we can get the conservation job done surely and on time. It would be the most practical and economical way of getting it done. Without a timetable we shall have to go along appropriating huge sums of money year after year, never knowing whether we are actually meeting the needs of the Nation, and indulging in a hit-or-miss flirtation with one of the most serious problems facing the country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Vermont to accept the amendment and take it to conference and see whether or not the conferees will accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator raising a point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to find out something. I wish to find out what happened to the previous amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. I did not hear the Chair say anything about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announced that it was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. If I have any time left.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator explain what is meant by a timetable?

Mr. WHERRY. I mean a schedule showing how fast we should go with conservation methods annually. I think we should go as fast as we can, but I think we should proceed over a period of years according to a timetable and make our appropriations annually on that basis to cover all the land—not too fast and not too slow. I think we are going at the program hit or miss. I think the amendment should be taken to conference to see if a timetable can be worked out

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska calls for a tremendous job on the part of the Department of Agriculture. I suppose it is a job which should be done. Whether now is the time to do it, I do not know. I am willing to take the amendment to conference. If it is left in the bill, there will still have to be an appropriation, and I doubt if it will be possible to obtain an appropriation for this purpose between now and the end of the session.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If I have any time left.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. BUTLER. I have some comments on the bill relating to the subject of conservation which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUGH BUTLER, OF NEBRASKA, ON S. 2318

Mr. President, in my judgment it is very unfortunate that we are forced by circumstances to take action on such an important matter so late in this session and under such trying and confusing conditions. I have a fear that many of the decisions we are making may not be wise decisions. This is a very complicated bill. It will have far-reaching effects on every farmer in the country. It deserves more careful and extended consideration than it is receiving.

Thus far, almost all the debate has centered around the new parity formula and the new proposals for price supports contained in the bill. Yet these provisions relating to farm prices are not the only important changes provided for in the bill. In titles I and II of the bill, a wholesale reorganization of the administrative agencies handling the agricultural program is provided. These titles would have far-reaching effects on the administration of the soil-conservation program, on the payments for conservation practices, and on other programs, if these should be enacted in their present form. Yet they have received almost no discussion during the course of the debate. There is real danger that they may be enacted into law without any real consideration by the Congress.

I do not believe such far-reaching changes in the organization of the Department should be enacted at the present time without much more thorough consideration by the Congress. In fact, I have considered preparing an amendment or amendments striking out all those sections of the bill which would reorganize the administrative framework for the programs. I finally decided not to offer such amendments at this time, since I realize it would be out of the question to ask the Senate to give them detailed consideration at this late hour. In any case, I feel fairly confident that the House will refuse even to consider these proposed administrative changes. Before the final vote is taken, however, I want to record a protest against these changes in the conservation program and other programs, so that it cannot be said there was no opposition to them.

Mr. President, very briefly I want to mention at least a few reasons why I believe this wholesale revision of the conservation program would be most unwise. First of all, we have not had time to give the implications of the new plan fair consideration. I believe that is obvious. We should not attempt to reshuffle the principal bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, the State and County Committees, and all the rest of the Department without giving very careful thought to every aspect of the proposed change.

Second, we already have at work a Commission—the Hoover Commission—which has been hard at work for some time on a general investigation and study of the organization of the entire Government, with a view to recommending changes and improvements in our methods of operation. I understand that the Hoover Commission is going very thoroughly into the various problems of the organization and administration of the farm programs. It seems that it would be foolish to try to legislate such changes at this time, when the Hoover Commission, early next year, may report recommendations along entirely different lines. I believe I am just as well aware of the need for certain changes in the methods of conducting these programs as are the sponsors of this bill. I do not believe, however, that this is the time or the way to make those changes.

Third, the effect of this bill apparently will be to place control over the soil-conservation program in the hands of county and State committees, rather than in the hands of the soil-conservation districts. I do not believe that would be wise. I am not sure it would even be practical. The sponsors of the bill seem to forget that the soil-conservation districts were authorized and created by action of each of the 48 States. This district set-up should not be wiped out, as proposed in this act. It is doing an excellent job for conservation at the present time. Personally, I do not see why the soil-conservation districts should be changed at all. They are one of the most successful elements of our agricultural program.

There are other reasons why no such drastic organizational changes should be made at this time. I will not try to give them in detail. I hope I have said enough to show why this proposal should not be rushed through in such a hasty fashion. I sincerely hope that the House will refuse to be stampeded in this matter, and will insist that these questions be put over for more thorough study.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2318) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in order to expedite the legislative process, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6248, which is the stopgap bill which was passed by the House; that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6248; and that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the language of Senate bill 2318, as amended, the bill which has just gone to a third reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6248, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6248?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, House bill 6248 will be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill 2318 as amended.

The amendment is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1948".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby recognized that a sound national economy requires that each segment of the population be maintained as an efficient producer and a constant consumer of goods and services, and it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide for a coordinated program, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with agencies in the several States, and designed—

(1) to restore, develop, conserve, and wisely use our basic resources of soil, water, forests, and wildlife habitat in order to assure an abundant production of all agricultural products necessary for the general well-being of all our people;

(2) to develop a means of supporting agricultural income on a flexible basis relative to prices and production so as to foster desirable shifts in agricultural production and aid in stabilizing the national economy;

(3) to improve methods of marketing, facilitate distribution, and increase utilization of agricultural commodities in both domestic and foreign markets;

(4) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of such commodities in interstate and foreign trade through price support, marketing quotas, diversion to various economic uses, and other means;

(5) to assist consumers in obtaining adequate and steady supplies of high-quality farm products at fair and equitable prices;

(6) to assist low-income families and school children in maintaining an adequate diet, particularly in periods of underconsumption and unemployment;

(7) to obtain full cooperation and coordinated action of land operators living on the farms in restoring, developing, conserving, and wisely using our basic resources of soil, water, forests, and wildlife habitat;

(8) to provide more adequately for the coordination and expansion of Federal and State soil surveys and other investigations, experimentation, and research pertaining to the conservation, restoration, and development of our natural agricultural resources, and for the publication of the results of such studies;

(9) to assure that payments to farmers in each State for soil-conservation practices shall be made only for practices approved by the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council (hereinafter provided for);

(10) to provide for the fullest development and the most efficient employment of rural human resources;

(11) to provide more fully for adult education through cooperative agricultural extension work as the recognized educational and demonstrational medium for reaching farm people and others in regard to agricultural information, policies, and programs;

(12) to provide for the full development of personal initiative and local responsibility in the development and administration of programs for the maintenance of a progressive agriculture;

(13) to provide for the adaptation of agricultural programs to the different and changing needs of regional and local communities;

(14) to encourage producers, processors, and distributors to enter into marketing agreements for the supplying of adequate quantities of selected farm products at a reasonable and assured price;

(15) to continue the use of certain revenues and funds for judicious support of prices of highly perishable products, including fresh fruits, vegetables, milk, and eggs, in facilitating distribution of such products for diet improvement of low-income families and school children, in stimulating improved nutrition, and in encouraging the exportation of such products; and

(16) to assist in the retention of foreign outlets in order to (a) maintain long-run export demands, (b) prevent short-run demoralization of domestic markets, and (c) maintain productive capacity sufficient to satisfy expected long-run domestic markets plus foreign demand for agricultural products.

TITLE I—REORGANIZATION

DECENTRALIZATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 101. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") shall establish an agency, to be known as the "Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement," to exercise all functions of the Secretary and of the various bureaus and agencies within the Department of Agriculture which (1), prior to the enactment of this act, were assigned to the Soil Conservation Service or to the Agricultural Conservation Programs Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration, or (2) the Secretary deems to be principally related to soil conservation and improvement or to those aspects of programs of the Department of Agriculture which require direct dealings by the Department with farmers; except that, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary—

(a) the educational, informational, and demonstrational features of such functions shall be exercised, in the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, through the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agencies performing cooperative agricultural extension work;

(b) the research and investigational features of such functions shall be exercised in the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico through the agricultural experiment stations in cooperation with the Secretary acting through the Office of Experiment Stations; and

(c) such functions, except as provided by clauses (a) and (b) of this section, shall within the continental United States be performed at State and county levels, insofar as the Secretary may deem practicable, by the State agricultural councils, the county and community agricultural program committees, and the county agricultural program executive committees, all hereinafter provided for.

Except as provided in clauses (a) and (b) of this section, the furnishing of technical assistance, and machinery and equipment to soil-conservation districts and others, as heretofore performed by the Soil Conservation Service, shall be performed by the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement in cooperation with the State agricultural councils established pursuant to this act and the soil-conservation districts established by State laws. The functions assigned pursuant to this section to the State agricultural councils and the agencies performing cooperative agricultural extension work shall be closely coordinated by the secretary and by such councils and agencies.

Conservation survey

(d) In order to effectuate the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, as rapidly as practicable, make a conservation survey of the Nation's present and potential agricultural lands, and he is authorized to analyze, publish, and distribute information concerning such survey and to provide land use capability maps to landowners and operators applicable to their units of land and to assist them in interpreting and analyzing such maps. On the basis of this conservation survey, maps shall also be prepared delineating those lands suitable for cultivation, those primarily suitable for the production of forests and forest products, those primarily suitable for range livestock production, those primarily suitable for wildlife purposes, and shall specify in addition those lands potentially suitable for intensive agricultural use through irrigation, drainage, clearing, or otherwise, and this survey shall be utilized by all agencies of the Federal Government in the development of agricultural lands within their jurisdiction.

Land conservation and development timetable

(e) Prior to the first request for an annual appropriation for purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and submit to the Congress a preliminary land conservation and development timetable, showing the current rates and extent of land damage to the United States, the dates practicable for the completion of the conservation survey, and a specification of the land treatment in his opinion deemed necessary, including estimated costs thereof. On completion and analysis of the conservation survey of the Nation's land, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise the land conservation and development timetable accordingly and shall submit it to Congress.

APPROPRIATIONS AVAILABLE FOR FUNCTIONS TO BE PERFORMED AS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK

SEC. 102. (a) (A) Any sums hereafter appropriated, other than as grants-in-aid, and available for functions which the Secretary determines to be functions required by section 101 (a) of this act to be exercised through the Extension Service and cooperating agencies in the several States and the Territory of Hawaii, to the extent that such funds are available at the time the Secretary makes such determination, and (B) any sums appropriated specifically for functions covered by section 101 (a), shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations as the additional sums appropriated under the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," approved May 8, 1914 (U. S. C., title 7, secs. 341–343, 344–348), except that—

(1) not more than 2 per centum of the sums so appropriated and available in each fiscal year shall be available for paying expenses of the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; and

(2) the remainder of the sums so appropriated and available in each fiscal year shall be paid to the several States and the Territory of Hawaii, without any requirement that equal sums be provided from any other sources, in the same proportions as the sums appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to section 23 of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 343d–1).

(b) The sums paid pursuant to this section shall be in addition to and not in substitution for sums appropriated under such act of May 8, 1914, as amended and supplemented, or sums otherwise appropriated for agricultural extension work. Allotments to any State or the Territory of Hawaii for any fiscal year as provided by this section shall be available for payment to such State or the Territory of Hawaii only if such State or the Territory of Hawaii complies, for such fiscal year, with the provisions with reference to offset of appropriations (other than appropriated funds allotted pursuant to this section) for agricultural extension work.

DIVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 103. The Secretary shall establish within the Office of Experiment Stations an organizational unit to carry out the functions assigned to him by section 101 (b) of this act. Not more than 5 percent of any Federal funds made available for research projects supervised by such organizational unit shall be available for its expenses.

APPROPRIATIONS AVAILABLE FOR FUNCTIONS TRANSFERRED TO EXPERIMENT STATIONS

SEC. 104. The Secretary is authorized to make available from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, other than as grants-in-aid, for functions which pursuant to section 101 (b) are to be exercised through the agricultural experiment stations in the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico such sums as he may deem appropriate for allotment to such agricultural experiment stations. The sums so allotted shall be in addition to and not in substitution for sums otherwise appropriated for the work of such agricultural experiment stations.

COMMUNITY, COUNTY, AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

Community agricultural program committees

SEC. 105. The farm operators within each local administrative area of the continental United States hereinafter provided for shall elect annually from among their number (1) three members of a community agricultural program committee, designating one of such members to be chairman, and (2) first and second alternates. In any county in which only one such area is situated five members and two alternates shall be elected for the community agricultural program committee for such area. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the committee between annual elections shall be filled for the unexpired terms by the first and second alternates in that order, or if there are no alternates available, by an election by the farm operators. Vacancies occurring in the chairmanship of the committee between annual elections shall be filled for the unexpired term by election by the committee from among its members. No member shall be elected for four full consecutive terms. The committee shall perform within its area the function assigned to it pursuant to section 101 (c) of this act and such other functions as the Secretary may assign to it. The local administrative areas designated by the Secretary and serving on the date of enactment of this act as units for administration of programs under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act shall serve as local administrative areas for the purposes of this section, but each county agricultural program committee may, with the approval of the State agricultural council, from time to time designate different local administrative areas within its county for the purposes of this section.

County agricultural program committees

SEC. 106. In each county there shall be a county agricultural program committee consisting of—

(1) the members of the community agricultural program committees in the county;

(2) the agricultural extension agent for the county, who shall have no vote; and

(3) one representative designated by each of such agencies concerned with soil conservation, grass conservation, drainage, irrigation or other agricultural interests as the State agricultural council may specify, but the number of agencies so specified shall be at least one less than the number of members provided for by clause (1).

The county agricultural program committee shall perform within its county the functions assigned to it pursuant to section 101 (c) of this act and such other functions as the Secretary may assign to it. It shall meet at such times as it may specify, or upon call of the chairman of the county agricultural program executive committee for its county.

County agricultural program executive committees

SEC. 107. The elected members of each county agricultural program committee shall elect annually from among their number (1) not less than three and not more than five, as determined by the State agricultural council, members of a county agricultural program executive committee, designating one of such members to be chairman, one to be vice chairman, and one to be secretary, of such executive committee, and (2) first and second alternates. Vacancies occurring among the members of such executive committee between annual elections shall be filled for the unexpired terms by the first and second alternates in that order, or, if there are no alternates available, by election from among their number by the elected members of the county agricultural program committee, and at such election first and second alternates again shall be elected. Vacancies in the offices of chairman, vice chairman, and secretary occurring between annual elections shall be filled for the unexpired terms by election by such executive committee from among its members. No member shall be elected for four full consecutive terms. The executive committee shall, through personnel employed by it, perform within the county the functions as-

signed to it pursuant to section 101 (c) of this Act and such other functions as the Secretary may assign to it.

State agricultural councils

SEC. 108. (a) For each State of the United States there shall be a State agricultural council consisting of the ex officio members hereinafter specified who shall have no vote, four farmer members, and as many additional farmer members as may be specified in accordance with the provisions of this section; but the number of additional farmer members so specified shall not exceed the greater of (1) two, or (2) one for each full 20 counties in the State, plus and if the number of counties in the State is not evenly divisible by 20 and exceeds by more than 10 the multiple of 20 which it least exceeds. The Commissioner (or Secretary or Director, as the case may be) of Agriculture, or his designee, the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, or his designee, and the Director of the Agricultural Extension Service, or his designee, for such State shall be the ex officio members.

(b) The farmer members shall be appointed by the Secretary from among farmers nominated, by majority vote, by the chairmen of the county agricultural program executive committees of the State, three nominations being submitted for each appointment to be made. Not more than two of the three nominations for any appointment shall be from among the number of such chairmen. The farmer members first appointed after the enactment of this Act shall be appointed for three-, two-, and one-year terms in as nearly equal groups as may be possible; and their successors shall be appointed for three-year terms. Farmer members shall be subject to removal by the Secretary at any time. Vacancies occurring among the farmer members shall be filled for the unexpired terms by appointment by the Secretary from among the farmers nominated, but not appointed, at the time of the last regular appointment prior to the occurrence of such vacancies. No farmer member shall be appointed for any term which, with any previous periods of service by him as such a member, would exceed five years during any six-year period.

(c) The number of additional farmer members, if any (not exceeding the maximum number prescribed by the first sentence of this section), to be appointed first after the enactment of this Act shall be specified by the ex officio members of the State agricultural council. The number of additional farmer members thereafter to be appointed shall be specified by the State agricultural council. Should the number of additional farmer members at any time be increased as provided by this section, the additional farmer members so added shall be appointed for such terms that the number of terms expiring in succeeding years shall, as nearly as may be possible, be equal. Any decrease, as provided by this section, in the number of additional farmer members shall be made by allowing terms to expire without appointing successors in such manner that the number of terms expiring annually after the decrease has been completed shall, as nearly as may be possible, be equal.

(d) The State agricultural council shall develop plans to effectuate the purposes of section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in its State, shall perform the functions assigned to it pursuant to section 101 (c) of this Act and such other functions within its State as the Secretary may assign to it, shall supervise and direct the work of the county agricultural program and executive committees in its State, and shall otherwise cooperate with the Secretary in the planning and carrying out of soil-conservation programs in its State. It shall elect from among its number a chairman, vice chairman, and secretary, shall employ, on an annual basis, a State administrator, and may employ such other personnel as it may deem necessary to carry out its functions. In carrying out the functions assigned to it, and subject to the approval of the Secretary, it may enter into arrangements with (1) the Agricultural Extension Service in its State for the conduct of educational and demonstrational programs, and (2) State agricultural councils of other States for cooperation on matters of mutual interest. Federal grants-in-aid for programs administered by the State agricultural council shall be disbursed by the appropriate agency of the State only pursuant to direction by the State agricultural council. Any grants-in-aid or other funds allocated to a State for programs administered by the State agricultural council may be withheld or recalled by the Secretary if he determines that such council is not faithfully administering the programs assigned to it.

Administrative expenses

SEC. 109. The Secretary is authorized and directed, from any funds made available for the purposes of the acts in connection with which State agricultural councils, county or community agricultural program committees, or county agricultural program executive committees may be utilized, to make payments to such councils or committees to cover the estimated administrative expenses incurred or to be incurred by them in carrying out the functions assigned to them under such acts. All or part of such administrative expenses of any such council or committee may be deducted pro rata from the Soil Conservation Act payments, parity payments, or loans, or other payments or grants-in-aid under such acts, unless payment of such expenses is otherwise provided by law. The Secretary may make such payments in advance of determination of performance. The administrative expenses covered by such payments shall not include compensation for services of members of State agricultural councils and of community and county agricultural program and executive committees except (subject to approval by the Secretary) as follows:

(a) Each farmer member of a State agricultural council shall be entitled to compensation, at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary, for time actually spent by him in the work of the council pursuant to its direction; and

(b) Each member of a county agricultural program executive committee shall be entitled to compensation, at such rate as may be fixed by the appropriate State agricultural council, for time actually spent by him in the work of the committee pursuant to its direction and subject to the approval of the State agricultural council.

Subject to such limitations as the Secretary may prescribe, such council and committee members shall also be entitled to their reasonable expenses incurred in serving as such members. No such member shall, out of any amounts paid by the Secretary, be paid for performing any services in addition to his services as member for any such council or committee, but a member may resign as member in order to accept employment by a council or committee, and a member of a community agricultural program committee may be paid for services performed at the request of the county agricultural program, or executive committee, or the State agricultural council. The Secretary shall make such regulations as are necessary relating to the selection and exercise of the functions of such councils and committees, respectively. A county agricultural program executive committee may, except as may be disapproved by the Secretary, accept, in addition to the amounts paid to it by the Secretary, funds from other public agencies to be utilized for agricultural purposes.

Membership limited to one council or committee

SEC. 110. No person shall be a member of more than one council or executive committee established pursuant to this act. Appointment of any chairman of a county agricultural program executive committee to be a member of a State agricultural council shall cause the offices he holds as a member of a community agricultural program committee, a county agricultural program committee, and a county agricultural program executive committee to become vacant.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS IN STATE PLANS

SEC. 201. Section 7 (d) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"No such plan submitted by a State of the United States shall be approved by the Secretary, except upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948; and unless by its terms such plan provides—

"(A) that any sum to be allocated by the Secretary to carry out the plan shall be disbursed by the appropriate agency of the State only pursuant to direction by the State agricultural council, and

"(B) that (i) the State agricultural council, and (ii) the community and county agricultural program committees and county agricultural program executive committees created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948, shall, respectively, if authorized by the State, be administering and participating agencies as provided in clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection".

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL-PAYMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 202. Section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended (a) by striking out "January 1, 1949" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1951", and (b) by striking out "December 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS IN NATIONAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 203. Section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary upon the recommendation of the respective State agricultural councils to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion; (2) changes in the use of their land, including the development of suitable wildlife habitat in carrying out the purposes of section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080); (3) their equitable share as determined by the Secretary, of the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; or (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a); or

(5) any combination of the above. In arid or semiarid sections, (1) and (2) above shall be constructed to cover water conservation and the beneficial use of water on individual farms, including measures to prevent runoff, the building of check dams and ponds, and providing facilities for applying water to the land. In determining the amount of any payment or grant measured by (1) or (2) the Secretary shall take into consideration the productivity of the land affected by the farming practices adopted during the year with respect to which such payment is made. In carrying out the provisions of this section in the continental United States, the Secretary is directed to utilize the State agricultural councils and community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall, as far as practicable, protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers; is authorized to utilize the agricultural extension service and other approved agencies; shall accord such recognition and encouragement to producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative association as will be in harmony with the policy toward cooperative associations set forth in existing acts of Congress and as will tend to promote efficient methods of marketing and distribution; shall not have power to acquire any land or any right or interest therein; shall, in every practicable manner, protect the interests of small producers; and shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding practices rather than the growing of soil-depleting crops. Rules and regulations governing payments or grants under this subsection shall be as simple and direct as possible, and, wherever practicable, they shall be classified on two bases: (a) Soil-depleting crops and practices, (b) soil-building crops and practices. Notwithstanding any other provision of law in making available conservation materials consisting of seeds, seed inoculants, fertilizers, liming and other soil-conditioning materials, trees, or plants, or in making available soil-conserving or soil-building services, to agricultural producers under this subsection, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or covering soil-conserving or soil-building services, furnished to producers at not to exceed a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, or who render services to the Secretary in delivering to producers approved conservation materials, for the carrying out, by the producers, of soil-building or soil-conserving practices approved by the Secretary.

"Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purchase in advance of the program year for which the appropriation is made of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or other plants, or any other farming materials or any services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in programs under this act, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other plants, or other farming materials, or any services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the cost incident to the delivery thereof."

SEC. 204. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended—

(a) By striking out the first word of section 8 (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the provisions of section 16 of this act, payments";

(b) By striking out the proviso contained in section 8 (e); and

(c) By adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 16. Payments or grants of aid to farmers in any State, under a State plan or by the Secretary, for soil-building or soil-conserving practices shall be—

"(a) made only for such practices as may be approved by the Secretary upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council;

"(b) made, except with respect to farms designated as demonstration or experimental farms, only for practices which the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council, determines have long-term conservation and improvement value; and

"(c) divided among the landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers of any farm, with respect to which such payments are made, on the basis of relative value of their contributions to such practices in such manner as may be provided by the Secretary upon the recommendation of the State agricultural council.

"Beginning with the calendar year 1949, the total payments for any year to any person, under all State plans and otherwise under this act, not including payments made with respect to demonstration or experimental farms, shall not exceed $1,000; but programs under this act may provide that, at the election of the owner of any farm, soil conservation or improvement practices taken with respect to such farm in any year which have long-term effect may form the basis for payments in such year and not to exceed the succeeding 4 years with respect to such farm."

SEC. 205. Section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. All funds available for carrying out this act shall be available for allotment to the bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture and for transfer to such other agencies of the Federal or State Governments as the Secretary may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out this act, and for payments to State agricultural councils or county or community agricultural program committees or executive committees to cover the estimated administrative expenses to be incurred by any such council or committee in cooperating in carrying out this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary may prescribe that all or part of such estimated expenses of any such council or committee may be deducted pro rata from the payments or grants made to the members thereof: *And provided further*, That the Secretary may make such payments in advance of determination of performance."

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

DEFINITIONS OF "PARITY PRICE," "CARRY-OVER," "NORMAL SUPPLY," AND "TOTAL SUPPLY"

SEC. 301. Section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

(a) By striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) (A) The 'parity price' for any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be determined by multiplying the adjusted base price of such commodity as of such date by the parity index as of such date.

"(B) The 'adjusted base price' of any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be (i) the average of the prices received by farmers for such commodity, at such times as the Secretary may select during each year of the 10-year period ending on the 31st of December last before such date, or during each marketing season beginning in such period if the Secretary determines use of a calendar-year basis to be impracticable, divided by (ii) the ratio of the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during such period to the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

"(C) The 'parity index,' as of any date, shall be the ratio of (i) the general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy, interest on farm indebtedness secured by farm real estate, and taxes on farm real estate, for the calendar month ending last before such date to (ii) the general level of such prices, rates, and taxes during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

"(D) The prices and indices provided for herein, and the data used in computing them, shall be determined by the Secretary, whose determination shall be final.

"(E) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the transitional parity price for any agricultural commodity, computed as provided in this subparagraph, shall be used as the parity price for such commodity until such date after January 1, 1949, as such transitional parity price may be lower than the parity price, computed as provided in subparagraph (A), for such commodity. The transitional parity price for any agricultural commodity as of any date shall be—

"(i) its parity price determined in the manner used prior to the effective date of the Agricultural Act of 1948, less

"(ii) five percent of the parity price so determined multiplied by the number of full calendar years which, as of such date, have elapsed after January 1, 1948.

"(F) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A) and (E), if the parity price for any agricultural commodity, computed as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (E) appears to be seriously out of line with the parity prices of other agricultural commodities, the Secretary may, and upon the request of a substantial number of interested producers shall, hold public hearings to determine the proper relationship between the parity price of such commodity and the parity prices of other agricultural commodities. Within 60 days after commencing such hearing the Secretary shall complete such hearing, proclaim his findings as to whether the facts require a revision of the method of computing the parity price of such commodity, and put into effect any revision so found to be required.

"(2) 'Parity,' as applied to income, shall be that gross income from agriculture which will provide the farm operator and his family with opportunities for living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupation. 'Parity' as applied to income from any agricultural commodity for any year, shall be that gross income which bears the same relationship to parity income from agriculture for such year as the average gross income from such commodity for the preceding 10 calendar years bears to the average gross income from agriculture for such 10 calendar years."

(b) By amending paragraph (3) (A) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(A) 'Carry-over,' in the case of corn, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be the quantity of the commodity on hand in the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, not including any quantity which was produced in the United States during the calendar year then current."

(c) By amending paragraph (3) (B) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(B) 'Carry-over' of cotton for any marketing year shall be quantity of cotton on hand within the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, which was produced in the United States prior to the beginning of the calendar year then current, plus the quantity on hand within the United States at the beginning of such marketing year which was produced outside the United States."

(d) By striking out paragraph (10) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(10) (A) 'Normal supply' in the case of corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated

domestic consumption of the commodity for the marketing year ending immediately prior to the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (iii) an allowance for carry-over. The allowance for carry-over shall be the following percentage of the sum of the consumption and exports used in computing normal supply: 7 percent in the case of corn; 30 percent in the case of cotton; 10 percent in the case of rice; 15 percent in the case of wheat; and 15 percent in the case of peanuts. In determining normal supply the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he may deem necessary.

"(B) 'Normal supply' in the case of tobacco shall be a normal year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 175 percent of a normal year's domestic consumption and 65 percent of a normal year's exports as an allowance for a normal carry-over."

(c) By amending paragraph (16) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(A) 'Total supply' of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be the carry-over of the commodity for such marketing year, plus the estimated production of the commodity in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins and the estimated imports of the commodity into the United States during such marketing year.

"(B) 'Total supply' of tobacco for any marketing year shall be the carry-over at the beginning of such marketing year plus the estimated production thereof in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins, except that the estimated production of type-46 tobacco during the marketing year with respect to which the determination is being made shall be used in lieu of the estimated production of such type during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins in determining the total supply of cigar filler and cigar binder tobacco."

PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 302. (a) Section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary, through the Commodity Credit Corporation (except as provided in subsection (c)) and other means available to him, is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amounts, terms, and conditions of such price-support operations, and the extent to which such operations are carried out, shall, in the case of operations carried out by Commodity Credit Corporation, be determined by the Corporation with the approval and subject to the direction of the Secretary, and, in the case of operations carried out by other means, be determined by the Secretary. In making such determinations, consideration shall be given to (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, (3) the availability of funds, (4) the perishability of the commodity, (5) its importance to agriculture and the national economy, (6) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation, (7) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets, and (8) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand. Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support. The Secretary shall in all cases give consideration to the practicability of supporting prices indirectly, as by the development of improved merchandising methods, rather than directly by purchase or loan.

"(b) (1) Price support shall be made available to producers of any basic agricultural commodity at levels determined as hereinafter provided in this subsection. On the basis of the latest available statistics of the Department of Agriculture as of the beginning of each marketing year for each such basic agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall, with respect to such marketing year and such basic agricultural commodity—

"(i) estimate the total supply;

"(ii) determine the normal supply; and

"(iii) determine the percentage which the estimated total supply is of the normal supply (such percentage being referred to herein as the 'supply percentage').

"(2) The level at which the price of such basic agricultural commodity for such marketing year shall be supported for cooperators (other than cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) shall not exceed 90 percent of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or be less than the percentage of its parity price as of the beginning of such marketing year determined from the following table:

"If the supply percentage is:	The level of support shall be not less than the following percentage of the parity price:
Not more than 70	90
More than 70 but not more than 72	89
More than 72 but not more than 74	88
More than 74 but not more than 76	87
More than 76 but not more than 78	86
More than 78 but not more than 80	85
More than 80 but not more than 82	84
More than 82 but not more than 84	83
More than 84 but not more than 86	82
More than 86 but not more than 88	81
More than 88 but not more than 90	80
More than 90 but not more than 92	79
More than 92 but not more than 94	78
More than 94 but not more than 96	77
More than 96 but not more than 98	76
More than 98 but not more than 102	75
More than 102 but not more than 104	74
More than 104 but not more than 106	73
More than 106 but not more than 108	72
More than 108 but not more than 110	71
More than 110 but not more than 112	70
More than 112 but not more than 114	69
More than 114 but not more than 116	68
More than 116 but not more than 118	67
More than 118 but not more than 120	66
More than 120 but not more than 122	65
More than 122 but not more than 124	64
More than 124 but not more than 126	63
More than 126 but not more than 128	62
More than 128 but not more than 130	61
More than 130	60

"(3) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

"(A) the minimum level of price support to cooperators for any basic agricultural commodity shall be 120 percent of the minimum level determined from the foregoing table, if acreage allotments are in effect at the beginning of the planting season for such commodity, or if marketing quotas are in effect at the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity; but in no case shall the level of price support for any commodity be increased thereby above 90 percent of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year; and

"(B) the level of price support for any basic agricultural commodity normally marketed in any marketing year with respect to which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers shall be 50 percent of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of such marketing year.

"(4) The level at which the price of corn shall be supported for cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 75 percent of the level at which the price is supported for cooperators in the commercial corn-producing area with respect to corn.

"(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas are in effect shall be 90 percent of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year.

"(c) The support price for any nonbasic agricultural commodity shall not exceed 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or season in the case of a commodity marketed on a marketing-year or seasonal basis, and as of January 1 in the case of any other commodity. Any price-support operation undertaken with respect to either turkeys or chickens shall be applicable to all chickens, including broilers, appropriate adjustments being made as provided in subsection (e) of this section: *Provided*, That if any price-support operation is undertaken with respect to either chickens or turkeys, the same parity price-support operation shall be undertaken with respect to ducks and ducklings and other poultry. The price of wool shall be supported at such level, not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of its parity price as of January 1, as the Secretary may consider necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. The price of any kind of Irish potatoes harvested after December 31, 1948, shall be supported at not less than 60 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price for Irish potatoes as of the beginning of the marketing season. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity (other than Irish potatoes) which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost, but any such operation may be carried out by the Secretary through other means available to him such as those provided by section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended: *Provided*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from supporting the price of any perishable nonbasic agricultural commodity by a loan, purchase, payment, or other operation undertaken with respect to a storable commodity processed from such perishable nonbasic agricultural commodity: *Provided further*, That the Secretary in carrying out programs with respect to perishable and nonperishable commodities under section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, and section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, may utilize the services and facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation (including but not limited to procurement by contract) and make advance payments to it: *And provided further*, That in any fiscal year, if at the end of the preceding fiscal year the sums appropriated under said section 32 and remaining unexpended do not exceed $300,000,000, Commodity Credit Corporation may, as provided in section 302 (a) of this act, carry out any operation to support the price of any such perishable, nonbasic agricultural commodity to the extent that the reserve

for the postwar price support of agriculture established pursuant to the First Supplemental Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 8) and other funds appropriated for agricultural price support are sufficient to cover any losses which may be incurred in connection with such operation.

"(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, price-support operations at levels in excess of the maximum level of price support otherwise prescribed in this section may be undertaken whenever it is determined by the Secretary after reasonable public notice and public hearing with records of said hearing and a finding thereon by said Secretary available to the public that price support at such increased levels is necessary in order to increase or maintain the production of any agricultural commodity in the interest of national security.

"(e) Appropriate adjustments may be made in the support price for any commodity for differences in grade, type, staple, quality, location, and other factors. Such adjustments shall be made in such manner that the average support price for such commodity in each marketing year will, on the basis of the anticipated incidence of such factors, be equal to the level determined as provided in this section for such marketing year.

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) A 'cooperator' with respect to any basic agricultural commodity shall be a producer on whose farm the acreage planted to the commodity does not exceed the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under this title, or, in the case of price support for corn to a producer outside the commercial corn-producing area, a producer who complies with conditions of eligibility prescribed by the Secretary. For the purposes of this subsection a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm acreage allotment unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment.

"(2) A 'basic agricultural commodity' shall mean any of the commodities cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts of a crop harvested after December 31, 1948.

"(3) A 'nonbasic agricultural commodity' shall mean any agricultural commodity other than a basic agricultural commodity.

"(g) No producer shall be personally liable for any deficiency arising from the sale of the collateral securing any loan made under authority of this section unless such loan was obtained through fraudulent representations by the producer. This provision shall not, however, be construed to prevent Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary from requiring producers to assume liability for deficiencies in the grade, quality, or quantity of commodities stored on the farm or delivered by them, for failure properly to care for and preserve commodities, or for failure or refusal to deliver commodities in accordance with the requirements of the program.

"(h) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than (1) a price determined on a pricing basis for its stocks of such commodity on hand, which makes due allowance for grade, type, quality, location, and other factors and which is reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred by it with respect to such stocks; (2) a price halfway between the support price, if any, and the parity price of such commodity; or (3) a price equivalent to 90 percent of the parity price of such commodity, whichever price is the lowest, except that the foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses."

(b) Section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is repealed.

(c) Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-8), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the expiration of the period specified in the preceding sentence, the price of Irish potatoes harvested prior to January 1, 1949, shall be supported as provided in this section until the close of June 30, 1949."

MARKETING QUOTAS

Corn

SEC. 303. (a) The first sentence of section 322 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever in any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"(1) that the total supply of corn for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent; or

"(2) that the total supply of corn for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending, and that the average farm price for corn for three successive months of the marketing year so ending does not exceed 66 percent of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than November 15 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and marketing quotas shall be in effect in the commercial corn producing area for the crop of corn grown in such area in the next succeeding calendar year and shall remain in effect until terminated in accordance with the provisions of this title."

(b) Sections 322 (b) and 322 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to section 322 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," approved July 26, 1939 (53 Stat. 1125), are hereby repealed.

(c) Section 322 (d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended (1) by striking out "(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)", and (2) by striking out "September" and inserting in lieu thereof "March."

Wheat

SEC. 304. (a) Section 335 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out the first two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Whenever in any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"(1) that the total supply of wheat for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent; or

"(2) that the total supply of wheat for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending, and that the average farm price for wheat for three successive months of the marketing year so ending does not exceed 66 percent of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than July 1 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning July 1 of the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect with respect to the marketing of wheat."

(b) The first sentence of section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out "June 10" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 25."

Cotton

SEC. 305. The first sentence of section 345 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"(1) That the total supply of cotton for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 8 percent; or

"(2) that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year, and that the average farm price for cotton for three successive months of such marketing year does not exceed 66 percent of parity,

the Secretary shall, not later than November 15 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and marketing quotas shall be in effect with respect to cotton during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year."

Rice

SEC. 306. The first sentence of section 355 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"(1) that the total supply of rice for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent; or

"(2) that the total supply of rice for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year, and that the average farm price for rice for three successive months of such marketing year does not exceed 66 percent of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than December 31 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect with respect to the marketing of rice by producers."

SEC. 307. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

(a) By inserting in section 328 after the words "outside the commercial corn-producing area" the following: "or imported";

(b) By inserting in section 333 after "for such crop" the following: "and imports";

(c) By inserting in section 343 (a) after "August 1 of such succeeding calendar year" the following: "and imports";

(d) By striking out sections 359 (d) and 359 (e);

(e) By striking out of section 364 "committee utilized for the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended", and inserting in lieu thereof "county agricultural program executive committee provided for by the Agricultural Act of 1948."

(f) By striking out of section 385 "or loan" and inserting in lieu thereof "loan, or price support operation."

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL ORGANIZATION IN CARRYING OUT THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

SEC. 308. Section 388 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 388. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is directed to utilize the State agricultural councils and community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees created pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948; and the local administrative areas and local and county committees referred to in this act shall be the local administrative areas and the community and county agricultural program committees and executive committees provided for by the Agricultural Act of 1948."

Tobacco

SEC. 309. Section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding marketing year, and shall proclaim a national marketing quota for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for each marketing year for which a quota is proclaimed for fire-cured tobacco, and, beginning on the first day of the marketing year next following and continuing throughout such year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the tobacco marketed during such marketing year."

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SECTION 32 FUNDS

SEC. 401. Section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 612c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this section until expended; but any excess of the amount remaining unexpended at the end of any fiscal year over $300,000,000 shall, in the same manner as though it had been appropriated for the service of such fiscal year, be subject to the provisions of section 3690 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 712), and section 5 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purpose' (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 713)."

SEC. 402. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

PARITY—OTHER STATUTES

SEC. 403. (a) Section 2 (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Through the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this title, to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions for agricultural commodities in interstate commerce as will establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices as defined by section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

(b) Section 8c (18) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended to read as follows:

"(18) The Secretary of Agriculture, prior to prescribing any term in any marketing agreement or order, or amendment thereto, relating to milk or its products, if such term is to fix minimum prices to be paid to producers or associations of producers, or prior to modifying the price fixed in any such term, shall ascertain the parity prices of such commodities. The prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish in section 2 of this title shall, for the purposes of such agreement, order, or amendment, be adjusted to reflect the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk or its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated marketing agreement, order, or amendment relates. Whenever the Secretary finds, upon the basis of the evidence adduced at the hearing required by section 8b or 8c, as the case may be, that the parity prices of such commodities are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk and its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated agreement, order, or amendment relates, he shall fix such prices as he finds will reflect such factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest. Thereafter, as the Secretary finds necessary on account of changed circumstances, he shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, make adjustments in such prices."

(c) Section 8c (17) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by striking out "and section 8e."

(d) Section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is repealed.

(e) Section 2 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after the section designation the subsection designation "(a)" and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Any program in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by this act, on the effective date of section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 shall continue in effect without the necessity for any amendatory action relative to such program, but any such program shall be continued in operation by the Secretary of Agriculture only to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions as will tend to effectuate the declared purpose set out in section 2 or 8c (18) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by this act."

(f) All references in other laws to—

(1) parity,

(2) parity prices,

(3) prices comparable to parity prices, or

(4) prices to be determined in the same manner as provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 prior to its amendment by this act for the determination of parity prices,

with respect to prices for agricultural commodities and products thereof, shall hereafter be deemed to refer to parity prices as determined in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by this act.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CONTINUED AS AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 404. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 405. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that sections 402 and 404 shall take effect upon the enactment of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Baldwin	Hawkes	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Holland	Russell
Brooks	Ives	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stennis
Capehart	Kilgore	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Feazel	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Maybank	Wilson
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
Green	Morse	
Gurney	Murray	

NAYS—3

Ecton	O'Daniel	Williams

NOT VOTING—14

Bushfield	Capper	Jenner
Byrd	George	Knowland
Lodge	O'Conor	Wagner
McCarran	O'Mahoney	White
Moore	Thomas, Utah	

So the bill (H. R. 6248) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for a coordinated agricultural program."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2318 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that House bill 6248 be printed showing the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4330. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1759); and

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1760).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4367. A bill authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1761); and

H. R. 5252. A bill to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1762).

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6829. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1758).

By Mr. GURNEY:

From the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6771. A bill making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1763).

From the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 6698. A bill to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 1766).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 6039. A bill to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1764); and

H. R. 6707. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1765).

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 263), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending March 31, 1949, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under the resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—PRELIMINARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 1757)

Mr. IVES, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted, pursuant to section 102 (g) (2) (D) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, a preliminary report on United States relations with international organizations, which was ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 17, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Piywacki;

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation:

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements;

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2885. A bill for the relief of Walter Gustav Bejeuhr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BREWSTER introduced Senate bill 2886, to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940 by authorizing the execution of executive travel agreements to expedite international travel, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF ALIEN REGISTRATION ACT OF 1940 RELATING TO EXECUTION OF EXECUTIVE TRAVEL AGREEMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940 by authorizing the execution of executive travel agreements to expedite international travel, and for other purposes, and I request that a statement explaining the purport of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement presented by the Senator from Maine will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2886) to amend the Alien Registration Act of 1940 by authorizing the execution of executive travel agreements to expedite international travel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. BREWSTER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER IN EXPLANATION OF BILL

Mr. President, the bill S. 2886, which I have just introduced, seeks to give the President permissive authority to negotiate Executive travel agreements with friendly foreign governments of nonquota countries to permit travel to and from the respective signatory countries, by native-born nationals and resident nationals for the preceding 18 years, upon presentation of a passport, travel card, or other document showing identity and nationality.

When such agreements have been concluded, the bill provides that such nationals of the countries with whom the agreements have been executed may enter the United States for business or pleasure for a period of 3 months without having to obtain a visa as provided in section 30 of the Alien Registration Act of 1940. One 3-month extension may be granted by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization upon proper showing.

In addition the bill permits the 350 offices of the Immigration and Naturalization Service throughout the United States to accept applications for and issue passports within the United States under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I want particularly to point out the following points in connection with this bill:

1. The bill relates only to travel for business or pleasure.

2. The waiving of the visa requirements for business or pleasure travel is confined to native-born nationals and resident nationals for the previous 18 years, thus excluding those who may have either recently acquired nationality in a nonquota country or who seek to come to the United States without a visa via a country with whom an agreement is concluded.

3. Such agreements can be negotiated solely with nonquota countries. That is, countries with respect to which the United States has no immigration quota.

4. The power to conclude such agreements is permissive.

5. Persons traveling under such agreements are required to return to the country to which they owe allegiance before seeking permanent residence in the country visited.

6. Passports would be available to our citizens with greater dispatch by decentralizing their issuance. Their issuance would continue to be subject to regulations issued by the Secretary of State, but no longer would all applications for passports be forwarded to Washington, as is now the case.

The purpose of this bill is to enable the United States to assume its place as a leader in promoting international business and pleasure travel as well as international trade. Trade and travel should be considered together and as necessary supplements to each other.

The world is looking to us to take constructive steps to bring about a lasting peace through understanding and good will. Dollars loaned or given to foreign countries will not alone, in my opinion, bring about the result we all so earnestly seek. We must take steps, consistent with present-day world conditions, to encourage the free movement of proper persons for business and pleasure to and from friendly countries. During the war obviously certain additional security safeguards were necessary for persons entering the United States. Moreover, I realize that, as a practical matter, additional requirements should be imposed upon quota countries to insure maximum results from our immigration policies.

Department of Commerce estimates indicate that potentially approximately $1,600,000,000 annually may be expected to be spent abroad by United States nationals if our current rate of national income continues over the next 5 to 10 years. The creation of such dollar exchange in customer countries will directly contribute to the maintenance of our trade and prosperity.

Government and business have agreed that if foreign travel of United States nationals is fully developed, approximately fifteen to seventeen billion dollars in exchange could be created in 10 years. In short, nearly as many dollars may be expected to be spent by our tourists abroad during this 10-year period as will be provided under the Marshall plan. And these very dollars may be used by these countries to maintain our export trade, thereby assuring not only our own but the world economy. Herein lies the reason why both Government and industry are so anxious to do everything possible to realize this goal by permitting and encouraging our people to travel abroad.

Prosperity depends to a large extent on world trade. An essential prop to world trade is travel, since travel results in dollars abroad and dollars abroad mean world trade.

The wisdom of promoting and facilitating world travel as a means of promoting a sound world economy has been recognized already by the Congress when they inserted section 117 (b) in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as follows:

"(b) The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall facilitate and encourage, through private and public travel, transport, and other agencies, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries."

As stated, this provision relates solely to our citizens traveling to and within the participating countries. Moreover, all of these participating countries are quota countries and our Government feels that visa restrictions from such countries to the United States should be maintained in order not to undermine our quota system through evasion.

There does exist however, an area in which this country should feel obligated to take constructive action to facilitate travel by eliminating visas and that area relates to the nonquota countries. It is fully appreciated that the very mention of abolishing any visa arouses fear and suspicion in the minds of those who think solely in terms of control. Just as our exports and imports must be balanced however, so must the relative merits of control and development. Both aspects must be studied on their merits and reconciled, rather than sole concentration on either. Thus the question is presented just what is a visitors visa supposed to do and does it accomplish what it was designed to accomplish?

Let us examine the effectiveness of the visitors visa regime from the standpoint of protecting the United States from undesirable aliens:

(a) It is generally conceded by security officers that any country desiring to send subversive elements into the United States may readily do so. The visa regime is therefore of little protection. This statement is based upon the following:

1. During both wars it was general experience that alien agents came fully documented. Means for producing spurious documents are ready at hand to any such country or person.

2. Any country desiring to introduce such elements may do so by the use of the diplomatic passport and visa.

3. Once an alien is admitted into the United States, he may move freely throughout the country. The visa itself does not aid in tracing his movements or controlling his activities.

It is purely a rubber stamp on the passport, which passport performs the function of identification. The passport not only identifies the individual officially as a national

of a particular country but carries with it commitment on the part of that country to receive back that individual.

It is clear that the real security of this country against undesirable aliens lies in the border check itself in the first instance, but secondly, and primarily, in the enforcement force provided to keep track of aliens and eject them at such time as they overstay their welcome or engage in activities inimical to the best interests of the country. Too much emphasis on this point cannot be given. This is the heart of the security problem and not an ineffective, duplicate document that burdens down the Foreign Service.

It may well be asked what is needed. It is clear that the individual presenting himself at the border must be identified. The passport does this without the visa. It is also clear that there should be some system whereby a follow-up can start on individuals entering the United States temporarily at or shortly after the time of the end of their legal permission to be in the United States. This can readily be done by the use of a simple three part entry card filled out at or prior to the time of entry without charge, cost, delay, or red tape, two parts to be retained by the immigration authorities, the third part stamped and returned to the visitor as evidence of his legal entry. This third part will be surrendered at the time of his exit. Matching these cards in a central office would determine precisely who and how many are overstaying, and affords the enforcement authorities an effective means for follow-up.

In summary, for purpose of enforcement, we will have the identification of the individual through the passport, with a commitment to take him back by the country issuing it; we have an adequate border check; we have increased border facilities; we will have a means for checking out the individual and a means for following up on those individuals who do not check out on time.

As a necessary supplement to the program just described, which my bill contemplates, I feel it most desirable to greatly expedite the issuance of passports to our citizens in the United States. In time of peace, I can see no reason why applications for passports, which can now be filed conveniently by our citizens with the clerks of all courts of record, need then be forwarded to one central office in the State Department in Washington for approval and issuance. This is bureaucracy at its worst. Our citizens are deserving of service by their Government within 24 hours after they apply for a passport.

I believe the over-all control of the issuance of passports should properly remain the function of the Secretary of State but I also feel that use should be made of the 350 field offices of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in order to expedite the issuance of passports in the United States These offices have had the authority and responsibility since 1906 for determining nationality so why should they not also issue the document identifying an American as an American? My bill would make this possible and would thereby reduce the average length of time presently required to issue a passport to a citizen from approximately 2 weeks to the desired time.

It should be clearly understood, that what the proposed legislation contemplates with respect to visas is entirely in accord with what the State Department says is the policy of our Government. In April 1947 at the meeting of experts on passports, visas, and frontier formalities called by the United Nations, which meeting was held in Geneva, the United States delegates proposed that the conference recommend that entrance and transit visas should be abolished by countries having no quantitative immigration restriction.

Ambassador Austin, in March of this year in reply to the Secretary General of the United Nations stated that the Government of the United States supports the view that there should be a distinction made between countries which have, and those which do not have a quota system for immigrants so far as the question of abolishing nonimmigrant visa requirements is concerned. This letter specifically states: "The United States has recommended that entrance and transit visas should be abolished by countries having no quantitative immigration restriction."

If this Government recommends to other countries who have no quota system for United States citizens, that they abolish entrance and transit visas, we should do likewise with respect to those countries from which we have no quota restrictions.

The proposed legislation would enable our stated policy to be carried out, on a permissive basis, with respect to nonquota countries. As a result of our announced policy with respect to nonquota countries our State Department should feel obligated to take such action.

If we take the lead in abolishing the requirements of visas by means of bilateral agreements with such non-quota countries, there can be little doubt that other countries, who followed our lead in requiring visas, would again follow our lead and abolish their requirements.

I feel that we should not advise other countries what to do and do nothing ourselves, but should take the lead in removing the visa requirement for persons traveling for business or pleasure between such non-quota countries and our own country. This is the purpose of the bill I have introduced and although I realize this bill is introduced near the close of this Congress I do so in order that reports may be obtained during the recess and I sincerely hope that the Government departments who are called upon to report on the bill will not attempt to cloud the issue by needless discussion of immigration, quota systems, etc., but will comment constructively upon the merits of the bill as an attempt to stimulate travel among friendly nonquota countries by removing what is recognized as a totally unnecessary peacetime requirement.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Chair now lays before the Senate, Senate bill 2589, Calendar No. 387.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, which is the bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6771, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill, 1949. It is very necessary that this bill be passed tonight, so that it can go to conference tonight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the bill presently before the Senate is the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment—not for the Navy, but for the Ground Forces, the Department of the Army, and the Air Force.

As the bill came from the House of Representatives, it provided appropriations amounting to $6,509,939,000.

The Senate Appropriations Committee recommends additions to the bill in the amount of $329,737,052. Moreover, there will be offered as a committee amendment, although it does not appear on the face of the report, an amendment which requires $76,000,000 in cash and $75,000,000 in contract authority. This additional cash would make a total increase of $405,737,052 over the amounts carried in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. President, I now ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations in the subcommittee print was, under the heading "National Security Resources Board," on page 4, line 25, after the word "purchase", to insert "(including one at not to exceed $3,000)"; on page 5, line 3, after "(28 U. S. C. 921)", to insert "a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150)"; and in line 9, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Air Force—United States Air Force", on page 6, line 19, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$884,486,000" and insert "$896,986,000"; in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$312,500,000"; and on page 7, line 8, after the word "storage", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That after June 30, 1948, in carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 219), with respect to the Department of the Air Force, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall so determine the number of civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) that the number shall not exceed 75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force," on page 7, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$825,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 25, after the word "Force", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Army—Office of the Secretary of the Army—Contingencies of the Army," on page 8, line

21, after the word "purposes", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$32,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Inter-American Relations, Department of the Army," on page 10, line 12, after "United States", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Finance Service, Army," on page 11, line 8, after "(Public Law 248)", to strike out "$2,300,000,000" and insert "$2,320,942,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 2, after the word "shall", to strike out "not."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 23, after the word "Department", to strike out "$28,000,000" and insert "$29,868,630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 12, after the word "Army", to strike out "$2,478,800,000" and insert "$2,501,610,630."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army," on page 20, line 5, after the word "personnel", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$8,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to offer an amendment on page 21. Is it in order to offer that amendment at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not in order to do so until consideration of the committee amendments is concluded.

The clerk will continue with the reading of the committee amendments.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 8, after the word "irrigation", to strike out "$95,000,000" and insert "$105,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 18, after the word "reasons", to strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$235,000,000, and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, prior to July 1, 1949, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $25,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 3, after the word "sites", to strike out "$110,000,000" and insert "$118,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 4, after the word "Army", to strike out "$913,000,000" and insert "$966,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation Corps—Transportation Service, Army," on page 26, line 23, after the word "station", to strike out "$400,000,000" and insert "$420,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Signal Corps—Signal Service of the Army," on page 29, line 14, after the figures "$50,000,000", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$155,787,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical Department—Medical and Hospital Department," on page 31, line 12, after the word "Department", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$75,126,163."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 32, line 11, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$160,000,000" and insert "$170,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 19, after the word "for", to strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$280,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 8, after the word "Army", to strike out "$410,000,000" and insert "$450,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department—Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army," on page 35, line 17, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$580,000,000" and insert "$665,000,000"; and in line 20, after the numerals "1948", to insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, prior to July 1, 1949, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $75,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Chemical Corps—Chemical Service, Army," on page 37, line 3, after the word "ranges", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance and operation, United States Military Academy," on page 39, line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$5,279,000" and insert "$5,600,000"; and in line 18, after the word "the" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "United States" and insert "Treasurer of the United States Military Academy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Guard," on page 40, line 5, after the word "facilities", to strike out "the hire (at a rate not exceeding $1 per diem) of passenger automobiles" and insert "the purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles"; and on page 41, line 9, after the word "supplies", to strike out "$240,000,000" and insert "$298,113,759."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 3, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for pay allowances, or traveling or other expenses of any officer or enlisted man of the National Guard who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay (where retirement has been made on account of physical disability or age) from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as barring the continuance of adjutants general in a federally recognized status without pay under this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

No appropriation in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the National Guard for periods of active duty, training, drills, instruction or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.), who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay (where retirement has been made on account of physical disability or age) from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the National Guard who may waive or relinquish said pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay for the periods of active duty, drill, training, instruction, or other duty, for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act appfoved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.): *Provided further*, That adjutants general who may be drawing such emoluments may be continued in a federally recognized status without pay under this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Organized Reserves," on page 44, line 22, after the words "in all", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 9, to strike out:

No appropriation made in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling or other expenses of any officer of the Organized Reserves who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

No appropriation in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Organized Reserves for periods of active duty, drills, training, instruction, or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.), who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Organized Reserves who may waive or relinquish said pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay for the periods of active duty, drills, training, instruction, or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, 80th Cong.).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 49, line 11, after the word "colleges", to strike out "$21,000,000" and insert "$21,175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army," on page 51, line 1, after the word "competitions", to insert "including not to exceed $5,000 for Olympic rifle and pistol competitions of the calendar year 1948"; and in line 14, after the word "Army", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$303,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Departmental salaries and expenses—Salaries, Department of the Army," on page 54, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$37,500,000" and to insert "$39,172,326"; in line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$600,000,000" and insert "$691,700,000"; in the same line, after the word "That", to strike out "$644,525,000" and insert "$737,897,326"; in line 8, after the word "whole", to strike out "without regard to the appropriation from which paid" and insert "and to transfer funds for their pay from any appropriation to the appropriation normally charged therewith"; and in line 19, after the word "contractors", to strike out "or to the use of funds for (a) water transportation of personnel and supplies, or (b) laundry services" and insert a semicolon and "(7) in connection with construction activities, or (8) for laundry services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Army," on page 55, line 2, after the word "each", to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert "$2,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions—Military functions, Department of the Army," on page 55, line 22, after the numerals "1942", to insert "for such printing and binding, communication and other services and supplies as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 3, after "April 6", to strike out "1941" and insert "1914."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 24, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947"; and in line 12, after the word "violence", to strike out the comma and "or that such person is not a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 23, after the words "to the", to strike out "War Department or the Military Establishment" and insert "Department of the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 14. During the fiscal year 1949, paid occupancy of the hotel on the grounds of the United States Military Academy on a rental basis by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 or by their dependents shall not deprive such personnel of money allowances for rental of quarters.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 11, to change the section number from "14" to "15", and in line 22, after the word "matériel," to strike out the period, insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That after June 30, 1948, in carrying out the provisions of such section 14 with respect to the Department of the Army, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall so determine the number of civilian employees (including the full-time equivalent of man-months of part-time employment) that the number shall not exceed 176,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 23, to change the section number from "15" to "16."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 14, to insert a new section 17, as follows:

SEC. 17. Funds appropriated for the agencies of the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available, contingent upon the enactment into law by the Eightieth Congress of S. 2655 or similar authorization for the voluntary enlistment of persons between the ages of 18 and 19 years, and subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, for all expenses necessary for and incident to the recruitment and service of such persons, pending and in anticipation of a supplemental appropriation by the Congress to provide funds for such expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 3, to change the section number from "16" to "18."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

Military construction, Army: For construction, installations and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $76,000,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used for the construction of family quarters for personnel of the Army at a cost per family unit in excess of $14,040, except that when such units are constructed outside the continental United States the average cost per unit of all such units constructed shall not exceed $20,800.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this is in accordance with the public-works program contained in a bill passed by the Senate about June 3. It is in accordance with the supplemental estimate sent to the Senate under date of June 3. I ask that the supplemental estimate and the explanation appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the estimate and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $121,000,000 and contract authorization in the amount of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949 for the National Military Establishment, Department of the Army—military functions, in the form of an amendment to the budget for the said fiscal year, as follows:

National Military Establishment—Department of the Army—Military functions—Corps of Engineers

Budget page	Heading	Original estimate	Change to—	Increase
676	Military construction, Army	0	$121,000,000	$121,000,000

Preceding the head "Acquisition of Land, Act June 26, 1940," insert new language and an estimate of appropriation, as follows:

"Military construction, Army: For construction, installations, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the act of ———, 1948 (Public Law —), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $121,000,000 to remain available until expended; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $60,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used for the construction of family quarters for personnel of the Army at a cost per family unit in excess of $14,040, except that when such units are constructed outside the continental United States the average cost per unit of all such units constructed shall not exceed $20,800."

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Budget page 707: Delete section 10 and renumber the remaining sections accordingly.

The foregoing estimate of appropriation will be necessary to implement the authority expected to be provided under the provisions of S. 1676 now in conference, and is transmitted at this time since it is considered essential for the national defense that the projects for which this appropriation is recommended be undertaken at an early date. Section 10 of the general provisions contains dollar limitations on family housing and is no longer required, since these limitations are superseded by space limitations contained in S. 1676 for all housing authorized.

I recommend that the foregoing supplemental estimate be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator have any further committee amendments?

Mr. GURNEY. There are no further committee amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, after line 21, it is proposed to strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That none of the money appropriated in this act shall be used for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes for other than cooking purposes, except to supply an expressed preference therefor or for use where climatic or other conditions render the use of butter impracticable."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the proviso, which is in my opinion a further example of legislation carried in similar appropriation bills since 1931, prohibits the Army from purchasing oleomargarine. I think the least the Senate can do in view of the fact that we are apparently going to be prevented from voting on total repeal of the oleomargarine tax is to remove the restriction.

It is just one of the many restrictions which have been imposed upon this product during the past few years. It is a curious thing.

I do not propose to go into the complete history of the action of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, because the Senate is familiar with it, but as a further evidence of the sentiment of the Congress, I may cite a bill, H. R. 6334, to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces, which the Committee on Armed Services of the House reported June 9, 1948. It is a legislative approach to the abolition of restrictions on the purchase of margarine by the armed forces. I desire to read a few sentences from the report of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, with regard to the restriction on margarine. The purpose was to repeal it by legislative action, whereas here, the Appropriations Committee is seeking to perpetuate it, I think, by means of legislation written into an appropriation bill. I would have made a point of order against the pending measure, except that the proviso was in the bill as it came from the House.

From page 2 of the committee report of June 9, 1948, where the basic issue involved in the proposed legislation are very simple and can be reduced to the following questions—that is, as to repeal of the restrictions—I read the following:

> 1. Is the nutritive value of oleomargarine equal to or superior to that of butter?
>
> This question was answered by several experts who testified that there is no difference in the nutritive value of these two products with respect to digestibility or other factors, provided that oleomargarine is fortified with vitamin A.
>
> 2. The second question is whether oleomargarine is equally acceptable from the psychological standpoint, bearing in mind such factors as the food habits of consumers.
>
> In answer to this question representatives of the services testified that there is no past experience upon which they can base any opinion as to the troop acceptability of oleomargarine, for the simple reason that it could not, heretofore, be substituted for butter. On this point, however, one witness with experience as an officer in World War II testified that in his opinion the personnel under his command would have been equally satisfied with oleomargarine. He pointed out, in this connection, that many of his men had come from homes where oleomargarine was already being served in lieu of butter.
>
> A very important consideration brought to light during the hearings was the fact that during World War II personnel in many forward areas were forced to do without butter because of unavailability due to transportation, storage, and refrigeration problems which either made it impossible to procure butter at all in those areas or which rendered such butter as was received unfit for human consumption because of rancidity and deterioration. In the absence of authority to serve oleomargarine as a substitute, troops were forced to rely upon other less satisfactory table spreads such as marmalade, jams, et cetera. These, while possessing nutritive values of their own, were in no way comparable because they did not furnish the fats and other ingredients which are contained in both butter and oleomargarine.

That statement seems to me a complete condemnation of a racket which has been going on for 60 years. In the Senate there are many gentlemen who on every occasion express great concern for the men in the services, and yet the report from which I have read states that because of the restriction the men were deprived of butter, not only because it turned rancid under certain conditions, but, note, because it was illegal to furnish them with margarine. It seems utterly indefensible and ridiculous from every point of view that the men simply had to do without margarine and had to use marmalade or jam or something of the sort.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. I was merely about to suggest that the dairy business is possibly not a racket.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The tax on margarine is a racket. That is what I had reference to. I do not think the Senator misunderstood what I had in mind.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I listened to what the Senator read, but I cannot see in the pending bill anything that prohibits the Army from buying oleomargarine to be furnished the men as a table spread. They can buy it for cooking uses without any restriction. They can buy it for table spread if the men say they want it. They can also buy it whenever climatic or other conditions render the use of butter impractical. I think the Senator has misread the language.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows very well that the report, which, as I said at the beginning, is a report of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, is not from the Department of Agriculture or from any other agency. It is from the Armed Services Committee. In the Senate, the Armed Services Committee is sponsoring the bill. The Senator knows very well as a practical matter that the Army has bought no margarine, interpreting the provision as a restriction on the purchase of margarine. They have not bought any, and have had none available. In the report of the committee, from which I just read, it is stated as to past experience on this point:

> In answer to this question, representatives of the services testified that there is no past experience upon which they can base any opinion as to the troop acceptability of oleomargarine, for the simple reason that it could not heretofore be substituted for butter.

There is no question about that.

I do not think the Senator means to leave the impression that there is any choice in the matter.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to say to the Senator, as representing the committee, that I do not have authority to accept the amendment for the committee. As for myself, personally, coming from a dairy section, the State of South Dakota, I could not accept it, anyway, because I helped former Senator La Follette some years ago to retain this provision in the bill. At that time the plea was made, which had general support on the floor of the Senate, that butter was better for the veterans in the hospitals, and over a period of years the amendment has been carried each year in appropriation bills. I know that the Army and Air Force are operating very nicely under the provision in the current year's act, and it has been in the acts during the war years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, I recognize the fact that the Senator, coming from South Dakota, would have that view. But if this is so acceptable, why does not the majority permit the Senate to decide the real essence of the whole question in connection with the bill now on the calendar? The Senator knows that some are afraid to permit it to come to a vote, because they know positively that the tax will be repealed. This is only one aspect of the many restrictions which have been foisted upon this country during the past 62 years.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. In 1942 Congress declined to permit the Army to buy corned beef from Argentina, and, as a result, the Army did not get the corned beef it needed and which it asked for in 1942. Is not that a parallel case?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for that contribution. I think the two cases have similar aspects.

Mr. President, I read further from the report:

> A third question considered by the committee, in addition to the factors of comparative nutritional value and psychological acceptability, was whether or not oleomargarine is protected by the same pure-food standards as butter. Testimony was received to the effect that all standards having to

do with purity, cleanliness, and sanitation are equally applicable to oleomargarine.

Mr. President, that is the entire statement, certainly as to the restrictions on the packages in which the two articles are sold and as notice of what is used in the two articles. Actually, the restrictions on oleomargarine are much more severe than are those on butter. Butter is one of the very few articles which does not have to carry a label showing it is artificially colored or stating its contents, how many vitamins, and so forth, all of which has to be done in connection with oleomargarine.

This point I want particularly to call the attention of the acting majority leader and some of his colleagues, because this is something which has been so close to their hearts during the past 2 years. This is the fourth point:

4. A final question pertinent to the problem is that of the comparative cost of the two products. Testimony was received to the effect that approximately ten to eleven million dollars per year could be saved by the armed services, assuming the complete substitution of oleomargarine for butter.

After all the talk of economy, particularly by some of the representatives of the butter-producing States, in order to perpetuate this restriction, they are perfectly willing to waste $10,000,000 or $11,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for the purpose of preventing the utilization of a product which the armed services are very anxious to have.

There are only two more paragraphs summing up the matter. I read from page 3 of the report:

In view of the fact that there is no difference in the nutritional value of the two products; in view of the fact that oleomargarine is an equally pure and sanitary product; in view of the fact that substantial savings can be effected through its use; and in view of the fact that there is no evidence from which it can be inferred that it would not be equally acceptable to troops, it is the view of this committee that the services should be permitted to use oleomargarine as they see fit.

I call that last sentence to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in reply to his implication that there was no restriction.

I read further:

The authority to exercise such discretion will enable the services to furnish an equally nutritious and, to many people, an equally palatable and acceptable product under circumstances where it would be impossible to furnish butter. A great deal of testimony was received bearing on the relative keeping qualities of the two products. While butter on the one hand is subject to rapid deterioration and must be kept under refrigeration at all times, oleomargarine can be preserved for weeks at room temperatures.

I hope that some of the great backers of butter will take that particular statement to heart, since it comes from the committee and is a statement with which they have often taken issue. I read further from the report:

Even if it be assumed, therefore, that troops would prefer butter, if given a choice between the two products, it is equally logical to assume that they will welcome a high-quality substitute, such as oleomargarine, when conditions are such as to preclude the use of butter.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate would lend itself to the perpetuation of this restriction, in view of the action by the committee of the House on House bill 6334. The Senate and the country well know that there is a large majority, more than 2 to 1, in the House of Representatives in favor of the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine. The votes which have been had in this body, one of which was 47 to 30, and later a vote on the motion to consider the bill, which was a vote of 57 to 26, conclusively prove, in my opinion, that a majority of 2 to 1 in the Senate would like to repeal this tax. In spite of that fact, the leadership of the Senate refused, and has refused up to this time, to bring that bill up for a vote. They are perfectly willing to bring up a measure which has no particular background or history, one in which there has not been the interest which has been evidenced in the oleomargarine bill. I had expected that the committee would accept this very mild restriction, in view of the fact that it would deny a vote on the bill which would repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the acting majority leader wish me to yield to him?

Mr. WHERRY. We have had two votes. If the Senator from Arkansas wants to have another one, the sooner the better.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am just about to conclude. I thought the Senator was indicating a desire for me to yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. No. I am satisfied, Mr. President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is satisfied, I hoped this amendment would be accepted, but since it has not been accepted, I ask that the Senate accept my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6771) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, as in executive session, now proceed to the consideration of matters on the Executive Calendar, and that the nomination of Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to get some information as to when that nomination may be taken up and considered.

Mr. WHERRY. That depends on when the Executive Calendar is called again. I cannot answer the question directly, but we intend to have other executive sessions. I trust the minority leader will agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not saying I am not going to agree to it, but under my privilege to reserve the right to object, I wish to say that this nomination is here from the committee on the same basis with other nominations. I do not think this nominee should be discriminated against because she happens to be a woman. The committee considered the nomination carefully and reported it, and I hope it will not go beyond another call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to please the distinguished minority leader. I always want to comply with his requests. I cannot answer when the nomination will come up again.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should also like to add that, presenting this nomination from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I do hope it may have appropriate consideration. It was ordered reported, as I recall, by a vote of 8 to 0. I will say, in justice to this side of the aisle, that the great majority of those votes were by Republicans. I am happy that the distinguished minority leader joins us in this, and I certainly hope that this nomination may receive the consideration to which it is entitled by its presence here and by its presentation on the calendar by the overwhelming action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine. I did not know there was any partisanship in the committee in voting to report this nomination. I did not know there was any opposition to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not saying there is any prejudice. I am merely trying to get the Executive Calendar approved without any difficulty, and I ask unanimous consent that the lady's nomination go over without prejudice until another call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. There will be another call of the Executive Calendar, will there?

Mr. WHERRY. I hope so. If we get along all right, I do not see why there should not be. We certainly intend there shall be a call of the Executive Calendar, and we intend to have the Legislative Calendar called.

Mr. BARKLEY. I intend to do what I can to see that the Senate gets along all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader whether or not a motion would be in order at an appropriate time to take the nomination up?

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly would be. Any Senator can make a motion to take up the Executive Calendar. I am asking unanimous consent, however, and if I get unanimous consent, a motion would not be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I did not quite understand what the Senator from Maine said a moment ago about a majority of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce voting to report Miss Hennock's nomination being Republican. I merely desire to keep the record straight and say that there were no Democrats against the confirmation of this very excellent nomination of the President.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I made no such statement. I said that the overwhelming majority of the votes in favor of reporting the nomination were by Republicans, calling attention to the fact that there were only two Democrats present. This is not to reflect on the Democrats at all, but I did want it to be clear that the Republican members of the committee had shown at least as great an interest, and I wanted to have the record clear to show that there was no partisanship or prejudice in the consideration of the nomination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I merely wanted to have the record straight that there was no opposition on the part of the Democratic members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to this nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that there was no opposition to the appointee by Republicans and no opposition by Democrats, who is opposed to the nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think we are making a mountain out of a mole hill. I went to the minority leader, if the Senator wishes to know the facts, and talked to Senators on the other side and asked if they would agree to have the Executive Calendar called provided this nomination would go over without prejudice. No one is indicating any prejudice against the consideration of this nomination, but in order to expedite matters I should like to have the unanimous-consent request granted. I did not want to put any obstruction in front of the nomination. If I cannot get unanimous consent, I should like to have the Senate recess.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. This lady whose nomination is being discussed comes from the State of New York, and I wish to have it definitely understood that there is no objection on the part of New York.

Mr. CAPEHART. I make a motion that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want it made clear, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield for the purpose of a motion to recess or adjourn. I shall be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not objected, and I do not intend to object, to the Senator's request, and I hope it will not be objected to, but I thought it was fair to get some sort of indication as to what we might expect with reference to this nomination.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the minority leader knows the reply to the question better than I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I knew the reply better than the Senator, I would not be asking him.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has had more experience here than any man in the Senate, and he knows what the Senate will do. I cannot guarantee what it will do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do say that whoever objects to this nomination—and it is not on the part of the Senator from Nebraska, as I understand—if there is any Senator in this body who objects to considering the nomination, it should be revealed who he is; let him stand up and say so.

Mr. WHERRY. If I may make an observation, I hope Senators will not get irritated tonight. Senators have all been so wonderfully cooperative.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I think that if Senators would all sit down and there were a little order, it might be helpful. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. This is not a riot. The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the President pro tempore, who is so ably directing the Senate. I wish to comply with the rules.

I hope Senators will give unanimous consent, without any further ado about this matter, and let us soon take a recess and get a good night's sleep, and when we return we probably will not have any argument over this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair inquire whether the unanimous-consent request would permit the consideration of the two routine treaties, which are simply double taxation treaties.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. The only thing I asked to go over was this one nomination, without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank all Senators.

Mr. HAWKES subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to the nomination of Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, I wish to associate myself with what was said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] with regard to the nomination, and also by the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY].

The nomination has the approval of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. It has the approval of many prominent Republicans in New York State. It has the approval of some of the most distinguished members of the bar who have been friends of mine for many years.

I did not take this nomination lightly. I called on the telephone and talked with those prominent gentlemen. They all give this lady a clean bill of health, and recommend her very highy. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce voted 8 to 0 in favor of her confirmation. It is my earnest hope that, regardless of the party with which she is associated, her nomination may have the approval of the Senate at a subsequent executive session.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from New Jersey for his very fair attitude in regard to this matter.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar. The first treaty will be passed over. The clerk will state the second order of business.

CONVENTION WITH DENMARK RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive H (80th Cong., 2d sess.), a convention between the United States of America and Denmark, signed at Washington on May 6, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with a reservation. The convention was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND DENMARK RELATING TO TAXES ON INCOME

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Denmark, desiring to conclude a convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

His Majesty the King of Denmark:

Mr. Henrik Kauffmann, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Denmark to the United States of America.

who, having communicated to one another their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States of America:

The Federal income tax, including surtaxes.

(b) In the case of Denmark:

The national income tax, including the war profits tax.

The intercommunial income tax.

The communal income tax.

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Denmark" means the Kingdom of Denmark; the provisions of the Convention shall not, however, extend to the Faroe Islands; nor do they apply to Greenland.

(c) The term "permanent establishment" means a branch office, factory, warehouse or other fixed place of business, but does not include the casual and temporary use of merely storage facilities, nor does it include an agency unless the agent has and exercises a general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts on behalf of an enterprise or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders on its behalf. An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other State merely because it carries on business dealings in such other State through a bona fide commission agent, broker, or custodian acting in the ordinary course of his business as such. The fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States maintains in the other State a fixed place of business exclusively for the purchase of goods or merchandise shall not of itself constitute such fixed place of business a permanent establishment of such enterprise. The fact that a corporation of one contracting State has a subsidiary corporation which is a corporation of the other State or which is engaged in trade or business in the other State shall not of itself constitute that subsidiary corporation a permanent establishment of its parent corporation.

(d) The term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, as the case may be, "United States enterprise" or "Danish enterprise".

(e) The term "enterprise" includes every form of undertaking whether carried on by an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other entity.

(f) The term "United States enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in the United States of America by a resident of the United States of America or by a United States corporation or other entity; the term "United States corporation or other entity" means a partnership, corporation or other entity created or organized in the United States of America or under the law of the United States of America or of any State or Territory of the United States of America.

(g) The term "Danish enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in Denmark by a resident of Denmark or by a Danish corporation or other entity; the term "Danish corporation or other entity" means a partnership, corporation or other entity created or organized in Denmark or under Danish laws.

(h) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or his authorized representative; and in the case of Denmark, the Chief of the Taxation Department of the Ministry of Finance (Generaldirektøren for Skattevaesenet) or his authorized representative.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under its own tax laws.

ARTICLE III

(1) An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be subject to taxation in the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits unless it is engaged in trade or business in such other State through a permanent establishment situated therein. If it is so engaged such other State may impose its tax upon the entire income of such enterprise from sources within such other State.

(2) In determining the industrial or commercial profits from sources within the territory of one of the contracting States of an enterprise of the other contracting State, no profits shall be deemed to arise from the mere purchase of goods or merchandise within the territory of the former contracting State by such enterprise.

(3) Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States is engaged in trade or business in the territory of the other contracting State through a permanent establishment situated therein, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the industrial or commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing at arm's length with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment and the profits so attributed shall, subject to the law of such other contracting State, be deemed to be income from sources within the territory of such other contracting State.

ARTICLE IV

Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States, by reason of its participation in the management or the financial structure of an enterprise of the other contracting State, makes with or imposes on the latter, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with an independent enterprise, any profits which would normally have accrued to one of the enterprises but by reason of those conditions have not so accrued, may be included in the profits of that enterprise and taxed accordingly.

ARTICLE V

(1) Income which an enterprise of one of the contracting States derives from the operation of ships or aircraft registered in that State shall be exempt from taxation in the other contracting State.

(2) The present Convention shall not be deemed to affect the arrangement between the United States and Denmark providing for relief from double income taxation on shipping profits, effected by exchanges of notes dated May 22, August 9 and 18, October 24, 25, and 28, and December 5 and 6, in the year 1922.

ARTICLE VI

(1) Dividends shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which the shareholder is resident or, if the shareholder is a corporation or other entity, in the contracting State in which such corporation or other entity is incorporated or organized.

(2) Each of the contracting States reserves, however, the right to collect and retain the tax which, under its revenue laws, is deductible at the source with respect to such dividends, but the tax shall not exceed 15 percent of the amount of dividends derived from sources within such State by a resident, corporation or other entity of the other State, if the recipient has no permanent establishment in the contracting State from which the dividends are derived.

(3) It is agreed, however, that the rate of dividend tax at the source shall not exceed five percent if the shareholder is a corporation controlling, directly or indirectly, at least 95 percent of the entire voting power in the corporation paying the dividend, and if not more than 25 percent of the gross income of such paying corporation is derived from interest and dividends, other than interest and dividends received from its own subsidiary corporations. Such reduction of the rate to five percent shall not apply if the relationship of the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of securing such reduced rate.

ARTICLE VII

Interest on bonds, securities, notes, debentures, or on any other form of indebtedness derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State not having a permanent establishment in the former State shall be exempt from tax by such former State.

ARTICLE VIII

Royalties and other amounts derived as consideration for the right to use copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulas, trade-marks and other like property (including rentals and like payments in respect of motion picture films) derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State not having a permanent establishment in the former State shall be exempt from taxation in such former State.

ARTICLE IX

(1) Income from real property (not including interest derived from mortgages and bonds secured by real property) and royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries, or other natural resources, shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which such property, mines, quarries, or other natural resources are situated.

(2) A resident or corporation of one of the contracting States deriving any such income from sources within the other contracting State may, for any taxable year, elect to be subject to the tax of such other contracting State, on a net basis, as if such resident or corporation were engaged in trade or business within such other contracting State through a permanent establishment therein during such taxable year.

ARTICLE X

(1) Wages, salaries, and similar compensation and pensions paid by one of the contracting States or by any other public authority within that State to individuals residing in the other State shall be taxable only in the former State.

(2) Private pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the contracting States and paid to individuals residing in the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

(3) The term "life annuities" as used herein means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make the payments in consideration of a gross sum paid for such obligation.

ARTICLE XI

(1) Compensation for labor or personal services, including the practice of the liberal professions, shall be taxable only in the con-

tracting State in which such services are rendered.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) are, however, subject to the following exceptions:

(a) A resident of Denmark shall be exempt from United States tax upon compensation for labor or personal services if he is temporarily present in the United States for a period or periods not exceeding a total of ninety days during the taxable year and the compensation received for such services does not exceed $3,000 in the aggregate. If, however, his compensation is received for labor or personal services performed as an employee of, or under contract with, a resident or corporation or other entity of Denmark, he will be exempt from United States tax if his stay in the United States does not exceed a total of 180 days during the taxable year.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (2) (a) of this Article shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to a resident of the United States with respect to compensation for personal services otherwise subject to income tax in Denmark.

(3) The provisions of this Article shall have no application to the income to which Article X (1) relates.

ARTICLE XII

Gains derived in one of the contracting States from the sale or exchange of capital assets by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State if such resident or corporation or other entity is not engaged in trade or business in such former State.

ARTICLE XIII

Students or apprentices, citizens of one of the contracting States, residing in the other contracting State exclusively for purposes of study or for acquiring business experience, shall not be taxable in the latter State in respect of remittances (other than their own income) received by them from abroad for the purposes of their maintenance or studies.

ARTICLE XIV

A professor or teacher, a resident of one of the contracting States, who temporarily visits the territory of the other contracting State for the purpose of teaching for a period not exceeding two years at a university, college, school or other educational institution in the other contracting State, shall be exempted in such other contracting State from tax on his remuneration for such teaching for such period.

ARTICLE XV

It is agreed that double taxation shall be avoided in the following manner:

(a) The United States in determining the income taxes, including surtaxes, of its citizens, residents, or corporations may, regardless of any other provisions of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of the United States as if this Convention had not come into effect. The United States shall, however, subject to the provisions of section 131, Internal Revenue Code, deduct from its taxes the amount of Danish taxes specified in Article I of this Convention.

(b) Denmark, in determining its taxes specified in Article I of this Convention, may, regardless of any other provision of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income subject to such taxes under the taxation laws of Denmark. Denmark shall, however, deduct from the taxes so calculated the United States tax on income coming within the provisions of Articles III, IX, X (1), XIII and XIV of this Convention and on earned income earned within the United States, but in an amount not exceeding that proportion of the Danish taxes which such income bears to the entire income subject to tax by Denmark. Denmark will also allow as a deduction from its taxes an amount equal to 15 percent (five percent in the case of dividends covered by Article VI (3)) of the gross amount of dividends (reduced by the United States tax applicable to such dividends) from sources within the United States.

ARTICLE XVI

(1) The citizens of one of the contracting States shall not, while resident in the other contracting State, be subjected therein to other or more burdensome taxes than are the citizens of such other contracting State residing in its territory. As used in this paragraph,

(a) the term "citizens" includes all legal persons, partnerships, and associations created or organized under the laws in the respective contracting States, and

(b) the term "taxes" means taxes of every kind or description whether national, Federal, State, provincial or municipal.

(2) It is agreed that section 25, paragraph 5, of the Danish law No. 391 of July 12, 1946, prescribing an addition of 50 percent of the capital increment tax on corporations in cases where more than 50 percent of the entire stock capital is owned by a single shareholder residing outside Denmark, shall not be applicable when the shareholder in question is a resident of the United States or a United States corporation or other entity.

ARTICLE XVII

The competent authorities of the contracting States shall exchange such information (being information available under the respective taxation laws of the contracting States) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the administration of statutory provisions against tax avoidance in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XVIII

(1) The contracting States undertake to lend assistance and support to each other in the collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention, together with interests, costs, and additional to the taxes.

(2) In the case of applications for enforcement of taxes, revenue claims of each of the contracting States which have been finally determined may be accepted for enforcement by the other contracting State and may be collected in that State in accordance with the laws applicable to the enforcement and collection of its own taxes.

(3) Any application shall include a certification that under the laws of the State making the application the taxes have been finally determined.

(4) The assistance provided for in this Article shall not be accorded with respect to the citizens, corporations, or other entities of the State to which application is made, except as is necessary to insure that the exemption or reduced rate of tax granted under the present Convention to such citizens, corporations, or other entities shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE XIX

The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it except that such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XX

Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the contracting States has resulted in double taxation in his case in respect of any of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, he shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or, if he is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, with the State of which he is a resident, or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of such State may come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XXI

(1) The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to deny or affect in any manner the right of diplomatic and consular officers to other or additional exemptions now enjoyed or which may hereafter be granted to such officers.

(2) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

(3) Should any difficult or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE XXII

The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of this Convention. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, minimum amounts subject to collection and related matters.

ARTICLE XXIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

(2) Upon the exchange of instruments of ratification, the present Convention shall have effect.

(a) in the case of United States tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January of the year in which such exchange takes place;

(b) in the case of Danish tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of April of the year in which such exchange takes place.

(3) The present Convention shall continue effective for a period of five years and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of the five-year period or at any time thereafter, privided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given and, in such event, the present Convention shall cease to be effective.

(a) as respects United States tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January next following the expiration of the six-month period;

(b) as respects Danish tax, for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of April next following the expiration of the six-month period.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Danish languages, the two texts

having equal authenticity, this 6th day of May, 1948.

For the President of the United States of America:

[SEAL] G C MARSHALL

For his Majesty the King of Denmark:

[SEAL] HENRIK KAUFFMANN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may be permitted to make a brief statement, both the treaties, Executive H and Executive I, are routine treaties to protect against double taxation. They follow the form which has been established in connection with treaties with other countries on the same subject.

The text of the treaty as originally submitted did include other matters which proved to be controversial, and the other matters have been eliminated by reservation. Both treaties were in charge of the able junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Chair will recognize the Senator from New Jersey if he feels that there is anything that should be said on the subject.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there is very little that need be said. The controversy over these treaties was taken care of under the French treaty which was ratified at the last executive session, as I recall. We provided the same protection to our interests we voted into the French treaty. There were one or two controversial paragraphs in the treaties, and because it was important that the treaties should be reported and ratified at this session, we eliminated the controversial features and put them to one side, and we are submitting the treaties with the controversial features omitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification, with the reservation, will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive H, Eightieth Congress, second session, the convention between the United States of America and Denmark, signed at Washington on May 6, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income subject to the following reservation:

The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XII of the convention relating to gains derived from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservation to the resolution of ratification.

The reservation was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the reservation. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification, with the reservation, is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

CONVENTION WITH THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS RELATING TO AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive I (80th Cong., 2d sess.), a convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes, signed at Washington on April 29, 1948, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with reservations. The convention was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME AND CERTAIN OTHER TAXES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, desiring to conclude a convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America:

Mr. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, and

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands:

Mr. E. N. van Kleffens, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of the Netherlands,

who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes which are the subject of the present Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States: the Federal income taxes.

(b) In the case of the Netherlands:

(i) for the application of the provisions of the Convention other than Article XX, the income tax and the Netherlands taxes credited against it, the corporation tax and the Netherlands taxes credited against it, the property tax, and the tax on fees of directors and managers of corporations; and

(ii) for the application of Articles XX to XXVIII inclusive (except Articles XXIV and XXVII), the capital accretions tax and the extraordinary capital tax.

(2) The present Convention shall apply also to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either Contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention, or, by the government of any overseas part of the Kingdom (in the case of the Netherlands) or overseas territory (in the case of the United States) to which the present Convention is extended under Article XXVII, subsequently to the date of the notification of extension.

(3) In the event of appreciable changes in the fiscal laws of either of the Contracting States the competent authorities of the Contracting States will consult together.

ARTICLE II

(1) In the present Convention, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense means the States, the Territories of Alaska and of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Netherlands" means only the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Europe.

(c) The term "United States corporation" means a corporation, association or other organization or juridical entity created in the United States or under the laws of the United States or of any State or territory of the United States.

(d) The term "Netherlands corporation" means a corporation, association or other organization or juridical entity created in the Netherlands or under the laws of the Netherlands.

(e) The terms "corporation of one Contracting State" and "corporation of the other Contracting State" means a United States corporation or a Netherlands corporation, as the context requires.

(f) The term "United States enterprise" means an industrial or commercial enterprise or undertaking carried on in the United States by a citizen or resident of the United States or by a United States corporation.

(g) The term "Netherlands enterprise" means an industrial or commercial enterprise or undertaking carried on in the Netherlands by a citizen or resident of the Netherlands or by a Netherlands corporation.

(h) The terms "enterprise of one of the Contracting States" and "enterprise of the other Contracting States" means a United States enterprise or a Netherlands enterprise, as the context requires.

(i) The term "permanent establishment", when used with respect to an enterprise of one of the Contracting States, means a branch, factory, or other fixed place of business, but does not include an agency unless the agent has, and habitually exercises, a general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts on behalf of such enterprise or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders on behalf of such enterprise. An enterprise of one of the Contracting States shall not be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other Contracting State merely because it carries on business dealings in such other Contracting State through a bona fide commission agent, broker or custodian acting in the ordinary course of his business as such. The fact that an enterprise of one of the Contracting States maintains in the other Contracting State a fixed place of business exclusively for the purchase of goods or merchandise shall not of itself constitute such fixed place of business a permanent establishment of such enterprise. When a corporation of one Contracting State has a subsidiary corporation which is a corporation of the other Contracting State or which is engaged in trade or business in such other Contracting State, such subsidiary corporation shall not, merely because of that fact, be deemed to be a permanent establishment of its parent corporation.

(j) The term "competent authority" or "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or his duly authorized representative; in the case of the Netherlands, the Directeur-Generaal der Belastingen or his duly authorized representative; and, in the case of any part or territory to which provisions of the present Convention are extended under Article XXVII, the competent authority for the administration in such part or territory of the taxes to which such provisions apply.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by either of the Contracting States, any term which is not defined in the present Convention shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which that term has under the laws of such Contracting State relating to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention.

ARTICLE III

(1) An enterprise of one of the Contracting States shall not be subject to taxation by the

other Contracting State in respect of its industrial or commercial profits unless it is engaged in trade or business in the other Contracting State through a permanent establishment situated therein. If it is so engaged the other Contracting State may impose the tax only upon the income of such enterprise from sources within such other State.

(2) Where an enterprise of one of the Contracting States is engaged in trade or business in the other Contracting State through a permanent establishment situated therein, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the industrial or commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing at arm's length with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment, and the profits so attributed shall, subject to the law of such other Contracting State, be deemed to be income from sources within such other Contracting State.

(3) In determining the industrial or commercial profits from sources within one of the Contracting States of an enterprise of the other Contracting State, no profits shall be deemed to arise from the mere purchase of goods or merchandise within the former Contracting State by such enterprise.

(4) The competent authorities of the Contracting States may lay down rules by agreement for the apportionment of industrial or commercial profits.

ARTICLE IV

Where an enterprise of one of the Contracting States, by reason of its participation in the management, control or capital of an enterprise of the other Contracting States, makes with or imposes on the latter enterprise, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with an independent enterprise, any profits which would, but for those conditions, have accrued to one of the enterprises, may be included in the taxable profits of that enterprise.

ARTICLE V

Income of whatever nature derived from real property and interest from mortgages secured by real property shall be taxable only in the Contracting State in which the real property is situated.

ARTICLE VI

(1) Income which an enterprise of one of the Contracting States derives from the operation of ships or aircraft registered in that State shall be taxable only in the State in which such ships or aircraft are registered. Income derived by such an enterprise from the operation of ships or aircraft not so registered shall be subject to the provisions of Article III.

(2) The present Convention shall be deemed to suspend, for the duration of the Convention as between the parties to which this Article applies, the provisions of the arrangement effected by exchange of notes between the United States and the Netherlands, dated September 13, October 19, and November 27, 1926, providing for relief from double income taxation on shipping profits.

(3) In the event that the application of this Article is extended to the Netherland Indies in accordance with Article XXVII, the exchange of notes between the United States and the Netherlands, dated March 8, May 23, and November 8, 1939, relating to the applications to the Netherland Indies of the arrangement referred to in paragraph (2) of this Article, shall be deemed to be suspended for so long as this Article continues to be applicable with respect to the Netherland Indies.

ARTICLE VII

(1) The rate of United States tax on dividends derived from a United States corporation by a resident or corporation of the Netherlands not engaged in trade or business in the United States through a permanent establishment shall not exceed 15 percent: *Provided*, That such rate of tax shall not exceed 5 percent if such Netherlands corporation controls, directly or indirectly, at least 95 percent of the entire voting power in the corporation paying the dividend, and not more than 25 percent of the gross income of such paying corporation is derived from interest and dividends, other than interest and dividends from its own subsidiary corporation. Such reduction of the rate to 5 percent shall not apply if the relationship of the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of securing such reduced rate.

(2) Dividends derived from sources within the Netherlands by a resident or corporation of the United States not engaged in trade or business in the Netherlands through a permanent establishment shall be exempt from Netherlands tax.

(3) Either of the Contracting States may terminate this Article, by giving written notice of termination to the other Contracting State through diplomatic channels, on or before the thirtieth day of June in any year after the first year for which the present Convention becomes effective. In such event this Article shall cease to be effective on and after the first day of January in the year next following that in which such notice is given.

ARTICLE VIII

(1) Interest (on bonds, securities, notes, debentures, or on any other form of indebtedness), other than interest referred to in Article V of the present Convention, derived from sources within the United States by a resident or corporation of the Netherlands not engaged in trade or business in the United States through a permanent establishment, shall be exempt from United States tax; but such exemption shall not apply to such interest paid by a United States corporation to a Netherlands corporation controlling, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the entire voting power in the paying corporation.

(2) Interest (on bonds, securities, notes, debentures, or on any other form of indebtedness), other than interest referred to in Article V of the present Convention, derived from sources within the Netherlands by a resident or corporation of the United States not engaged in trade or business in the Netherlands through a permanent establishment, shall be exempt from Netherlands tax; but such exemption shall not apply to such interest paid by a Netherlands corporation to a United States corporation controlling, directly or indirectly, more than 50 percent of the entire voting power in the paying corporation.

ARTICLE IX

Royalties for the right to use copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulae, trade marks, and other analogous property, and royalties, including rentals, in respect of motion-picture films or for the use of industrial, commercial, or scientific equipment, derived from sources within one of the Contracting States by a resident or corporation of the other Contracting State not engaged in trade or business in the former State through a permanent establishment, shall be exempt from tax imposed by the former State.

ARTICLE X

A resident or corporation of one of the Contracting States, deriving from sources within the other Contracting State royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries, or natural resources, or rentals from real property, may elect for any taxable year to be subject to the tax of such other Contracting State, on a net basis, as if such resident or corporation were engaged in trade or business within such other Contracting State through a permanent establishment therein during such taxable year.

ARTICLE XI

A resident or corporation of one of the Contracting States not engaged in trade or business in the other Contracting State shall be exempt from tax in such other State on gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

ARTICLE XII

Dividends and interest paid by a Netherlands corporation shall be exempt from United States tax except where the recipient is a citizen, resident, or corporation of the United States.

ARTICLE XIII

A Netherlands corporation shall be exempt from United States tax on its accumulated or undistributed earnings, profits, income or surplus if it can prove to the satisfaction of the competent authorities of the United States that individuals who are residents of the Netherlands (other than citizens of the United States) control, directly or indirectly, throughout the last half of the taxable year, more than 50 percent of the entire voting power in such corporation.

ARTICLE XIV

(1) The United States income tax liability for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1936, of any individual (other than a citizen of the United States) resident in the Netherlands, or of any Netherlands corporation, remaining unpaid on the effective date of the present Convention, may be adjusted on a basis satisfactory to the United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue: *Provided*, That the amount to be paid in settlement of such liability shall not exceed the amount of the liability which would have been determined if

(a) The United States Revenue Act of 1936 (except in the case of a Netherlands corporation in which more than 50 percent of the entire voting power was controlled, directly or indirectly, throughout the latter half of the taxable year, by citizens or residents of the United States), and

(b) Articles XII and XIII of the present Convention, had been in effect for such year. If the taxpayer was not, within the meaning of such Revenue Act, engaged in trade or business in the United States and had no office or place of business therein during the taxable year, the amount of interest and penalties shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount of the tax with respect to which such interest and penalties have been computed.

(2) The United States income tax unpaid on the effective date of the present Convention for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1935, and prior to the effective date of the present Convention in the case of an individual (other than a citizen of the United States) resident of the Netherlands, or in the case of any Netherlands corporation, shall be determined as if the provisions of Article XII and XIII of the present Convention had been in effect for such taxable year.

(3) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this Article shall not apply

(a) unless the taxpayer files with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within a period of 2 years following the effective date of the present Convention a request that such tax liability be so adjusted and furnishes such information as the Commissioner may require; or

(b) in any case in which the Commissioner is satisfied that any deficiency in tax is due to fraud with intent to evade the tax.

ARTICLE XV

(1) Wages, salaries, and similar compensation, and pensions and life annuities, paid either directly by, or from funds created by, one of the Contracting States or the political subdivisions or territories thereof to individuals in the other Contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the latter State.

(2) Private pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the Contracting States and paid to individuals in the other Contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

(3) The term "pensions" as used in this Article means periodic payments made in consideration for services rendered or by way of compensation for injuries received.

(4) The term "life annuities" as used in this Article means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make the payments in return for adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth.

ARTICLE XVI

(1) A resident of the Netherlands shall be exempt from United States tax upon compensation for labor or personal services performed within the United States if he is temporarily present within the United States for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 183 days during the taxable year and his compensation is received for labor or personal services performed as a worker or employee of, or under contract with, a resident of the Netherlands, or a Netherlands corporation, carrying the actual burden of the remuneration.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this Article shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to a resident of the United States deriving compensation for labor or personal services performed within the Netherlands.

ARTICLE XVII

Professors or teachers, residents of one of the Contracting States, who, in accordance with agreements between the Contracting States or between teaching establishments in the Contracting States for the exchange of professors and teachers, visit the other Contracting State to teach, for a maximum period of two years, in a university, college or other teaching establishment in such other Contracting State, shall not be taxed by such other State with respect to the remuneration which they receive for such teaching.

ARTICLE XVIII

Students or business apprentices of one Contracting State residing in the other Contracting State exclusively for purposes of study or for acquiring business experience shall not be taxable by the latter State in respect of remittances received by them from abroad for the purpose of their maintenance or studies.

ARTICLE XIX

(1) Notwithstanding any provisions of the present Convention (other than paragraph (1) of Article XV when applicable in the case of an individual who is deemed by each Contracting State to be a citizen thereof), each of the two Contracting States, in determining the taxes, including all surtaxes, of its citizens or residents or corporations, may include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under its own revenue laws as though this Convention had not come into effect.

(2) As far as may be in accordance with the provisions of the United States Internal Revenue Code, the United States agrees to allow as a deduction from the income taxes imposed by the United States the appropriate amount of taxes paid to the Netherlands, whether paid directly by the taxpayer or by withholding at the source.

(3) As far as may be in accordance with the provisions of Netherlands law, the Netherlands agrees to allow a deduction from Netherlands tax with respect to income from sources within the United States, in order to take into account the Federal income taxes paid to the United States, whether paid directly by the taxpayer or by withholding at the source.

ARTICLE XX

(1) All persons who left the Netherlands between April 30, 1939, and December 31, 1945, inclusive (other than persons who were citizens of the United States at the time of leaving the Netherlands or Netherlands subject who by reason of their function as governmental officials in established service reside abroad and the members of their family living with them), and who are deemed to be taxpayers under the provisions of Netherlands law relating to the capital accretions tax or the extraordinary capital tax, and who became residents of the United States (according to the income tax law of the United States) during that period, and who did not return to the Netherlands on or before December 31, 1945, to resume residence in the Netherlands (according to the income tax law of the Netherlands), shall be taxable by the Netherlands:

(a) Under the law relating to the capital accretions tax, only in respect of accretions arising from their property situated in the Netherlands (as defined in that law in the case of nonresidents) and from their activities in the Netherlands;

(b) Under the law relating to the extraordinary capital tax, only in respect of their property situated in the Netherlands (as defined in that law in the case of nonresidents).

(2) All persons who left the Netherlands between April 30, 1939, and December 31, 1945, inclusive, and who were citizens of the United States at the time of leaving the Netherlands, and who are deemed to be taxpayers under the provisions of Netherlands law relating to the capital accretions tax or the extraordinary capital tax, and who became residents of the United States (according to the income tax law of the United States) on or before December 31, 1945, shall be taxable by the Netherlands:

(a) under the law relating to the capital accretions tax, only in respect of accretions arising from their property situated in the Netherlands (as defined in that law in the case of nonresidents) and from their activities in the Netherlands;

(b) under the law relating to the extraordinary capital tax, only in respect of their property situated in the Netherlands (as defined in that law in the case of nonresidents).

(3) The provisions of this Article shall be deemed to be effective as though the present Convention had entered into force on the effective date of the Netherlands law relating to the capital accretions tax or the extraordinary capital tax, as the case may be.

ARTICLE XXI

The competent authorities of the Contracting States shall exchange such information (being information which such authorities have in proper order at their disposal) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the administration of statutory provisions against legal avoidance in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information as aforesaid shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XXII

(1) The Contracting States undertake to lend assistance and support to each other in the collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention, together with interest, costs, and additions to the taxes and fines not being of a penal character.

(2) In the case of applications for enforcement of taxes, revenue claims of each of the Contracting States which have been finally determined may be acceptd for enforcement by the other Contracting State and collected in that State in accordance with the laws applicable to the enforcement and collection of its own taxes. The State to which application is made shall not be required to enforce executory measures for which there is no provision in the law of the State making the application.

(3) Any application shall be accompanied by documents establishing that under the laws of the State making the application the taxes have been finally determined.

(4) The assistance provided for in this Article shall not be accorded with respect to the citizens, corporations, or other entities of the State to which application is made, except as is necessary to insure that the exemption or reduced rate of tax granted under the convention to such citizens, corporations or other entities shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE XXIII

(1) In no case shall the provisions of Articles XXI and XXII be construed so as to impose upon either of the Contracting States the obligation

(a) to carry out administrative measures at variance with the regulations and practice of either Contracting State, or

(b) to supply particulars which are not procurable under its own legislation or that of the State making application.

(2) The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it. Nevertheless, such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process. In such case it shall inform, as soon as possible, the State making the application.

ARTICLE XXIV

Where the action of the revenue authorities of the Contracting States has resulted or will result in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, the taxpayer shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or subject or, if he is not a citizen or subject of either of the Contracting States, with the State of which he is a resident, or, if the taxpayer is a corporation, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of such State shall undertake to come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XXV

(1) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the Contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

(2) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, the competent authorities of the Contracting States shall undertake to settle the question by mutual agreement.

(3) The citizens or subjects of one of the Contracting States shall not, while resident

in the other Contracting State, be subjected therein to other or more burdensome taxes than are the citizens or subjects of such other Contracting State residing in its territory. The term "citizens" or "subjects" as used in this Article includes all legal persons, partnerships and associations deriving their status from, or created or organized under the laws in force in, the respective Contracting States. In this Article the word "taxes" means taxes of every kind or description whether national, federal, state, provincial or municipal.

ARTICLE XXVI

(1) The authorities of each of the Contracting States, in accordance with the practices of that State, may prescribe regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the present Convention.

(2) With respect to the provisions of the present Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, the competent authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, minimum amounts subject to collection, and related matters.

ARTICLE XXVII

(1) Either of the Contracting States may, at the time of exchange of instruments of ratification or thereafter while the present Convention continues in force, by a written notification of extension given to the other Contracting State through diplomatic channels, declare the desire of the government of any overseas part of the Kingdom (in the case of the Netherlands) or overseas territory (in the case of the United States), which imposes taxes substantially similar in character to those which are the subject of the present Convention, that the operation of the present Convention, either in whole or as to such provisions thereof as may be deemed to have special application, shall extend to such part or territory.

(2) In the event that a notification is given by one of the Contracting States in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Article, the present Convention, or such provisions thereof as may be specified in the notification, shall apply to any part or territory named in such notification on and after the first day of January following the date of a written communication through diplomatic channels addressed to such Contracting State by the other Contracting State, after such action by the latter States as may be necessary in accordance with its own procedures, stating that such notification is accepted in respect of such part or territory. In the absence of such acceptance, none of the provisions of the present Convention shall apply to such part or territory.

(3) At any time after the expiration of one year from the effective date of an extension made by virtue of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this Article, either of the Contracting States may, by a written notice of termination given to the other Contracting State through diplomatic channels, terminate the application of the present Convention to any part or territory to which the convention, or any of its provisions, has been extended. In that case, the present Convention, or the provisions thereof specified in the notice of termination, shall cease to be applicable to the part or territory named in such notice of termination on and after the first day of January following the expiration of a period of 6 months after the date of such notice; provided, however, that this shall not affect the continued application of the Convention, or any of the provisions thereof, to the United States, to the Netherlands, or to any part or territory (not named in the notice of termination) to which the Convention, or such provision thereof, applies.

(4) For the application of the present Convention in relation to any part or territory to which it is extended by notification given by the United States or the Netherlands, references to "the United States" or to "the Netherlands" or to one or the other Contracting State, as the case may be, shall be construed to refer to such part or territory.

ARTICLE XXVIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

(2) The present Convention shall become effective on the first day of January in the year last preceding the year in which the exchange of instruments of ratification takes place. It shall continue effective for a period of 5 years beginning with that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the Contracting States at the end of the 5-year period or at any time thereafter, provided that at least 6 months' prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective on the first day of January following the expiration of the 6-month period.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Dutch languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this 29th day of April, 1948.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL] G C MARSHALL

For the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands:

[SEAL] E. N. VAN KLEFFENS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification, with the reservations, will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive I, Eightieth Congress, second session, the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes, signed at Washington on April 29, 1948, subject to the following reservations:

(1) The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XI of the convention relating to gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

(2) The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XIII of the convention relating to United States taxation of the undistributed earnings, profits, income or surplus of a Netherlands corporation.

(3) The Government of the United States of America does not accept article XIV of the convention relating to settlement of unpaid United States income tax liability unless there be eliminated therefrom, (a) references now appearing therein to article XIII and (b) any language which might prevent the taxation by the United States of capital gains, if any, taxable under the revenue laws of the United States for the respective years in which such gains were realized.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservations to the resolution of ratification.

The reservations were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the reservations.

[Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification, with the reservations, is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Klahr Huddle, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Burma, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Kashmir Commission of the Security Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude G. Bowers, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Latin America established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, February 25, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at the top of page 3, under Diplomatic and Foreign Service, appears the name Edward T. Barnard, and the next name is that of Jules E. Bernard. I wonder if there is a misprint; whether the second name should be Bernard or Barnard?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not have any knowledge of that. The Chair doubts, however, whether there is a misprint.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the

Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Thorvald A. Solberg, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fred S. Martin, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, William T. Sherwood, resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl K. Connell to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri, to fill an existing vacancy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul R. Leake to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Armed Services certain junior nominations in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, 700 in number, and ask for their immediate consideration without their going to the calendar. The nominations are routine. I make this request in order to save printing the names in the calendar. Such a request has been customarily made in order to save the expense of printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be received.

Without objection, the nominations will be confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. GURNEY. I failed to say that the nominations have all been approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

ILLINOIS POSTMASTERS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question respecting a number of postmaster nominations, in view of the fact that many postmasters have been confirmed tonight. It is my understanding that some 38 or 40 postmaster nominations in Illinois have been approved by the Civil Service Committee, and I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is present and can tell me why those postmasters do not appear on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from North Dakota is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that my colleague from Illinois has objected to these postmasters, and he is present. I should like to know whether that is true or not.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I may say to my colleague that I know nothing about the nominations of postmasters that are not on the calendar. I was asked if I approved them and I said I did not know who they were. I do not know who they are and to that extent I have not approved them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to submit resolutions respecting each and every one of these postmasters. The purpose of the resolution is to discharge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from further consideration of the nominations of the postmasters to whom I refer. The first one is Monroe A. Lawson, of Clay City, Ill. Mr. Lawson is a disabled marine veteran of World War II, having been wounded on Saipan.

He was the only applicant for the office and the only eligible certified by the Civil Service Commission from an open competitive examination.

He has served as acting postmaster since October 1946, and is unanimously endorsed by the Clay City Chamber of Commerce, and was recommended by the Republican Congressman from that district.

Personally, the Senator from Illinois does not know whether this gentleman is a Democrat or a Republican, and it would not make any difference, because he is a veteran, and is No. 1 on the eligible list, and the only one on the list.

Mr. President, why that individual cannot be confirmed by the Senate of the United States at this session will be a little difficult for me to understand, and it will be a little difficult for many people in Illinois to understand—people who will know more about it as time goes by.

I submit the resolution, and ask that it lie over for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be filed and will lie over for the day.

Mr. LUCAS. The second nomination is that of Charles H. McGough, to be postmaster at Secor, Ill. Mr. McGough was the first man on the eligible register established by the Civil Service Commission as the result of an open competitive examination.

He is a disabled veteran of World War II, and is not serving as acting postmaster.

Some other individual is serving as acting postmaster while this disabled veteran of World War II, who was the first man on the eligible list, waits for his commission because of someone here in the United States Senate who refuses to approve him or who refuses to report out his nomination.

Mr. President, to me this is indefensible and it is unbelievable that an Illinois boy who went out to fight for his country, and is disabled, and is No. 1 on the list, should not be confirmed. There is nothing that anyone can do about it under the law. He must be ultimately accepted whether anyone likes it or not, because under the law no one can be chosen over him. I do not know what his politics is, but I know that he is a disabled veteran, and I know that he is waiting for this job, and that he cannot get it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Chair's pardon.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Nebraska wants to ask me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. How does the Senator know that the nomination in question will not be reported from the committee?

Mr. LUCAS. I hope it will.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the Senator really begging the question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not begging the question very much because unless the nomination is reported from the committee within 48 hours he will not be confirmed. There would not be any action in this matter if it were not for the fact that the Senator from Illinois has taken the floor and proceeded to take the action he is now taking.

Mr. WHERRY. The chairman of the committee is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. I have asked the chairman about this.

Mr. WHERRY. The chairman has done quite well in the matter of reporting nominations, and the Senate has confirmed every nomination which has been placed on the Executive Calendar, with the exception of one, during the executive session today.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is something of a record. Only one nomination on the calendar has been put over today. I have taken the position that when the Senate acted on the Executive Calendar all nominations on the calendar should be confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. I have tried to get these nominations on the Executive Calendar. Obviously they cannot be confirmed until that is done.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied that if the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were present he

could give the Senator satisfactory answers respecting these postmasters.

Mr. LUCAS. He cannot give me satisfactory answers respecting the individuals I have mentioned, because there is nothing that can be done about these postmasters except confirm them or turn them down.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I cannot answer the Senator respecting the postmasters in question, but I will say there is a meeting of the committee scheduled for tomorrow morning, when nominations for postmasters will be considered, and I hope these nominations may be reported then.

Mr. LUCAS. Recently I called the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], a member of the committee, on the phone and he told me that some 33 nominations for postmasters had been reported favorably by the committee, that there was no objection to them, and since that time nominations from one State after another have been placed on the Executive Calendar, but the Illinois postmasters are not on the calendar, and time is running out in this Congress. Action must be taken quickly if the nominations are to be confirmed before the session is ended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There are three nominations of postmasters from Illinois on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; there are three from Illinois. This is somewhat of an anomaly. I went before the committee and appealed to the committee to have the three postmasters from Illinois placed on the calendar, and the committee voted practically unanimously to place them on the calendar while I was there; and, lo and behold, they are now on the Executive Calendar. The reason I appeared was because some slight objection had been raised to these three. Lo and behold, they are on the calendar. But these other postmasters, to whom there is no objection, have not been placed on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps if the Senator went before the committee again he would succeed in having them placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought they would be placed on the calendar in view of the favorable report by the Committee on Civil Service. I had every reason to believe they would be on the Executive Calendar as a result of favorable action by that committee. I relied upon my good friend from South Carolina. He told me what had been done. He was very joyful about it. He thought all the postmaster nominations had been reported.

Next is the nomination of Glen W. Seaton, of Glen Carbon. Mr. Seaton is a disabled veteran of World War II. He was first on the eligible register set up by the Civil Service Commission from an examination. He is now serving as acting postmaster and is married.

Next is the nomination of Frank C. Spengler, to be postmaster at Shannon, Ill. Mr. Spengler was No. 1 on the register established by the Civil Service Commission from an open competitve examination. He is a disabled veteran of World War II, and has been serving as acting postmaster at Shannon since December 1946.

The next is the nomination of Mr. Russell E. Snyder, to be postmaster at Hull, Ill. Mr. Snyder was No. 1 on the eligible register established by the Civil Service Commission. He has been acting postmaster at Hull since June 1946, and is a disabled veteran of World War II. He ought to have a little opportunity to get a job as postmaster at Hull, Ill. It is not a very big job, but it is worth while to him.

The next nomination is that of William K. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Chandlerville. Mr. Armstrong is now serving as acting postmaster. He is a veteran of World War II, having enlisted in January 1942. Served overseas for more than 2 years. He was a classified postal employee who was promoted through noncompetitive examination. Served as clerk in the Chandlerville office from 1941 to 1942, when he enlisted in the Army. Went back to his job in the post office in 1946 when he was discharged. His services have been entirely satisfactory.

This is stack No. 3, consisting of veterans and veterans' widows who were first on the eligible register, or the only eligibles. I do not wish to read all of these. I call attention particularly to Daniel J. Boyd, who is nominated to be postmaster at Blue Island, Ill. Mr. Boyd was the only eligible certified by the Civil Service Commission as the result of an open competitive examination. He is a veteran of World War II and is serving as acting postmaster. His services in this capacity have been highly satisfactory.

Most of these are World War II veterans. Two are widows. One of these is the nomination of Harry A. Osman, to be postmaster at Cypress, Ill. Another is the nomination of Fred H. Popp, Jr., to be postmaster at Dundee, Ill.; another, the nomination of Lester A. Binder, to be postmaster at Hinckley, Ill.

Another is the nomination of C. Lincoln Guernsey, to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Ill. He is another veteran. These are all veterans.

Mrs. Helen F. Gleich is the widow of a veteran of World War I.

Next is stack No. 4, consisting of veterans who were second or third on the register. I will not take the time of the Senate to read the list.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does not the Senator file them en bloc?

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to file them by stacks.

Stack No. 5 consists of nonveterans who were classified postal employees promoted to the postmastership.

Stack No. 6 consists of nonveterans who were either first on the eligible register or the only eligibles. There are quite a few of those.

Stack No. 7 consists of veterans who were second or third on the eligible register.

In conclusion, I hope that my able friend the acting majority leader will try to prevail upon the committee to report these nominations. In all seriousness, these are some of the most meritorious cases I have ever considered since I have been considering postmasters in all the years I have been in Congress. I sincerely hope that this Congress will not adjourn without the Senate confirming these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions to discharge the committee will lie on the table.

The nominations referred to by Mr. LUCAS are as follows:

Monroe A. Lawson, to be postmaster at Clay City, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 54).

Charles H. McGough, to be postmaster at Secor, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 55).

Glen W. Seaton, to be postmaster at Glen Carbon, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 56).

Frank C. Spengler, to be postmaster at Shannon, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 57).

Russell E. Snyder, to be postmaster at Hull, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 58).

William K. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Chandlerville, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 59).

Arthur E. Maloney, to be postmaster at Mooseheart, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 60).

Daniel J. Boyd, to be postmaster at Blue Island, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 61).

George A. Frazer, to be postmaster at Hamilton, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 62).

Harry A. Osman, to be postmaster at Cypress, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 63).

Fred H. Popp, Jr., to be postmaster at Dundee, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 64).

Lester A. Binder, to be postmaster at Hinckley, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 65).

Russell M. Shoaf, to be postmaster at Homer, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 66).

C. Lincoln Guernsey, to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 67).

Helen F. Gleich, to be postmaster at Menard, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 68).

James T. Malley, to be postmaster at Mounds, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 69).

Jerry Volny, Jr., to be postmaster at Northfield, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 70).

William H. Watson, to be postmaster at Prospect Heights, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 71).

Andrew J. Rogers, Jr., to be postmaster at Cordova, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 72).

John C. McKinstra, to be postmaster at Freeport, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 73).

Richard R. Atkins, to be postmaster at Kinmundy, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 74).

Adam A. Munsterman, to be postmaster at Nameoki, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 75).

Joseph J. Holloway, to be postmaster at Elmhurst, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 76).

Leland Adams, to be postmaster at Deiterich, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 77).

Albert J. Buehler, to be postmaster at Chestnut, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 78).

Francis L. Weghorst, to be postmaster at South Pekin, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 79).

Herbert M. Bowman, to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 80).

Mrs. Ruth Sartain, to be postmaster at Fithian, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 81).

Beatrice Reck, to be postmaster at Winslow, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 82).

Margaret Carlson, to be postmaster at Bureau, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 83).

Ray B. Brockhouse, to be postmaster at Chapin, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 84).

Eula McCawley, to be postmaster at Chesterfield, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 85).

Louis Sloter, to be postmaster at Crescent City, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 86).

Mary E. McCarl, to be postmaster at Kinderhook, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 87).

Ralph D. Waddell, to be postmaster at Latham, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 88).

Joseph O. Brown, to be postmaster at Long Point, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 89).

George M. Farrell, to be postmaster at Marseilles, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 90).

Daniel F. Pembroke, to be postmaster at Monticello, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 91).

S. Jay Thomas, to be postmaster at Oregon, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 92).

Emmett P. Hayes, to be postmaster at Rochelle, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 93).

Orville L. Glasford, to be postmaster at Trivoli, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 94).

Mabel H. Green, to be postmaster at Alvin, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 95).

John W. Bosaw, to be postmaster at New Haven, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 96).

Charles J. Murphy, to be postmaster at Oak Park, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 97).

Besse M. Hewitt, to be postmaster at Steward, Ill. (S. Ex. Res. 98).

THE HOUSING PROGRAM—IMPORT DUTIES ON PLYWOOD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make brief comment on two matters which I seek to have inserted in the RECORD.

I have been advised that the so-called housing bill which is under consideration in the House has had added to it today an amendment which seeks to eliminate import duties on plywood.

Mr. President, that amendment would play havoc with the plywood industry in the Pacific Northwest. In my opinion that amendment is just another reason why it would be much better to have no housing bill at all than the monstrosity which apparently is coming out of the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in regard to the effect of such an amendment on the plywood industry of the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Douglas fir plywood industry employs in direct production of plywood approximately 10,000 workmen in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California. There are 35 complete fir plywood plants and 5 green fir veneer plants now in production. There are 7 fir plywood plants under construction which will be in operation by the end of 1948. There are 7 plywood plants projected. All of these plants should be in production in 1949 so that during 1949 there will be a total of 49 plywood plants in operation. It is expected that by the end of 1948 there will be 50 fir plywood plants and by the end of 1949 there will be 60.

In 1947 the fir plywood industry produced at the rate of 29,000,000 square feet a week. The present production is 36,000,000 square feet per week. New plants coming into production within the next 4 months will increase the production to 40,000,000 square feet per week by this fall. New plants coming into production during 1949 will bring in an additional 4,000,000 square feet per week so that production in 1949 will be 44,000,000 square feet per week, or an increase of 65 percent over 1947.

The Douglas fir plywood industry pays an average wage straight time of $1.62½ an hour. The Canadian plywood industry pays an average wage straight time of $0.92½ an hour. There is approximately the same differential between the cost of Canadian peeler logs and domestic peeler logs.

Log cost and labor represent 52 percent of the American mill price of softwood plywood. Therefore, assuming that the other costs of the Canadian manufacturers are equal percentagewise to the American manufacturers, which is certainly not the case, the Canadian manufacturer by his lower wage and lumber costs can produce plywood for 45 cents on a dollar less than the American producer.

HARDWOOD PLYWOOD

The production of hardwood plywood in the United States is approximately 1,000,000,000 square feet surface measure. The principal species are birch and gum. Birch plywood is produced in the Lake and Northeastern States, gum in the Southeastern States. The principal import from Canada is birch plywood on which there is a 25 percent duty. At the present time there is sufficient United States production of hardwood plywood to meet all requirements. Hardwood plywood is not construction material. Canadian birch plywood is presently selling in the United States at less than it costs the United States mills to produce it. The average wage in the United States Plywood Corp.'s plant in Wisconsin is $1.10 an hour straight time, in its Canadian plant at Woodstock, Ontario, it is 83 cents an hour. Birch logs cost $140 in the United States per thousand and in Canada $130 per thousand. Therefore there is an advantage to the Canadian producer of 24 percent in labor costs and 9 percent in log costs or a total in these two items of 33 percent.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last item on which I want to comment is an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Teachers' Pay." I make this comment not only as a Member of the Senate, but as president of the Home and School Association of the Alice Deal School in Washington, D. C. In the capacity of president of that association, I have worked this year with parent groups in this city in regard to the plight in which the school teachers find themselves in the District of Columbia.

I not only heartily endorse every word of the editorial on teachers' pay in this morning's Washington Post, but I wish to say that in my opinion the Congress of the United States should set an example for school districts throughout the Nation in regard to teachers' pay. We are not giving to the teachers in the District of Columbia the economic support which I think is justified by the great trust which they have thrust upon them, namely, the training of future citizens of this country. This is a sad reflection on the Congress of the United States. I do not believe that we should adjourn this session without increasing the pay of the teachers in the District of Columbia a minimum of $500 per teacher. I do not know how the taxpayers' money could be better spent so far as a sound return to the Nation is concerned, than by way of an increase in teachers' pay.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial referred to printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHERS' PAY

The praise due Representative GEORGE BATES for initiating congressional action toward a pay increase for District teachers must be qualified on account of the niggardliness of the increase which he has suggested and which the House has approved. A raise of $200 for the year—not quite $4 a week—is certainly, as Dr. Regis Boyle put it, "withering, so far as morale is concerned." It would do almost nothing to enable teachers to cope with the increased cost of living, to restore the dignity of their profession, or to arrest the dangerous drift away from the schools into more remunerative callings.

Among the 20 largest cities in the United States, Washington, according to Superintendent of Schools Hobart Corning, ranks fifteenth on the basis of the average salary paid to teachers in its public-school system. The average teacher salary here is $3,398—in a city where, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, costs are higher than in any other major city in the country. Washingtonians will never secure adequate schooling for their children by a pauperization of the teachers in their schools.

The District's teachers deserve at the very least a pay increase equal to that granted Federal workers. If the pending Federal pay legislation is enacted, some of the janitors in school buildings may be getting more pay than the classroom teachers. Parsimony could be given no more uneconomic form than to exclude teachers from equal benefits. We hope that Congress will act, before its adjournment, to give teachers a pay increase commensurate with their desperate need and with the vital importance of the duties they perform.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2589.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Chair state the unanimous-consent agreement relative to the calling of the calendar tomorrow morning?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. When the Senate meets tomorrow it will meet under a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed with the call of the calendar of bills and other measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1504, where the previous call of the calendar concluded.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. At the conclusion of the call of the calendar tomorrow, will the Senate then proceed immediately to the consideration of Senate bill 2589, providing for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 18, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert Alexander, of the District of Columbia.

Charles R. Enlow, of Kansas.

William Kling, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Samuel I. Katz, of Tennessee, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Arthur R. Scroggins, East Tallassee, Ala., in place of J. D. Hilyer, deceased.

J. Ponder Livingston, Eutaw, Ala., in place of J. J. Harkness, deceased.

James C. Mattox, Guin, Ala., in place of J. N. A. Hulsey, deceased.

James D. Jackson, Horton, Ala., in place of J. T. Mabrey, transferred.

Felton Jones, Kennedy, Ala., in place of Tom Dorroh, transferred.

Marvin T. Davis, Letohatchee, Ala., in place of W. L. Adams, deceased.

Pauline B. Sandlin, Magnolia Springs, Ala., in place of J. W. Sandlin, deceased.

John W. Roney, Newville, Ala., in place of L. J. Brannon, retired.

Charles H. Eddins, Jr., Peterman, Ala., in place of Marguerite Helton, resigned.

Oscar Day, Jr., Oakman, Ala., in place of L. W. Richardson, transferred.

ARKANSAS

Orval E. Faubus, Huntsville, Ark., in place of Hugh Murphy, transferred.

Charles L. Duncan, Murfreesboro, Ark., in place of H. M. Austin, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Harry Bergseid, Bell, Calif., in place of C. L. Boren, retired.

Edythe Burgett, El Segundo, Calif., in place of Clyde Burgett, deceased.

Cleo A. Moilring, Galt, Calif., in place of M. B. Bradford, resigned.

Oscar Ditmanson, Lodi, Calif., in place of C. M. Jones, deceased.

Walter J. Degregori, Los Banos, Calif., in place of B. A. Wilson, retired.

Raymond R. Dingle, Middletown, Calif., in place of F. R. Carpenter, resigned.

Puella E. Forbes, Orcutt, Calif., in place of R. A. Osborn, resigned.

Harry H. Lauritzen, Rio Vista, Calif., in place of J. I. Fiscus, resigned.

William E. Krenning, San Diego, Calif., in place of D. M. Stewart, retired.

CONNECTICUT

John G. Coffin, Ridgefield, Conn., in place of J. L. Walker, deceased.

Mary T. Doyle, Thomaston, Conn., in place of F. C. Flynn, deceased.

FLORIDA

Myrtle Clare Booth, Cantonment, Fla., in place of M. C. Booth, transferred.

Earl L. Williams, Lady Lake, Fla., in place of L. R. Estell, retired.

Grady A. Warren, Lake City, Fla., in place of O. K. Holmes, resigned.

Evan D. Mixon, Ruskin, Fla., in place of J. F. Linder, resigned.

GEORGIA

Norwood W. Miley, Hahira, Ga., in place of W. H. Massey, deceased.

Jack Herring, Ochlochnee, Ga., in place of S. W. Bulloch, resigned.

Claude Rountree, Thomasville, Ga., in place of B. C. Blanton, deceased.

Evander L. Raulston, Trenton, Ga., in place of W. H. Brock, retired.

ILLINOIS

Fred D. Knaus, Arcola, Ill., in place of J. F. Spellman, resigned.

William A. Goetz, Bethany, Ill., in place of H. L. Bone, transferred.

Gilbert R. Gish, Buda, Ill., in place of R. V. Westervelt, resigned.

Pearl H. Collins, Catlin, Ill., in place of R. O. Huffman, transferred.

Donald L. Doan, Claremont, Ill., in place of J. H. Leathers, deceased.

Marie Little, Dallas City, Ill., in place of Claude Shaffner, retired.

John J. McCaughey, Gurnee, Ill., in place of W. K. Kimball, retired.

Hazel M. Wolf, Sidney, Ill., in place of F. R. Drews, removed.

INDIANA

Lloyd B. Helms, Centerville, Ind., in place of P. L. Helms, transferred.

Harry G. Thompson, Danville, Ind., in place of Bertha Higgins, resigned.

Marion L. Garstka, New Haven, Ind., in place of D. A. Blaising, transferred.

IOWA

Estelle M. Burroughs, Albion, Iowa, in place of B. E. Fraley, retired.

Vernon L. Dinges, Avoca, Iowa, in place of Harry Eckhardt, deceased.

George R. Lewis, Elliott, Iowa, in place of Mable Kinney, deceased.

Raymond J. Gilday, Fort Dodge, Iowa, in place of P. T. Vaughan, retired.

Marjorie B. Cochran, Quasqueton, Iowa, in place of G. B. Garrison, retired.

KANSAS

Harry C. Brooks, Fort Scott, Kans., in place of J. M. Miller, retired.

Harry Lang, Jetmore, Kans., in place of F. R. Wilson, resigned.

Richard D. Wiley, Sedgwick, Kans., in place of J. A. Wiley, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Leland G. Rubarts, Dunville, Ky., in place of O. L. Ellis, retired.

LOUISIANA

Miles K. Hartsell, Rodessa, La., in place of M. K. Hartsell, transferred.

MAINE

Howard Mills Martin, Kennebunk Port, Maine, in place of W. F. Goodwin, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis A. Crowley, Boston, Mass., in place of P. J. Connelly, retired.

Malcolm W. Chase, Princeton, Mass., in place of R. J. Gregory, deceased.

Thomas J. Gilgun, Winchester, Mass., in place of V. C. Ambrose, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Elias William Lyons, Armada, Mich., in place of M. E. Shaw, resigned.

Frank A. Prais, Belleville, Mich., in place of E. T. McGlothlin, resigned.

Woodrow L. LaLonde, Felch, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Darwin H. Van Houten, Sixlakes, Mich., in place of Ward Gibbs, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Joseph F. Ruzek, Hayfield, Minn., in place of Earl Stanton, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Charles C. Provine, Big Creek, Miss., in place of J. H. Seale, deceased.

Ray Bickham Ball, Smithdale, Miss., in place of D. R. Butler, retired.

Owen O. Odom, Steens, Miss., in place of S. L. Brewer, deceased.

MISSOURI

Maude E. Coburn, Arbyrd, Mo., in place of H. K. Bridges, resigned.

Robert G. Simpson, Herculaneum, Mo., in place of G. S. Manning, resigned.

Jacob E. Fry, Stover, Mo., in place of E. J. Fry, retired.

NEBRASKA

Robert K. Corn, Papillion, Nebr., in place of G. P. Miller, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Sesto A. Ferretti, Alpha, N. J., in place of R. B. Sokolowski, deceased.

Stanley John Ryba, Burlington, N. J., in place of R. P. Hughes, retired.

George T. Albrecht, Dover, N. J., in place of Irving Washburn, retired.

Edward J. Breen, Edgewater, N. J., in place of Emery Benoit, retired.

John V. Snow, Hillsdale, N. J., in place of J. S. Hains, deceased.

Joseph Carroll Bransfield, Wildwood, N. J., in place of P. J. Shortt, retired.

William M. Danridge, Wortendyke, N. J., in place of Nora Loughman, resigned.

NEW YORK

Edward Warner, Point Pleasant, N. Y., in place of E. R. Chaffer, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Evelyn J. Sutton, Dillsboro, N. C., in place of E. B. Monteith, retired.

George H. Ross, Wadesboro, N. C., in place of F. M. Mills, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Byron P. Pulles, Stanton, N. Dak., in place of I. D. Thue, deceased.

OHIO

Ida U. Smeltz, Attica, Ohio, in place of R. W. Senn, resigned.

Herbert N. Dunfee, Jacobsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Michael J. Gaughan, Leetonia, Ohio, in place of H. D. Arnold, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Phil Lee Brown, Cherokee, Okla., in place of H. C. Forde, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Nally, Carbondale, Pa., in place of F. P. Kelly, retired.

Ruth B. Nyquist, Dagus Mines, Pa., in place of S. P. Veoni, transferred.

Richard F. Albright, Kulpsville, Pa., in place of E. M. Stover, retired.

Luther E. Kunkle, Mount Wolf, Pa., in place of L. A. Strayer, deceased.

Kenneth W. Hoag, Ralston, Pa., in place of L. S. Mansuy, resigned.

William H. Rufe, Jr., Sellersville, Pa., in place of Alexander Alexander, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Gerome H. Stafford, Jr., Latta, S. C., in place of Houston Manning, resigned.

Edmund R. Kaminer, Lexington, S. C., in place of J. H. Fox, retired.

George C. Aycock, Pinewood, S. C., in place of R. J. Aycock, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Earl J. Pierce, Burke, S. Dak., in place of M. E. Smith, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Lawrence J. Bullington, Atwood, Tenn., in place of C. W. Younger, resigned.

D. Naomi Brewer, Madison College, Tenn., in place of R. B. King, resigned.

Russell E. Rankin, Union City, Tenn., in place of E. A. Jones, resigned.

TEXAS

Benjamin F. Sullivan, Jr., Bangs, Tex., in place of L. G. Porter, resigned.

Robert A. Smith, Decatur, Tex., in place of R. T. Rieger, resigned.

Thomas G. Sandel, Huntsville, Tex., in place of L. B. Baldwin, resigned.

Robert J. Quinlivan, Idalou, Tex., in place of Baxter Orr, deceased.

Harold Voss, Post, Tex., in place of P. S. Bouchier, transferred.

Miller J. Sweeden, Sweetwater, Tex., in place of A. G. Lee, resigned.

UTAH

Riley W. Goodfellow, Bountiful, Utah, in place of J. H. Rampton, resigned.

Ted R. Mower, Fairview, Utah, in place of N. S. Brady, transferred.

VIRGINIA

Carroll E. Burgess, Blairs, Va., in place of C. B. Roach, resigned.

Grace F. Hiehle, Mount Vernon, Va., in place of E. J. Monroe, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Douglas P. Salisbury, Chewelah, Wash., in place of H. S. Storms, resigned.

Gladys M. Pearson, Olalla, Wash., in place of M. C. Nelson, retired.

Richard K. Morley, Stevenson, Wash., in place of W. H. Lamm, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Clara Marie Hess, Farmington, W. Va., in place of R. B. Mapel, deceased.

Mary L. Vance, Whitmans, W. Va., in place of Nellie Nix, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Oswald L. Weber, Cedarburg, Wis., in place of G. J. Armbruster, resigned.

Clarence Keith Hammond, De Soto, Wis., in place of Anna Loftus, resigned.

Hazel M. Pfeil, Granville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

J. Klahr Huddle, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Burma, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Kashmir Commission of the Security Council of the United Nations.

Claude G. Bowers, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Latin America established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, February 25, 1948.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William E. DeCourcy to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

Harold H. Tittmann, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Peru.

To be Foreign Service officers of the class of career minister

Charles E. Bohlen
Herbert S. Bursley
Richard P. Butrick
John M. Cabot
North Winship

To be consul generals of the United States of America

Leo J. Callanan
Carlos J. Warner

To be consuls of the United States of America

Ray L. Thurston
George T. Colman
William C. Burdett, Jr.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Julius C. Holmes

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Ellis M. Goodwin
Howard P. Jones
S. Shepard Jones
Edwin M. J. Kretzmann
George S. Roper
Harold R. Spiegel

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Charles H. Abbott
Elmer H. Harrelson
Henry L. T. Koren
Eugene L. Padberg, Jr.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Edward T. Barnard
Jules E. Bernard
William T. Carpenter, Jr.
Miss Eileen R. Donovan
George Hubert Maness

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Richard M. Connell
Joseph B. Costanzo
Woodruff Wallner

To be Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Albert E. Carter

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

D. Chadwick Braggiotti
Richard I. Phillips

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

John P. Gardiner
Peyton A. Kerr, Jr.
Robert C. Martindale
Charles Nelson Spinks
Carroll M. Terry

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

William C. Brister
Harry W. Johnstone
Maurice S. Rice
Robert W. Tucker
Joseph A. Todd
David G. Wilson, Jr.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Milton Barall
Joseph Chase
Leon B. Poullada
Richard M. Scammon

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Willard Allan
Russell C. Heater
Paul R. Hughes

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Thorvald A. Solberg to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Fred S. Martin to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Carl K. Connell to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Missouri.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Paul R. Leake to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

To be rear admirals

Capt. Lucien M. Grant
Capt. Lloyd Harrison
Capt. Roy T. Cowdrey

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

APPOINTMENTS IN THE COAST GUARD

To be lieutenant, to rank from December 1, 1943

Arthur E. Muffler

To be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from January 1, 1947

George W. Miller
Ralph W. Niess
Mark F. Mitchell
Frederick N. Lattin
William O. Schach
Robert B. Long
Robert G. Schwing
Hubert W. Cocklin
James J. Hill
Robert D. Winship
Alvin N. Ward
Risto A. Mattila
William D. Ball, Jr.
James A. Dillian
William C. Brown
Robert I. Price
George T. Richardson
Frank C. Anderson
Robert J. Healy
Frances A. Tubeck
Robert L. Kallin
John P. Obarski
Gerald G. Brown
Winford W. Barrow
Clifford F. Peistrup
Robert E. Williams
William R. Banks
Stanley B. Russell
Joseph B. O'Hara
Marc Welliver II
Willis N. Seehorn
Leslie J. Williamson
Martin W. Flesh
Eugene E. McCrory
David R. Rondestvedt
James C. Heffernan
Jesse G. Magee
Kevin L. Moser
Jack D. Lyon
Douglas H. Clifton
Allen C. Pearce
David G. Walker
William D. Ebright
David C. Porter
Abe H. Siemens
James H. B. Morton
Robert R. Hagan, Jr.
Paul A. Hansen
David D. Fritts
Laurence M. Newkirk
Spencer M. Higley
Herbert J. Lynch
William G. Donaldson
Leslie M. Greig
Christopher S. Changaris
Mario J. Cataffo
Meindert P. Boon
Casimir S. Rojeski
James R. Iversen
Philip M. Hildebrandt
Norman L. Scherer
Charles W. Berkman
Paul W. Welker
John J. Barry

To be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from January 15, 1947

George A. Choquette
Leroy B. Smith
George A. Gyland
John Kruszewski
Floyd L. Hartson
Jacob C. Sorensen
Earl G. Hamilton
Lloyd S. Sadler
Loren V. Perry
Franklin H. Schonewolf
Clemons C. Pearson
Elmer Winbeck
Charles W. Smith
Nathan Vanger
Alton F. Pinkham
Ernest W. Payne
Axel R. Mattson
Marvin H. Twiford
Charles B. Martinson, Jr.
Leland O. Wilkie
Orville C. Hinnen
Byron M. Wineke
Adam Stanzak
Paul A. Berg
Olaf T. Sturdy
Thomas B. Prather
James G. Cowart
Carl D. Eubanks
Ronald S. Krueger
Mart L. Jackson
Sterling M. Anderson
Harry S. Raleigh
Leo J. A. King
William S. Bishop
Henry J. Pfeiffer
Thomas C. Pennock
Hugh E. McCullough
Alvin J. Boxwell
Willard E. Carlson
Hugh J. LeBlanc
David T. Haislip
Stanley L. Waitzfelder
Harold D. Muth
James C. Boteler
Richard L. Huxtable
John Vukic

To be lieutenant commanders, to rank from December 1, 1942

Ferdinand Lederle

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be captains in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective June 3, 1948

Henry W. Hemple
Casper M. Durgin
Oliver S. Reading
Francis L. Gallen
John A. Bond
Cornelius D. Meaney
Augustus P. Ratti

To be captain in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective August 1, 1948

Earl O. Heaton

To be captains in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective September 1, 1948

William M. Scaife
Robert F. A. Studds
Henry C. Warwick

To be captain in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective October 1, 1948

Benjamin H. Rigg

To be commanders in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective June 3, 1948

Ronald R. Moore
Ralph W. Woodworth
Leo C. Wilder
Henry E. Finnegan
Charles M. Thomas
Charles Pierce
Thomas B. Reed
Jack C. Sammons
Robert W. Knox
H. Arnold Karo
Edgar H. Bernstein
George L. Anderson
Isidor E. Rittenburg
Kenneth G. Crosby
Glendon E. Boothe
Earle A. Delly
Leonard S. Hubbard
Philip C. Doran
Hubert A. Paton
Walter H. Bainbridge
Carl I. Aslakson
Paul A. Smith
John C. Rose
Riley J. Sipe
Samuel B. Grenell
Frank G. Johnson
William M. Gibson
Ralph L. Pfau

To be commanders in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective December 1, 1948

Alvin C. Thorson
Joe C. Partington
Ector B. Latham

To be lieutenant commanders in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective June 3, 1948

A. Newton Stewart
Max G. Ricketts
Clarence A. George
Robert A. Earle
Harry F. Garber
Karl B. Jeffers
John Laskowski
Ross A. Gilmore
Gilbert C. Mast
Fred A. Riddell
Ira R. Rubottom
Maurice E. Wennermank
Fred Natella
Jeremiah S. Morton
Robert A. Marshall
Edward B. Brown, Jr.
John C. Ellerbe
Maurice A. Hecht
John C. Tribble, Jr.
James C. Tison, Jr.
Edmund L. Jones
Kenneth S. Ulm
Clarence R. Reed
William C. Russell
Junius T. Jarman
Herman C. Applequist
William F. Deane
Edgar F. Hicks, Jr.
John C. Bull
Arthur L. Wardwell
Emmett H. Sheridan
Raymond H. Tryon, Jr.
Chester J. Beyma
Joseph E. Waugh
Dorland H. Konichek
Philip A. Weber
Paul Taylor
Horace G. Conerly
Charles F. Chenworth
Charles A. Schoene
William N. Martin
Harold J. Seaborg
Fair J. Bryant
Charles W. Clark
Glenn W. Moore

To be lieutenants in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective June 3, 1948

Don A. Jones
David M. Whipp
Francis X. Popper
Howard S. Cole
Harry D. Reed

To be lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective December 16, 1948

Raymond M. Stone

To be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective July 5, 1948

Hubert W. Keith, Jr.

To be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective July 6, 1948

Walter B. Hamstrom

To be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective July 12, 1948

Dale E. Fisher

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Henry W. Kassel
Edward K. Reid

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Malcolm J. Williams
Jerry W. Carter, Jr.,
John C. Eberhart

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948

Lee C. Watkins
William P. Ossenfort
Joseph O. Dean
Ivan W. Steele
Kenneth R. Nelson
Vane M. Hoge
Frank F. Thweatt, Jr.
Gilbert L. Dunnahoo
Eddie M. Gordon
Ralph Gregg
Edwin G. Williams
Gerald M. Kunkel
Harold D. Lyman
Frederick W. Kratz
John D. Lane, Jr.
Donald J. Hunt
Chapman H. Binford
John A. Trautman
Joseph A. Bell
Edward C. Rinck
Gordon A. Abbott
Sidney P. Cooper
George W. Bolin
Waldemar C. Dreessen
Noka B. Hon
Otis L. Anderson
Claude D. Head, Jr.
Mason V. Hargett
Cassius .'. Van Slyke
Thurman H. Rose
Victor H. Vogel
Thomas B. McKneely
William G. Workman
Robert K. Maddock
Alfred B. Geyer
Robert H. Flinn
Roy E. Butler
Leland J. Hanchett
Richard C. Arnold
Austin V. Deibert
John L. Wilson
Leslie M. Smith
Llewellyn L. Ashburn
Oliver C. Williams
B. Oliver Lewis
Clifton K. Himmelsbach
John W. Oliphant
Seymour D. Vestermark
Hollis U. Maness
Leroy E. Burney
Charles R. Mallary
Michael J. Pescor
Don S. Cameron
George H. Hunt
Harry Eagle
Dean A. Clark
Norvin C. Kiefer
Myron D. Miller
George L. Fite
Arthur W. Newitt
H. van Zile Hyde
Robert H. Felix
Walter P. Griffey

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948

Virgil J. Dorset
John R. McGibony
Robert F. Martin
Herman E. Hilleboe
Theodore L. Perrin
Harris Isbell
David J. Zaugg
Howard D. Fishburn
Rolla R. Wolcott
James F. Lane
John N. Bowden
Ralph B. Hogan
Waldo B. Edwards .
Vernon B. Link
Norman H. Topping
James A. Grider, Jr.
Byron J. Olson
Harold R. Sandstead
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith
John A. Lewis, Jr.
Dale C. Cameron
Leo D. O'Kane
Jack L. James
Leon S. Saler
Thomas A. Hathcock, Jr.
Robert C. Dunn
Randall B. Haas
Charles G. Spicknall
Vernam T. Davis
Harold T. Castberg
Terrence E. Billings
James R. Shaw
James Watt
Edgar B. Johnwick
Lawrence W. Brown
Francis J. Weber
Thomas R. Dawber
Theodore F. Hilbish
Michael L. Furcolow
George E. Tooley, Jr.
Robert L. Zobel
Thomas F. Crahan
Raymond F. Kaiser
Glenn S. Usher
James V. Lowry
Harald M. Graning
Karl Habel
Francis T. Zinn
Robert T. Hewitt
Robert R. Smith
Murray A. Diamond
Max R. Kiesselbach
Weldon A. Williamson
Robert D. Wright
Joseph S. Spoto
Aaron W. Christensen
John P. Turner
Waldron M. Sennott
Benjamin Highman
Curtis G. Southard
Daniel J. Daley
James J. Griffitts
John B. Vander
Albert L. Chapman
George K. Massengill
Michael B. Shimkin
Lloyd S. Rolufs
Dorland J. Davis
Joseph C. Sturgell
Robert A. Hingson
Robert L. Griffith
Kenneth W. Chapman
James K. Shafer
Benno K. Milmore
John D. Porterfield
John T. Wright
Benjamin Wolfman
Allen B. Eschenbrenner
Ralph W. McComas
William J. Brown
Louis Jacobs
Bryan A. Dawber
Carl L. Larson
James A. Smith
Glen E. Ogden
George F. Ellinger
David B. Wilson
John F. Oesterle
James L. Southworth
Joe M. Chisolm
Clarence L. Hebert
Leslie W. Knott
Robert J. Anderson
William H. Stimson
William S. Baum
Albert N. Sarwold
William G. Budington
Kenneth M. Endicott
Samuel S. Spicer
James B. Donaldson
Jesse D. Harris
Malcolm J. Ford
Donald W. McNaughton
Edwin N. Hesbacher
James A. Finger
Robert Lincoln Smith
George E. Parkhurst
Arnold B. Kurlander
Stanley E. Krumbiegel
Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Emerson Y. Gledhill
Clarence B. Mayes
Mark E. Myers
Daniel MacKillop
Ray H. Vanderhook
William J. McAnally, Jr.
Nunzio J. Carrozzo
Carl Enna
W. Clark Cooper
Robert W. Biach
Clarence Kooiker
Harold J. Magnuson
Jack C. Haldeman
Walter S. Mozden
Paul C. Campbell, Jr.
David E. Price
Charles L. Williams, Jr.
Charles C. Shepard
James L. Baker
Wayne W. Carpenter
Selwyn H. Drummond
Timothy J. Haley
Michael J. Clarke
Linden E. Johnson
James M. Hundley
Russell I. Pierce
Luther L. Terry

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948

Richard H. Linn
Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.
Leland C. Burrill
Warfield Garson
Willie G. Simpson
Keith F. Farr
Norman C. Morgan
Robert E. Staff
John W. Smillie.
Sidney Krohn
William P. Ramey
Leo J. Gehrig
Robert Leslie Smith
Arthur E. Mikli
Stuart H. Nartel
David S. Citron
Leonard T. Kurland
Robert B. Shelby
Carl A. Boswell
William A. Himmelsbach
Thomas A. Burch
John G. Robinson
Andrew L. Hoekstra
Gordon B. Wheeler
Alan D. Miller
Charles L. A. Wehr
Louis B. Thomas
Leon T. Atlas
Harry E. Halden III
Martin M. Cummings
Robert B. Dorsen
John C. Wyre III
Albert V. Myatt
Frederic D. Regan
Gove Hambidge, Jr.
Lewis Francis
Kirkland C. Brace
Hans R. Huessy
Terrell O. Carver
Milton J. Miller
John H. Miller
Elroy G. Burgwald
Carl R. Reed
Carroll D. Savage
John P. Lombardi
Vincent E. Price
Frederick G. Germugh, Jr.
Daniel Shapiro
Robert H. Dysinger
Robert B. Neu
John J. Antel
Heinz R. Weisheit
Roy P. Lindgren
Edmund V. Cowdry, Jr.
Gleb A. Nedzel
Alton Meister
Clyde H. Dabbs, Jr.
Robert S. Weinhaus
W. Burton Haley
Ralph T. Behling
Marion P. Graham
LaVere G. White
Lindsay K. Bishop
Howard W. Halfman
Robert E. Greenfield, Jr.
Eugene A. Vaccaro
Clarence A. Velat
James R. Green
Maurice W. Peterson
Charles C. Griffin, Jr.
Robert D. Dooley
John S. McMillin
Kenneth W. Horne
Robert M. Farrier
Stuart M. Sessoms
James B. Dukes
Francis P. Nicholson
Robert A. Mattingly, Jr.
Robert C. Rodger
Luther E. Smith
Joseph Leighton
Sheldon Dray
Donald Harting
Cornelius J. O'Donovan
C. Brooks Fry, Jr.
Robert E. Westfall
M. Lawrence Brockmyer
Donn G. Mosser
Henry D. Smith
Robert P. Ralls
Henry C. Savage
A. McChesney Evans
John L. Lightburn
Virgil Hanson
Raymond N. Brown
Raymond G. Halvorson

To be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948

David Cooper
Fritz R. Jackson
John A. Hammer
James F. Lewis

Thomas L. Hagan	Leonard R. Eisenhouser
Ray P. Breaux	Mark E. Bowers
James S. Miller	Joseph J. Dunlay
Gordon G. Braendle	Walter J. Pelton
John M. Francis	Robert H. Moore
Charles B. Galt	Frank E. Law
Robert A. Scroggie	
Leland E. Weyer	

To be dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948

Charles H. Wright, Jr.	Clovis E. Martin
Howard J. Woodbridge	Donald J. Galagan
Francis A. Arnold, Jr.	Joseph E. Unsworth
William W. Calhoun, Jr.	James O. Blythe, Jr.
	Fred D. Lewis, Jr.
George E. Waterman	Francis J. Walters
William C. Neaf	Vernon J. Forney
Joseph G. Yount	

To be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948

Richard P. French
Joseph W. Fridl
Charles P. White

To be senior sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel) effective July 1, 1948

Ellis S. Tisdale	James H. Le Van
Omar C. Hopkins	Franz J. Maier
Vincent B. Lamoureux	Maurice LeBosquet, Jr.

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948

Walter N. Dashiell	Ralph Porges
Mark D. Hollis	James G. Terrill, Jr.
Frank E. DeMartini	Richard T. Page
Vernon G. MacKenzie	John S. Wiley
Gordon E. McCallum	August T. Rossano, Jr.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948

William W. Payne
Frank A. Butrico
Henry J. L. Rechen

To be engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948

Joseph E. Flanagan, Jr.
Lucian E. Renes

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948

Donald E. Wenschhof
Robert E. Jones
Henry L. Verhulst

To be senior scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948

Heinz Specht
G. Robert Coatney

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective July 1, 1948

Anne K. Buck	Jennie H. Rakich
Mary F. Callan	Janine A. Dziejowski
Dorothy L. Connors	Anne Woudema
Rita A. Arzt	C. Vistula Lancaster
Vivian L. Gibson	Virginia L. Roberts
Roberta C. Brave	Ruth I. Webb
Margaret M. Cahalan	Alice M. Driscoll
Mildred K. McDermott	Nelle F. McCarthy
Mary B. Krause	Elaine Felt
Mary C. Larkin	Pauline M. Gronas
Emilie S. Wilson	Ann M. Zidzik
Mary E. Evans	Elsie M. Pinkham
Florence J. Ullman	

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Ted Bauer, Benton.
Winifred Hughes, Broughton.
Joseph J. Smaron, Posen.

INDIANA

John Edgar Sachs, Evansville.
Lawrence S. Miller, Griffith.

IOWA

Baird Jennings Okey, Dayton.
Harold A. Lofgreen, Montezuma.
Wilda Stephenson, Packwood.

KENTUCKY

Orland C. Seeley, Corbin.

LOUISIANA

Bernard Buras, Buras.

MARYLAND

Patrick J. Byrne, Berwyn.
Donald N. Canada, Glen Echo.
William Paul Graham, Mardela Springs.
Ruby C. Williams, Prince Frederick.
Dorothy M. Phillips, Shady Side.

MASSACHUSETTS

Grace S. Whippee, Barre.
Lawrence J. O'Brien, East Bridgewater.
Daniel G. Dowd, North Amherst.

MICHIGAN

Edward J. Murphy, Kawkawlin.
August M. Huotari, Mass.
Emanuel W. Rupprecht, Reese.
Glenn W. Herzog, Romulus.
Robert M. Engemann, Rothbury.
Max P. Frederick, Sandusky.
August L. Babel, Traverse City.
Henry A. Gready, Walled Lake.
Frank M. Forteika, Wellston.

MINNESOTA

Joe W. Cain, Alpha.
Henning O. Mickelson, Carson Lake.
Harold V. Nelson, Clitherall.
Frank A. Heidemann, Courtland.
Elmer H. Haugland, Hazel Run.
Orville L. Babl, Holloway.
Arthur M. Eykyn, Lamberton.
Edward J. Bach, Lismore.
Helene A. Ingstad, Marcell.
Joseph W. Henning, Miltona.
Lawrence H. Wegner, Raymond.
Leo L. Panneck, Taunton.

MISSISSIPPI

Edward M. Commander, Ackerman.
Conway F. Dickey, Alligator.
Marvin C. Miller, Blue Springs.
Josephine R. Brown, Bolton.
John H. Henderson, Carthage.
Charles D. Bragg, Crawford.
Jennie S. Catching, Georgetown.
James H. Boyette, Goodman.
Odessa C. Cockerham, Gunnison.
Dickson L. Hall, Hollandale.
Claude W. Johnson, Kilmichael.
Valley L. Carpenter, Morgan City.
William H. Baldwin, Natchez.
Kay Eakin, Pattison.
Barney W. Burnett, Rienzi.
Norman Terrence Poore, Jr., Tunica.
Nola W. Long, Whitfield.

MONTANA

Alfred E. Heikkila, Roberts.
Winnie M. Rife, Roy.

NEW JERSEY

John P. Leahy, Sea Girt.

NEW MEXICO

Calixto Garcia, Central.
Donna A. Klepper, Jal.

NEW YORK

Doris D. Smith, Hemlock.
Helen M. Woodin, Poughquag.
Sister M. Leontine, Stella Niagara.

NORTH CAROLINA

John Lynn Jones, Clarkton.
Charles L. Ray, Flat Rock.
Thomas E. Bivins, Hillsboro.
Grady R. Hemphill, Julian.
Robert R. Kessinger, Nags Head.
John L. Kearns, Seagrove.

OREGON

Thomas O. Palmer, Albany.

TENNESSEE

George W. Sexton, Dover.
Jefferson C. Roberts, Jr., Hilham.
Harvey H. Bozeman, Mascot.
Paul F. Brooks, Portland.
Y. Z. Pate, Rutherford.
Vernon A. Poole, Savannah.

VERMONT

Susie M. Eastman, East Hardwick.
Andrew P. Morrison, Springfield.

VIRGINIA

A. Biedler Heltzel, Harrisonburg.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of First Lt. Vincent William Bezich and other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 14, 1948, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of First Lt. Vincent William Bezich on page 8395 and ending with the name of First Lt. Frances Mildred Davison on page 8403.

IN THE AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE OF SECOND LIEUTENANT, WITH DATES OF RANK TO BE DETERMINED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Harry M. Berry	Phillip E. Hoffge
Tommy F. Butler	Thomas M. Knoles III
John D. Cowgill	John R. Newton, Jr.
Raymond Goss, Jr.	Richard N. Rusk

IN THE NAVY

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE NAVY IN THE GRADE HEREINAFTER STATED, AND TO CORRECT THE SPELLING OF THE NAME AS PREVIOUSLY NOMINATED AND CONFIRMED

Lieutenant

Werner, Sherwood H.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE NAVY IN THE GRADE HEREINAFTER STATED

Lieutenant

Gardiner, Charles V.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Francis J. McQuillen	Ben Z. Redfield
Luther S. Moore	Clifford H. Shuey
Harry S. Leon	Edward J. Dillon
Charles J. Schlapkohl	

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Ross S. Mickey	Henry Aplington II
Robert G. Owens, Jr.	Francis X. Beamer
Homer Sterling	George F. Waters, Jr.
Kenneth E. Martin	Richard I. Moss
John A. White	Lloyd G. Coutts

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Bennet G. Powers.
Martin E. W. Oelrich.
Jack F. McCollum.

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Ralph E. Britt	Donald V. Anderson
Delmar M. Persinger	Donald T. Rohrabacher
James B. Carpenter, Jr.	
John P. Lanigan	George H. Hazel
Bernard McShane	Henry W. Hise
Maurice H. Clarke	Robert Floeck
Robert A. McCabe	Frank S. Krasniewicz
Richard J. Morrisey	Griffith B. Doyle
Jack R. Munday	John S. Reamy
Frank C. Thomas	Alton P. Trapnell

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Austin O. DeVol, Jr.	Woodrow B. Lewis
Jack W. Temple	Joseph A. Mitchell
Herbert A. Nelson	Tolbert T. Gentry
Warren R. Young	Neil Dimond
Sylvestus W. Holtzclawe	Henry D. Menzies
	Malcom C. Hagan
Anton N. Fassino	George G. Abadie
Elery G. Poppe	John L. Shearer
Walter P. Dean	George C. Henshaw
Robert G. Hayton	Walter L. Redmond
Ardell Ebel	Robert H. Barrow
William C. Doty, Jr.	Alvin J. Jensen

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Winslow E. Lewis	John K. Aller
Joseph S. Hall	Francis J. Field
Robert H. Piehl	Robert W. Barnes
Byron G. Genung	Jonee L. Helms
Cleon E. Nesbitt	Ermine L. Meeker
Frank R. DeNormandie	Ollie B. Porter
James C. Barr	Ernest C. Hargett
John A. Waters	James B. Oliver, Jr.
Raymond O. Ball	Allen B. Clark

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Harold E. Haught
Robert W. Wells

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Francis Finnegan, O. P., St. Dominic's Catholic Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most just and merciful God, look down with favor upon these Thy lawmakers. Enlighten their minds and strengthen their wills, that they may, in all times and places, do good and avoid evil, that they may always be in conformity with Thine adorable will. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2759. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at Bunker Hill, Ill.; and

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta; and

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. National Archives.
6. Federal Security Agency.
7. Interstate Commerce Commission.
8. Veterans' Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) entitled "An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2825) entitled "An act to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CONNALLY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that he will receive requests for extension of remarks only. No 1-minute speeches.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper items.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 10 minutes, after any other special orders which may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 114]

Bell	Clark	Dirksen
Boykin	Curtis	Domengeaux
Brown, Ohio	Dawson, Ill.	Douglas
Carroll	Dingell	Eberharter
Fenton	King	Scoblick
Fuller	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Grant, Ala.	Ludlow	Smathers
Gwinn, N. Y.	Lusk	Smith, Maine
Harness, Ind.	Macy	Stigler
Harris	Meade, Md.	Stockman
Hartley	Mitchell	Teague
Havenner	Morrison	Thomas, N. J.
Hébert	Norton	Welch
Hendricks	O'Toole	West
Herter	Peden	Whitaker
Hinshaw	Regan	Wilson, Ind.
Jenkins, Ohio	Rivers	Wood
Johnson, Okla.	Robertson	
Johnson, Tex.	Sadowski	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the consideration of the veto message on the bill S. 110.

The question is, Will the House on reconsideration agree to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is recognized.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been debated on several occasions in the House. It is an issue with which everyone is familiar. I do not think any good purpose would be served by having extended debate on the matter.

Preliminary to that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put that request later.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I object. I demand the regular order.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the consent request.

The SPEAKER. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 297, nays 102, answered "present" 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—297

Abbitt	Blackney	Chapman
Allen, Calif.	Bland	Chelf
Allen, Ill.	Boggs, Del.	Chenoweth
Allen, La.	Boggs, La.	Chiperfield
Andersen, H. Carl	Bolton	Church
	Boykin	Clark
Anderson, Calif.	Bradley	Clason
Andresen, August H.	Bramblett	Clevenger
	Brehm	Clippinger
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Coffin
Andrews, N. Y.	Brophy	Cole, Kans.
Angell	Buck	Cole, Mo.
Arends	Buckley	Cole, N. Y.
Arnold	Buffett	Cooper
Auchincloss	Bulwinkle	Corbett
Bakewell	Burke	Cotton
Banta	Burleson	Coudert
Barrett	Busbey	Courtney
Bates, Mass.	Butler	Cravens
Battle	Byrnes, Wis.	Crawford
Beall	Canfield	Crow
Bender	Carson	Cunningham
Bennett, Mich.	Case, N. J.	Curtis
Bennett, Mo.	Case, S. Dak.	Dague
Bishop	Chadwick	Davis, Tenn.

Davis, Wis.	Jensen	Plumley
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Calif.	Potter
Devitt	Johnson, Ill.	Potts
D'Ewart	Johnson, Ind.	Price, Fla.
Dirksen	Jones, N. C.	Priest
Dolliver	Jones, Wash.	Rains
Domengeaux	Jonkman	Ramey
Dondero	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Donohue	Kean	Reed, N. Y.
Doughton	Kearney	Rees
Eaton	Kearns	Reeves
Elliott	Keating	Rich
Ellis	Keefe	Richlman
Ellsworth	Keogh	Riley
Elsaesser	Kerr	Rizley
Elston	Kersten, Wis.	Rockwell
Engel, Mich.	Kilburn	Rogers, Fla.
Engle, Calif.	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Fallon	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Fellows	Landis	Ross
Fenton	Larcade	Russell
Fisher	Latham	Sadlak
Fletcher	Lea	St. George
Foote	LeCompte	Sanborn
Fuller	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Fulton	Lemke	Sasscer
Gallagher	Lewis, Ky.	Schwabe, Mo.
Gamble	Lewis, Ohio	Schwabe, Okla.
Garmatz	Lichtenwalter	Scoblick
Gary	Lodge	Scott, Hardie
Gathings	Love	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gavin	Lucas	Scrivner
Gearhart	Lusk	Seely-Brown
Gillette	McConnell	Shafer
Gillie	McCowen	Short
Goff	McCulloch	Sikes
Goodwin	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Gore	McDowell	Simpson, Pa.
Graham	McGarvey	Smathers
Grant, Ala.	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Grant, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Gregory	Mack	Smith, Va.
Griffiths	MacKinnon	Smith, Wis.
Gross	Maloney	Snyder
Gwinn, N. Y.	Manasco	Stanley
Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Hagen	Mason	Stevenson
Hale	Mathews	Stratton
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meade, Ky.	Sundstrom
Hall, Leonard W.	Merrow	Taber
Halleck	Meyer	Talle
Hand	Michener	Taylor
Hardy	Miller, Conn.	Teague
Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Md.	Thompson
Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.	Tibbott
Harrison	Mills	Tollefson
Harvey	Mitchell	Towe
Hays	Morrison	Twyman
Hébert	Morton	Vail
Hedrick	Muhlenberg	Van Zandt
Heselton	Mundt	Vorys
Hess	Murray, Tenn.	Vursell
Hill	Murray, Wis.	Wadsworth
Hinshaw	Nicholson	Walter
Hoeven	Nixon	Weichel
Hoffman	Nodar	Whitaker
Holmes	Norblad	Whittington
Hope	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Horan	O'Konski	Wilson, Tex.
Jackson, Calif.	Passman	Wolcott
Jenison	Patterson	Wolverton
Jenkins, Ohio	Peterson	Woodruff
Jenkins, Pa.	Philbin	Worley
Jennings	Phillips, Calif.	Youngblood
	Phillips, Tenn.	
	Ploeser	

NAYS—102

Abernethy	Douglas	Jones, Ala.
Albert	Durham	Karsten, Mo.
Barden	Eberharter	Kee
Bates, Ky.	Evins	Kefauver
Beckworth	Feighan	Kelley
Bloom	Fernandez	Kennedy
Bonner	Flannagan	Kilday
Brown, Ga.	Fogarty	King
Bryson	Folger	Kirwan
Buchanan	Forand	Klein
Byrne, N. Y.	Gordon	Lanham
Camp	Gorski	Lesinski
Cannon	Gossett	Lyle
Carroll	Granger	McMillan, S. C.
Celler	Hart	Madden
Colmer	Havenner	Mahon
Combs	Heffernan	Mansfield
Cooley	Hobbs	Marcantonio
Crosser	Holifield	Miller, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Huber	Monroney
Dawson, Ill.	Hull	Morgan
Deane	Isacson	Morris
Delaney	Jackson, Wash.	Multer
Dingell	Jarman	Murdock
Dorn	Javits	Norton
O'Brien	Preston	Spence
O'Hara	Price, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Pace	Rankin	Trimble
Patman	Redden	Vinson
Pfeifer	Richards	Wheeler
Pickett	Rooney	Whitten
Poage	Sabath	Williams
Poulson	Sheppard	Winstead
Powell	Somers	Wood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cox

NOT VOTING—30

Bell	Ludlow	Rivers
Blatnik	Lynch	Robertson
Brown, Ohio	McCormack	Sadowski
Harris	McMahon	Smith, Maine
Hartley	Macy	Stigler
Hendricks	Meade, Md.	Stockman
Herter	O'Toole	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	Welch
Johnson, Tex.	Rayburn	West
Lane	Regan	Wilson, Ind.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Harris.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Macy with Mr. West.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Sadowski.

Mr. FERNANDEZ changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WHITAKER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER CERTAIN MOTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of this week it shall be in order for the Speaker at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII; that it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess; and that it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause (2) (b), rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby suspended during the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Indiana was good enough this morning to state to me generally, and I think rather fully, the bills that the Speaker would in all probability recognize for suspension. They are all agreeable to me except one. Since the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, and the high-handed manner in which that committee acted in not allowing a Member of the minority, as I understand, to even make a motion or say anything, I could not agree to this request, if it involves a bill of the far-reaching significance as the so-called housing bill.

If that is to come in the list I shall be constrained to object, and if I did not there would be another who would.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, a resolution, as the gentleman knows, which can be called up; and I propose to call it up if this request is objected to. If that course becomes necessary, then of necessity we will say something about the adoption of the resolution; but I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Texas that in 1938 when he was then the majority leader, occupying the position I now hold, an identical resolution was presented. The question arose as to what legislation might be brought out. At that time the so-called reorganization bill was under consideration and there was a question as to whether or not that kind of measure should be considered under suspension. In response to a request from the then minority leader, the now eminent Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], as to what the program might be, the gentleman from Texas, being then the majority leader, replied:

I am not ready to answer right now as to the full program for the remainder of the session, I may say very candidly to the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. That was a very frank statement, the kind the gentleman from Texas always makes, and I am certain that if I had named in the list as highly controversial a matter as the so-called housing bill, that the then minority leader, now Speaker, would have pursued the course I am pursuing at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know about that, but I am sure the gentleman from Texas knows that there are outstanding now 10 to 12 rules, most of them on very important questions that we are trying to clear by Saturday night. Obviously, resort to suspension must be had.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the gentleman is correct about that, and I wish to say to him also that it is my desire very much for a sine die adjournment on Saturday or earlier because I always go on the theory that it is a good thing for the country to adjourn a Republican Congress at any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SUSPENSIONS AND RECESSES MADE IN ORDER FOR WEEK

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 685 making in order motions to suspend the rules, motions for a recess, and the consideration of reports from the Committee on Rules, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of this week it shall be in order for the Speaker

at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII; it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess, and said motion is hereby made of the highest privilege; and it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of this week to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause (2) (b), rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby suspended during the balance of this week.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York to submit a request.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it require a two-thirds vote to pass this resolution?

The SPEAKER. No; a majority vote is all that is required.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 6705, the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bills H. R. 5888 and S. 418 may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that this matter might have been disposed of by unanimous consent. However, I cannot quarrel with the attitude of the gentleman from Texas in his objection to the unanimous-consent request. Since that objection has been made, there is no alternative except to proceed with debate on this resolution.

The gentleman from Texas spoke of one piece of legislation. I may suggest to the House that there are a number of rules pending from the Rules Committee dealing with matters of considerable importance, such as the fuel-policy matter from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a rule to amend the rules of the House in regard to striking out remarks from the RECORD, the Virgin Islands Corporation bill, revision of the Internal Revenue Code, the matter relating to motor carriers' claims, the matter of the extension of the terms of the Atomic Energy Commission, the bill pertaining to extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the matter of pay raise for postal employees and postage rate increases, and a bill to increase Federal salaries generally, and the air parcel-post bill.

There are also many other matters of considerable consequence on which rules have not been granted that many Members have urged upon me as important that action be taken on them as expeditiously as possible.

There are some bills from the Veterans' Affairs Committee which fall in that category, and there are some bills from the Foreign Affairs Committee that also come within that category. There are a number of bills from the Armed Services Committee, one of them having to do with the allowance and longevity pay for service in the academies, and another having to do with a revolving fund for the purchase of cotton and wool fibers for export to Japan, about which many Members have spoken to me.

Mr. SHORT. I hope the distinguished leader will not overlook the Russell bill that would give us some lead, zinc, and manganese. That is most essential.

Mr. HALLECK. That is another matter in which many Members are interested.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all understand that every effort is being made to adjourn the Congress by Saturday night or earlier. I cannot quite agree with the reasons expressed by the gentleman from Texas for that adjournment, because this has been a very, very good Congress. When we get through with the program, as we expect to complete it this week, I am sure the people generally throughout the country will applaud us for what we have accomplished.

Under the rules of the House, if an adjournment resolution were passed now providing for adjournment on Saturday, suspensions would be in order for the rest of the week. I do not know how many of these matters may be called under rules or may be called under suspension of the rules. But, as to that, certainly at the moment no one could expect me to make a definite determination. The whole effort here is to expedite the business of the House on a fair basis.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand, the rule only provides for this week.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. If Congress should go over another week, then it would not apply to next week.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. I might say to the gentleman from Mississippi that that is a restriction that has not heretofore been found in similar resolutions that you people on that side of the aisle used when you were in the majority and had the primary responsibility for the program.

I think probably the best argument that could be made for this resolution was made in 1938 when a similar resolution was offered and presented by the then chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Connor. In that presentation, Mr. O'Connor said:

Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution brought in toward the close of a session of Congress.

Its purpose is to expedite the business of the House. It provides that suspensions shall be in order on any day instead of on the first and third Mondays or during the last 6 days of the session. It has been impossible for some years to fix those last 6 days of a session, because the adjournment resolution usually comes in an hour or two before the actual adjournment.

The resolution also provides for recesses of the House rather than adjournment. The chief purpose this serves is to save, in the morning, the reading of a long Journal of the previous day's proceedings. Unfortunately, it also dispenses with the morning prayer.

The third purpose the resolution serves is to permit rules to be brought up on the same day they are reported rather than lying over for 1 day.

These provisions are all directed toward expediting the business of the Congress so we may reach that greatest of national holidays, the day Congress adjourns.

The present Speaker of the House was the minority leader, and he was trying to be fair about it, as we always were in those days and as you gentlemen are now. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said:

This resolution is generally reported when we are about to adjourn. The House, I am sure, would like to have some assurance upon the point before we grant this additional power to the Speaker and to the leadership. Can the gentleman from New York tell us whether we are going to adjourn this week, or next week, a month from now, or 2 months from now?

In substance the answer of the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Connor, was that he could not tell them very much about it.

Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] raised the question as to whether or not they might be given a little information as to what major legislation was to be considered before adjournment, and the answer of the gentleman from New York was:

I think the gentleman knows that, if he reads the daily press.

I have endeavored to be a little more helpful than that. Yesterday and today I outlined a number of possible suspensions that might be called. Of course, I do not know exactly why the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], being a newspaper man himself, said this, but he said:

We do not believe all we read in the newspapers.

Then I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] got into the discussion, too. But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] yielded himself 5 minutes, and he said this:

> Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the gentleman from New York does not seem to have very much information as to the future legislative situation. I had hoped we might get some information, because we ought to have it before adopting this important resolution. I am going to pause to see if the majority leader might not want to take the House into his confidence as to what we might expect.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] then replied:

> I will after tomorrow.

Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said:

> Why not now?

And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] said:

> I am not ready to answer right now as to the full program during the remainder of the session, I may say very candidly to the gentleman.

Of course, that was a candid statement. I think that could not be misunderstood.

Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], recognizing the position in which he found himself, said:

> I am sorry Members of the House cannot get information before we read it in the newspapers and before passing a resolution which is going to give tremendous power to the House administration; but, of course, you on that side have merely a 4-to-1 majority and can do what you wish. In all fairness, though, the House should have this information before a resolution of this sort is called up.

Whereupon, after a rather perfunctory debate, the question was put, and on a division, which did not even go to a roll call, the resolution was adopted.

All I am pointing out is that there is nothing new in this procedure. It is well established. By this resolution we seek only to expedite the consideration of business before us. There are a number of measures here in which every Member has a great interest. The whole country has an interest in them. We can move forward to the accomplishment of the program if we follow the practice that has heretofore been followed and adopt this resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the real issue here is the housing bill. Let there be no deception about that fact. The real issue involved in the consideration of this resolution today is whether or not Congress is going to pass the housing bill, because if this resolution is adopted there will be no housing legislation, and I make that prediction. If the House leadership wanted to and if they stated they would do so, they could bring up the bill reported out of the committee, which is the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, under a suspension. They could have done that last Monday, the last suspension day, and they could do it now if they wanted to. But we know that this resolution is designed to bring up the meaningless Wolcott bill, the purpose of which is to prevent the passage of decent housing legislation by Congress before adjournment. The intention is to pass the bill under suspension, if they can, and send it over to the other House, with that bill over there and with the Senate bill over here. I predict that they will not even move or take steps to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert this bill, and then send it to conference.

The resolution under consideration today is entirely different from the resolutions in the past. We never were in this predicament where there were so many big or major measures pending. The ordinary resolution permitting the Speaker to recognize for suspensions is entirely different from the present situation. There are from 8 to 12 major pieces of legislation now pending, according to the statement of the majority leader. The intention is to bring them up under suspension of the rules, denying the opportunity of amendment in any one of those cases of major legislation, and taking away from the minority even its inherent right to a motion to recommit.

The gentleman from Indiana proceeded upon the theory that what was done in 1938 was wrong. Certainly our beloved Speaker now at that time as minority leader took the position that it was wrong. Because it was wrong then it is claimed that it is all right for the Republican leadership to do something wrong now. I never knew that two wrongs made one right, assuming that the contention of the gentleman from Indiana that it was wrong in 1938 is correct. But the situation in 1938 was entirely different from what it is today. There were not a dozen pieces of major legislation waiting to be acted upon under suspension of the rules.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Of course we have had the resistance of the Executive, and we have had all of these vetoes which have delayed the work of the Congress. The legislation that this Congress has passed has been so meritorious that you voted to override the veto of a President who is the leader of your own political party.

Mr. McCORMACK. If you had not put up bum legislation to the President, you would not have had these vetoes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana says that this is a very good Congress. That is a matter of judgment. I respect my friend's right to think so. We have a perfect right to our own opinion. There has been a 40-percent increase in the cost of living to the people of America during the past 2 years, and nothing has been done by the Congress and nothing is going to be done. Still he says that it is a very good Congress. There are lobbies of all kinds operating here, not only through the corridors, but actually in committee rooms. A record that supports everything that President Truman has been saying has been made, not only during the Congress, but during the present week by the Republican Party in control of this body. Only yesterday a very distinguished Republican outside of this body criticized the very action that was taken on the housing bill. What is the housing situation? What has happened? The other body passed a bill. It went to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. Against the efforts of the Republican leadership, a bill was reported out substantially the same as the bill passed by the other body. Then it went to the Committee on Rules. We know what happened. It comes back this morning after being introduced yesterday in committee stripped of any important features. They met, and at 2 minutes past 10 the bill was reported out. The chairman said, "Put down on the record that it was at 9:59." Not a Democrat was permitted to offer a motion to amend the bill. That is what happened only this morning. This resolution is designed primarily to consider the housing bill under suspension of the rules so that amendments will not be permitted and a motion to recommit cannot be made.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will this procedure under suspension of the rules also make in order matters which would normally be subject to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means—in other words, you have no way of challenging a point of order against the housing bill which incorporates a great tax advantage for the rich?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is absolutely correct. Nothing can be done under the procedure on suspension of the rules. Yet the gentleman from Indiana says that this is a very, very good Congress.

President Truman had a little something to say about that the other day at Los Angeles; and he made a fair statement. I quote:

> I made this trip to tell you the facts. If I am wrong, you have a chance to attend to me later on. If I am not wrong, you ought to attend to somebody else.

That is fair. That "somebody else" is the Republican Party.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, he challenged the passage of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor bill, for which 108 Democrats voted and against which 67 Democrats voted. I wonder if he was slapping some of the Members on your side of the aisle.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the gentleman is relying on that as justification for the Republican vote, is he? Well, the gentleman cannot get away with that.

How many Republicans voted for the Taft-Hartley bill?

Mr. HALLECK. All but 11.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. All but 11. So the gentleman proceeds upon the theory that because a number of Democrats

voted for it he is going to absolve the Republicans from their wrongdoing in voting for legislation that is repressive of and punitive to labor.

Now, we have the issue presented here, the issue that the people of the country will know that dictatorial exercise of the rules is being made in order to prevent Members of Congress from having an opportunity to pass upon one of the most important bills that has come before any Congress, and to pass upon it under the rules of the House. If you brought in a closed rule, giving us a motion to recommit, at least you would be preserving the right of the minority to make its record. That is the purpose of a motion to recommit, to enable the minority to make its record before the country, under its right to make a motion to recommit.

So this resolution in relation to the housing bill presents to the people of the country, more pointedly than anything could do, the situation that exists and that this Republican-controlled Congress has been nothing but an against-the-people Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am unwilling to make a matter of party politics out of this resolution.

On yesterday, the resolution came before the Rules Committee on application for a rule and the committee very promptly granted it. It did so because it recognized that the resolution would expedite the consideration of pending matters. There is nothing new in it. It is what has been done in Congresses heretofore.

The point has been made that the purpose of the resolution is to avoid a record vote on the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who just yielded the floor, probably expresses the views of most Members on this side of the aisle but not for all. That entire question was submitted to the Rules Committee on yesterday and the day before and it was made perfectly clear and perfectly plain that the adoption of that bill would commit this country to socialized housing forevermore.

The Wolcott bill, which has been referred to and which it is said will be called up in the event the pending resolution is adopted, is the old bill stripped of the public-housing features in the original Taft bill and I am assured that it does more for veterans than the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which puts emphasis on public housing rather than housing for veterans.

As far as I am concerned, my sense of obligation to myself and to my country compels me to make clear the position that I take on that proposed legislation. I am opposed to committing this country to socialized housing, and that is what you do if you take that bill.

Let me make this statement: If the pending resolution is voted down, the advocates of the Wolcott bill, the new bill to which reference was made, can still bring that question before the House, because they can go to the Rules Committee now and get a rule and the bill could be called up tomorrow under the rule.

It is true that with a procedure of that kind a record might not be obtained as to how Members of this House stand on the question of socialized housing, but so far I have no hesitation in making clear my position and I hope all Members on this side who have appealed to me as a member of the Rules Committe to hold that bill in the committee would feel the same way about it, and if presented with the issue they will be courageous enough to declare their position on this question.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not also that stricken out of that bill is the rediscount feature on GI loans and also aid for the building of farm homes?

Mr. COX. I just have this to say on the question of housing: I am interested in providing housing for veterans. There is pending in the House the Rogers bill, the veterans' homestead bill, which bill would be acceptable to me and which I would like to see adopted. I will go as far as any others in doing something for the veterans. They have an especial claim upon the country to the satisfying of which we should give our attention. Certainly providing housing for them, to which nobody objects, should not be conditioned upon doing something that is opposed by a majority of the membership of this House at the same time. The two questions should be divided.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very sincerely to agree with my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], who has just discussed in some detail the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. That bill has been the subject of discussion in the press, on the radio, and elsewhere for many years, and I think the House of Representatives should know just exactly what is transpiring in the Committee on Banking and Currency, insofar as any effort is being made in that committee to solve the most pressing social problem which is facing this Nation today from the standpoint of the veterans and from the standpoint of our civilian population. The House shall know how inadequately we have faced that issue.

The bill that was reported out by the House committee this morning after the House was in session strips the proposed legislation not only of public housing but strips it of every provision for doing a single solitary thing about the slums in the cities. It strips the bill of every provision to aid the veterans, to aid the farmer, and to aid the low-income groups. We had a veterans' homestead provision incorporating the principles of the Veterans' Homestead Act written into this legislation. That is stricken.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am sorry, I have but a few minutes.

Not even sections dealing with certain matters that should be noncontroversial such as housing research are left in the bill. Can anyone tell me why any reasonable man who knows that there are 3,000,000 veterans living doubled up—that there are 2,000,000 others living in single rooms and rooming houses—should object to a research program on the technique of housing construction so that we can improve our methods?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I refuse to yield.

It has been argued that this is socialism. Mr. Speaker, I say that if this is socialism, then the Socialists have made some of the most amazing converts of any party in the history of this Nation. Let me name some of them: Senator Taft, of Ohio; Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan; Governor Dewey, of New York; Governor Warren, of California. Are they Socialists? They favor the T-E-W bill. They are the principal Republican candidates for President.

Let me name a few others: The American Bar Association. Is that a Socialist organization? The organs that speak for the Protestant Churches in America, all divisions of the Protestant Church. Are the Protestant Churches embracing socialism? The organs which speak for the Catholic Church in America. Is the Catholic Church embracing socialism? The governors of this country almost unanimously have endorsed the general housing bill, and practically every mayor of every major city in the United States has endorsed it. So I say that if that be socialism, make the best of it. Of course it is not socialism. It is an honest attempt to solve a pressing problem.

And I may add that every major veterans' organization in America are proponents of the legislation: The AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the other agencies who speak for the men who fought to preserve this country have not, I am sure, adopted socialism, but they are for the T-E-W bill. And why are they for it? Because 15,000,000 young Americans went out to make it possible for you to sit here and debate in the American democratic tradition today.

Mr. DINGELL. One hundred and forty-nine Members signed a petition.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. One-hundred-forty-some-odd Members of this Congress have signed a discharge petition for this legislation. Have they embraced socialism? Mr. Speaker, I say to you with the greatest feeling of sincerity with which I have ever spoken on the floor of this House, that there has never been a measure that has more bipartisan support than the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, why does this legislation have this universal support? Because all over America, in the cities and in the rural areas, people who think about housing know that the major problem facing any family, aside from food and clothing, is a place in which to live. I say to you that the sorriest thing this Eightieth Congress is doing is playing politics with the veterans, with the people who are living in the slums of this country, sending out the message all over America that as this Congress closes its doors on Saturday night, while we have made a show, while we have tried to convince someone we have done something, and while we have brought up the bugaboo and the red herring of socialism, we have done nothing to solve the major social and economic problem facing this Nation.

I venture to say it will be a campaign issue and I hope it will be and I for one as a Democrat shall attempt to make it everywhere on every stump because it is the most important issue facing America. You can yell socialism from now until the time the sun sets next week but it will not alter one iota the fact that this Congress is doing nothing for housing except to satisfy the most greedy, the most selfish, lobby that we have ever seen operating in this body.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does not the gentleman believe the shortage of housing has done more to increase the rate of divorce and juvenile delinquency, and is today the greatest moral issue in this country?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the fact that all the religious institutions and organizations in America have endorsed this bill is evidence enough that slums and the housing shortage have contributed to the divorce rate, to juvenile delinquency and crime, and to the other evils our body politic is suffering from.

I wish there were some way we could bring before this House the measure the committee voted out 14 to 13, with every Democrat voting for it, and when you talk about socialism that means every Democrat and three members of the Republican Party have voted for socialism. I shall, therefore, vote against the pending resolution.

In conclusion I include an editorial from the New York Times of this morning:

HOUSING: A PARTY TEST

There is no more desperate and basic need in this country than that for housing. This need has been estimated by backers of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which passed the Senate by voice vote on April 22, at 1,500,000 dwelling units a year for the next 10 years. We owe these homes particularly to our veterans and to young people just coming of marriageable age. If we believe in the American home we have to believe in the living space that makes it possible.

The T-E-W bill tackled this problem from all sides, putting its major emphasis on encouragement to private industry, with low-interest loans and low-cost insurance. But Senator TAFT and his colleagues, who are certainly no Socialists, included a provision for the construction, during the next 5 years, of 500,000 low-rent public housing units. The whole cost of the program to the Federal taxpayer would be about $150,000,000 a year. If we don't owe our veterans and other young people this much help, what do our fine words about youth mean?

In the lower House it has begun to seem that they do not mean much to some Members. By a parliamentary technicality, the main T-E-W provisions were tacked to a bill by Representative WOLCOTT, of Michigan, who is no friend of public housing. Over Mr. WOLCOTT's stormy protests the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which he is chairman, reported the amended bill out by a vote of 14 to 13 a week ago. It then went to that cemetery of so many good bills, the Rules Committee.

Yesterday that committee, with its Republican chairman and majority, voted to table by 6 to 2. Thus, by its power to suppress the measure, it is in effect legislating, for the Banking Committee is now compelled to amend, wreck, or forget the housing bill. This abuse of power does not seem to us fair to our young married people or to the democratic system. We believe it is time the House Republican leaders, who soon will be asking for votes, saw the light. The Republicans will hardly dare go before the country without at least a pretense of housing legislation; many of them, like Senator TAFT and the present Senate majority, are willing to do all they can to meet the crisis.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

(Mr. COMBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I want to preface what I am going to say by saying that I would not intentionally injure the personal feelings of any Member of this House. I prize the friendships that I have on the other side of the aisle, as well as on this side, and appreciate the fine character of the men and women who compose the membership of this House. It seems to me that in recent days we have gotten into a sort of hysteria in which we forget some fundamentals. In our haste to adjourn we have invoked procedures and permitted ourselves to submit to procedures that could not be justified in any representative legislative body. It has been suggested that the limitation of time makes it necessary to consider bills under suspension of the rules, which, of course, will allow only 40 minutes of debate at most and permit of no amendments whatever. There is no reasonable excuse for this situation. In the first place, we have been in session for many months, during which time full consideration could have been given to such important legislation as housing, Federal employees' pay legislation, selective service, long-range farm legislation, and many others. In the second place, more than 6 months remain of the Eightieth Congress. Like the balance of you, I would like to go home—I have been there only once, and that for a period of 4 or 5 days, since January. But our duty is to consider and pass needed legislation and we should do that even though it requires us to remain here all summer and all the fall.

Now, with regard to the alleged housing bill reported out by the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning in lieu of the bill passed out by the same committee previously, but upon which the Rules Committee refused a rule. Let me say, in all kindness with reference to this new bill, that to call it a housing bill is a misnomer. It is nothing of the kind. The bill for which it is to be offered as a substitute contains provisions providing for the building of Federal housing, for slum clearance in our great cities and centers of congested population. That provision has been stricken out. It would not have meant so much down where I live in the wide open spaces but it would have meant a lot to the people of our great cities where vast areas of slums exist and to the people of low income who are forced to live two, three, and four families in miserable shacks. Many of those who live in them are ex-servicemen, their wives and children, who have no other place to go. This new bill condemns them to remain where they are. Oh yes, it holds out an offer of housing for them, but how? Free enterprise will come in in the form of some fellow or a syndicate with plenty of cash and build tenement houses. All semblance of rent controls will shortly expire. And for a period of 5 years, under the provisions of this bill, the owner of such tenements not only will be permitted to charge all the traffic will bear but it actually gives a tax rebate of 10 percent per year, over and above the tax bill already passed, on the profits derived. Yes, they will build their big housing projects which the ex-servicemen and others must occupy in this time of housing shortage, and then get a tax rebate over a period of 5 years in order that they may put more of the income extracted from the misery of these people into their pockets.

In the bill for which this was substituted are provisions to give the farm people of our country the benefit of FHA loans to build homes and improve their farms. That is stricken out by this bill. The Rules Committee refused to grant a rule because it is said such provisions are socialistic. Yet the bill merely would have extended to 7,000,000 farm people the same privileges of Government loans in building homes that city dwellers have enjoyed under FHA for 14 or 15 years. Incidentally, the House bill omitted, and I think properly, the provision for a grant of funds to certain persons of low income and merely extended loan privileges to farm people. The bill we are to consider under suspension of the rules denies the rural people of America these privileges.

Talk about farm people being socialistic. I learned as a boy on the farm and as county agricultural agent in the years gone by that farmers are the most independent-minded and individualistic of any group. The very fact that they are self-employed and control their own

farm operations, live at home and board at the same place, is conducive to the spirit of liberty and independence. The simple truth is that the farmers of America constitute one of the greatest bulwarks of free, independent Americanism in this country today. Yet you would brand them as socialist-minded because they want the provisions of the bill that have been scuttled. And by this bill you will refuse them a dime of help, in the form of a loan, to improve their own living conditions.

But the new bill not only does that—it also strikes out those provisions of the first bill which gave to the GI's the benefit of a secondary market through RFC for GI loans. Without such provision of a secondary market the farm GI's can get no benefit from the loan provisions of the GI bill. Why, the farm boys, ex-servicemen, who live in the region I represent have not been able to borrow a dime under the provisions of the GI bill to purchase land, build a home, or improve a farm. It was intended when the GI bill was passed that all ex-servicemen would share equally the benefits, but such has not been the case. Some of us have made repeated efforts in this House during the present Congress to have the rediscount provision for farm GI's restored. During consideration of an amendment, which I offered a few weeks ago to the RFC extension bill, which would have restored the rediscount privileges it was promised by the chairman of the committee in opposing my amendment that this would be taken care of in the bill which has now been scuttled. It is omitted completely from the new bill and a phony provision inserted which provides only for certain secondary mortgage privileges which, in fact, mean nothing in actual practice.

Do you want to support such a bill? Listen. I could not support a bill which does such rank injustice to people who are forced to live in slums, to the farm people, and to the ex-servicemen of our Nation.

But in addition to that, I will not support it because of the means that have been used to scuttle a real housing bill and bring this thing before us as a substitute. I may say in this connection that the way the housing bill has been scuttled is but the climax of a series of behind-the-scenes maneuvers by which one important committee after another of the House has been completely ignored by the refusing of rules on important bills or bypassed through the usurpation of their prerogatives by the Appropriations Committee. In some instances, as in the case of the housing bill, some bills meeting the wishes of the controlling group have been forced out of committee under what amounted to an ultimatum that it was this or nothing. The other day when an article appeared in the newspapers indicating that three Members of the majority party had had the courage to defy the ultimatum and vote their convictions I think it sent a thrill throughout America. It was a sort of reassurance to millions of our people that the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, would reassert the independence of its Members and their right to consider, debate, and pass upon legislation vital to our people. What a shock those same people must have gotten this morning.

Let me tell you there is something more at stake here today than a housing bill. The faith and confidence of the American people in the ability and courage of their Representatives in this House is at stake. I have sat here many times while some excited Member expressed fear that some "ism" would take over this country and change the form of our Government and thus destroy our freedom. I reflected then that our real security rests upon the solid foundation of the common sense and patriotism of the American people and their attachment to the Constitution and the form of government under which we live. However, our liberties will be in danger when, and only when, our people lose their faith in the institutions of government. It will be only when they lose faith in their elected Representatives and in the system of representative government, our ability and willingness in the Congress to face forthrightly and to solve the great problems of government that seriously affect them.

They have not lost such faith. They still have the ballot and the opportunity to choose Representatives who will face issues with courage.

I would vote against this rule and against the bill it is intended to force through this House if for no other reason than to express my protest against a system and a procedure that will deny to 435 Members of this House the right to consider, deliberate, and debate so important a measure.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regretted having to object to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. My objection could have been removed by his just saying one word, and that was "housing."

I have been here a good while, and I have seen cooperation by the minority with the majority and I have seen it when it was otherwise. If the gentleman from Indiana does not think I have cooperated with the majority pretty well, I might some of these days give him a real demonstration of how to lock the wheels of progress in the House of Representatives. I can do it for 3 hours any day that I choose, and that is at the beginning of the session.

I do not think there has been a time when we have ever passed a rule like this or gotten unanimous consent that the Speaker might recognize to suspend, when anybody raised the question of a bill of as major importance as the housing bill. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] will say to me now, or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] will say to me now that they will not move to suspend the rules on the housing bill but will bring in a rule, closed or otherwise, even giving us the paltry privilege of offering one motion to recommit, there will be no vote against this resolution on my side of the House.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say the housing bill is not before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not answer the question.

Mr. RAYBURN. It could get there pretty fast, and the gentleman knows it. But I do think we are stretching the thing a long way when we are willing to agree that other bills of importance, but not controversial, that would take a great deal of time, can come up under suspension of the rules. I do think you are denying to the American people through their Representatives the right to pass the housing bill that will get houses built.

As to this talk about its being socialistic, where is CLARENCE BROWN, Mr. TAFT's manager. Mr. TAFT happened to father a bill known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It is my understanding that my good friend from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] yesterday before the Committee on Rules for the second time denounced the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as socialistic. I really believe that is the first time I ever heard that great conservative Senator accused of fathering socialistic legislation.

You are going to do this, and in doing it you will in all probability adjourn this Congress without passing any housing bill at all. If you as a party can take that, we will and can make it an issue between now and November.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having deprived myself of time by mistake, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is almost unbelievable to what extent the Republicans will go to defeat construction of housing and price control, enlarged social security, Federal aid to education, and other legislation which they solemnly promised in the 1946 campaign would be enacted into law. The resolution before us to provide a rule for a so-called housing bill is an illustration of the outrageous collusion on the part of the Republican leadership and its betrayal of promises to enact legislation to provide low-cost homes and homes at reasonable rentals to the American war veterans and to citizens of low and moderate income.

It is deplorable that the avaricious combination of contractors, real-estate operators, and banking-investment brokers, operating through one of the shrewdest and most heavily financed lobbies ever to infest this Capitol, should control the action of the Republican majority of this Congress. This lobby, with the help of the National Association of Manufacturers, has expended, as reported, over $5,000,000 in its campaign to defeat a real housing bill, a bill which has been endorsed by every church and farm organization, by the American Legion, and all other veterans' organizations. This resolution makes it possible

to bring in a fraudulent housing bill which is not in the interest, or for the benefit, of millions of home-seeking veterans and other citizens.

The rule was not even considered or acted upon under the regular procedure and in a meeting of the Committee on Rules. I charge a most outrageous scheme and collusive action has made it possible to consider the rule and makeshift housing bill. On a few minutes' notice at a night session of the House the committee reported the worst gag rule in the history of the Congress. The rule permitted the bill to be considered under a so-called suspension of the rules that provides only 20 minutes to each side to discuss the bill and no amendments may be offered. It is unthinkable that the Republican leadership should have invoked this drastic procedure to consider subject matter of legislation of such vital importance, which has been batted around and upon which the Committee on Banking and Currency has procrastinated and withheld action for nearly 2 years. It is one of the most shameful legislative actions that has ever been perpetrated, with a total disregard of the rights of the membership, in my many years of service in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting for the country to know that more than 2 years ago the Joint Housing Committee of the Congress conducted hearings in all the large cities throughout the United States; spent $100,000 in its investigations; obtained testimony from 32 governors, from nearly all the mayors of the large cities, and from hundreds of representatives of civic, religious, educational, veterans', labor, welfare, and other organizations, including local housing authorities, in every section of the country. With this mass of testimony, covering every phase of the existing shortages and need of housing in all sections of the United States, the joint committee, after months of deliberate and careful consideration, recommended the passage of the generally known Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Although the Senate passed this bill in 1946 and again in 1947, this reactionary House kept the bill in the House Banking and Currency Committee until a few days ago. During the nearly 2 years that the Republican majority of that committee kept the bill bottled up, the Democratic members made many efforts to have the bill reported, but it was not until a few days ago, as I have stated, that they succeeded. This was only possible by unanimous vote of all the Democrats and two Republican members of the committee who, under terrific pressure from constituents at home, finally voted with the Democrats. By a vote of 14 to 13 the chairman of the committee was directed to request the Committee on Rules to grant a rule for consideration of the bill. The chairman, contrary to the instructions of a majority of his committee, instead of urging that a rule be granted on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, actually opposed the granting of such a rule. The Rules Committee, with the unanimous vote of its Republican members, voted against the reporting of a rule for the consideration of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. That is the story as to how the Republicans killed this meritorious housing bill.

It was interesting to note that while the Committee on Rules was still holding hearings for a rule on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. WOLCOTT, hurriedly introduced in the House this makeshift bill which was, and is, to all intents and purposes, entirely devoid of provisions to provide low-cost housing and rental homes for our veterans and low-paid workers, for housing research, for slum clearance, for rural housing rehabilitation, and for public housing. One can come to no other conclusion than that the introduction of this new bill by Chairman WOLCOTT was for no other purpose or reason than to attempt to "pull the wool" over the eyes of the American people and lead them to believe that the Republican Congress was passing a real housing bill. In fact, the only provision left in the new Wolcott bill was that which provided for secondary mortgages, which the mortgage investment bankers gave advance notice they would not handle unless they were guaranteed against loss in such transactions. And the main provision in the Wolcott bill was such a guarantee.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how you Republicans will have the temerity or nerve to face your constituents when you return to your respective districts. How can you explain your failure to the exservicemen and their families who, for years, have been unsuccessfully seeking decent places in which to live, in refusing to pass a bill to provide them with low-cost or reasonable rental homes within their financial reach.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]; the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]; the gentleman from Texas, the former Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN], have most impressively and convincingly proven beyond any question of doubt the need for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and have revealed the unfair tactics of the Republican majority in stifling the consideration of the most important provision in the bill that would afford decent housing for our veterans and other citizens.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] charged that the bill is socialistic and stated that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and other gentlemen on the Democratic side did not express the views of the Democrats. I am constrained to say to the gentleman from Georgia that if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] does not express the views of all the Democrats, surely the gentleman from Georgia does not. This is something the gentleman from Georgia cannot refute. With particular reference to his opposition to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, it is difficult for me to understand his position because only a few days ago, according to an article appearing in the Albany (Ga.) Herald he sent a telegram to Mr. Hudson Malone, executive director of the Albany Housing Authority, part of which I quote:

> You may assure all interested that I will do everything in my power to see that a rule is granted promptly for House consideration.
>
> The House's version of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill now in the Rules Committee will have my strongest support with the hope that it will be passed before adjournment.

In view of this telegram I cannot understand why the gentleman from Georgia should charge that this bill is socialistic in character.

Mr. Speaker, I have explained the antagonistic Republican record on housing and now I shall call attention to its record on other legislation.

THE DEPLORABLE—YES, MISERABLE REPUBLICAN RECORD

The Republican majority leader, Mr. HALLECK, in answer to President Truman's statement that this last Congress was the worst in history, replied that this is and has been a good Congress. Yes, it has been a good Congress for the special and vested interests and for the privileged and wealthy, but a most miserable and regrettable one for the common people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record of this Congress:

First. You Republicans passed the drastic and infamous Taft-Hartley Act to enslave labor by even reviving the use of injunction, and followed with the passage by the House of the Mundt-Nixon bill, designed to further restrict, yes, to actually destroy organized labor.

Second. You wiped out all price controls and gave big business the right to voluntarily—among themselves—fix prices on all necessities of life and, taking advantage of this unprecedented privilege, instead of reducing prices and the high cost of living in accordance with your and their promise to the people in 1946, the cost of living has increased by 40 percent since you came into power.

Third. You gave railroads the right to fix and increase rates in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and to the detriment of the American shippers and consumers, notwithstanding that during the war they overcharged the Government nearly $2,000,000,000 in freight rates.

Fourth. You passed three so-called tax-reduction bills in the interest of war profiteers, black and gray marketeers, and profit-gouging big business, giving billions of dollars in hand-outs to the wealthy corporation executives for whom Congress has already repealed excess-profits taxes, while giving penny tax reductions to the majority of low and middle income-tax payers. Yes, you Republicans can take full credit for passing a tax-reduction bill for the greedy, not for the needy.

Fifth. You extended but emasculated the Rent Control Act by permitting an increase of 15 percent in rents.

Sixth. You voted away our oil reserves valued at billions of dollars to the big oil producers, who overcharged the Government $2,000,000,000 for oil supplies during the war and robbed the American

consumer of millions by unjustifiably increasing the prices of their products.

Seventh. You appropriated sixty millions for the eradication of hoof-and-mouth disease in cattle in Mexico, but failed to appropriate 1 cent for a health-insurance program for the American people and reduced the appropriations for school lunches for our needy children.

Eighth. You passed a sugar bill, not in the interest of the American consumer, but in the interest of the Sugar Trust.

Ninth. You passed a wool-support price bill to enable the Wool Trust to import foreign wool at low prices and at the same time permitted manufacturers to charge the consumer higher prices for all manufactured woolen products.

Tenth. You passed a Government warhousing disposal bill that enabled real-estate operators to make millions, but which forced thousands of veterans and other worthy tenants to either pay higher rentals or vacate their homes.

Eleventh. You passed an Employers' Liability Act to limit the venue in certain cases that will operate in the interest and to the benefit of employers and deny fair rights to employees.

Twelfth. You passed a Credit Controls Act encouraging installment buying, which is adding to the present juicy profits of business that operates against the people with low incomes, who, due to the increasingly high prices in the last 18 months, have been obliged to withdraw $4,000,000,000 from their saving accounts, sell 25 percent of their Government bonds, and give up 23 percent of their life-insurance policies.

Thirteenth. You passed a bill to exempt the packers who have been gouging the American people from paying for inspection of their meat products, which adds an additional eleven million in taxes on the backs of the taxpayers.

Fourteenth. You passed an act to extend old-age and survivors' social security, but instead of broadening the act to provide such benefits for twelve to fifteen million more citizens, you have actually deprived 750,000 people of benefits determined by the Supreme Court; and instead of increasing these social-security benefits by $25 a month, you increased them by a measly $5.

THE "PUBLIC BE DAMNED" RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, what a sorry "public be damned" record is that of the Eightieth Republican Congress. I have called attention to some of the legislation you Republicans have enacted, not in the interest of but against the interest of the average people, and now I wish to direct attention to your failure to enact legislation to relieve the distressed middle class, the white-collar workers, the pensioners, and low-paid wage earners. You took no action to curb high prices and stop the inflationary spiral.

As I have frequently stated on the floor of the House, in 1946 you Republicans solemnly promised that prices would be reduced and the then existing shortages eliminated if the OPA were repealed. You promised that your so-called free enterprise would reduce the already high prices.

To force the repeal of the OPA, the packers went on strike and refused to slaughter, which created a shortage of meat and meat products and skyrocketed the prices, notwithstanding that there were plenty of cattle and hogs in the pens ready for slaughter. Unfortunately, with the repeal of the OPA, the misled American people failed to realize that the packers and industrialists were preparing to still further increase the cost of living—as they are today doing with a vengeance.

Nevertheless, you did destroy the OPA, as well as eliminate the priorities on material for home construction, and after 18 months prices not only have not been reduced but have risen, and are still going outrageously higher and higher. You have disregarded the increasing danger of inflation, as did the hoarders, profiteers, speculators, and industrialists in 1920-21, and to a still greater degree in 1928–29, when, under Mr. Hoover, the Wall Street speculators unloaded stocks and bonds amounting up to $50,000,000,000 and withdrew the money from the country banks on various pretenses, even using the small bankers in the cities as their agents to dispose of most of the worthless securities.

In 1929, after these speculators unloaded all their worthless securities and withdrew all the money possible from legitimate channels, they pulled the chain that brought about the greatest economic crash in the history of the world. Today you are again emulating this damnable practice of 1928–29 and I fear within 3 or 4 years—if this devastating inflation is not arrested and you should come into full power—the inflated balloon will explode and another financial crash and panic will engulf us.

The Republican Congress ignored its mandate from the people and listened only to the avaricious big business combines to help them grab up foreign holdings, prepare for war, curb labor, suppress civil liberty, shamefully manipulate and continue to further increase the already high prices, and to further increase the greatest profits in history at the distressed people's expense.

The Republicans refused to consider legislation which would have raised the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour, although the present 40-cent wage minimum is today worth about 23 cents in purchasing power. According to a report issued by the Federal Reserve Board in June of this year, corporation profits in 1948 are "likely to be larger" than in 1947, when they broke all previous records and reached $17,000,000,000 after all taxation and other deductions for reconversion and expansion. In the last 4 years wages of the average American wage earners rose 26 percent, but the cost of living in that period has tripled the increase in wages, or reached 68 percent. Since 1944 corporation profits have increased 116 percent—from an annual rate of $10,000,000,000 to $21,600,000,000. These figures prove that the industrial royalists, whose interest you serve, are exploiting the people, are reaping huge profits, and are responsible for the continuous increase of the cost of living.

The Republican Congress, despite its 1944 platform, failed to pass any civil rights legislation. Bills to outlaw lynching, end the poll tax, and set up a permanent fair employment practices commission were buried by the Eightieth Congress.

In 1944 the Republican platform further pledged support to "extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance to all employees not already covered," strengthening of Federal-State health programs, "and the stimulation by Federal aid of State plans to make medical and hospital treatment available to those in need." And what is your record of the Republican Congress on such legislation? Bills to extend social security coverage and benefits, as recommended, died in the congressional committees, although the cost of living has risen 70 percent since present social security rates were set and the average old-age pension today is $25 a month. The Republican Congress did, however, as I have mentioned, pass a bill removing 750,000 workers from social-security coverage. Yes, the Republican Congress followed the orders of the National Association of Manufacturers and big business to make certain that the social-security pay-roll deductions that were to help these deserving workers be not increased progressively according to law, but be added to corporations' already fat profits.

The national health insurance bill was buried deep in congressional committees and the bill for Federal aid to education never saw the light of day in the House Committee on Education and Labor; likewise a bill to improve unemployment insurance also died in committee.

The failure of the Republicans to consider these bills in the interest and welfare of the people can only be construed as a flagrant disregard of their platform pledges and evidence that the Republican Party, as ever, serves only the special and vested interests.

Notably among your failures to legislate in the interest of the people was your action in filibustering to death the bill to repeal the oleomargarine tax demanded by the housewives; the emasculation of the Foreign Trade Agreements Act which has contributed so greatly to the increase of our exports, which took the tariff out of politics, but which now endangers our world-wide foreign trade structure; instead of passing a bill as you promised to reduce the cost of maintaining the displaced-persons camps in the American zone of occupation, to permit the entry of 400,000 unfortunate displaced persons that could be absorbed into the families of their relatives, and some of whom could even be employed to relieve the house servant shortage, you passed a bill which reduces the number to 212,000 and which shamefully discriminates against and limits the entry of displaced Catholics and Jews.

THE COUNTRY MUST AVOID ANOTHER REPUBLICAN CRASH

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in years gone by have succeeded in misleading the people by untrue statements regarding panics, but these are the actual facts:

The first panic in our memory originated in 1892–93 during the administration of Republican President Benjamin Harrison. Then followed the panic of 1907, under the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, when the banks issued only script instead of money to their depositors, and the depression of 1920 during Warren G. Harding's Teapot Dome administration. From 1929 to 1933, under the administration of President Herbert Hoover, the Nation struggled through the greatest financial crash and panic in history. During this period banks failed on every corner; factories and plants were closed; people were obliged to live in dugouts and shacks; 18,000,000 jobless people walked the streets and highways, hungry, disillusioned, embittered, except for the few that were employed for $1 a day; home owners and farmers were losing their homes. After these Republican-made panics it remained for Democratic Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt to effect the rehabilitation of the havoc and destruction wrought by the preceding Republican administrations, put the people back to work, and restore the country's financial structure and confidence.

History repeats the Republican method of deception in misleading the American people. In 1920, with no issue to go before the people, the strategists of the Republican Party, under the leadership of Republican Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and with the cooperation of their big interest sponsors, made the League of Nations the issue in the Presidential campaign, which resulted in the unwarranted defeat of the first world-organized plan to create and promote peace and understanding among the nations of the world, and ultimately led to the rebuilding of a militaristic Germany and was directly responsible for the Second World War. And whom did we find behind the scenes in the nomination and election of President Harding but Senator Boise Penrose and the Pennsylvania gang, ably supported by Pennsylvania's Joe Grundy and his National Association of Manufacturers, defeating former Illinois Governor, Frank Lowden, and Gen. Leonard Wood.

In 1928 another Pennsylvania leader, Senator William Vare—successor to Boise Penrose—joined hands with Mr. Joe Grundy, the high-tariff advocate and NAM representative, who finally occupied a seat in the Senate, and nominated and elected the British purchasing agent, Herbert Hoover.

Today we find the special-interest forces, headed by Pennsylvania's Joe Grundy, the Pews, and others of their hue, working with the tariff barons and the National Association of Manufacturers, the banking clique of J. P. Morgan, Rockefeller, du Pont, Dillon, Read, and other Wall Street bankers, ready to nominate a man on the Republican ticket who will be subservient to their dictates. These special-interest forces are vitally interested in rebuilding Germany because of their vast holdings in the I. G. Farben cartels and other German combinations and, as reports indicate, they are preparing for world war III in the same manner they prepared for the Second World War.

All through the years the Pennsylvania crowd, under the banners of Mark Hanna, Foraker, Dalzell, Penrose, Vare, and Grundy, has a black record of corruption, and even today the disclosures in Philadelphia show that the Republicans continue, as they have for years, in corruptive control of that city. But Philadelphia is not alone dominated by such Republican forces. Other cities and States as well feel the corruption hand of Republican bosses.

In that connection, unfortunately, my own State of Illinois, under a Republican administration, has been deprived of millions of dollars through failure of proper sales-tax collection returns to the State, which, together with hundreds of thousands of dollars illegally collected as political tribute from State employees, have been shamefully diverted for political campaign purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from again referring to the high cost of living that is today plaguing our country and give below a comparison of prewar and present-day prices:

	Prewar prices	Present prices
Homes	$5,000	$10,000–$15,000
Automobiles	500	1,700–2,500
Men's clothing	18–25	50–75
Men's, women's, and children's shoes	2–6	4–15–18
Furniture, household appliances, and furnishings		[1]

[1] 150 percent higher.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all these exorbitant prices on commodities, the greatest necessity of life—food—has led the field in price rises. Here is a tabulation on a few food items of prewar prices as compared to present-day prices:

	Prewar prices	Present prices
Steak	$0.40	[1] $1.10–$1.19
Bacon	.35	.73
Chuck roast	.23	.71
Smoked ham	.28	.71
Leg of lamb	.32	.76
Lamb chops	.42	1.06
Lamb breast	.11	.38
Veal cutlets	.44	1.08
Pork chops	.30	1.06
Cheese	[1] 0.10–.15	[1] 40–.75
Butter	.42	[1] 93–1.00
Quart of grade A milk	.13	.21
Eggs	.28	.64
Bread	.08	.16
Coffe	.22	.51
Canned fruits and vegetables	.10–.15	.19–.30

[1] Per pound.
[2] Per dozen.

Mr. Speaker, when will there be an end to these continuously rising prices? We all know an end to price rises will come in due time, but will it be soon enough to save the low-wage earners, the white-collar workers living on fixed small incomes, and the people living on meager pensions, who are the ones that are suffering the most as a result of these unwarranted price wars.

THE PEOPLE HAVE HAD ENOUGH OF THE REPUBLICANS

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the Republican leaders seem to feel they can fool and mislead the people in 1948 as they did in the 1946 campaign, when they feed them with reckless promises, distorted propaganda, half-truths, and untruths. But in this campaign the people will have before them the actual performance record of the Eightieth Republican Congress. The memory of the people will not be so short-lived as to forget your 1946 promises and to realize the stark truth that you have betrayed them. Do not think they have forgotten when President Roosevelt was elected banks were failing on every corner; factories and plants were closed; nearly 18,000,000 jobless people walked the streets and the highways; that farm mortgages were being foreclosed and home owners were losing their homes. They will not forget the famous "hundred days" following Roosevelt's election when new legislation flowed out of a Democratic Congress to meet the dire emergency. Banks reopened. Factories flung wide their doors and started their motors humming. The working people gradually went back to work.

Now, 15 years later—despite your criticism of the New Deal—we have 62,000,000 people at work. Business is booming, and the country is enjoying the greatest prosperity in history. Today our national income is $210,000,000,000, as compared to the thirty-eight to forty-two billion in 1932 and 1933. Measured by every index, our prosperity is so great that our only just cause for anxiety is the danger of a run-away inflation and the high cost of living. And what does the record show since you Republicans took control of both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States? It shows that you have done everything possible to encourage inflation in the name of so-called free enterprise, which, however, is not free, because it is controlled by your trusts and combines whom you are serving.

You like the idea of a big boom that is bound to go bust.

There are always some smart operators ready to make a killing out of human misery, unemployment, deflation, depression; and you have made yourselves the errand boys for those cruel profiteers, your friends, the Wall Street manipulators, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the special and vested interests who, through the greatest horde of lobbyists ever to infest the Capitol, have forced you to do their bidding.

Notwithstanding all the insincere promises, the misrepresentations, the scare campaigns, and the ballyhoo of the Republican 1946 campaign, the fact remains that the Republican Party has miserably failed the people and the Nation. They have failed to adopt any constructive plan or policy or to adopt positive

legislation to meet real needs. However, the nearest approach to combat the high cost of living was the advice of one of the Republican Presidential candidates that the people should produce more and eat less.

Everything the Republicans have done has been repressive and negative. They have been busy in this Congress in turning the clock back—in repealing the OPA and weakening many of the beneficial laws in the interest of labor. The Republicans were able to do nothing but disparage what the Democrats have done, and although you control 90 percent of the press, magazines, and a majority of the radio stations, the American voters will not be lulled to sleep or misled as they were in 1946 when only 33 percent of them voted. They now realize they owe it to themselves and to their country to vote and register their protest and resentment against the Republican betrayal and record.

The Democrats have really made a splendid, most constructive record. I repeat: They can point with pride to the highest employment in all history, to the largest national income, and the greatest prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything further about this matter, but in view of some of the arguments that we have heard here, I would just like to reiterate that, after all, this is a procedural matter. It is identical with the practice that has been followed all through the years. In 1938 the Republicans were concerned about the so-called reorganization bill. Many Democrats were concerned about it. There was a question at that time with respect to the calling up of that bill when a similar resolution to that now before us was presented.

As I pointed out in my opening statement, there are rules outstanding on this that may be called up or the bills may be considered under suspension of the rules. I do not know what additional rules may be granted. Undoubtedly, there will be suspension of the rule before the week is out on many matters that involve considerable controversy. The opportunity, of course, is always present to vote on that controversy. However, this is not the time to debate any of these measures. We might, in debating many measures in which a great many Members are interested, and in which a great many people in the country are interested, have very considerable differences of opinion on both sides of the aisle. But let us stick to the original fundamental proposition. By adopting this resolution we are doing what previous Congresses have done all through the years. We are simply doing what the rules of the House contemplate, and we are doing what the rules provide. It is designed to expedite the business of the House. That is the only issue here. There is no other issue to be debated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 160, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—240

Allen, Calif.	Gearhart	Michener
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Miller, Conn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillie	Miller, Md.
	Goff	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Mitchell
Andrews, N. Y.	Gossett	Morton
Angell	Graham	Muhlenberg
Arends	Grant, Ind.	Mundt
Arnold	Griffiths	Murray, Wis.
Auchincloss	Gross	Nicholson
Banta	Gwinn, N. Y.	Nixon
Barden	Gwynne, Iowa	Nodar
Barrett	Hagen	Norblad
Bates, Mass.	Hale	O'Hara
Beall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski
Bell		Passman
Bender	Hall, Leonard W.	Patterson
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Phillips, Calif.
Bennett, Mo.	Hand	Phillips, Tenn.
Bishop	Harness, Ind.	Ploeser
Blackney	Harvey	Plumley
Boggs, Del.	Hébert	Potter
Bolton	Herter	Potts
Bradley	Heselton	Ramey
Bramblett	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Brophy	Hinshaw	Rees
Buck	Hoeven	Reeves
Buffett	Hoffman	Rich
Burke	Holmes	Richlman
Busbey	Hope	Rizley
Butler	Horan	Rockwell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Rohrbough
Carson	Jenison	Ross
Case, N. J.	Jenkins, Ohio	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins, Pa.	Sadlak
Chadwick	Jennings	St. George
Chenoweth	Jensen	Sanborn
Chiperfield	Johnson, Calif.	Sarbacher
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Mo.
Clark	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Okla.
Clason	Jones, Wash.	Scoblick
Clevenger	Jonkman	Scott, Hardie
Clippinger	Judd	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Coffin	Kean	Scrivner
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Seely-Brown
Cole, Mo.	Kearns	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Short
Corbett	Keefe	Simpson, Ill.
Cotton	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Cox	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Kunkel	Smith, Va.
Crow	Landis	Smith, Wis.
Cunningham	Larcade	Snyder
Curtis	Latham	Stefan
Dague	LeCompte	Stevenson
Davis, Wis.	LeFevre	Stockman
Dawson, Utah	Lemke	Stratton
Devitt	Lewis, Ky.	Sundstrom
D'Ewart	Lewis, Ohio	Taber
Dirksen	Lichtenwalter	Talle
Dolliver	Lodge	Taylor
Domengeaux	Love	Tibbott
Dondero	McConnell	Tollefson
Eaton	McCowen	Towe
Ellis	McCulloch	Twyman
Ellsworth	McDonough	Vail
Elsaesser	McDowell	Van Zandt
Elston	McGarvey	Vorys
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Wadsworth
Fellows	McMillen, Ill.	Weichel
Fenton	Mack	Whittington
Fletcher	MacKinnon	Wigglesworth
Foote	Maloney	Wolcott
Fuller	Martin, Iowa	Wolverton
Fulton	Mason	Woodruff
Gallagher	Mathews	Youngblood
Gamble	Merrow	
Gathings	Meyer	
Gavin		

NAYS—160

Abbitt	Garmatz	Morris
Abernethy	Gary	Morrison
Albert	Gordon	Multer
Allen, La.	Gore	Murdock
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	Murray, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Norrell
Battle	Grant, Ala.	Norton
Beckworth	Gregory	O'Brien
Bland	Hardy	O'Toole
Blatnik	Harless, Ariz.	Pace
Bloom	Harris	Patman
Boggs, La.	Harrison	Peterson
Bonner	Hart	Pfeifer
Brooks	Havenner	Philbin
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Pickett
Bryson	Hedrick	Poage
Buchanan	Heffernan	Powell
Buckley	Hendricks	Preston
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Price, Fla.
Burleson	Holifield	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Priest
Camp	Isacson	Rains
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	Rankin
Celler	Jarman	Rayburn
Chapman	Jones, Ala.	Redden
Cheif	Jones, N. C.	Richards
Colmer	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Combs	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Kefauver	Rooney
Cooper	Kelley	Sabath
Courtney	Kennedy	Sadowski
Cravens	Keogh	Sasscer
Crosser	Kerr	Sheppard
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	King	Smathers
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Somers
Deane	Klein	Spence
Delaney	Lanham	Stanley
Dingell	Lea	Teague
Donohue	Lesinski	Thomas, Tex.
Dorn	Lucas	Thompson
Doughton	Lusk	Trimble
Douglas	Lyle	Vinson
Durham	Lynch	Walter
Eberharter	McCormack	Wheeler
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Whitaker
Evins	Mahon	Whitten
Fallon	Manasco	Williams
Feighan	Mansfield	Wilson, Tex.
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Winstead
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wood
Flannagan	Mills	Worley
Fogarty	Monroney	
Forand	Morgan	

NOT VOTING—30

Andresen, August H.	Johnson, Tex.	Rivers
	Lane	Robertson
Bakewell	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Boykin	McMahon	Stigler
Brown, Ohio	McMillan, S. C.	Thomas, N. J.
Cannon	Macy	Vursell
Elliott	Meade, Ky.	Welch
Folger	Meade, Md.	West
Hartley	Peden	Wilson, Ind.
Javits	Poulson	
Johnson, Okla.	Regan	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Peden against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Johnson of Texas against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Meade of Maryland against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. McMahon with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Folger.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. West.

Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Regan.

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Admiral Swanson relative to the remarks he made yesterday regarding the number of dentists who had attempted to enlist in the Navy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) "making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6 and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 37, 38, 39, 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$360,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$209,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$585,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$132,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,965,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,207,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$69,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$305,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,532,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,208,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,012,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,046,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,087,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,611,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The Committee of Conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 16, 23, and 40.

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
E. V. ROBERTSON,
M. E. TYDINGS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 appropriates $7,500,000 for Miscellaneous Expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2 allows $2,250,000 of the appropriation for Miscellaneous Expenses to be used for the payment of claims instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 appropriates $42,255,000 for Research, Navy, as proposed by the Senate instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates $9,245,500 for Operation and Conservation of Naval Petroleum Reserves as proposed by the Senate instead of $245,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5 appropriates $465,000 for the Naval Observatory as proposed by the Senate instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates $3,500,000 for the Hydrographic Office as proposed by the House instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 appropriates $13,200,000 for Training and Education, Navy, instead of

$13,000,000 as proposed by the House and $13,741,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates $1,400,000 for General Expenses, Bureau of Naval Personnel instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the House and $1,570,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $125,436,000 for Naval Reserve as proposed by the Senate instead of $125,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $360,000,000 for Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, instead of $350,000,000 as proposed by the House and $370,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 appropriates $230,000,000 for Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Navy, instead of $210,000,000 as proposed by the House and $248,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12 strikes out language proposed by the Senate relating to services performed in quarters of female officers and enlisted women and in residences of naval attachés.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates $209,000,000 for Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, instead of $200,000,000 as proposed by the House and $218,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14 appropriates $4,875,000 for operation of housing projects under the appropriation Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15 corrects the total amount appropriated for Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17 appropriates $450,000,000 for maintenance, under Aviation, Navy, instead of $440,000,000 as proposed by the House and $470,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 adjusts a total.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates $145,744,000 for pay of enlisted personnel in the Marine Corps as proposed by the Senate instead of $144,862,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates $15,313,000 for pay and allowances of the Marine Corps Reserve, as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21 adjusts a total.

Amendment No. 22 appropriates $132,000,000 for General Expenses, Marine Corps instead of $130,000,000 as proposed by the House and $134,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $3,965,000 for Salaries, Office of the Secretary, instead of $3,641,000 as proposed by the House and $4,289,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25 appropriates $1,207,000 for Salaries, Office of Naval Research, instead of $1,152,000 as proposed by the House and $1,262,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26 appropriates $69,000 for Salaries, Office of Naval Records and Library, instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House and $78,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 appropriates $305,300 for Salaries, Office of Judge Advocate General, instead of $294,300 as proposed by the House and $316,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28 appropriates $1,225,000 for Salaries, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, instead of $1,125,000 as proposed by the House and $1,325,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29 appropriates $38,000 for Salaries, Board of Inspection and Survey, instead of $36,000 as proposed by the House and $40,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30 appropriates $4,532,000 for Salaries, Bureau of Naval Personnel, instead of $3,870,000 as proposed by the House and $5,194,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31 appropriates $6,208,500 for Salaries, Bureau of Ships, instead of $5,715,000 as proposed by the House and $6,702,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32 appropriates $3,012,600 for Salaries, Bureau of Ordnance, instead of $2,757,600 as proposed by the House and $3,267,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33 appropriates $4,385,000 for Salaries, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, instead of $3,960,000 as proposed by the House and $4,810,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34 appropriates $1,046,200 for Salaries, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, instead of $970,200 as proposed by the House and $1,122,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35 appropriates $2,087,500 for Salaries, Bureau of Yards and Docks, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,175,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36 adjusts the total for Salaries, Navy Department at $32,611,100 instead of $30,111,100 as proposed by the House and $35,111,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37 appropriates $1,100,000 for Contingent Expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39 strike from the bill language proposed by the House to forbid employment of members of labor organizations which are not in compliance with the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Amendment No. 40 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 41 corrects a section number.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 16 authorizes the use of the appropriation, Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, for expenses incident to transferring offices of the Navy Department between buildings as the seat of government. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 23 authorizes the balances of the appropriation Increase and Replacement of Naval Vessels to be used for the employment of personnel in the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance during the fiscal year 1949 in such sums as the Secretary may determine. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 40 relates to the use of funds for making time-measuring studies, payments of premiums and rewards, and work done in naval establishments. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PLUMLEY (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a very brief statement, and perhaps we can save a great deal of time. I would like to ask the ranking minority member of this subcommittee if this report is not unanimous and if we have not agreed on every single item in it. I would like to further ask him if he knows of any objections to be made by anyone on his side. I know of none to be made on my side.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's inquiry, there was no objection expressed to me in the conference. There was harmonious agreement on the part of all parties concerned.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That being so, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 17, line 14, insert ": *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for any expenses incident to transferring offices of the Navy Department between buildings at the seat of government."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLUMLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 24, line 2, insert ": *Provided*, That of the balances remaining of appropriations under this head, there shall be available during the fiscal year 1949 such sums as the Secretary may from time to time determine to be necessary for the employment of personnel in the Bureau of Ships and the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with the construction of vessels which have been heretofore authorized under this head."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is the the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLUMLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 33, line 3, insert:

"SEC. 112. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee; no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any

Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary be advantageous to the national defense."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLUMLEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 112. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee within the Navy; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include a table showing the House and Senate action and the conferees' agreement on the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949. I feel that the conferees have arrived at a very fair figure. It is, in terms of dollars, almost an even compromise between the House and Senate figures. The bill carries a grand total in continuing and annual appropriations of $3,749,059,250 which is $63,111,000 below the amount of the Senate bill and $62,326,000 above the amount passed by the House. The final action is a reduction below the total budget estimates of $187,679,450.

Action by Congress on Navy Department estimates, 1949 (excludes funds for construction of aircraft)

Appropriation title	Budget estimates	House action	Senate action	Conference agreement
Office of the Secretary:				
Miscellaneous expenses, Navy	$12,417,000	$8,000,000	$7,500,000	$7,500,000
Contingencies of the Navy	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Research, Navy	53,108,000	45,000,000	42,255,000	42,255,000
Operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves	9,245,500	245,500	9,245,000	9,245,500
Exploration of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4	14,600,000	14,600,000	14,600,000	14,600,000
Expenses, island governments and liberated occupied areas	2,500,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
Penalty-mail costs, Navy Department	2,500,000			
Naval Observatory	504,100	450,000	465,000	465,000
Hydrographic Office	3,942,000	3,500,000	3,700,000	3,500,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	110,816,600	86,045,500	92,015,500	91,815,500
Bureau of Naval Personnel:				
Training and education, Navy	13,745,000	13,000,000	13,741,000	13,200,000
Welfare of naval personnel	2,510,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Officer candidate training, Navy	12,900,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
General expenses, Bureau of Naval Personnel	1,640,000	1,250,000	1,570,000	1,400,000
Naval Reserve	129,224,350	125,000,000	125,436,000	125,436,000
Naval Academy	5,085,000	5,020,000	5,020,000	5,020,000
Naval Home	382,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
Total, Bureau of Naval Personnel	165,486,350	159,050,000	160,547,000	159,836,000
Bureau of Ships: Maintenance, Bureau of Ships	377,443,000	350,000,000	370,000,000	360,000,000
Bureau of Ordnance: Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy	266,860,000	210,000,000	248,000,000	230,000,000
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:				
Pay and subsistence of naval personnel	(1,215,912,000)	(1,215,912,000)	(1,215,912,000)	(1,215,912,000)
Pay and allowances	1,111,116,000	1,111,116,000	1,111,116,000	1,111,116,000
Subsistence	104,796,000	104,796,000	104,796,000	104,796,000
Retired pay, Navy	78,520,650	78,520,650	78,520,650	78,520,650
Transportation and recruiting of naval personnel	33,800,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	229,630,000	200,000,000	218,000,000	209,000,000
Transportation of things, Navy	94,818,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
Fuel, Navy	70,800,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
Total, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	1,723,480,650	1,676,432,650	1,694,432,650	1,685,432,650
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: Medical Department, Navy	40,343,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Bureau of Yards and Docks: Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks	171,772,000	150,000,000	150,375,000	150,375,000
Bureau of Aeronautics:				
Aviation, Navy	(617,268,000)	(575,000,000)	(605,000,000)	(585,000,000)
Aeronautical instruments	27,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Maintenance and operation	480,268,000	440,000,000	470,000,000	450,000,000
Research and development	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000
Total, Bureau of Aeronautics (except construction of aircraft)	617,268,000	575,000,000	605,000,000	585,000,000
Marine Corps:				
Pay, Marine Corps	200,405,000	199,492,000	201,287,000	201,287,000
Retired pay, Marine Corps	8,519,000	8,519,000	8,519,000	8,519,000
Pay of civil force	(2,318,000)	(2,178,000)	(2,178,000)	(2,178,000)
Office of Commandant	1,170,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Supply Department	1,148,000	1,078,000	1,078,000	1,078,000
General expenses, Marine Corps	135,205,000	130,000,000	134,700,000	132,000,000
Total, Marine Corps	346,447,000	340,189,000	346,684,000	343,984,000
Navy Department salaries:				
Office of the Secretary	4,345,900	3,641,000	4,289,000	3,965,000
Office of Naval Research	1,280,000	1,152,000	1,262,000	1,207,000
Office of Naval Records and Library	80,000	60,000	78,000	69,000
Office of Judge Advocate General	345,000	294,300	316,300	305,300
Office of Chief of Naval Operations	1,350,000	1,125,000	1,325,000	1,225,000
Board of Inspection and Survey	40,000	36,000	40,000	38,000
Office of Chief of Naval Communications	570,000	550,000	550,000	550,000

Action by Congress on Navy Department estimates, 1949 (excludes funds for construction of aircraft)—Continued

Appropriation title	Budget estimates	House action	Senate action	Conference agreement
Navy Department salaries—continued				
Office of Naval Intelligence	$1,220,000	$980,000	$980,000	$950,000
Bureau of Naval Personnel	5,300,000	3,870,600	5,194,000	4,532,000
Bureau of Ships	6,850,000	5,715,000	6,702,000	6,208,500
Bureau of Ordnance	3,314,000	2,757,600	3,267,600	3,012,600
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	4,850,000	3,960,000	4,810,000	4,385,000
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	1,123,000	970,200	1,122,200	1,046,200
Bureau of Yards and Docks	2,179,200	2,000,000	2,175,000	2,087,500
Bureau of Aeronautics	3,645,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total, Navy Department salaries	36,492,100	30,111,100	35,111,100	32,611,100
Contingent expenses:				
Contingent expenses, Navy Department	1,175,000	1,000,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Printing and binding, Navy Department	2,885,000	2,635,000	2,635,000	2,635,000
Total, contingent expenses	4,060,000	3,635,000	3,735,000	3,735,000
Total annual appropriations	3,860,468,700	3,620,463,250	3,745,900,250	3,682,789,250
Continuing appropriations:				
Shipbuilding:				
Construction of ships	64,800,000	56,800,000	56,800,000	56,800,000
	[1] (14,300,000)	[2] (14,300,000)	[1] (14,300,000)	[3] (14,300,000)
Ordnance for new construction	11,470,000	9,470,000	9,470,000	9,470,000
	[3] (1,700,000)	[2] (1,700,000)	[3] (1,700,000)	[3] (1,700,000)
Total, shipbuilding	76,270,000	66,270,000	66,270,000	66,270,000
	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)
Total annual and continuing appropriations	3,936,738,700	3,686,733,250	3,812,170,250	3,749,059,250

[1] Includes supplemental request in amount of $9,000,000 not acted on by the House.
[2] Transfer from I RNV (construction and machinery).
[3] Transfer from I RNV (armor, armament, and ammunition).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARRETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the DAV.

AUTHORIZING PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, both the conference report and statement are available to the Members.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the words "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 8, 1948." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "House Document Numbered 682, Eightieth Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the figures "568" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "668"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the words "his report dated February 19, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof the words "House Document Numbered 643, Eightieth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Change the period to a comma and add the following: "and the authorization for the Lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the words "his report dated August 22, 1947" and insert in lieu thereof the words "House Document Numbered 651, Eightieth Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 10, lines 10 and 11, of the amendments of the Senate strike out the following "at prices, on terms, and with titles satisfactory to him"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the figure "65,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following figure "62,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE A. DONDERO,
EARL WILSON,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
EDWARD MARTIN,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6419) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

As the bill passed the House the following projects were included under Title I, Rivers and Harbors:

Items (sec. 101, unless otherwise indicated)

	Doc. No. (80th Cong.)[1]	Cost, new work	Annual maintenance
Beals Harbor, Maine	H. 553	$85,700	$1,000
Cape Porpoise Harbor, Maine	H. 555	41,500	1,500
Buzzards Bay to Buttermilk Bay, Mass.	H. 552	18,300	500
Falmouth Harbor, Mass.	H. 556	35,000	4,000

[1] H. indicates House document; S. indicates Senate document.

Items (sec. 101, unless otherwise indicated)—Continued

	Doc. No. (80th Cong.)	Cost, new work	Annual maintenance
Taunton River, Mass	H. 196	----------	$1,000
Provincetown Harbor, Mass	H. 600	$760,000	1,000
Point Judith Harbor of Refuge, R. I	S. 15	176,000	7,000
Westcott Cove, Conn	H. 379	21,000	1,200
Greenwich Harbor, Conn	H. 272	82,000	5,000
Rockhall Harbor, Md	H. 273	40,000	2,000
Channel from Kent Island Narrows to Wells Cove, Chester River, Md.	H. 380	16,400	1,000
Cambridge Harbor, Md	H. 381	77,000	2,000
Honga River and Tar Bay, Md.	H. 580	31,600	2,000
Bransons Cove, Lower Machodoc River, Va.	H. 420	28,600	1,000
Deep Creek, Warwick Co., Va.	H. 601	153,000	8,200
Norfolk Harbor, Va., southern branch of Elizabeth River.	H. 545	1,730,000	82,800
Stumpy Point Bay, N. C	H. 422	32,500	3,000
Inland Waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C.	H. 421	196,000	3,000
St. Andrew Bay, Fla	H. 559	80,000	12,000
Galveston Harbor, Galveston Channel, and Houston ship channel.	H. 561	5,057,000	219,500
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi, Tex.	H. 560	2,250,000	100,000
Grand Traverse Bay, Mich.	H. 546	316,200	3,500
Dunkirk Harbor, N. Y	H. 632	390,000	----------
Pillar Point, Halfmoon Bay, Calif.	H. 644	4,500,000	43,800
Noyo River and Harbor, Calif.	H. 586	190,000	4,000
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.	H. 650	70,000	3,000
Umpqua Harbor and River at Winchester Bay, Oreg.	S. 154	34,500	500
Channel at Charleston, South Slough, Oreg.	H. 646	349,300	4,500
Coos and Millicoma Rivers, Oreg.	S. 124	310,000	19,000
Skipanon Channel, Oreg	S. 93	114,500	----------
Smith River, Oreg	S. 94	96,100	11,500
Grays Harbor, Wash	H. 635	3,605,700	103,700
Baltimore Harbor, Md. (sec. 102).	----------	----------	----------
Modification of Neches-Angelina Rivers project, Texas (sec. 103).	----------	----------	----------
Total	----------	20,887,900	652,200

List of projects added to title I of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 101)

	Doc. No. (80th Cong.)	Cost, new work	Annual maintenance
Winyah Bay, S. C	----------	[1] 0	----------
Gulfport Harbor, Miss	----------	$496,900	$108,000
Harrison County, Miss., shore protection.	H. 382	1,133,000	----------
Mississippi River at Fort Madison, Iowa.	H. 661	56,200	1,000
Port Wing Harbor, Wis	H. 668	17,000	500
Oswego Harbor, N. Y	----------	7,838,000	28,400
Bayou Carlin, La	----------	15,000	----------
Total	----------	9,556,100	137,900

[1] Modification of previously authorized project at saving of $137,000.

Title II—Flood control

List of projects in bill as passed by House:

Items (sec. 203)

	Document No. (80th Cong.)	Estimated cost
Arkansas River Basin, at Carthage and Monett, Mo.	H. 445	$740,000
Special provision re approaches to certain highway bridges across the Arkansas River.	----------	200,000

Title II—Flood control

List of projects in bill as passed by House:

Items (sec. 203)—Continued

	Document No. (80th Cong.)	Estimated cost
Rock River at South Beloit, Ill	H. 112	$100,000
Henderson River, Ill	H. 245	1,520,000
Mississippi River in vicinity of Aitkin, Minn.	H. 599	1,680,000
Redstone Creek, Pa	H. 301	1,015,000
Ohio River at Rosiclare, Ill	S. 125	200,000
Tonawanda Creek, N. Y	S. 46	565,000
Genesee River (Canaseraga Creek), N. Y.	H. 206	165,000
Clinton River (Red Run), Mich	H. 628	1,010,000
Reno Beach-Howards farm area, Ohio.	H. 554	330,000
Santa Clara River, Calif	H. 443	4,900,000
Gila River Basin, Tucson, Ariz	H. 274	2,380,000
Mississippi River below Cape Girardeau, Mo.	H. 627	7,700,000
Total	----------	22,875,000

List of projects added to title II of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 203)

	Document No. (80th Cong.)	Authorization in bill
Lackawaxen River, Pa	H. 113	$6,150,000
Wilkes-Barre-Hanover Township, Pa.	----------	250,000
Central and southern Florida	H. 643	16,300,000
Special provision re approaches to certain highway bridges across the Arkansas River, Ark.	----------	[1] 100,000
Bradens Bend, Okla	----------	1,000,000
Red River of the North, N. Dak., Minn., and S. Dak.	----------	2,000,000
Miners Bend, Nebr. and S. Dak	----------	3,000,000
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg. (power features).	----------	----------
L'Anguille River, Ark	H. 651	2,000,000
Rio Grande, N. Mex	----------	3,500,000
Total	----------	34,300,000

[1] In addition to $200,000 included in bill as passed by House.

The following is an explanation of each of the Senate amendments, some of which cover minor amendments:

AMENDMENT NO. 1, WINYAH BAY, S. C.

Item adopts new project as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project by a cut-off 27 feet deep and not less than 400 feet wide across the base of the point to the present turning basin in Sampit River and a branch channel 27 feet deep and not less than 200 feet wide from the upstream end of the cut-off downstream to existing and prospective terminals on the sharp bend at Georgetown in lieu of the intercepted reach of the authorized channel that follows the river along the Georgetown City water front, and maintenance of the intercepted reach of the river to a depth of 18 feet and width of 400 feet.

Estimated cost to United States for construction: Construction of the proposed plan will present a saving to the United States of $137,000 over that of the existing authorized project.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 2, GULFPORT HARBOR, MISS.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project for Gulfport Harbor, Miss., to provide for a depth of 30 feet in the anchorage basin, a channel 30 feet deep and 220 feet wide from the basin across Mississippi Sound to Ship Island bar, and a channel 32 feet deep and 300 feet wide across Ship Island bar to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico, generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer.

Estimated cost to the United States for construction: $496,900.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 3, HARRISON COUNTY, MISS., SHORE PROTECTION

Item adopts new project as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Adoption of a project by the United States authorizing Federal participation toward the structural repair of the Harrison County sea wall and its protection by the construction of a beach, 300 feet wide, from Biloxi lighthouse to Henderson Point, a distance of about 24 miles. In addition, local interests will accomplish reconstruction of drainage facilities and comply with the following: (1) Adopt the afore-mentioned plan of improvement including repairs and alterations; (2) submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecuting the entire improvement prior to the commencement of such work; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for accomplishment of the work; and agree to (a) maintain the sea wall and drainage facilities, and the beach by artificial replenishment, during the useful life of these works as may be required to serve their intended purpose; (b) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages that may arise either before, during or after prosecution of work; (c) remedy water pollution that would endanger public health; and (d) assure perpetual public ownership of the beach and its administration for public use only.

Federal participation in first cost for construction: $1,133,000.

Total estimated first cost for construction: $2,368,000.

Annual maintenance charges to the United States: None; all to be assumed by local interests.

House conferees concur with an amendment to insert the document number.

AMENDMENT NO. 4, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT FORT MADISON, IOWA

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., to provide for (1) a small-boat basin and harbor of refuge at Fort Madison, Iowa, to be secured by constructing a breakwater and dredging the protected area and entrance channel to a project depth of 5 feet and (2) a dredged approach channel 9 feet deep to a site for a river-borne freight terminal at Fort Madison; both improvements to be accomplished in general accordance with the plans of the district engineer.

Estimated cost to United States for new work: $41,200 for the small-boat harbor, and $15,000 for the commercial harbor.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 5, PORT WING HARBOR, WIS.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: That the existing project be modified to provide for abandonment of the extension of the return pile revetment at the inner end of the east pier, the construction of the revetment on the east bank facing the entrance, and the inner channel with a depth of 15 feet. It is also recommended that it be further modified to provide for two inner channels 8 feet deep, extending easterly and southerly 1,170 and 340 feet, respectively, from an irregular-shaped turning basin 15 feet deep at the inner end of the piers.

Estimated cost to United States: $17,000.

House conferees concur with an amendment inserting "668" in lieu of "568" as the document number.

AMENDMENT NO. 6, OSWEGO HARBOR, N. Y.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended modification of existing project: (1) A breakwater approximately parallel to shore extending easterly from the existing east arrowhead breakwater, 10 feet above low-water datum for 2,300 feet and to 12 feet above low-water datum for 2,600 feet; (2) removal of approximately 1,020 feet of the inner end of the existing east arrowhead breakwater; and (3) a channel 250 feet wide extending easterly and terminating in an irregularly shaped basin at the easterly end of the harbor, all to a project depth of 18 feet in earth and 19 in rock; all generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer and with such modifications as in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers may be deemed advisable.

Estimated cost to United States for new work: $7,838,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 7, INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY FROM THE CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO THE ANCLOTE RIVER, FLA.

The item adopts a new section which modifies the existing project to the extent that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to utilize, at and in the vicinity of Venice, any of four routes described in the Act, the existing route being included in the list. The item provides that the cost to the United States shall not exceed the cost of the original route.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

Change in section number.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 9, BAYOU CARLIN, LA.

This item authorizes the Chief of Engineers, in the prosecution of the existing project, to protect the piers of the railway bridge crossing at Delcambre, La. Estimated cost, $15,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

Provides for the printing of river and harbor laws relating to rivers and harbors passed since June 25, 1938, for the use of the Department of the Army.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

Item provides that not to exceed $5,000 annually of the funds appropriated for rivers and harbors shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment in amounts approved by the Chief of Engineers of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meetings of the Congresses and of the Commission. This provides an increase of $2,000 over the amount provided under existing law.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 12

Item provides that the dam site known as Foster Creek Dam on the Columbia River, Wash., shall hereafter be known as the Chief Joseph Dam.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 13

Provides for change in section number.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

Item provides for a preliminary examination and survey of Quilcene Bay Harbor, Wash.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 15

Provides for a change in section number.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 16, LACKAWAXEN RIVER, DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, PA.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for construction of an earth-fill dam 94 feet high on Dyberry Creek 2.7 miles above the mouth to control a drainage area of 65 square miles and provide a reservoir with a capacity of 20,800 acre-feet; construction of an earth-fill dam 102 feet high on the Lackawaxen River, just above Prompton which would create a reservoir with a capacity of 19,200 acre-feet; and the removal of the three small dams at Honesdale. (Removal of these dams has been accomplished by local interests.)

Estimated cost to United States for construction: $12,150,000.

The sum of $6,150,000 is authorized to be appropriated for partial accomplishment of this project.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 17, WILKES-BARRE AND HANOVER TOWNSHIP, PA., SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

Item adopts new project as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Raising a low portion of the embankment at Wilkes-Barre an additional 2 feet by embankment or low concrete wall for a distance of 7,400 feet between Old River Road and Union Street.

Estimated cost to United States for construction: The project has been completed at a cost of $3,538,000. The cost of the additional work proposed is $250,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 18, JAMES RIVER BASIN, VA.

Item provides that preparation of plans or construction shall not be undertaken on the Gathright Reservoir and the Falling Springs reregulating dam on Jackson River, Va., heretofore authorized, until completion of review of the project to determine the desirability of its construction at the present time, and a finding of the proper local contribution on the basis of benefits to be derived for water supply, pollution abatement, and other conservation purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 19, CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for levees, channel works, and control structures at lake outlets in the St. Johns and Kissimmee areas; for increased levee protection around Lake Okeechobee and enlargement of its outlets, the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie waterways; for enlargement of existing drainage canals, and the construction of new canals and levees and pumping plants, for control of water in the Everglades area; and levees and channel work for protection of the area along the east coast.

Estimated cost to United States for construction: $171,041,000.

Amount authorized to be appropriated for partial accomplishment of said plan by this amendment, $16,300,000.

House conferees concur with an amendment inserting the document number.

AMENDMENT NO. 20, ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

This item provides that the second paragraph under the heading "Arkansas River Basin" in the Flood Control Act of 1946 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Engineers is authorized to provide in the Canton Reservoir on the North Canadian River one hundred and seven thousand acre-feet of irrigation and water supply storage (including approximately sixty-nine thousand acre-feet for irrigation and thirty-eight thousand acre-feet for municipal water supply for Enid, Oklahoma, to be utilized in accordance with section 8 and section 6, respectively, of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (Public, 534, Seventy-eighth Congress)), upon the condition that when siltation of the reservoir shall encroach upon the flood control authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946, and the authorization for appropriation for the Arkansas River Basin is hereby increased accordingly."

AMENDMENT NO. 21, APPROACHES TO CERTAIN BRIDGES ON ARKANSAS RIVER

The bill as passed by the House contains a modification of existing projects for flood protection on the Arkansas River which were authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944. That modification is intended to reestablish the general distribution of Federal and local participation in the first cost of alterations to highway bridges and approaches at Morrilton and at Van Buren-Fort Smith, as set forth in House Document No. 447, Seventy-eighth Congress. The present estimated cost of these alterations is $571,000. United States Highways 64 and 71 are strategic highways and State Highway No. 9 is a secondary Federal-aid road. Due to changes in design of the structures, channel changes caused by floods, and the emergency nature of accomplishing these alterations in a satisfactory manner at an early date, the committee believes that a Federal contribution to the modifications on a basis of approximately 50 percent is desirable and, therefor, recommends that the figure in the House bill be raised from $200,000 to $300,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 22, BRADENS BEND, ARKANSAS RIVER

Item adopts as an emergency measure, a plan for bank protection and control works at Bradens Bend, Okla., at an estimated cost of $1,000,000. The right bank of the Arkansas River has been actively sloughing into the stream since 1900. Active bank caving is now taking place downstream from the existing riprap. The branch line of the Kansas City Southern Railroad has been abandoned because of the bank caving, and United States Highway No. 271 relocated out of the area since it was severed. There now remains about 3,500 feet between the present bank line of the Arkansas River and the Poteau River. An existing draw between the Poteau and Arkansas Rivers would provide a pilot channel for the Arkansas River to change its course into the Poteau River, forming a double channel and isolating upward of 7,300 acres of high quality cultivated farm land comprising 45 farm units. This would have a detrimental effect on construction of the authorized navigation project at a later date.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 23, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH DRAINAGE BASIN, MINN. AND N. DAK.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for channel clearing, enlargement and realinement and construction of levees and flood walls along certain sectors of the main stem and of its major tributaries in Minnesota and North Dakota and construction of a multiple-purpose reservoir with the dam at mile 38.6 on the Otter Tail River, Minn.

Estimated cost to United States for construction: $9,928,000.

House conferees concur.

The sum of $2,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for partial accomplishment of this project.

AMENDMENT NO. 24, MISSOURI RIVER IN VICINITY OF MINERS BEND, NEBR. AND S. DAK.

Item adopts as an emergency measure the following project:

Plan of recommended improvement: The proposed project consists of a system of dikes and revetments to control erosion and prevent loss of farm lands from caving banks in Ponca and Miners Bends on the Missouri

River over a distance of about 9 miles. Construction of about 6 miles of revetment and 5,000 linear feet of dikes is contemplated. The project ties into the bluff line in Ponca Bend well above the critical area.

Estimated cost to the United States for construction: $3,000,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 25, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, COLO., WYO., AND NEBR.

Item adopts new project as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for the construction of the following works of improvement: (a) Reservoir at the Chatfield Dam site, (b) Continuous levee system along the South Platte River, between the Chatfield Dam site and St. Vrain Creek, (c) Channel improvements along South Platte River below St. Vrain Creek, (d) Channel improvement and related works at Boulder, Colo., and (e) Levee and appurtenant works at Erie, Colo.

Estimated cost to the United States for construction: $49,432,000.

Senate recedes.

AMENDMENT NO. 26, DETROIT RESERVOIR, ON NORTH SANTIAM RIVER, WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN

Item provides for the installation of generating facilities at the Detroit Dam and the construction of a reregulating reservoir. The Detroit Reservoir is one of the elements of the system of flood control and multipurpose reservoirs in the Willamette River Basin. It is advantageously located with respect to a power market area, and a major transmission network exists in that vicinity. The needed additional power-generating capacity in the Pacific Northwest is critical and will become more acute in the next few years. The proposed power installation would generate 443,100,000 kilowatt-hours annually which would have a value of $1,657,000. The ratio of benefits to costs is 1.57 to 1.0.

The total estimated Federal cost for the installation of power facilities including a reregulating dam at Detroit Reservoir is $19,030,000. Additional monetary authorization for this work need not necessarily be included in the bill since the available monetary authorization for the comprehensive plan for the Willamette River Basin, for which appropriations have not yet been made, is sufficient to cover the initial items of work on the installation of power facilities which might be undertaken in the near future. Approval of the inclusion of power, however, is urgently needed to permit this work to go ahead.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 27, 28, AND 29

These amendments rearrange the House language on the project for the West Tennessee tributaries under Lower Mississippi River by inserting a subsection, (a), and the following: "and the authorization for the Lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly".

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 30, DEVILS SWAMP PROJECT AT BATON ROUGE, LA.

House conferees concur with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the item insert the following: "and the authorization for the Lower Mississippi River project is increased accordingly".

AMENDMENT NO. 31, L'ANGUILLE RIVER, MO. AND ARK.

Item adopts new project, as follows:

Plan of recommended improvement: The plan of improvement provides for clearing, enlargement, and realignment as required of L'Anguille River below mile 108, Brushy Creek below mile 6, and First Creek below mile 8, to convey flood flows at stages sufficiently low to facilitate drainage of areas outside the first bottoms of the flood plain above the limit of Mississippi and St. Francis Rivers backwater.

Estimated cost to the United States for construction: $5,100,000.

House conferees concur.

AMENDMENT NO. 32, RIO GRANDE BASIN

Item adopts project covering the construction of reservoirs, floodways, rehabilitation and miscellaneous work, as follows:

Project [1]	Federal	Non-Federal	Tota
Chamita Reservoir	$30,833,000	----------	$30,833,000
Jemez Reservoir	7,201,000	----------	7,201,000
Rio Grande floodway	11,526,000	$181,000	11,707,000
Bluewater floodway	200,000	[2] 75,200	275,200
Rehabilitation work	18,233,000	----------	18,233,000
Miscellaneous work	1,525,000	----------	1,525,000
Total	69,518,000	256,200	70,328,849

[1] Based on December 1947 prices.
[2] $75,000 is a cash contribution and $200 is lands and damages.

Local cooperation: Local interests are required to give the customary assurances in connection with flood-control projects covering lands, damages, and highway and highway-bridge alterations for channel and levees in addition to maintaining and operating all levees in the Bluewater floodway. They must also contribute in cash $75,000 to the cost of constructing a culvert which is part of the Bluewater floodway project. Total estimated non-Federal cost is $256,200.

The plan will provide for the development of the water resources of the Rio Grande Basin and the flood-control phase of the plan covered in this report will provide improvements essential to the economic welfare of the inhabitants of the basin. The ratio of average annual benefits to average annual costs is 1.2 to 1.

The plan has been coordinated among the Federal and State agencies concerned and all are in agreement. Construction of the entire plan would be a joint undertaking of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior. The committee is of the opinion that flood and sediment control in the Rio Grande Basin is essential for protection of the valley lands. Sedimentation of the stream bed has raised ground-water levels in the valley and caused abandonment of large agricultural areas and increased damages from floods. The comprehensive plan worked out by State, Federal, and local officials would reduce flood damages and permit continued use of a large area for agricultural and other purposes. Approval of the plan with small authorization to construct emergency features and prosecute plans for certain remaining items is believed desirable and the committee so recommends.

The sum of $3,500,000 is authorized to be appropriated to be expended by the Department of the Army for partial accomplishment of this plan.

House conferees concur, with an amendment in lines 19 and 20, page 23, striking out the words: "at prices, on terms, and with titles satisfactory to him."

AMENDMENTS NOS. 33 TO 38, INCLUSIVE

These items provide for the making of preliminary examinations and surveys at the following localities:

Two Mile Creek, Oregon.

Aroostook River and tributaries, Maine.

Beaver Creek, Lincoln County, Oregon.

Skinner Creek, at and in the vicinity of Mannsville, New York.

Steinhatchee and Fenholloway Rivers, Florida.

River Rouge and tributaries, Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 39

This amendment increases the amount authorized in the House bill for carrying out improvements authorized under title II of the bill from $25,000,000 to $65,000,000.

House conferees concur with an amendment striking out "$65,000,000", and inserting in lieu thereof "$62,000,000."

GEO. A. DONDERO,
EARL WILSON,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

"(a) such sums, not to exceed $1,091,739 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization, as apportioned by the International Labour Conference in accordance with Article 13 (c) of the Constitution of the Organization; and

"(b) such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 per annum, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including—

"(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; under such rules

and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light and cost of living allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and

"(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946, Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

"SEC. 3. No person shall serve as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States until such person has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

And the House agree to the same.

DONALD L. JACKSON,
FRANKLIN J. MALONEY,
WIRT COURTNEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate joint resolution authorized the appropriation annually of such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of members and for participation by it in the International Labor Organization. The House amendment authorized to be appropriated annually such sums, not to exceed $550,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary for payment by the United States of its share of the expenses and further provided that "the annual United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the Organization shall not be greater in proportion than the United States quota of contribution to the total budget of the United Nations." The House amendment further authorized the annual appropriation of such additional sums, not to exceed $95,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, as may be necessary to pay the expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization. The amendment agreed to in conference follows the House provision except that (1) the amount authorized to be appropriated for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Organization is limited to $1,091,739 per annum in conformity with the appropriation bill recently passed by both Houses and this limitation is made applicable to all fiscal years, (2) the requirement quoted above as to quota of contribution is eliminated, and (3) the limitation of $95,000 on the authorization for the payment of expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization is made applicable to each fiscal year.

The House amendment provided that no citizen of, or resident in, the United States shall participate in any session, conference, or meeting, or other work of the International Labor Organization or of any subordinate committee or organization thereof, without the consent of the Secretary of State. The amendment agreed to in conference omits this provision. However, the House provision requiring investigation as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of any person serving as representative, delegate, or alternate from the United States has been retained.

DONALD L. JACKSON,
FRANKLIN J. MALONEY,
WIRT COURTNEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARITAL DEDUCTION, FOR ESTATE-TAX PURPOSES, IN CASE OF LIFE INSURANCE OR ANNUITY PAYMENTS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 429) relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 812 (e) (1) (G) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to life insurance with power of appointment in surviving spouse) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(G) Life insurance or annuity payments with power of appointment in surviving spouse: In the case of an interest in property passing from the decedent consisting of proceeds under a life insurance, endowment, or annuity contract, if under the terms of the contract such proceeds are payable in installments or are held by the insurer subject to an agreement to pay interest thereon (whether the proceeds, upon the termination of any interest payments, are payable in a lump sum or in annual or more frequent installments), and such installment or interest payments are payable annually or at more frequent intervals, commencing not later than 13 months after the decedent's death, and all amounts payable during the life of the surviving spouse are payable only to such spouse, and such spouse has the power to appoint all amounts payable under such contract (exercisable in favor of such surviving spouse, or of the estate of such surviving spouse, or in favor of either, whether or not in each case the power is exercisable in favor of others), with no power in any other person to appoint to any person other than the surviving spouse any part of the amounts payable under such contract—

"(i) such proceeds shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), be considered as passing to the surviving spouse, and

"(ii) no part of such proceeds shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (i), be considered as passing to any person other than the surviving spouse.

"This subparagraph shall be applicable only if, under the terms of the contract, such power in the surviving spouse to appoint, whether exercisable by will or during life, is exercisable by such spouse alone and in all events."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this joint resolution shall be applicable with respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1947.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this proposal is intended to correct an inequity in the Revenue Act of 1948 whereby insurance proceeds left with the insurer at interest, or settlement under endowment and annuity contracts are denied the marital deduction. Insurers have received requests from a large number of policy holders to rearrange their insurance proceeds to comply with the law, and it is causing confusion among millions of policy holders.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CLAIMING CREDIT OR REFUND WITH RESPECT TO WAR LOSSES

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 428) providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That if a claim for credit or refund under the internal-revenue laws relates to an overpayment on account of the deductibility by the taxpayer of a loss in respect of property considered destroyed or seized under section 127 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to war losses, for a taxable year beginning in 1941 or 1942, the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall in no event expire prior to December 31, 1949. In the case of such a claim filed on or before December 31, 1949, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in section 322 (b) (2) or (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the deductibility of the loss described in this section.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Andresen, August H.	Kee	O'Toole
Bell	Kefauver	Peden
Blackney	Keogh	Ploeser
Bland	Kerr	Plumley
Brown, Ohio	King	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Kirwan	Regan
Celler	Lane	Rivers
Combs	Lewis, Ohio	Robertson
Elliott	Ludlow	Shafer
Fellows	Lusk	Smathers
Fogarty	Lyle	Smith, Maine
Granger	Lynch	Stigler
Hartley	McMahon	Thomas, N. J.
Jennings	Macy	Welch
Johnson, Okla.	Meade, Md.	West
Johnson, Tex.	Michener	Wilson, Ind.
	Morton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INCREASING COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Messrs. KEARNEY, MATHEWS, ALLEN of Louisiana and RANKIN.

INCREASING RATES OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH COMPENSATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Messrs. KEARNEY, MATHEWS, RANKIN, and ALLEN of Louisiana.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members, including the Speaker, are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6401, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 4 of the bill is still pending. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems best to make a short announcement for the possible information of a great many of the Members of the House.

In the first place, I would like to say that I quite understand the situation. I have been in the House long enough, I think, to at least have a reasonable understanding of the present situation and the views of both those in favor of this bill and those opposed to it.

It is not my doing that this bill comes up on the closing days of the Congress. If I had had my way, it would have been up a month ago, with ample time, 2 or 3 days, for debate. I would not be disposed to rush the consideration of this bill under the 5-minute rule, were it not for the fact that it comes up at the very close of the Congress.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I have tried to conduct it in a way that was fair to all Members on the majority side. I think even though some of them have opposed me on this measure, they will say that they have been reasonably fairly treated. I think the same is true, if you would ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], on the minority side. It has been my disposition to be that way in the House under the 5-minute rule.

This is a very important bill. It is not a pleasant bill for Members to vote on, but it is a bill that has a great deal to do with the security of this Nation, looking to the future, as we see it, for the next 2 years.

Thirty-three members of the Armed Services Committee heard all the testimony. They are informed, and a preponderant majority of that committee having heard all the testimony, reported this bill favorably. I do not say that they are more correct in their viewpoint than you, but at least they are better informed in the premises than the average Member of the House.

It is true that on yesterday, on an amendment providing for 1 year, a great many men, who were opposed to the bill completely, spoke for the 1-year amendment. They spoke of how fine it would be for the young men of this country to have 1 year's training in the Army—the very gentlemen who opposed universal military training and assisted in blocking the consideration of that bill by the Congress.

I hold nothing against anybody. Personally, I am not concerned with the views of anybody here. It is a fact that this large committee reported this bill favorably, and the Senate of the United States has acted upon it. The President of the United States suggested it. It is true that one of the candidates on the Republican ticket, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TAFT, voted for this bill. It is true that the Governor of New York, Mr. Dewey, in a press release—and I congratulate him upon the guts it took to do it—stated that he was in favor of the bill; and so is the young former Governor of Minnesota, Mr. Stassen.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Has the President of the United States said anything about the draft on his trip out West?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Whether he has or has not, he made a speech for it. I think the public generally expects the Congress to vote on this issue.

This morning, the Speaker of the House who has been a long-time friend of mine, a man in whom I have confidence, asked me to hurry this bill as fast as I could, to go as long as I could, and try to pass this bill tonight. That is my intention. If in attempting to do that I seem to ride over somebody it is not ANDREWS personally that does it. I am chairman of a committee charged with consideration of an important measure for the security of this country whether you believe it or not. There is my friend, and he has been a friend of mine, who at this time opposes this bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. You would not think it, but I campaigned at his invitation in his district although I will admit he did not allow me to speak at the meeting, but it was a very pleasant evening I spent with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. Now he may attempt to do all sorts of things. He may try to block a vote on this bill, as he represents a party which is diametrically opposed to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw it. Let the gentleman from Texas proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, we went through an experience last night. I know exactly what happened. I know that I was ignominiously defeated; but I do not believe it was in accordance with the majority view of the House. To those of you who found it convenient or comfortable to be in your homes or in your offices last night when we were voting on a most important issue, I say to you, I hope that you enjoyed the diversions in which you were interested.

I do not regard this bill as just another bill. I do not think that this is like adding a few million or subtracting a few million from an appropriation bill;

I think that this bill is one of the fundamental things involving the security of this Nation. I voted for the Marshall plan, for ERP or ECA, whichever you want to call it, and I think this is just as important as that.

I know there is a filibuster on here. I admire the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] because they are unalterably opposed to this bill and say so. I cannot say that I admire those of you who resort to the expediency of gutting amendments in order to defeat this bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. No. I know the gentleman is opposed to the bill, that he thought when he voted for the 70-group air force that he would avoid the necessity of voting on this. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

I realize we have just had a roll call to develop a quorum, but I doubt very sincerely if there is a quorum present since the Speaker counted last.

There is here an effort to prevent the consideration of this bill. Let every Member of this House atone to his own conscience. I think that this is a necessity. I think that it is entitled to consideration on its merits; and those of you who will resort to devices to avoid that vote, may your conscience not trouble you.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT:

Pages 6 and 7, strike out all of subsection (e) beginning on line 22, page 6, and extending through line 23, page 7.

Page 8, line 19, after the number "1940", strike out the remainder of the line and the word "more" in line 20.

Page 28, line 24, strike out the words "prior to September 2, 1945."

Page 9, strike lines 4 through 23, inclusive.

Strike out all of page 10.

Strike out lines 1 through 4, page 11.

Page 13, line 20, strike out the words "less than ninety" and insert in lieu thereof the words "no prior."

Page 13, line 21, strike out the words "days' continuous."

Page 13, line 22, strike out the comma after the word "States" and the words "exclusive of periods of active training duty."

Page 48, strike out lines 8 through 11, inclusive.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (interrupting reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the remainder of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to exempt veterans of World War II. If the Clerk had read the entire amendment, he would have read a combination of deletions, and it is for that reason I asked unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The language of the bill before us provides that those veterans of World War II who had up to 12 months of service would be included in the draft, except the holders of the Purple Heart, citations, members of Reserve components, and those who are not physically qualified, and so forth.

Let us keep in mind yesterday we spent hours talking about doctors, also students between the ages of 19 and 25. This amendment concerns 613,000 young men who left their homes, their jobs, and their education—some volunteered, while others were drafted into the service. When you deduct the number of veterans of World War II who hold the Purple Heart, also citations, and the number who are physically disqualified, you shrink the number of 613,000 to a mere 50,000. Therefore this amendment will exempt only 50,000 veterans of World War II who are not at the moment exempt under the language of the bill.

I ask you, is it fair for us, the Congress of the United States, to apply another draft to a veteran who has been drafted already or to one who volunteered in the last war? The responsibility of fighting this country's wars, the responsibility of military service, is a responsibility that belongs to every young man who is physically qualified. By exempting the veterans of World War II you will simply be passing the responsibility of military service to the shoulders of those who have not served their country already.

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars appeared before our committee in support of this amendment. The committee by a marginal vote defeated it and it is for that reason that the amendment is offered at this time.

In conclusion let me mention again there are only 50,000 veterans of World War II involved. Let us exempt them by adopting this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would eliminate from the bill those provisions requiring veterans with limited service to serve in Reserve components?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The veterans of World War II.

Mr. KILDAY. World War II, yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Who have less than 12 months of service.

Mr. KILDAY. The bill as drawn would require one with less than 12 months service to enter a Reserve component. Were the gentleman's amendment adopted those men would be totally exempt under the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, the gentleman's argument in support of his amendment was not in consonance with the terms of the amendment. The gentleman will agree that what we are attempting to do here is to channel into the reserve components those men who have served more than 90 days and less than 12 months. Do I understand the gentleman to mean if one has served more than 90 days and less than 12 months that he is to be exempt entirely?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My amendment provides that all men of World War II who had less than 12 months' service shall be exempt from the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. In other words, as to those who were in the service, but had no combat service—in very rare instances they may have had combat service—the gentleman would exempt all of them?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Then what would become of our reserve components?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make reply to the genial gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. I have nothing but the fondest regard for him and I have a great deal of respect for him. I think that he has been working for this kind of legislation most assiduously and in all earnestness. I disagree with him, but nevertheless I respect him.

However, I do not think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] was playing fair with this House when he sought to arouse the political prejudices of the membership on both sides of the House in order to corral votes in support of this measure. His attempt was so obvious that even a blind man could see it when he tried to lump together the opposition of the gentlemen on his side of the aisle and the opposition of some gentlemen on this side of the aisle with my opposition and that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISAACSON].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I prefer to complete my statement and then I shall yield.

Then the gentleman from New York went a step further and in order to arouse political prejudice, he stated that this measure is being diametrically opposed by the party which I have the honor and the distinction to represent in this House. We have been here long enough, gentlemen, and we know that time and time again that Members, who have an extremely opposed political philosophy may vote for or against a proposition for different reasons. There are some Members of this House who oppose this measure for pacific reasons. There are other Members of this House who oppose this measure because they feel that it is not necessary. There are others who oppose this measure because they conscientiously believe that if a system of voluntary enlistment were properly encouraged, that it would fulfill the alleged need. Those gentleman are just as much in earnest in their opposition to this measure as the gentleman from New York is in earnest in support of this measure, and those gentlemen are just as sincere in the reasons that they attribute in opposition to this measure as the gentleman from New York is in support of this measure.

As for me and as for the party I represent, we have no apology to make for our opposition. We oppose it because it is another step in the direction of war for profits and resultant depressions. How ironical it is that on the very day

when this Congress has placed the seal of doom on public housing you open the flood gates of militarism in support of an imperialist foreign policy. Yes; in support of Wall Street domination of the world. Today, you refused to house the veterans and you refused to house the youth of this country, and now, on this very same day, you announce here a program of rushing through legislation to house them in the Army.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not at this time.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman does not intend to yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do intend to yield, but the gentleman knows I want to complete my statement. Then I shall ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from Texas. I am not trying to evade any question.

We look upon this legislation as part of a program, a program that has carried this Nation of ours into Europe, in support of reaction in Turkey and fascism in Greece, and into China in support of its Hitler and I say that that program is not in defense of the interests of the American people, it is in defense not of America, but of an expansionism of the same monopoly capital that has today ruthlessly crushed all hopes of housing legislation in this House. This conscription is part of a program that is in the interest of the exploitation of the people of the world, not in the interest of the common people who reside in your districts but in the interest of those who have made war time and time again in this world. I repeat again that we are in no danger of attack from the Soviet Union. We are under attack from the big trusts that are raising prices daily, refuse Americans housing, that are enslaving and exploiting labor, destroying the liberties of our people and now seek to militarize our youth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I say this before I yield to the gentleman: That if I believed, and the new party which I represent believed, that this were not in the interest of imperialism, that it were really in the interest of the defense of the common people of this Nation, particularly that one-third that you refuse to house today by your action, then I would support it.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. In enumerating those who are opposed to the bill, I notice the gentleman did not refer to the Wallacites and those who are for appeasing Russia. The gentleman agrees that they are opposed to the bill, does he?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not know where the gentleman has been, but I have been speaking of the position of the new party. We do not agree that we are appeasing anyone. We say that those who support this legislation are appeasing those elements in this country that are driving this Nation to war for profits and depression. Appeasement comes from them and not from us. In opposing this bill we are defending the best interest of our Nation and we are fighting in the very defense of the common people of this Nation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is very ironical also that, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said, there is before the Committee on Rules today an extremely fine housing measure just for veterans alone, the best housing measure for veterans that I have ever seen. I refer, of course, to the veterans' homestead housing bill (H. R. 4488) which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I am hopeful that we will get a rule or a suspension to pass that bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said that before the Rules Committee yesterday it was a fine measure, that it did not interfere in any way with his bill or with any other bill. He told me the same thing; 29 Members introduced the bill with me. It was reported unanimously out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is not talking about the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will proceed in order.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will proceed to talk about the bill, and the gentleman may like what I have to say regarding the bill or regarding some 50 disabled veterans who are here in the gallery and outside the House Chamber, single amputees and double-leg-and-arm amputees, some in wheel chairs. Many are sitting on the floor. There are no chairs. They cannot stand. Not one of those men said anything about the draft today. I believe firmly all those men would rather have a draft if it is going to save more men from being disabled and be a protection to the United States. Grievously disabled as they are, they are not complaining today about their disabilities. Most of them are discharged. Some of them now have automobiles. It is a matter of rehabilitation. Those who now have cars came from different parts of the United States to help others to secure this legislation. They know what cars have done for them in rehabilitation, in enabling them to secure jobs, and to get them GI training in schools and colleges.

They are here asking for a bill which includes the blind and other amputees, and those who are not included in the bill which passed 2 years ago and was enacted again last year. Similar groups in hospitals cannot get cars because they must be discharged before they can apply for cars. That bill expires June 30.

Mr. Chairman, I was never so shocked in all my experience in Washington since 1913 as when there was an Independent Offices appropriation bill being considered, including appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. A rule was secured in order to waive all points of order. There was much legislation in that appropriation bill. There were provisions contained in that bill affecting civilians. Yet, when I tried to offer an amendment inserting the provisions of the Senate bill, S. 1391, providing automobiles, a point of order was made against it as being legislation in an appropriation bill. That provision would have helped badly disabled combat casualties.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Rules Committee for a rule. I have asked the Speaker and floor leaders to allow the bill to come up under suspension of the rules. I do not believe there is a Member who would vote against the measure if once it gets to the floor. During that debate that day, Member after Member said in speaking, "There is nothing we would not do for the disabled." They did not live up to those brave words. This is a small thing to do for the combat disabled. It is a bill that the Senate passed unanimously over a year ago, a bill that our Committee reported over a year ago, and which is ready for action. I am positive, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress cannot adjourn without taking care of these amputees and these blind men who are not protesting against the draft. It may mean that there will be even more disabled, but in the minds of some, and in their minds, it means that if we did not have a large enough Army and Navy, there would probably be more disabled men in the end. You all do honor to the disabled, as I do, and I know that you will all act for them. This Congress which has spent billions for foreign relief and rehabilitation cannot refuse to authorize the comparatively small sum of $8,000,000 to provide cars for these grievously disabled veterans who are our first and primary charge.

During the frantic war days we promised to rehabilitate them. See that we fulfill that promise before adjournment 2 days off—before it is too late after adjournment.

No Member can go through the hospital amputee, paraplegic, and blind wards and say, "No, I did not help you," without shame.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the so-called Van Zandt amendment close in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the so-called Van Zandt amendment close in 17 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, it has been difficult for me to understand exactly the purport or import of the gentleman's amendment.

Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Under subsection (2) on page 5, in inducting persons, pursuant to paragraph 1 of this subsection, the President shall induct in the following order of priority:

The first deals with the Medical and Dental Corps; the second with those who participate in Army specialty training; and the third those who are less than 35 years of age.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yesterday the House struck from the bill the entire provision that applies to doctors.

Mr. FOLGER. I understand that, but what change does your amendment make with respect to 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 6?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I might reply to the gentleman that all of page 6, down through line 17, has been deleted from the bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Does that mean that none of these people who have been in the service are exempt from the draft?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It means that no doctors——

Mr. FOLGER. I am not talking about doctors, but others who have been in the service, who are less than 35 and have had less than 90 days' service.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The language the gentleman refers to relates only to doctors and no one else.

Mr. FOLGER. Now, what about your amendment?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My amendment affects the language beginning on page 6, line 22, and deletes throughout the remainder of the bill all requirements of draft on the part of honorably discharged veterans of World War II, who had 12 months', or less, service. In other words, they cannot be drafted in accordance with the provisions of this bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Your amendment, then, takes them out from under the authority of this bill?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, it means that they will have no obligation, no matter how short their service may have been, to enter the National Guard or the organized Reserves?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. In other words, a man who served 60 days would be exempt from all liability for service. A man who served less than 12 months would be exempt from further liability, whereas our bill provides that if he had had less than 12 months he must go into the Reserves or the National Guard. The bill passed by the Senate, if he had less than 18 months. It would eliminate from the bill all of those provisions which we had hoped would accelerate enlistments in the Reserve components. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as I interpret the intent of the Committee on Armed Services in writing in this language as it now stands, it is to help build up the citizen Organized Reserves in the country who, in the last analysis, in the face of any major emergency, must be relied upon to defend the country. We cannot in a major emergency, rely upon a standing army or a standing professional air force or a standing professional navy. We must go to citizens, as we have done in every contest in which we have taken part.

The purpose here, to my mind, is perfectly legitimate. It does not inflict a hardship upon these veterans of World War II who had less than 12 months' service. It does not compel them to go into active service; rather it invites them, instead of going into active service, to join a unit of the National Guard or the Naval Reserve or the Marine Reserve or the Air Force Reserve and thus build up those elements with men who already have had some training in World War II. A man might have had only 2 or 3 months' service in World War II and never have left the training camp. They are good men. It is no reflection on them at all. They are now in their early twenties. It is fair to say that they have not suffered, but they can be of great use to the country if they are encouraged to go into the Organized Reserves. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says, I recollect, that there are 50,000 of them. That is a very important number for the Reserves. It would greatly help the National Guard if some of these World War veterans of short service would join up. It would be a great incentive for others to join and would help recruiting and help the efficiency of the National Guard.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. I heartily agree with what the gentleman says regarding the Reserves and National Guard. It is true also that these men of short service have received substantial benefits from the Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Indeed they have. They have enjoyed the GI bill of rights if they had over 90 days of service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Also, it should be pointed out that in the case of the veterans covered by the gentleman's discussion it would not interfere with their vocation or education. It would just be extracurricular service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all; not at all. They could live at home—live like ordinary citizens.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This would supplement the short period of service they had in the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman feel that by the passage of this amendment it would supplement enlistments in the National Guard?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be very helpful to the National Guard if this provision were retained, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I am supporting anything that will strike from this bill any of those parts which together comprise the biggest tissue of lies ever forced upon the American people in peacetime. On Saturday I made a public statement that this bill was so important, regardless of what happened to other legislation, I was determined that we were going to have free and ample time to discuss it; and when the committee brought out a 3-hour-debate limitation I again, day before yesterday, emphasized that if there was any gag placed on the 5-minute rule I would oppose it even if it meant that no other business would be transacted in this Congress during this session.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I will not.

The gentleman from New York has limited 7 speakers to 17 minutes. That is gagging this legislation.

Therefore, as of this minute I will object to every unanimous consent for the balance of this Congress. As of this minute there will be no unanimous-consent requests agreed to on this floor. You might as well pack your bags up and go home.

Also I am very happy to say——

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Not unless I get extra time.

Mr. KILDAY. Time has been fixed. It is not under my control.

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

I would like to say that the saying that the opposers of this bill are members of a party diametrically opposed to the bill marks another cheap subterfuge, another cheap trick to brand those of us who are not members of the American Labor Party, but who are honestly opposed to this bill.

The gentleman from New York, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, knows better than anyone else here, because the witnesses appeared before him, that the vast majority of the religious leaders of this Nation, Protestant and Catholic, are opposed to this bill. He does not call Cardinal Daugherty a Wallaceite, does he? Does he mean to imply that the Reverend Ralph Sockman, of the Methodist Church, must be an American Labor Party member because he is opposed to this bill? Does he mean to imply that Chancelor Graham, of the University of North Carolina, who is the national president of the Council Against Conscription, is a leftwinger because he is opposed to this bill? No.

There are plenty of us on both sides of this House opposed to this bill who take our place along with Communists or pacifists, or anyone opposing this slavery. Thank God, we recaptured enough of our manhood late yesterday to rise up and defeat the brass-hat dictatorship of this House and put into this bill some

things that we believed was honest by reducing the draft to 1 year. I have faith enough in this recaptured manhood to believe that when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], brings his amendment before us we are going to pass it and, therefore, kill this Army-Fascist-dictatorship control of our national life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I am quite surprised to hear for the first time someone expressing an interest in the Reserves. The gentleman from New York says that if we strike this out of the bill it will vitally affect the Reserves. Now, I do not believe that remark, because I have been a part of the Reserves since 1925. Anyone who is a veteran of World War II will gladly join the Reserves if the Regular Army will make it available to him.

We have been out of this war for over 2 years, almost 3 years, as a matter of fact, and the handling of the Reserve organization by the Army is a crime.

May I call your attention to the minority report. General Evans, head of the Reserve Officers' Association, testified before the committee that he had been working for 3 years trying to get somebody to do something for the Reserves. He testified further that he had been told by a member of the Regular Army that they were not interested in building up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard, because they were going to get UMT and the draft.

Mr. Chairman, may I say as a member of the Reserve organization, as one man who served during the last war, and I am still a colonel in the Ordnance Reserve, that if we were to run into an emergency I assure you I would be ready to go tomorrow. I say that all members who are eligible for the Reserve will be glad to join if it is available, if the Army will take an interest in it and build it up.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think any man should be subject to two drafts. The first draft was on account of an emergency. There is no question about that. No one can claim differently.

Now, in connection with this draft I would like to know what the emergency is. Has anyone told us on this floor yet what it is?

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment to strike out the veterans of World War II from this draft and I hope it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the attacks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] on Members who are opposed to this bill. Those insulting insinuations cannot intimidate an honest man.

Today is the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill where American patriots started this Nation on its road to glorious achievements. I wonder if on that anniversary we are going to pass a bill that will fasten militarism upon the American people for all time to come?

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas and all the rest of you that no man in this House has fought communism any harder than I have. No man in this Congress has done more to turn the spotlight of merciless publicity onto Communist activities in this country than I have.

No man has taken more of their abuse than I am taking even today, because I am opposed to communism and everything for which communism stands. It is atheistic anarchy dedicated to the destruction of our Christian civilization. I am opposed to it and will do everything in my power to prevent its fastening itself upon the American people.

Is any Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs present? If so, were you present and did you hear General Marshall this morning make the statement that there was no danger of war at this time, or words to that effect? If so, why do you not stand up here and give us General Marshall's statement? Why do you not tell the American Congress what General Marshall said?

The sponsors of this legislation are carrying on the same old tactics that were carried on after World War I. I was here then, and I heard that debate. They attempted then to fasten militarism upon the American people; and that is what this means. You will never live to see us get rid of it if this bill is passed and becomes law.

Not only that, but you are getting ready to draft these men to fight the battle of the UN, that unpredictable, international organization congregated up here in New York that is trying to get rid of the United States and force upon us a world government. Do not forget that. And, do not forget that the mothers and the fathers and the young men of this country are going to know that and they are going to ask you why when you go home.

Yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] made one of the most intelligent statements I have heard on this measure.

Oh, they say, "You voted for the 70-unit air force."

Certainly we did. But you want to subordinate that air force to a vast army dominated by men who probably are more interested in promotion than anything else.

If you want to defend this Nation, put that 70-unit air force into effect and, as the gentleman from North Carolina said, promote these men in the Air Force, raise their pay to where they can afford it, give them the power to employ the technicians necessary, and with the atomic bomb they will not only protect this Nation, but I dare say with America in that condition no world power would start a war in which we would likely be involved.

I have on my wall today a picture of a steel mill in Nagasaki after the atomic bomb was dropped on that city. It is simply a twisted mass of steel girders.

But they say, "Oh, we have to have ground forces." You did not have to have ground forces in Nagasaki or Hiroshima, because it was even dangerous for anybody to go there for days and weeks and probably months after the bomb was dropped. But this young man, this soldier boy from my home county, took a picture of a steel mill a mile from where the bomb fell. As I said, it is a twisted mass of steel girders. No, we are living in an atomic age, and if we will take advantage of it, build and maintain the 70-group air force we have voted, and provide it with the funds to employ the necessary technicians, we will not need to wreck the Republic in this way.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to cover just about two points in regard to this matter that I think are rather significant so that you may consider them for what if anything you might think they are worth.

I will read hurriedly here, and then make a comment concerning the same, a statement that was made by the minority in the committee report, as follows:

General Evans, the executive director of the Reserve Officers' Association, told the Armed Services Committee that the Army had done "very little" to help the Reserves, had done "nothing" to furnish equipment, and did not contact or "put in units" the members of the Reserve. General Evans said—

"I am not talking about procurement. All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we have now."

General Evans agreed that, "there would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to build them up."

In the Senate hearings, General Evans said:

"There is an apparent policy which exists in the Pentagon today which says we will do very little with the Reserve program until the National Guard program is 100-percent organized. It cannot be 100-percent organized in the manner in which it is supposed to be, completely, until the passage of universal military training."

General Reckord of the National Guard told our House committee that General Marshall in 1944 directed him, as chairman of the Joint General Staff Committee, to set up the National Guard and the Reserves "based on the fact that Congress would give us UMT."

General Evans backed this up by saying he had heard the statement made that the Army leaders "felt that they need not build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard because they were going to get UMT or the draft."

The situation is simply this. It is as plain as the nose on your face, and here is the record showing it, that the Army has made no real effort to try to bring the Army up to the standard necessary, by the voluntary system. They just have made no effort along that line, yet they ask us to depart from the traditions of this country and to become a military conscription Nation like the European nations, before having done their part in attempting to get what they say is necessary by the voluntary method.

Let us examine another statement. I am a member of a Protestant church but I am not a Baptist. In my thinking, however, the Baptists are good folk. The Northern Baptists passed a resolution not long ago in their convention, meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., May 28, 1948, and in the resolution they said this significant thing, and I believe they are telling the truth because they are good people:

Whereas the determination of our international relations is now so much in the hands of military men that the Army and Navy Bulletin of January 18, 1947, stated, "Today the Army has virtual control of foreign affairs * * * the chain of control in diplomatic hot spots both in the execution of basic policy and in the formulation of ad hoc arrangements lies almost totally in the hands of the military authorities."

The Army and Navy Bulletin has the audacity to tell us that. Everybody knows it, it is as plain as day what is going on, but here they publish the fact that the foreign policy of our Government has been turned over to the Army. Are we going to go a step further and make it a cinch that you and I as representatives of the people no longer represent their interests along that line? I am afraid that is what we are doing today, if we take this step, and perhaps some others that will follow it. We cannot continue to do these things and properly represent our people and protect our people, in my judgment.

You may say that we need this program to have a big backlog of men. I tell you that if we get into another war all of us will have to get into it, every one of us. The civilians will be in it, and those who served in the last war will be in again. We already have a backlog of about 10,000,000 trained men. There is no crisis at this time the proponents do not even claim there is. These gentlemen, honest and sincere men, good American citizens, brainy men, who sit back here on both sides on the committee have made no showing that there is any such crisis in this country as would justify this kind of legislation. They just have not made such a showing. So let us defeat this bill. It just is not any good. All right, let us kill it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the Chairman advise the Committee how many amendments are proposed to be offered to section 4?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can advise the gentleman from New York that there are 14 amendments to section 4 at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on section 4 and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to be generous, as I know that some of these amendments are going to be accepted by the Committee. Therefore, I move that debate on section 4 and all amendments thereto close at 3:30.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. I just want to say I am very happy that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has become magnanimous.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is quite a devastating week, as I heard some Member say. We have to make decisions here that call for considerable courage. I have prayed a little bit about this bill and about this decision that I have to make. The conclusion I have come to is definite and clear, and I want everybody to know it. I am against this bill. Why am I against this bill? I will tell you. A little over 50 years ago when I was just a young fellow, the Standard Oil Co. laid a pipe line through our farm. In those days the ditches were all dug by hand, and hundreds of men slept in our barns and our sheds. For weeks and weeks and for a good while after that, those fellows went through there from time to time attending to their jobs and inspecting the line and one thing or other. Foreign immigration was at high tide in those days. I talked with some of those men over a period of years, as did my father. There was one reason why nearly every man had come to America, and that was to escape militarism in Europe. I am afraid that we are embarking here on a program in which our young people, my grandchildren and your grandchildren, will have nothing to look forward to but the military in the years to come. By the gods, I will not be a party to anything like that until I am convinced that an honest effort has been made to keep our armed forces properly filled by other means or until an emergency arises that makes it necessary. I do not believe it is right from any angle. I want to suggest something else. In computing our manpower, I find that in the age group from 19 through 25, we have an estimated pool of only 1,300,000 qualified physically fit men. At the same time we have a pool in that same age group of 1,686,000 physically unfit men who I think ought to be taken into consideration. I have heard a great many remarks made about Russia and China and their great war pool, and the great manpower pool that they have. I wonder why this Government which wants to do everything for everybody in the world does not take this IV–F group, these physically unfit people and put those, at least who are redeemable and can be made strong, into camps and give them a year's training or a year of physical building up? Has it ever occurred to you that those fellows stay at home and that they are the ones who get married and raise families that many of them are physically unfit to raise and physically not qualified to support those families after they have brought them into the world. I believe we could make a definite contribution to our manpower, to our strength, and be a greater potential threat to any aggressor nation if that is what we want to do, by building up our own manpower rather than creating a situation here where maybe some day our sons and daughters will try to go to another country to get away from the military here. When that time comes, they will have no country to go to, just as the millions who came to this country fifty and more years ago, had no other country to go to.

I am giving you some food for thought. I am going to everlastingly be against it until I am convinced that the Army is dealing honestly with us and that there is an emergency arising that makes it necessary.

So far, even the proponents of this legislation have not claimed that an emergency exists that would warrant putting the selective service act into operation in peacetime. The whole program is something new and unheard of during our long history.

The fact is that the Army is the only branch of our armed service which has urged the passage of this bill. The Army has created a scarcity of manpower by raising the physical requirements to the point that many men who would volunteer for service cannot pass the physical tests. The recruiting service, on the other hand, has admittedly made little or no effort to maintain the required number of men in the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the time for debate was limited, were not those on their feet at the time to be given time?

The CHAIRMAN. There was no such request made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the customary procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not done in this case.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Page 4, line 21, after the word "birth", strike out the period, and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no person who, after he has attained the twenty-first anniversary of the date of his birth, and who subsequent to July 1, 1949, becomes a member of a Reserve component mentioned in subsection (D) of this act, shall thereafter, without his consent, be inducted for service under this act, so long as he remains a member of such Reserve component."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say it is my expectation to vote for this bill. I do not offer this amendment with any idea of destroying the legislation, defeating it, or delaying it. I believe that this amendment, if adopted, will strengthen the defense of America, because I have a great deal more confidence in the component Reserve units than some of the members of the committee seem to have. I believe that our National Guard is a very effective and a very important part of our national defense. I fear that we have

not given enough attention to this important element of our armed forces. I also fear that this bill does not give enough attention to the rights of the individual young man who is called upon to make sacrifices for his country.

I think it is the unquestionable right of the Government and the people collectively to call upon any citizen to make sacrifices to see that his country is perpetuated, and that, as I understand it, is the purpose of this legislation. But it seems to me that any necessary sacrifice should be divided as equitably as possible.

Under this bill, as it is now written, any young man is subject to draft for seven long years. Any young man who becomes 19 years of age may be drafted that year. He may be drafted when he is 20, when he is 21, but it may happen that he will not be drafted. He may be 24, and he is still subject to draft. He may be 25 and still be subject to the draft. Until he attains the age of 26 years, he is still subject to being taken by the scruff of the neck and haled from his civilian avocation and placed in the armed services of the United States. With that prospect confronting him, how can he expect to establish a home? How can he expect to establish a business? How can he expect to receive the kind of consideration for employment at the hands of private industry or at the hands of the United States Government, if you please, to which he is entitled?

It seems to me that in all fairness to these boys whom we are calling upon to protect us, that we should in turn make some sacrifices in order to give them a square deal. Why should we hold a sword of Damocles over their heads for seven long years? Why should we not say to the armed forces of the United States: "When Johnny Jones becomes 19 years of age, if you need him, go out and take him. We give you that power. When he is 19 or 20, or until he is 21, you may still go out and grab him, no matter what he is doing, but when he has held himself in readiness for 2 years, and you have not called him, he shall have the opportunity to secure his future by joining and serving in a Reserve unit.

We say that it is the duty of that boy to serve his country, if he is needed. The amendment recognizes that duty, but surely if he is not needed there should be no desire to impose any useless burden on anyone. If the Army does not call a boy for two full years, it is pretty plain that they do not need him. If he is not needed, let him go with no strings on his future. When that boy gets to be 21 years old we should at least be fair enough to that boy to say that if he is still willing to serve his country, although his country has not called him, if he is willing to join a Reserve unit, if he is willing to join a National Guard unit, where he will probably do the Nation just as much good as he would in the standing Army, then he could be sure that he was not going to be called out unless we went to war. Then he could found a home, he could safely go into business or seek a job without any handicap. At least then he can have some security, at least when he is 21 he will not then be faced with an uncertainty as to his future if he makes a home or establishes himself in business.

The amendment provides very carefully that he cannot join this Reserve component during the next year. The purpose of that is to give the armed services a year in which to get those 330,000 young men who the committee told us did not serve in World War II but who were subject to draft and who were never called. This makes it certain that the Army shall have the opportunity to go out and get those boys that it did not call during World War II who were eligible. Under this amendment you still have the opportunity to call these boys who were not called during the recent war. On the contrary, all of these men would be subject to the draft unconditionally for the next year, and if they did not join the Guard, they would remain subject to draft until they reached 26. It would, however, give the younger boys a little protection and security so that they will not be tied up with uncertainty for a very important part of their lives. The young men of America should and will cooperate with their Government and with the armed services, but just as surely the Government and the armed services owe a high duty to cooperate with the young men who are asked to sacrifice a part of their lives. The Government should not ask for useless sacrifices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order that I may calmly ask the gentleman from Texas a question or two.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I stay on my feet will I get recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will be recognized in due time.

The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to ask the gentleman from Texas, does his amendment defer induction?

Mr. POAGE. Not at all; it leaves induction just as it is at present in the bill until the boys are 21. When they become 21 they may join a Reserve component or they may at their option remain subject to the draft. It is recognized under the amendment that if a man joins a Reserve component after he becomes 21, and as long as he remains in that Reserve component he is deferred.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The Reserves are deferred under the provisions of the bill; also the National Guard.

Mr. POAGE. Except a boy has to join up before he is 18½. He gets no protection under the bill by joining the National Guard after he is 21.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Eighteen and one-half years is the figure.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman from Texas says that if the young man joins the National Guard or the Reserve Corps he should be deferred. We are giving the young man up until the time he is 18½ years to join the National Guard of his own State, or the Reserve Corps up until that age, and following that age, he is deferred under this act up to the ceiling limits of the Reserve or the National Guard.

I think there is no one single feature that will do more to build up the National Guard and the Reserve Corps than that one thing.

Mr. POAGE. You give the boy a 6-month period of time while he is still a high-school boy, while he is 18 to 18½, before he has felt the responsibilities of life, before he has been faced with the realities of making a living for himself—you give him that 6 months during which to make up his mind; but after he is 21 and takes on responsibilities you give him no such opportunity.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. After he is 17. He can come into the Guard at 17.

Mr. POAGE. But that is still younger. You require him at those tender years to make a vital decision that will involve his whole life. I am asking that you give him the same opportunity after he has assumed the responsibilities of manhood at 21. Surely there is little to be gained for the country to keep every man between 21 and 26 in a state of uncertainty, and especially when that uncertainty can be removed and the National Guard can be strengthened at the same time. Surely the chairman of the committee would want to create as little hardship as possible.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested this morning in picking up the paper to find in big, black headlines, "Left-Wing Filibuster Aims to Kill the Draft." I want to know if there is anyone in this House who would ever say that I was a left-winger? I have never known the time when I felt that anybody could say that I was anything but a right-winger and so far to the right they thought I could not even get in the middle of the road. If there are any left-wingers here who are against this bill, they cannot be against it any more than I am. So the fellow who wrote that big newspaper headline is just off the beam.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman, one of the left-wingers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I just want to say to the gentleman he is suffering from guilt by association as contained in the Mundt bill.

Mr. RICH. Oh, no. I have never been a New Dealer and I hope that I never will be. I have been against the New Deal and the squandering that has been going on under the New Deal ever since it started. Just look at the mess they got the Nation into.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will get this Nation into a very bad situation. If this bill is passed, we will have a military

Government for a certainty. This is only the beginning of completing the wedge that is going to cause our country to suffer the ills of a military dictatorship.

Now, let us see what happened to countries that had a military dictatorship.

Ask yourself the following questions:

First. Did military training in Germany keep Germany from going to war?

Second. Did conscript military training keep Hitler from invading Poland, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, Norway, France, Russia, north Africa, and so forth?

Third. Did conscript military training in Japan keep Japan out of war?

Fourth. Did conscript military training keep Japan from attacking Pearl Harbor?

Fifth. Did conscript military training help Germany and Japan to win World War II?

Sixth. Did conscript military training in France keep France from being invaded?

Seventh. Has conscript military training in Europe kept the peace, prevented wars, and saved lives?

Eighth. Did the countries having conscript military training lose less men than the United States without military training?

The following is the answer to question 8:

Men killed in World War II

Countries without military training:

United States	392,000
British Empire	353,000

Countries with universal military training:

Germany	2,100,000
Russia	3,500,000
Japan	1,200,000
China	1,300,000

Source of information: United States figures—U. S. War Department and U. S. Navy Department.

The British Empire figures are official.

All others from Government reports, information services and publications with a semiofficial status.

Casualties in World War II

Countries without universal military training:

United States	1,068,000
British Empire	980,000

Countries with universal military training:

Germany	9,500,000
Russia	13,000,000
Japan	5,750,000
China	3,178,000

Source of information: United States figures—U. S. War Department and U. S. Navy Department.

The British Empire figures are official.

All others from Government reports, information services and publications with a semiofficial status.

Our military leaders admit there is no defense against the atomic bomb and little against chemical warfare except a powerful air force.

I have read a very fine editorial in the February 14 issue of Labor, part of which follows:

This newspaper is for defense which will insure our land against any attack, but believes peacetime conscription will weaken instead of strengthen us.

In that opinion, we are supported by all history, and by many able army and navy officers who dare not speak out publicly, because they have been "muzzled" by a few "brass hats" at the top, and by the administration.

No one can point to any country which was ever saved by conscription. On the contrary, France, Germany, Japan and other countries which long had it have gone down to ignominious defeat. Free Uncle Sam has emerged the victor in every clash with nations which regimented their citizens in time of peace.

Labor believes this country should maintain the strongest Air Force and Navy in the world, and an adequate professional Army, trained to perfection in the use of modern weapons, instead of a "mass Army" of ill-trained conscripts.

Peacetime conscription has destroyed democracy in every land where it was tried. It starts with drafting boys, but inevitably expands to conscription of workers and women, until the whole nation is militarized.

All these steps are already being proposed. The whole program will come "as sure as shooting," once we take the first step.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 6, noes 30.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Page 6, line 17, after letter "(d)", insert the number "(1)" in parentheses, and after line 21 insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) Any enlisted member of any Reserve component of the armed forces, may during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standard prescribed by the head of the department concerned; and *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such Reserve component."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that any man in the Organized Reserve who may wish to volunteer, whether he be in the Navy, Marine Corps or any other Reserve, may apply to serve the same period of time prescribed within the provisions of the act, and that his application shall be accepted. In other words, it just gives a man an opportunity to volunteer. There are tens of thousands of young men in the Organized Reserves. Unless this amendment is passed, where they want to volunteer, there is no certainty of their application being accepted. I have talked to the members of the committee and the committee is in favor of this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. There is no objection on this side to the amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If you had passed some of the amendments you are now putting on this bill and told the War Department about it a year ago, you would have had all the men you wanted, and you would not have to go out and conscript anybody. The trouble with the Army is that they have just prohibited the people from enlisting, and now you want to go out and do the thing in this country that was never done before, and that is, taking young men and throwing them into the Army against their will. It is about time that the members of the military committee woke up to see just what the Army has been doing.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that any man serving in the Organized Reserve may volunteer for service, and if he does, that his application must be accepted.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CROW. Is it not a fact that, under the present law, he can enlist in the Organized Reserve?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the present law, he may enlist in the Organized Reserve, and under the provisions of this bill, he may do so, but if he is a member of the Naval Organized Reserve or the Marine Organized Reserve and makes application for active duty, his application shall be approved if he meets the physical qualifications.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I will say to my good friend from Massachusetts that there has never been a time when he could not volunteer. This could be accomplished without his amendment. However, there is some question about the Navy and the Marine Corps, and the committee will be glad to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAFER:

On page 4, line 3, after the word "act", insert a colon in lieu of the period and insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no person shall be inducted under this act before January 31, 1949: *Provided further*, That no person shall be inducted under this act on or after January 31, 1949, unless the President shall first find that the requisite manpower strengths of the armed forces have not been attained or maintained by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. For the purposes of such campaign and notwithstanding any other provisions of law (a) original enlistments in the armed forces for periods of 2 years shall be accepted from among all age groups suitable for military service, with such enlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for enlistments for periods of more than 2 years, and (b) reenlistments in the

armed forces for periods of 1 or 2 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, shall be accepted with such reenlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for reenlistments for longer periods, and the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force are further directed to report to the Congress before January 31, 1949."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. SHAFER. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. VINSON. I will reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the chairman would have made no point of making a point of order against the amendment. He has discussed the amendment with the gentleman from Michigan and made it perfectly clear that he did not intend to make a point of order against it.

I call the attention of the Clerk to the fact that the amendment should now be offered to the proviso adopted by the committee yesterday deferring the induction for 75 days. It is the proviso at the top of page 4.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not understand that any statement was made that the gentleman is opposed to the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I make no point of order against the amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. But the gentleman from Georgia has made a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has reserved the point of order.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure my good friend and colleague from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will not insist on his point of order after I have explained my amendment. In fact, I do not believe his point of order would hold.

What this amendment does is to postpone the induction of youths under this bill until January 31, 1949, in order to provide the armed services with sufficient time to attain manpower objectives through voluntary enlistments rather than by conscription.

The proposed amendment has the virtue of directing the secretaries of the respective services to initiate an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign, specifying that during such campaign the services shall accept 2-year enlistments and 1- and 2-year reenlistments. The amendment further provides that the services must report the results of such a campaign to the Congress by January 31, 1949. Then if the President determines that manpower requirements have not been attained he shall proclaim such and order the induction of men if he deems the situation requires such action.

Many members feel that an intensified recruiting campaign, such as provided in this amendment, will provide sufficient manpower without resorting to conscription. The provision allowing 1- and 2-year reenlistments would be especially beneficial, it is thought. Many Members feel that the services should have concentrated on reenlistments in the past. It costs nothing to train men who desire to reenlist. If such men are accepted for less than 3 years, as has been required, it is believed, that thousands and thousands of dollars in training costs would have been saved.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, extends the time for the enactment of this legislation only a few short weeks beyond the date the committee has recommended. The fact that the committee unanimously decided to amend this bill to extend the enactment date 90 days is adequate evidence that this is not an emergency measure. In fact, nowhere in the hearings can anyone find testimony of any of our defense officers to the effect that there is an emergency or that war is imminent. That being true, let us use conscription as we have in the past—as the last resort. My amendment will provide this.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, upon further examination of the amendment, I withdraw my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I have no intention of making a point of order against the amendment. I want to be reasonable and calm in the busy, closing days of this session. I want to make factual statements to you. I do not believe the majority of the Members on my side of the aisle want to throw this subject open to the new Congress in January with all the hurly-burly. Admitting also that there may be a Republican President, I do not think they want him to deal with that at the outset.

So far as the recruiting program is concerned with reference to the point system of qualification, 170 points are the maximum and 80 points is the passing mark showing the young man's adaptability to learning. It is not a question of intelligence, you will realize. As you have possibly heard, I failed in the test given to me in the Committee on Rules by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. Of course, he only gave me the 6 most difficult questions out of the 150 questions. There was very little choice. He failed to give me the other questions. The average man coming into the service only has to get 31 of those 150 questions correct to qualify. If the 80 point mark were lowered to 70 in the last 2 or 3 years of an enlistment, the Army would only get 1,000 more men per month. That is all they would get by lowering it to 70. Statistics showed all during the war, and have shown since the war, that within this group, when they did lower it from 80 to 70, were most of the courts-martial cases, most of the cases of men getting hurt, and most of the cases of those who were not good soldiers.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is a good newspaperman. They get the kind of men that are not good in your print shop.

I do not believe this amendment should be adopted.

Yesterday the House, by an overwhelming vote, showed that it was in favor of deferring the action on this bill, assuming it is passed, for 75 days. All this amendment provides is to throw it into January, to a new Congress, at the first start-off of business, to a new President, with something more about the recruiting question. One million three hundred thousand men have been enlisted since the war—the most remarkable record of enlistments in the history of any country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If you leave this to the new Congress, you will not need to worry about what the new Congress will do. If you pass this bill, you will have a new Congress. Just remember what the people of this country will do. That is one reason why you do not want to run again.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Now, I understand the gentleman's point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] has expired.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me during general debate, I endeavored to assemble consecutively from the record of the committee hearings the evidence which has convinced me, as a member of the committee, that this bill is not necessary. But I was unable to complete my statement, and I have taken this time in order to recapitulate my arguments.

All of the Members of this House ought to be familiar with the reports made by the publicity and propaganda subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, following their investigation of the participation of Federal officials of the War Department in publicity and propaganda relating to universal military training. For the purpose of this RECORD, I want to read the subcommittee report which was transmitted to the Attorney General with a letter. The report ends with the following statement:

> Your committee reports its firm conclusion that, on the basis of the evidence at hand, the War Department, its personnel, and civilian employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress, and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending in the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I cannot yield. My time is short.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That was a unanimous report.

Mr. HAVENNER. That report was unanimous, and it was signed by the following Members: Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Hon. HENRY J. LATHAM, Hon. CARTER MANASCO, and Hon. J. FRANK WILSON.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I cannot yield now. I do not have time.

To sum up my previous statements, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the failure of the National Military Establishment to make any adequate provision for an efficient Reserve and National Guard in the postwar period, the arbitrary restrictions imposed by the Department of the Army upon the voluntary recruitment system, the amazing refusal of the military high command to comply with the mandate of Congress to transfer millions of men to a Reserve status after World War II—and, mind you, the specific direction of Congress was deliberately evaded and disobeyed by the Army in that respect—and the improper expenditure of tax funds by the War Department on propaganda in support of universal military training, clearly demonstrate that the insistent demand from military sources for the enactment of this bill is not based upon any grave emergency which imperils our national security, but is the culmination of a long-term, carefully conceived campaign to compel the Congress to approve some kind of compulsory military service at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the real purpose of this bill is not our national defense. If I believed that such a fateful step were necessary for that purpose I would vote for it willingly, as I voted for the Selective Service Act of 1940; but I am convinced that the purpose of this legislation is to transform the traditional free democratic society of America into a disciplined state and to impose upon our liberty-loving people a system of military control for all time in the future.

And I want to point out again what I said the other day, Mr. Chairman, that the American people have been deceived into the belief that this is a temporary measure and yet the record is full of forthright statements from every spokesman for the National Military Establishment that the purpose is to continue this draft, if it is enacted, indefinitely until we have universal military training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We have a number of amendments at the desk. I want to be fair to those who have offered the amendments. At my suggestion debate was limited on this section to 3:30. In fairness to those who offered the amendment I believe it would be well for the Chair first to recognize proponents and opponents of real amendments. There should be an opportunity afforded to consider the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that he is in a position to close debate on any amendment any time he so wishes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New York for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have here several of these posters that were given to me by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. They are at the desk. I hope the Members will look at them. They indicate that the Army has never made a worth-while effort to get men to enlist. We know very well that during the war General Hershey paid no attention whatever to the Tydings amendment. He admitted to me personally that he wanted the men and he was going to get the men, and we all know that he was doing it regardless of any law the Congress wrote.

The Army can get the men they want if they go about it the right way but not when they put out things like this. Here is a picture of a desert scene with the words "Ready, Aim, Fry" on it. Now, who is going to enlist when promised that he will "fry" if he does.

That might well be the impression that the average young man, taking a glance at the poster as he walked by, would get.

True enough, there is a lot of small print on it that tells a different story, but they put it in small print and a fellow comes along, takes a look at the picture, he does not stop to read the print.

But let me tell you another reason I believe the Army is not following a course to encourage enlistments. The officers and the men of the Army are just as honest and just as moral as those of any other group, but let me give you a little sidelight on what they do sometimes and how the high command stands back of some of their practices. Just a few years ago there came down from the Midwest a young lady and, like tourists who come here on a sight-seeing trip, she went down to the War College. There she met one of those handsome officers all dressed up in his fine clothes and brass buttons and he courted her as Army officers sometimes do, impetuously and vigorously, and they got married. And later on, lo and behold, she discovered that he had a wife in Washington, and so it was necessary for her Congressman to do what he could. The result—the first wife down here obtained a divorce so that the second marriage—and they were remarried. That situation was called to the attention of the officers down here, and what was their answer? "Oh, well, we do not try to regulate the private morals of our officers." Fine, was it not?

Nor is that the whole story.

The second wife finally obtained a divorce. In the meantime she had learned, and the Army officers had been advised, that the officer she married, in addition to having a wife when he entered into the second marriage, had stolen the papers and the medals which he was wearing from a brother officer who had been lost in the First World War. He was parading under an assumed name. He was carried on the Army rolls under an assumed name, but the Army did nothing about it. He finally left the service.

There is a provision in the statutes which states than an officer may be disciplined for conduct unbecoming a gentleman, but it seems, in some instances at least, in two of which I have personal knowledge and the records, to be a dead letter.

Now, there is a certain group of, shall we say, old-fashioned mothers who are not anxious to see their boys put under what they term "evil influence." They have little, if any, patience with instructors who ridicule and poke fun at boys and young men who have respect for women and treat them as they want their mothers and sisters to be treated.

Let me give you a little story of the record of an officer who is here at Fort Belvoir and who is acting as an instructor for the youth of our land.

He was married; his wife had a child. She obtained a divorce. He married again, and again there was a divorce or annulment. Then shortly thereafter—and he is still a young man—he concluded he would get married again. His second divorce was obtained in October of 1943—on the 14th I think it was. On the 15th of October he made application for a marriage license in the Ninth District Court at Rapides Parish, La., and took oath that he had not been previously married. Now the young lady he was marrying for his third wife was a Catholic, and on the 16th day of October 1943, he was united in marriage by Chaplain L. J. Matuszewski, reputed to be a Catholic priest.

On the 11th day of October 1943, in his deposition to obtain a divorce from his second wife, he testified positively that he had been married on September 27, 1938. On the 15th day of October he subscribed and swore to a statement that he had not been previously married. He admitted that that statement was not true, but states that the clerk who granted the license filled it in hastily and so the inspector general concludes that there is no basis for the assumption that the officer deliberately made a false answer.

The situation was called to the attention of those in command and to the attention of the personnel officer and of General Royall. What was the answer? The answer, in substance, was that inasmuch as the third wife, who is a Catholic, learned prior to her marriage to the officer that he had been married before, there really was no harm done. The fact that he deceived the priest and that he lied under oaths seems not to have been considered as anything reprehensible.

The officer's Army record shows that he claimed legal residence in Alabama, but that having lived in Indiana for a little more than a year he thought himself justified, when he wanted to obtain a divorce in Indiana, in giving Indiana as his place of residence, and so the inspector general concludes that no onus is attached to this officer who, according

to the record, lied on two occasions, and that there is nothing to indicate that his conduct was unbecoming that of an officer.

Well, that may be the view of the inspector general, but the old-fashioned mothers of America just do not condone that kind of conduct and they just do not think that that kind of an officer is one who should instruct their boys as to Army life.

No one would condemn the Army or any group or class for the misdeeds of a very few. On the other hand, when specific instances, substantiated by indisputable evidence, are called to the attention of the Army officers, they are in duty bound to clean up the bad spots.

The Army knew about General Meyers, but it did nothing about it until the mess became so bad that something had to be done.

The officer in Michigan who, while drunk, shot his chauffeur, was demoted, but he was never adequately punished.

The Navy had a stinking mess down at Annapolis, but it promptly cleaned it up.

Just why those in charge at Fort Belvoir should continue to cover up repeated infractions of their own rules, as in this particular case they have, and why they should assign to instruct young men an officer who does not deny that he did, under oath, fail to tell the truth, whose only defense, according to his own statement, is that he did it inadvertently, is something the average citizen cannot understand.

There are other reasons why the Army is not getting the number of enlistments that it desires. American boys are subject to a peculiar disease—if it may be termed a disease. Sometime between the years of 15 and 20 many of them have an attack of what is known as big head. Some of us never get over it. The Army seems to have a larger percentage of those who never recovered than some other groups. The charge has often been made that altogether too many Army officers are snobs. Of the merit of that charge I know nothing. During the war I do know that General Hershey's group, charged with the conscription of men, paid little attention to the law—I refer now to the Tydings amendments—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carries plenty of evidence showing specific violations of the intent of Congress and the law as written.

I do know that many a fine young man, desirous of enlisting and fighting for his country, was grievously disappointed, disillusioned by the petty, unnecessary duties imposed upon enlisted men. The young men of America, convinced of the need, will enlist, fight, and if need be, die, in defense of their homes and their country. They are, however, impatient—and thank God for that—of needless arbitrary discipline imposed merely to keep a man busy. Strange as it may seem to those in high authority, the average young man cannot, without necessity, be molded like a piece of clay or putty into a machine which snaps to attention, salutes and bows the head to an individual whose only claim to obedience and respect is that he has rank.

If those in charge of recruiting men for the Army will take a few lessons in human nature; will get out in civilian life for say 6 months; earn a livelihood as do millions of other Americans; familiarize themselves with the thoughts and the ways of civilians, they will be more than successful in their efforts to get the youth of America into the Army of which, after all, we are all extremely proud.

It is disheartening and discouraging to see a few who, for want of a better name, may be called "brass hats," do so much to injure the service in the eyes of the people who furnish them food, clothing, and shelter.

I would suggest to the Committee on Military Affairs, either revise that definition of gentlemanly conduct or take some action in reference to some of these fellows who are teaching these young boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan about the morals and what not of the officers of the Regular Army. I would like to pose the question, How did they become officers of the Regular Army? The vast majority of them became officers because some Congressman nominated them to West Point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KILDAY. I imagine that you have appointed some of those who are in trouble. Mine are not in trouble.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I never did appoint any of those, and thank God I have not been that unlucky. But these are old gray-haired men passing upon their conduct. Does the gentleman contend that they were not all right when they went in? They are what they are now because your institutions made them that way.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. May I point out those officers did a whale of a good job in winning the war.

Mr. KILDAY. Why, certainly they did. There is no question about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr KILDAY. I do not yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell you about those officers.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is not interested in perfecting this bill, he is not interested in whether there is a necessity existing in the United States today for this sort of proposal. The gentleman is interested in talking about such things as he spoke about a while ago. I am not interested in the extrasexual affairs of Army officers. Maybe the gentleman is. I am a family man.

Now, to get back to the amendment. What does it do? It provides that there shall be no inductions before January 31, 1949. I congratulate those of you who are opposed to this bill; but those of you who are seeking an easy way out, just vote for this amendment.

There has been a great deal of talk here about things which are not included in this amendment. They were included in the amendment offered yesterday.

Let us get an idea of the thinking of the gentleman from Michigan who offered this amendment. On yesterday he had in the amendment that the pay of the enlisted personnel of the Army shall be increased 10 percent. What would that have meant? In the last appropriation bill for the pay for the enlisted personnel of the Army there was $2,300,000,000. If you increase that 10 percent, then you would have an increase of $230,000,000 based on the present personnel of the Army. An incentive? Of course not. They are in the Army. They are bound by contract to stay in the Army, and under the thinking that he had at that time you would have had here an additional $230,000,000 for the people already in the Army.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentlemen from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I observe at this point that that is not included in the amendment that I have offered today.

Mr. KILDAY. I so stated.

Mr. SHAFER. And I see no reason why the gentleman should discuss the amendment that I offered yesterday which I explained to the House was offered hurriedly because I did not have a chance to give it much study.

Mr. KILDAY. I so stated when I began to discuss the amendment. But it shows the knowledge that the gentleman has, the research that he has made, and how firmly implanted he is on the situation which exists in the armed forces.

You are either for the bill or you are against the bill, and postponing it until January 31 serves no purpose. Now, the committee came in here yesterday and offered an amendment which took everything out of this amendment that would be of any substance. Somebody here wanted to place the responsibility on the President, and we did that yesterday, so that the substance of the amendment is gone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take 5 minutes at this time, because I hope to speak briefly before we close the debate on this measure. But, I rise at this moment to corroborate the testimony that has been given here by the very able gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]. Only day before yesterday, in Denver, Colo., Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, of Washington, D. C., director of the Reserve Officers Association, gathering in annual convention, said in this interview—and I want you all to listen closely:

Our military leaders have been sitting for 3 years watching a highly trained, combat-hardened reserve force disintegrate. The Navy has done something but not enough. They all have lost the cream of the enlisted men of World War II who joined the Reserves for a 3-year hitch. The average Re-

serve officer is disgusted, his morale is way down. We have no real Reserve force which could be rallied for national defense in an emergency.

That is not a pacifist talking. That is a general who is the director of the Reserve Officers' Association of this country. Listen further to this article. Melvin Maas who for 18 years served in this House, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and a colonel in the Marine Corps in this last war, a great American speaks:

Melvin Maas, former Minnesota House Member and a colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve, declared, "In the last war, 98 percent of the fighting was done by civilians. Yet in peacetime today, less than 2 percent of the armed forces' budget is devoted to civilian defense activities."

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, these are only one of the objections to this bill:

First, the shameful and disgraceful treatment the Army has dealt out to the Reserve Corps.

Second, the way they have ignored our National Guard, which the major general who is director of the National Guard, says the enactment of this bill will annihilate and destroy. And remember, these are generals speaking to you.

Third, their refusal or unwillingness to provide proper and adequate housing for old sergeants and enlisted men with families.

Fourth, their refusal to accept enlistments for 1 year or 18 months, insisting on taking men for only 3, 4, or 5 years.

Fifth, their raising the standard, or the points, from 59 in wartime to 80 now, where, I repeat, only a classical scholar in Greek and Latin or a Philadelphia lawyer could pass.

The Army has been turning down a third of all applications for enlistment. The Navy and the Air Corps have been turning down more than 50 percent, because they can get all they need through the volunteer system.

These five things are sufficient proof that this bill is totally unnecessary, yet here we are seriously contemplating saddling upon the American people control of the youth of this country, the old European creed of peacetime conscription, outworn, outmoded, and discredited, which has led every Nation that has followed it down the road to war and inevitable ruin. Shall we now transplant the Prussian philosophy from Potsdam to the Pentagon?

What in the world is the matter with us? We passed the 70-group air force recently and we passed two other bills 2 months ago in this body. We have not had time enough yet to feel the effects of that legislation, that is, the legislation for inactive duty pay and secondly for retirement. Both those acts will stimulate volunteer enlistments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what my good friend the gentleman from Missouri has just stated, an examination of the hearings will disclose that Major General Reckord, the Chief of the National Guard, representing the National Guard in a full and open statement before the Committee on Armed Services said that the passage of this bill would be the passage of the single greatest measure ever passed through Congress for the benefit of the National Guard.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I hold in my hand a letter signed by Milton A. Reckord, who is the Adjutant General for the State of Maryland and the head of the National Guards of the United States, in which he approves the draft bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman from New York try to fix some time when we can vote on the Shafer amendment?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] suggested that the sooner his amendment was voted on the better it would be.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of other Members who have amendments here and wish to be heard on them, I move that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 65, noes 53.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are 19 amendments on the Clerk's desk. This one amendment has taken so much time, I would like to ask whether we will be allowed to be heard on our amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he sincerely hopes that the Committee will get to all the amendments in time so that Members may be heard.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I understand that debate will close at 3:30 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CROW. The 10 minutes allowed on this amendment will expire at 20 minutes after 3, and that will give us 10 minutes to consider 19 amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as a number of Members have sought to speak on the so-called Shafer amendment, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Shafer amendment. It simply provides that when this draft bill is enacted, that it does not go into effect before January 31, 1949, and not then unless the Congress and the President approves it.

This delay will give the Army officials about 6 months' time to see if by putting on a real drive they can get the extra 230,000 men they need as volunteers. If they fail and world conditions get worse we can then in the next session quickly, if necessary, put the act into effect.

If world conditions during this time grow suddenly worse the President can call the Congress to meet in a special session and we can in a few days approve the legislation and quickly begin inductions.

During the 6 months two things can and may happen to make it unnecessary: They may be able to secure enough volunteers; more important, more peaceful world conditions may develop, making it entirely unnecessary to fasten military conscription on this country.

It would be unwise and a great mistake to enact the draft in peacetime unless it is absolutely necessary for the defense of our country.

I hope the House will approve this amendment. I do not believe world conditions are such that we cannot delay the actual operation of the draft for these few months. It may save billions of dollars and will prevent the disturbing of the plans of our young men, their schooling, and so forth.

I do not believe the Members of the House are justified in defeating this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Shafer amendment.

Opposition to any measure relating to selective service stems from three groups with which I can find little common ground on which to meet.

First, of course, are those misguided—indeed, thoroughly reprehensible—Americans, who, from ulterior motives, are opposed to any effort to strengthen our national defenses, and, in fact, seek to weaken them. Their subservience to a foreign power and venal subordination of the interests of their own country subjects them to the justified condemnation of every patriotic American. To find one's self in agreement with them on any issue is abhorrent to one's better instincts.

A second group who opposes the measure are sincere pacifists who do not believe in war, even when a country is attacked by an aggressor, and who therefore contend that no step whatever should be taken to protect our Nation militarily, that international disarmament is the only solution to the ills which beset the world, and that our Nation should set a good example by taking the first step toward such disarmament. While entirely distinguishable from the first category and thoroughly patriotic in their motives, the proponents of this position are, to my mind, utterly unrealistic in this, perhaps, wicked world.

All who sincerely desire peace pray that the day may come when men may be made to realize the utter futility of war

as a method of settling international disputes and may resolve, by joint action, that all nations should embark upon a systematic program of disarmament. But so long as naked aggression stalks the world, so long as there are those in high places in governments, who, through wicked lust for power, seek to dominate less powerful nations, it seems but simple common sense that our country maintain a strong national defense.

A third group which I have observed opposes any such legislation, is composed of those who look upon any effort to secure and train additional military personnel as part of a pattern for a greater participation by this country in world affairs. They argue that we should withdraw into our shell, attend to our own knitting, abandon the position of world leadership which, by choice or chance, is ours, and that thereby we can dispense with a large part of our military and naval forces and, as a corollary, will need not more, but fewer men. Conceding to this group also the utmost sincerity and devotion to their country's welfare, I feel them likewise to be misguided in their objective and shortsighted in their viewpoint. With their position, my conception of national responsibility and ultimate welfare does not square.

Nevertheless, in addition to these groups of our citizens, finding, mayhap, their spokesmen in this body, there are many others who have what might be called a conditional opposition to any form of compulsory peacetime conscription. For myself, it is my firm belief in a strong national defense and my deep conviction that only therein lies the surest road to an enduring and just peace, which raises in my mind a conflict, in the face of an inherent revolusion against attaining this objective through the imposition of a compulsion on our youth, our family life, our economy, and our innate sense of freedom.

A difficult decision is before us. I have wrestled with the problem. I have prayed to God for guidance in its solution.

Having voted for a large number of defense measures, having supported various foreign-aid programs, having enjoyed the high privilege of voluntarily serving my country in the armed forces for several years, I approached the problem before us sympathetically, and certainly with an open mind. My mind is still open, though my sympathy with this legislation considerably dimmed.

A basic premise in my thinking on the issues before us is my emphatic conviction that every possible effort to secure the required strength for our forces by voluntary means should first be exhausted before we resort to compulsion. Generally speaking, volunteers make better soldiers. That, however, is secondary. My primary objection is based upon a fundamental belief that the conscription of our youth as soldiers in peacetime is foreign to American traditions and has never led to anything but grief, and frequently, ruin, where tried.

Parenthetically, it should be pointed out that these remarks are directed toward the drafting of soldiers, not necessarily a mere training program for our youth. We must not lose sight of the fact that we are not here considering a universal military training bill, but a peacetime draft of young men for general military duties.

Many of the sincere proponents of this measure will say that we are not now at peace; that a "cold war" is going on, waged against our country with relentless fury and great resourcefulness. I cannot accept the concept that we are at war. Indeed, in the testimony of these hearings our leaders in government were asked several times whether we are confronted with a situation of national emergency. They disclaimed it. They termed the present a "period of great international tension." No doubt it is that.

We all hope and pray that this tension may be speedily and permanently relieved. In the international picture, however, with the claims and counterclaims of one nation against another and with clashes of creed and race raising ugly heads from one end of the world to the other, it seems almost too much to hope that there will not continue what may properly be described as a "period of great tension" for an indefinite length of time in the future. I seriously question whether, unless this rises to the dignity of a true emergency, our Government is justified in using it as a basis for imposing a program of compulsion upon the youth of our land.

This is not to say that a draft law should never be enacted unless this Nation is at war. Much has been said in the debate about a parallel to the year 1940, when a draft was instituted for the first time in our peacetime history, and in the year 1941 when, by a margin of one vote, this draft law was extended. I have searched this record in vain for a statement on the part of any of our national defense leaders to the effect that we are now faced with a crisis comparable to that then presented. If I were convinced by anything in this record or in the debate—indeed, if the chairman or any members of the Armed Services Committee, or any other Member, can produce satisfactory evidence that my Nation stands in immediate peril, that a true emergency now exists, I shall have no hesitancy in voting for immediate conscription. Upon evidence, however, not generalities nor hysteria, I shall make my decision.

To a large extent, of course, we must rely upon our military and naval advisers for an estimate of the requirements of our national defense. We are told that the Army on March 1 was about 129,000 below its authorized strength and that it was losing men in the first months of this year at a rate of 6,000 to 8,000 a month above its enlistments. Unless this tendency is checked, it will result in a shortage at the end of the year of around 200,000 men, we are informed.

There is no pressure on the part of the Navy or the Air Force for the passage of this bill. They have been able to keep up their strength through voluntary methods. In this connection a strange sentence appears in the majority report, at page 3, where it says:

> The Air Force expects to meet all of its needs through voluntary recruitment but this expectation appears optimistic to the committee—at least, in the absence of a selective-service law.

One wonders whether an equal degree of skepticism existed in the minds of the committee regarding the confidence on the part of the Army that it could not obtain its requisite strength through voluntary methods.

We are asked here today to embark upon a radical departure from fundamental American traditions. There are those who sincerely and ably argue that this is a course which we should have long since pursued. I should not want to close my mind to the possibility of being convinced regarding the soundness of that argument. To date, however, I remain unconvinced.

Until I am completely satisfied that every effort has been made by the Army to obtain voluntary recruits sufficient to provide reasonable military strength, I am not prepared to place in the hands of the military the weapon of compulsion. It is my belief that by the amendment now before us, buttressed by other amendments which I hope will be offered and passed, a sincere, intensified effort may be made to met the necessary manpower requirements of the Army.

The amendment contemplates that new enlistments be taken for a 2-year period, which should draw many men now unwilling to sign up for 3 years. Reenlistments must be accepted for a 1- or 2-year period, which I know, from several personal experiences in my own congressional district, will cause many men to decide to continue on, whereas they would be unwilling to do so under the rigid 3-year requirement now in force.

It is my hope that an amendment will be adopted later to require the Army to reduce the unnecessarily high aptitude qualifications. I favor an increase in basic pay, at least for enlisted personnel. Steps should be taken to implement our legislation to provide better housing for married enlisted men.

Nor should the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force consider this amendment, if written into law, as limiting them to the specific steps outlined therein, to obtain voluntary enlistments. They are directed by it to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. That means action, not lip service. It means pursuit of this objective indicating the will of Congress, with the same devotion to duty and to their country which our military leaders so eloquently displayed in time of war.

I share the regret voiced by my good neighbor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], over wholesale and indiscriminate criticism of the great soldiers who now occupy high position in military and naval circles. Only a short time ago they were national heroes. Their achievements in the recent war are perhaps unmatched in all military history. Although no more nor less infallible than Congressmen, they are men of great ability and unswerving loyalty. If they will sincerely devote their unusual energy and talents to a program to obtain voluntary enlistments, calling upon the civilian population for aid in this intensified campaign, there is every rea-

son to anticipate that it may never be necessary to put into actual effect the provisions of such a law as that now before us.

Only if the Army fails in the successful pursuit of this mission, should we recruit a conscript force. That is the motivating purpose of this amendment.

It is so vital to the crucial issue before us that there are many, I am sure, who feel as I do, that we will support it and will find great difficulty in voting for the measure, without such a provision incorporated in it.

In providing for the adequate defense of our Nation, we must not weaken the central pillar of our strength, which is our freedom.

Let us, by the passage of this amendment, first exercise compulsion on the United States Army to acquire volunteers, before enploying compulsion to force conscripts into the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated here, neither the Navy nor the Air Force have any particular direct need for this bill. However, just as the Army is in favor of it, so are the Navy and the Air Force in favor of it as a matter of mutual support. Why does the Army need men? It needs them because our boys do not like to serve in Korea or in Europe. They dislike that service very much indeed. But more than that, I do not believe the Army has put on a satisfactory recruiting program. I have looked at these copies of recruiting posters which have been presented to us informally on this floor. They are made to frighten a boy from enlisting in the United States Army instead of encouraging enlistment. It seems to me that the public-relations section of the recruiting service could do a great deal better than that. I believe in view of the lack of emergency, as has been stated, that the so-called Shafer amendment has merit.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, during the past several months I have received many letters from constituents on the draft bill. I know this is true of other Members of Congress, too.

There are those who favor the draft and there are those who are opposed to it. Frankly, I respect the opinions of all on this important legislation.

Those who say that we should not pass the bill during peacetime have a good argument; however, we are still technically at war. The President has not asked Congress to declare the war officially over. It is obvious, then, that the Chief Executive has evidence that the international situation is rather perilous.

We cannot ignore the possibilities of a third world war. We cannot then say we just do not want to do anything about it. We most certainly are a big part of this world.

I am of the opinion that Russia is still reaching out for world domination. This makes the international situation more critical.

As a nation which is involved in perilous world conditions, what are we going to do about it from a protection standpoint? The answer, as I see it, is to remain strong as a nation, which after all we must be if we are to sustain our liberty and freedom.

I am a firm believer in the volunteer enlistment system for a strong Air Force, Army, and Navy. I favor the proper appeals from the volunteer angle to those interested in joining our defense forces. We must fight to preserve our democratic way of life. There should be no doubt in any nation's mind that we will fight to protect it.

It comes down to this, then, that our best line of action is one of preparedness. We should, in the face of this, train our boys for self-defense as we teach our children to protect themselves against danger. At the same time there should be safeguards in this act against evil. There should also be in the law a provision to protect our youth against the loss of educational opportunities. I am supporting every amendment offered for such. I am supporting the Shafer amendment, which to all purposes provides for an intensified volunteer enlistment campaign before this bill becomes effective.

The needs of the armed forces demand the kind of action contained in this measure.

We do not want to witness another Pearl Harbor, but we must be prepared against such an attack. It is an unpleasant thing to think of, but should another Pearl Harbor come to our shores we must have more security than we had on December 8, 1941.

For these compelling reasons I shall cast my vote in support of this measure with the amendments which I have previously mentioned.

It is not legislation of aggression, but that of security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I am only taking this minute so that I can talk on one amendment which is at the desk. It looks as though I will not get to say anything at all.

I am asking to add a new paragraph on page 4, between lines 8 and 9. This paragraph appears in the bill that was passed by the other body. It simply requires that before any man can be inducted they must furnish proper shelter, sanitary facilities, water supply, heating and lighting facilities, medical care, and hospital accommodations.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. CROW. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOLIFIELD moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the enacting clause deleted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have waited on this floor now for 3 days and since 10 o'clock this morning in order to be allowed to speak for 5 minutes on this bill. I believe that the Shafer amendment should be agreed to. In view of the fact that we are being precluded from full debate on the important matter which is before us; in view of the fact that the Shafer amendment has not been adequately discussed, I have offered a preferential motion so that I might be recognized by the Chairman for 5 minutes. The Shafer amendment is the most important amendment that can be presented to this bill, in that it allows the American tradition which has been established for 165 years to be extended for 7 more months. That is what it amounts to. For 165 years this Nation has grown and prospered on the theory of volunteer armament and no conscription in peacetime. It is true we have resorted to conscription in wartime, and I have voted for such a bill. I am not a pacifist, although I hate war with all my heart. I have voted for every defense measure that has been presented in this House in the last 6 years. I am not a Wallaceite. The Wallace party is running a candidate for Congress against me in my district, trying to defeat me. I consider that I am a traditional American; an American who believes in the Constitution and the principles thereof; the principles which, once established, caused the greatest wave of immigration to this country that the world has ever known, from countries which employed the method of peacetime conscription; countries which have gone to rack and ruin and to defeat in military competition with free nations, because they depended upon conscription of their military personnel.

I call to your attention, and I challenge the committee to show me a Nation, which has been able to perpetuate itself, which employed peacetime conscription. As an example, I point to Germany in World War I. Peacetime conscription brought Germany to her knees, defeated by free nations. She failed. Conscripted soldiers did not defend her borders. When the battle became hot the German conscripts wilted and surrended to free troops.

In World War II, Italy, Japan, and Germany had had 25 years of peacetime conscription to build up their defenses, to militarize their nations; to goosestep their nations; to regiment their industries. Yet they fell before the onslaught of free men from free democracies, who outproduced, who outworked, and who outfought these slave labor and slave soldiers of the nations which practiced peacetime conscription.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will not yield now.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman does not intend to yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. The gentleman has had unlimited time on this floor, due to the fact that he is a member of the committee. This is the first time that I have been able to obtain 5 minutes during this day's debate.

The Army has not proved its good faith in trying to get volunteers. The Navy

embarked on a volunteer program and in March of this year it had to stop its volunteer program because it received in March 19,000 applications and its quota was only 15,000. The Air Force is turning men down every day.

I have letters on my desk of boys wanting to go back into the Army, having served in World War II, and they are being refused.

The Shafer amendment insures that the armed forces will make an honest attempt to obtain volunteer enlistments for the Army in the next 7 months and then the President, can inaugurate the draft.

The Shafer amendment would supersede the amendment that was adopted with committee approval, which puts upon the President of the United States 2 weeks before the November election the political handicap of pulling the trigger on the draft.

I maintain that such cowardice on the part of Congress is inexcusable. Congress should have the nerve to take the responsibility of deciding whether we need a draft or not.

The original Shafer amendment put the responsibility on the President and Congress jointly. The pending Shafer amendment removes the responsibility of Congress concurring with the President.

I regret that this deletion occured and although I shall support the pending amendment, I regret this return to the political cowardice I have mentioned. The present amendment postpones the action of the President from 90 days to 7 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this motion made by the gentleman from California to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. In substance what this motion does is kill the bill.

I can well understand the viewpoint, the honest viewpoint of the ones who do not approve this bill, but my mind goes back a few years, back to 1938, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, when we saw the specter arising across the sea of Hitler, Mussolini, and the war lords of Japan, and we saw Admiral Leahy appear before the Committee on Naval Affairs and recommend an expansion in the fleet of only 20 percent. We saw immediately an outburst of opposition in the committee and all over the country. After many many days of hearings we reported out a bill recommending this 20 percent expansion. That bill was reported on the floor of the House and when the vote was counted, 100 votes had been cast against that bill even though it had been 16 years since we had built any battleships of any size or number; and yet, Mr. Chairman, it was these very ships that were authorized on the floor of the House as a result of the recommendation of the Naval Affairs Committee in 1938 that won the battle of the Philippines in the recent war.

Then we come into the year of 1940 after Hitler had overrun northern France and the Lowlands and had reached Dunkerque and the Channel ports, before we had risen to the point where we felt that in the interest of our own security we ought to enact the draft. The Selective Service Act was passed late in that year.

Then we come to September of 1941 and the question before the House then was whether we should extend the draft giving those boys a better training who were already in and to build up a stronger Army. We had already called the National Guard in; and, Mr. Chairman, we heard then as we are hearing today the same voices in opposition to the extension of the draft that we are hearing in opposition to this bill today; and the bill passed by only one vote.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a similar situation today insofar as our future security is concerned, that demands action. Why do I say that? As a member of the Committee on the Armed Services I inquired of some of the witnesses, of course, as to how they felt about world conditions. Let me just repeat the question that was asked of Dr. Karl J. Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who was a member of the President's Committee To Investigate the Need of a Universal Military Training Program, whether or not in his opinion the situation today is as critical insofar as our own future security is concerned as it was in 1938, 1940, and 1941. And what was his answer?

"In many ways," Dr. Compton says, "I think the situation may be more serious now than it was then."

Then Dr. Walsh, another member of the President's committee, had something to say. He said that the menace is greater today than it was in the periods I mentioned before.

The Committee on the Armed Services of the House has given this matter very thorough consideration. We are interested, of course, in the security of our country and in the peace of the world. If it were not for that feeling on our part we certainly would not recommend the passage of this legislation today. We know the specter of communism that exists throughout the world. We know that it is a world movement and sooner or later it may involve the security of this great Nation of ours.

I hope the motion will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 22, noes 80.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in support of the Shafer amendment, I desire to read from page 2 of the committee report:

> The Navy is able to maintain its present strength of 397,000 by voluntary enlistment.

I quote again from page 3:

> The Navy modified its physical standards for both the Navy and Marine Corps during fiscal year 1948.

Mr. Chairman, no one can say that the Navy and Marine Corps are now or ever have been inferior to the Army in fighting ability. Yet they have gotten their quota by voluntary enlistments through reducing the physical requirements. If the Army had done the same thing this bill would not now be before us.

In adopting the Shafer amendment it will compel the Army to do what the Navy has done and is now doing and by next year we will know whether or not we will need this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] told us of three Reserve generals who are, he claims, opposed to this legislation. Every one of those men support this bill. They did criticize the activities of the War Department with reference to the National Guard and the Reserves, but they are for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have made a study of the recruiting efforts of the Army and I am convinced that the Army has made an honest and intelligent effort to recruit men during the last year; yet with the money at its command and considering its widespread activities in recruiting all over the United States, the Army lost 135,000 men between July 1, 1947, and March 1, 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the committee itself offered an amendment to extend the period of induction of men for 90 days after the passage of this bill. Now, that is evidence in my mind that no emergency does exist. Secretary Marshall said, I believe, today, that there is no real immediate danger of war. There is no emergency existing. Now, why should we not extend this until January 31, 1949, so that the Congress can again investigate the matter? If the armed forces, after a real effort to get men, fail, then the Congress can review the situation and take proper action. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is constructive; it requires the armed forces to put on an intensive recruiting program, something they have not done. I shall offer an amendment to reduce the examination point to 70—it is 80 now, and during the draft it was 56 points. I sincerely feel that these amendments will make for a better bill. It will draw support to the bill. I urge the committee to adopt both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, 1 minute to discuss the amendment now pending is not enough. Certainly there has been no reason given why this amendment should not be adopted. The greatest reason why it should not be adopted is the attitude taken by the leaders of this committee to have this law passed. I want to tell you that we are in bad shape in this country and we are in bad shape because the Army has got such a hold on a lot of people in this Congress that they are afraid to do anything that the Army does not want them to do, and you wait until they get the same hold on the people of this country that they have on some of the members of this committee, and then this country is going to be in the grip of the United States Army.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he wants to send my boy and girl and my family to war without any reason?

Mr. RICH. I do not want to send your boy to war. I do not want to conscript anybody's boy. I think it is un-American. I think you will get all the boys you need if the country is in danger, and you will not have to worry about that. The boys will volunteer when they know that the United States is in danger. That is the reason I am against the bill. It is not necessary—this bill in particular is not necessary. Our people will join our Army to protect our Nation when the Nation is in danger. They always have done so and they always will do just that. No one has stated we are in such danger. Let the United Nations do their work in preventing war; you set them up for that purpose. You have given billions of dollars to prevent war. This is a red flag in front of a wild bull trying to start the third world war. Stop, think, pray, look, listen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri raises a question in regard to the National Guard and the Army recruiting program. We spent last year $35,000,000 for a recruiting program, and I suppose we could have spent more if we could have gotten it out of this Congress. It was probably our fault. It cost $140 per man to get those recruits. Now, that is the picture. Now the picture with regard to amount expended for Reserve components 1948 and for request for 1949. The estimated expenditure in 1948 for the National Guard was $104,000,000, for the Air National Guard $45,000,000, for the Army Organized Reserves $277,301,000, for the Air Force $4,014,000, and for the Navy, including Marines, $159,530,000.

This year, fiscal 1949, the budget requests are $154,216,000 for the National Guard, for the Air National Guard, $70,784,000.

Organized Reserves: Army, $52,000,000; Air Force, $73,000,000; Navy, including Marines, $364,146,000.

Sure we have not done enough but it is not altogether the Army's fault.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOLIFIELD) there were—ayes 123, noes 72.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SHAFER and Mr. ANDREWS of New York.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 90.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

Amendment to H. R. 6401 offered by Mr. REES: On page 6, following subsection (d) insert:

"(e) The passing requirement for the general classification test shall be fixed at 70 points or less. The monthly requisitions on the President under this act by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee, debate ceases at 3:30 o'clock on section 4, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is to fix the ceiling at 70 points on general classification tests and limiting the draft to the number needed over voluntary enlistments. One of the things that has been discussed during the debate on this measure is that the Army has been fixing these points too high. I call attention to the fact that the recent war was fought on a basis of passing grade of 59 in the classification text. Furthermore, our Army prior to the war was smaller than the Army that is being asked for today. It was passed on a 59 mark for entrance.

It has been charged and there is good reason to believe that the Army has injured the volunteer system because of the requirements now being made. The reason there are so many rejections is because the Army requires a mark of 80 points. The passing test of 80 is unnecessarily high. General Eisenhower, in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, at page 1001 of the Senate hearings on universal military training, said, and I quote:

> My memory is sometimes tricky, but I thought I had directed, before I left as Chief of Staff, to drop, for the Ground Forces at least, the figure back to 70, and I thought there is where it was, so we could fill up certain places where we could do this.

If the passing mark were lowered to the figure where General Eisenhower thought it should be fixed, at 70, the Army, in my judgment, could get the additional 300,000 men required under this legislation by voluntary enlistment. If not, they can come a whole lot nearer doing it than now, and thereby cut down the demand for draft legislation. Even at 70 the requirements are so much higher for a so-called peace army than the military required for an active fighting force.

The last draft bill passed by Congress contained the provision:

> *And provided further*, That the monthly requisitions on the President under this Act by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made (title 50, U. S. Code No. 303 (a)).

The purpose was to prevent unnecessary drafting of men. If the Army's requirements were filled by voluntary enlistment, it was not necessary for them to draft men, and it was not the intent of Congress that men should be drafted unnecessarily. The language of the proposed amendment is taken from this act.

Coupled with a required ceiling of 70, I believe it would be effective in materially reducing the need for the drafting of any men. It seems to me that courses of training in our colleges and the extension of the Reserve Corps and the expansion of the National Guard would further relieve the demand on the part of the Army for the drafting of men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

All time has expired on this section.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROW: On page 4, between lines 8 and 9, add the following paragraph:

"No person shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to public and personal health."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 6, line 21, after the section, strike the period and insert "*Provided*, That during the life of this act there shall be in the Army, including the Air Force, and in the Navy, including the Marine Corps, a ratio to total active strength of not to exceed 2 doctors of medicine and 2 dentists per 1,000 men; 1 osteopath per 5,000 men; 1 veterinarian per 2,000 men; and 1 pharmacist and 1 optometrist per 3,000 men."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLGER:

On page 3, line 17, after "between the ages of", strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty-one";

And in line 19, strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty-one."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carlina [Mr. FOLGER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, selective service in time of peace is in direct conflict with the philosophy of our American democracy. This is the second time in the life of our Nation this Congress has considered selective service when we were at peace.

In 1940, after Hitler had successfully annexed Austria, by force, taken over Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Lowlands, and France and we could see the war clouds shifting in our direction a selective service and training act was passed by this Congress. In the face of loud complaints from many of the pacifist groups the country recognized the danger which threatened our very lives. The war has been fought and won at a terrible sacrifice, but technically, Mr. Chairman, we are still at war, the national emergency not having yet been terminated, and even more important, the peace has not been achieved.

I do not like selective service. I do not believe any militaristic government can long prevail. I do not like to have to vote for selective service, in time of peace or war, but we must recognize the cold facts and act accordingly.

This is a selective-service act to provide the personnel necessary to win the peace as we have won the war. It is not a selective training program. It is not a universal military program. It is a program, I repeat, to provide adequate personnel to assure this Nation that we intend to back up the peace in an effort that we believe will avoid another terrible and devastating world conflict. It is a program for a period of 2 years, a time in which we fervently hope that peace will come to a troubled world.

If this legislation is needed at all, it is needed now. Postponing it until January 31 is further endangering the peace, in my opinion.

It makes little difference whether it becomes necessary for the President to declare a day within a certain time for it to become effective. It is a responsibility that must be accepted by both the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

It is not so important from the national welfare whether we have the personnel inducted for a period of 1 year, 18 months, or 2 years. The question before the Nation today is: Are we willing to show the world that we are going to stand solidly on a program for peace or will we relegate ourselves into a pacifist and hopeful attitude as we did after World War I?

This amendment postponing the effectiveness of this act to January 31 is all-important. We have heard the old adage that "Nero fiddled while Rome burned." Mutilating this legislation to make it wholly ineffective is worse if it is possible than its actual defeat. If we fail to back up our program for peace, we are sowing the seed of world war III.

How easy it is to lapse into a coma. How easy it is to become complacent. It was so after the First World War. We demobilized after this world war in good faith and the forces that would ally themselves with Russia are joining with forces who fail in my opinion to recognize the truth to defeat this program as all other programs, if we win the cold war and ultimately have a durable and just peace.

Why is it necessary to have selective service? We only have to go back to the actions of this country for the past three years for testimony as to our intentions. We have a lot of action in the interest of peace unparalleled in history. On the other hand, Russia has deliberately failed to cooperate in reaching a peaceful settlement but on the other hand through aggression not only thwarted the peace but has actually taken over many nations and endeavoring to force its own totalitarianism on other freedom-loving peoples.

It is a recognized fact that the international situation over the past several months has seriously deteriorated. Specific, aggressive, and dangerous action on the part of the Soviet Union makes it mandatory that we respond to these dangers.

We only have to look to their actions in Greece and threats on Turkey, the Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, the excessive pressure on Finland immediately thereafter, the threat in Scandinavia and the severe and annoying restrictions on our American occupation forces in Berlin, Vienna, and Trieste.

Therefore, we have given the Army an assignment. We have given it a mission to carry out. It cannot adequately carry out this mission unless it has adequate personnel. When I was in Europe with our committee last year, the Army was undermanned in every occupation zone. I say we should bring about our giving them sufficient strength and personnel to carry out the mission to which we have assigned them.

This mission, I repeat, is to bring about peace, the kind of peace that will endure. Without it, it will be only a few years, I believe, until we would be called upon again to expend our resources, our economy and millions of youth again.

Let us not sell the Nation short. We have been given by divine providence a position of leadership. Let us not by inaction permit our own house to be destroyed. If this were a permanent program it would be an entirely different question at this time. It is a limited program for a specific purpose. We are facing today and will for the next few years and until the peace is attained the fears that I have entertained during these hectic years we have gone through, and that is we were willing to sacrifice, produce, and fight to preserve freedom, but are we willing to pay the price to preserve the peace that will sustain the freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to section 4? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. (a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; members of the Reserve components of the armed forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for service under section 4 (b).

(b) (1) No person who has been awarded the Purple Heart or who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 12 months or more in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service on active duty with the armed forces or the Coast Guard, or in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

(2) No person who, for service in the armed forces between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, has been authorized to wear any badge, award, or decoration, or other authorized evidence of exceptional valor in the face of the enemy, bravery in combat, or continued service in combat, as determined under regulations prescribed by the President, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(3) No person who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 90 days or more but less than 12 months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service on active duty with the armed forces or the Coast Guard, or in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, if—

(A) the local board determines that he is regularly enlisted or commissioned in an organized unit of a Reserve component of the armed force in which he served, or in a Reserve component (other than in an organized unit) of the armed forces in which he served in any case in which enlistment or commission in such organized unit is not available to him; or

(B) the local board determines that enlistment or commission in a Reserve component of the armed force in which he served is not available to him.

(c) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty referred to in subsection (b) of this section, no credit shall be allowed for—

(A) periods of active duty for training purposes;

(B) periods of active duty in which the service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized training program, the Army Air Force college training program, or any

similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard;

(C) periods of active duty as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of such Academies; or

(D) periods of active duty in any of the armed forces while being processed for entry into or separation from any educational program or institution referred to in paragraphs (B) or (C).

(d) (1) Persons who, on the effective date of this act, are members of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, and the Public Health Service Reserve, and are not on active duty, shall, so long as they continue to be such members, and perform service for which they are entitled to receive pay throughout the year for attendance at drill or equivalent duty, be exempt from service by induction or call to active duty under the provisions of this act, but not from registration.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (b) and except as hereinafter provided, no person who shall become a member of a Reserve component after the effective date of this act shall thereby be exempt from registration or service by induction or call to active duty under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That persons who, prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months, are appointed to or enlisted in an organized unit of any of the Reserve components of the armed forces mentioned in paragraph (1) of this subsection, which participate in scheduled drills and training periods throughout the year, shall, so long as they continue to be members of any of such components, be exempt from service by induction under the provisions of this act, but not from registration.

(e) (1) Any person who, on the effective date of this act, is enrolled in the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and has entered upon the junior or senior year, or is a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, shall be deferred from induction for service under this act until the completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long thereafter as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall be required to register under section 3, but after completion or termination of the course of instruction may be ordered to active duty without his consent as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

(2) Within such number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, on or after the effective date of this act, is selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or who is appointed a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and who is selected for enrollment or continuance in the course after the effective date of this act, and who agrees, in writing, to accept a commission if tendered and to serve, subject to call by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, not less than 3 years on active duty after receipt of a commission, shall be deferred from induction for service under this act until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long thereafter as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this act except paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of this section, the President is hereby authorized to order into the active service of the armed forces of the United States, for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months each, members of any or all reserve components of the armed forces of the United States without their consent who prior to the effective date of this act have had less than 90 days' continuous active service in the armed forces of the United States, exclusive of periods of active training duty: *Provided*, That with respect to ordering members of the National Guard of the United States into the active service of the United States, the consent of the Governor of the State or Territory concerned, in each case, and for the District of Columbia, the consent of the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard, shall first be secured: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not be construed as repealing or abridging any existing law which authorizes the ordering of members of reserve components into active service.

(f) Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period covered by the agreement but not to exceed 4 months, from induction for service under this act, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(g) The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States.

(h) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, shall be exempt from service (but not from registration) under this act.

(i) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (g) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.

(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States, of those persons whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the persons so deferred.

(j) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act prior to his graduation from such school or institution, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this subsection beyond the date so determined.

(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act after the beginning and prior to the end of one of his academic years, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the end of such academic year or (B) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier.

(k) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant service (which for the purposes hereof includes training for combatant duties) in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially sociological or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any such person claiming such exemption from combatant service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the armed forces under this act, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to

participation in such noncombatant service, be deferred. Any such person claiming such exemption from combatant service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the persons concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the armed forces under this act, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, he shall be deferred. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

(l) No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from service, under this act, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

(m) No person shall be relieved from service under this act by reason of conviction for a criminal offense, except where the offense for which he has been convicted may be punished by death or by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

(n) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment made or denied under subsection (i) of this section may, within 10 days after such deferment is made or denied, be submitted for review and decision to the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public.

(o) When one or more members of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States between September 8, 1939, and September 2, 1945, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, and the sole surviving son of such family is inducted for service under the terms of this act, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service, as defined by the President, and shall not be assigned to service outside the United States (as defined in this act).

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that section 5 be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 21, after line 23, insert the following new section 6, and renumber the following existing sections accordingly:

"SEC. 6. (a) Under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps), and the United States Air Force from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age for enlistment periods of not less than 3 years: *Provided*, That the total number of aliens who may be enlisted pursuant to this section shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time. Persons enlisted pursuant to this section shall, upon completion of 3 years' honorable service in one or more of the armed forces of the United States, be eligible, subject to such qualifications and examinations as may be prescribed, for naturalization in accordance with the provisions of section 324 of the act approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1149; 8 U. S. C. 724), and other provisions of applicable law.

"(b) Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlist in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps) or the Air Force, under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section nor to their dependents or beneficiaries.

"(c) So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat. ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads '; an ' in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army,' is hereby repealed."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane and call attention to the fact that it proposes to amend the naturalization laws.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York would make a point of order against this amendment. I point out the fact that a similar amendment has been accepted by the upper body. If it is in order in the upper body, it certainly should be in order in the House.

It might be interesting to the gentleman to know that from 1941 to 1945 approximately 117,000 noncitizens were accepted into the armed services, which, I believe, established a precedent for accepting aliens into the armed services.

With my amendment, and under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, would be authorized to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy—including the Marine Corps—and the United States Air Force from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age for enlistment periods of not less than 3 years, provided that the total number of aliens who were enlisted pursuant to this section would not exceed 100,000 at any one time. Persons enlisted pursuant to this section would, upon completion of 3 years' honorable service in one or more of the armed forces of the United States, be eligible, subject to such qualifications and examinations as would be prescribed, for naturalization in accordance with the provisions of section 342 of the act approved October 14, 1940, Fifty-fourth Statutes, page 1149, Eighth United States Code, page 724, and other provisions of applicable law. Therefore, I contend that this amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that all the gentleman's amendment does is add another way of getting men for the armed forces of the United States; therefore it is pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has suggested that in view of the fact a similar amendment was adopted in another body it should be permitted here. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the House of Representatives has a rule on germaneness which does not apply to a certain other body. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania includes a proviso which affects the naturalization laws by establishing a new basis for eligibility to citizenship. A bill proposing to amend the naturalization laws would be beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Armed Services. Under the rule which has been adopted no immunity was granted to Members to offer amendments which are not germane; consequently, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 14, line 24, insert after "religion" the words "Christian Science readers and practitioners."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, and on behalf of the committee, I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately prior to the reading of section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time to discuss one matter that has been repeated here many times today. I refer to the question, What is the emergency, if any, that calls for this legislation?

The words used by witnesses who appeared before the committee were that there was international tension. In my humble opinion there is a distinct emergency in which the United States of America is involved today.

What is it? The war ended in August 1945. Three years have gone by, yet in that period only one treaty of peace has been signed. Why? Be-

cause one power, one of our allies in the late war, has continuously obstructed all efforts at peace.

Furthermore, that country has overrun 10 or 12 countries by penetration, by subversive methods, and by all kinds of means contrary to the will of the people in those small countries. We do not know but what this is going to continue, and the result is that there is fear, terror, uncertainty, and hopelessness on the part of most every country in the world which was affected by the war. We are the one country, I believe, that has the capacity and the leadership to help bring stability to the world. We are the ones that pioneered and carried through the organization of the United Nations, though it has been feeble and ineffective to date. I believe that the American public is thoroughly sold on the idea that we must find some way to have selective security or the world will lapse back into the days of the Dark Ages. That is why I am so disappointed in what has been going on here today in emasculating this bill. Twenty-eight or twenty-nine members of our committee listened diligently to the testimony of the various witnesses. It appealed to our judgment that the bill before us today, which was supported by the executive department, was a step moving in the direction of world stability. In other words, if we show a determination that we are going to have peace if we have to fight for it, then perhaps we will bring peace about. You know, you can drift into a war, and if we drift along the way we are drifting, that is exactly what we might do. But you cannot drift into peace. You must have a program. You must work it out diligently. You must use every conceivable effort, including your military strength, to bring about the peace that the soldiers of the war fought for and that the people of the United States and the world want and are entitled to.

I say to you that there is an emergency that calls for the show of American strength and American determination. This is only one part of the picture. Just think of it. Over 3 years have gone and the people all over the world are living in hopeless confusion and disappointment due to the fact that the stability, the tranquillity, the peace, the opportunity that they thought would be theirs when the war ended, has not been realized. That is the chaotic, uncertain, indefinite and hopeless situation that I believe American strength can furnish the leadership to terminate. We can, by our leadership, bring stability to the world. We can bring collective security to the world, but we cannot do it by drifting along like this. If you do not like this bill, for heaven's sake kill it, but do not try to smother it by worthless, useless amendments. That is exactly what is going on in this House today. Members have announced it in the Chamber and some have announced it in the press that they want to smother this bill; they want to kill the bill; they do not care how they do it, or what combination of devices is used. That is what disappoints and shocks me tremendously. To me it indicates a failure to look realistically at the world today. It seems to me to fail to grasp the serious challenge to peace and the strategic position of the United States to furnish the leadership for world peace.

This bill has the thought and all shades of political opinion behind it. It has the support of people of both parties. It has the support of the different agencies of government involved. It has the support of practically every prominently mentioned candidate for the Presidency. I say to you, if you think that we should take an affirmative stand for peace, I do hope that you will not further emasculate or try to kill this bill by amendments or delays.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I have never been confronted with a more difficult vote than the one I am to cast at the conclusion of this debate. Our people have been traditionally opposed to any law drafting young men for military service in peacetime. In the early days of our history we were thousands of miles frpm any enemy. Surrounded by the oceans, our national security required only the ability to fight off an invader. Indeed, in Revolutionary days, a Paul Revere could ride horseback through his local community and call the men and boys to arms. That was adequate national defense in those times.

We have gone a long way since 1776. National defense of that day would not be any more effective now than the ox team would be in meeting current problems of transportation. We won the Revolutionary War under that system.

Then came the Spanish-American War, and again methods of warfare had changed. The great World War I followed and we know that war could not have been successfully terminated had we used Spanish-American War technique. Then came World War II. Conditions were again entirely different and we could not have hoped to win World War II by relying upon the methods which were so successful in World War I.

Today we are living in still another era. Our geographical position is no longer a guaranty of safety. Our ships, our airplanes, and our military forces are everywhere in the civilized world. These are the circumstances that confront us in 1948.

Of necessity, our foreign policy has also changed. Whether we like it or not, we must accept conditions as they are and not as we wish they were. The superdreadnought, the submarine, the airplane, the atomic bomb, and all the developments and inventions that go with them, are realities. We find ourselves in the position of world leadership. We must either abandon that leadership and our ideals, and supinely place our country at the mercy of communism and aggressor nations, or we must be sufficiently prepared to meet force with force.

We have provided for the greatest and most invulnerable air force in all history. The money has been authorized. The job we have before us today is to provide the personnel to carry out that policy; in short, to staff our military forces. Our air bases and our defense units are useless unless there are adequate men to man them. If these forces can be provided by the voluntary method, then that should be done. We are told by every student of the situation, who because of experience and responsibility should speak with accuracy, that the way the matter now stands we will not have the necessary number of voluntary enlistments.

The purpose of this bill is really to provide a second line of defense; that is, the draft will not function or call men to service unless the voluntary system fails. This bill sets up the machinery and gives notice as to what will happen in case of necessity. No one will be drafted if adequate volunteers enlist. The committees of Congress and the agencies of government charged with our national defense have been studying this problem ever since the shooting stopped in World War II. No Congress likes to pass a draft law but it seems clear that unless there is such an incentive to additional enlistments, the draft is the only way out.

I agree that world war III is not inevitable. I cannot agree that we are not faced at the moment with a potential war. There is a real emergency confronting us. War is at our gates and Congress is not measuring up to its responsibilities if it lives in a twilight zone between peace and war and does not prepare for all eventualities. Briefly, we are confronted with a condition and not with a theory, and with facts that we do not like. We will get nowhere by thinking entirely in retrospect. We must courageously face the future. No one wants war, and no one wants the draft. Stern reality must not yield to political expediency when the roll is called today.

Our form of government and the freedom and liberty of our constitutional guaranties are in the balance. Right or wrong, a bipartisan foreign policy has been approved overwhelmingly by the Senate and the House. This bill is a requisite step to implement that policy provided, of course, that voluntary enlistments do not measure up to requirements. This is not a Republican measure or a Democratic measure. It has the support of all candidates for the Presidency, with the exception of Henry Wallace. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and most other veteran groups are backing this draft bill. It will not be permanent law and terminates in 2 years. The fact that these veterans, who know that war is hell, and who have borne the brunt of battle in recent wars, are here demanding action by the Congress should have great weight.

We all want peace and I am persuaded that under world conditions we cannot have peace by appeasement. I believe in the United Nations, but realize its difficult task. With the prevailing veto power, Russia can call the numbers and, especially so long as this condition obtains, our country must be on guard and prepared at all times, if our way of life is to continue.

Mr. Chairman, I have had numerous messages urging me to vote for the draft because it is accepted as a national security necessity at the moment. Many of the same people are opposed to universal military training. I have had very few messages in opposition to this bill. I have not promised my constituents to vote for or against a draft now. I have

written to all of them: "I shall give this matter the best consideration possible in the light of the information which is available to me at the time of the vote. After conscientious and prayerful consideration, I shall do that which I sincerely believe to be in the best interest of my country and I am sure that you would not want me to do otherwise."

In conformity with this promise and with full realization of what this law will mean, I am forced to the conclusion that our national security requires that this temporary draft law be on the statute books, ready for use if and when voluntary enlistments fail to meet requirements. I shall, therefore, vote for the bill.

NOTE.—The draft bill passed the Senate by a vote of 78 for to 10 against, and the House by 283 for to 130 against. The conference report passed the House by 259 for to 136 against.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we are living in a "twilight zone" between war and peace. The war clouds are still hovering over us and the sun of peace has not yet risen. It appears to me that in the condition in which we now find this world and particularly our great Nation we should give serious consideration and we should give prayerful consideration to what we are now about to do. We are in a period the like of which this Nation has never before passed through. If we are to preserve this democracy we must use statesmanship. We must throw away politics, we must throw away unfair reasoning, in order that we may arrive at a program that will preserve this democracy and that will preserve this Nation. Our national security is the paramount issue.

I, for one, with a great deal of misgivings, am going to support this bill. I hate to do it, but I think this is a duty of patriotism. I think this is the time, if you will consider the status in which we find ourselves today, compared to the other nations of the world, when you can conscientiously do but one thing, and that is, get this Nation prepared.

What is the situation? There is a nation that for 3½ years has thrown every obstacle it can in the way of peace, in the way of getting back to normalcy, in the way of doing away with confusion and chaos and getting back to order and rehabilitation. She has thrown every obstacle in the way of the United Nations she could, using the veto power 23 times. Today that nation has a standing army of some 4,000,000 men, ready at any moment, if the occasion arises, to overrun Europe, yet this Nation, the leader of the world today, can do nothing. Why? We do not have even normal military strength to take care of our defense.

I deplore the fact that some gentlemen here refer to our military leaders as brass hats. God knows they contributed something to the winning of this last war. When they were over there on the battlefields they were great fellows. But now there are a number of men in this Congress who refer to them ironically as brass hats. It is not fair to them. If it comes to the matter of leadership in another war, will they be brass hats? If they have to lead us through another conflict, are these men who are here referring to them as brass hats going to volunteer? Are they going to say to these generals, "Here is my advice to you; I want to cooperate with you"? No; they are not going to do that, but they will criticize. That is the greatest contribution they can make.

These are serious times. The only thing you have heard argued here so far is the sacrifices our boys would be making, and they would be making sacrifices to go in the Army. But I think this is a step toward peace. It is not a step toward war. Unless we take this step we might get into war.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer several committee amendments containing some clarifications.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

On page 9, line 4, strike out the word "No" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Any."

On page 9, line 10, after the word "shall", strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert "be exempt from induction for service or call to active duty under this act, but not from registration."

Page 13, line 14, after the word "except", insert "subsection (4) (a) and."

Page 20, line 24, delete the words "between September 8, 1939, and September 2, 1945," appearing in lines 24 and 25.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time as a matter of fairness to the Committee on Armed Services, as I try always to play the game upon the square.

I have lived with the defense of this Nation for many years. I have served under the Stars and Stripes for more than four decades—through two great wars and many times of national crisis—and this Nation has been good to me and mine. I have studied the rise and fall of nations in connection with their military establishments and some years ago I reached the conclusion that compulsory military service in time of peace on a permanent basis has not been beneficial to any state, but rather has been instrumental in its downfall.

The strength of a nation in its struggle for self-preservation is dependent, in the end, more upon its industrial, financial, and moral strength than on its military might at the outbreak of hostilities, providing that it has sufficient force immediately available to withstand the first shock of war. We do not lack that strength now; in fact, with forces now in being and which will be presently available, we greatly exceed the minimum which will assure safety.

The whole history of the United States cries out the truth of these assertions. We, a Nation of free and unregimented people, time after time, have risen in the glory of our freedom, produced the sinews of war, called out our people, and gone on to victory. No other nation on earth has such a record of success on the fields of battle—on land, and sea, and in the air. And now we are asked to abandon freedom and accept conscription and regimentation—military domination—in time of peace. Why? Because of the aspirations of an everexpanding Military Establishment to expand even more? Because of the determination of certain political or industrial leaders to become lords of the earth? I do not know the answer but I do know that every grain of common sense I have cries out against this saddling permanently upon a free people of the very system which I believe has been instrumental in destroying those who have practiced it.

I have stood for every move to build up the national security of this Nation. I have and do support a large Army and a large Navy and a large Air Force. I have intended to support the current bill on the basis of the temporary need of these measures due to the existence of an emergency or a crisis. I have intended to support it even though I told the people of my district and my State, prior to the election in 1946, that I was thoroughly opposed to the institution of conscription as a national policy. But now I learn that even the advocates of this measure do not claim that either an emergency or a crisis exists—merely that we are in a state of tension, which I conclude will continue indefinitely.

I conclude also that while the current bill limits this selective service to 2 years, this time limit means nothing, and that once fastened upon the American people, the tentacles of this destructive system will be fixed in our body politic far into the future—perhaps until we collapse in ignominy.

Mr. Chairman, all history shows that heretofore the state which has controlled the seas has been able, in the end, to dominate the world. Now, a new factor has come into the scope of war: the power of ships of the air. Exactly how this will affect the status of sea power—exactly how sea power and air power will be combined in the future—no one of us can tell. But, Mr. Chairman, we now have the greatest Navy in the world by a vast margin and we shall have the world's best Air Force when our 70-group establishment is completed. I do not believe that the Army can prosper through becoming a reservoir of conscripts. I believe it can prosper by affording better conditions of service, by more liberal promotions into noncommissioned forces, by better efforts of recruiting, by recognizing that it is not going to get a draft and so must stand on its own feet through voluntary service—perhaps by emulating the Navy or Air Force in these matters. The difference of opportunity between the enlisted men of the Army and enlisted men of the Navy has been notorious for years. From what I understand, the Air Force is at least equaling the Navy in this respect and I suggest the Army do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I have searched my conscience in the matter of this legislation. I have deeply considered my duty to my constituents and to the people of the United States and I have concluded that I cannot support this bill, that I cannot have any part in making conscription an established part of the American way of life.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 21, line 6, after section 5, insert the following new sections, to be numbered 6 and 7, respectively, and renumbering the existing sections 6 through 23 accordingly.

"SEC. 6. (a) Under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy (including the Marine Corps), and the United States Air Force from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age for enlistment periods of not less than 3 years: *Provided*, That the total number of aliens who may be enlisted pursuant to this section shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time.

"SEC. 7. So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625) as amended, as reads '; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army', is hereby repealed."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman care to state in what particular the amendment is regarded as not germane?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill is the Selective Service Act of 1948, and does not contain any provisions similar to those contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair calls attention to the fact that the bill is entitled "A bill to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes." The bill carries sections relating to enlistments and other means of increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States.

The Chair has examined the amendment and believes that the amendment is clearly within the scope of the bill.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, it might be said that the idea for this amendment was originated by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Senator LODGE. However, I had been thinking of introducing a similar amendment as part of the Selective Service Act, so I anxiously awaited the action that would be taken by the Senate on the Lodge amendment.

The Lodge amendment was carefully debated in the Senate and many suggestions were made on the Senate floor to change the amendment. However, it was, with but little change, passed and the debate appears in the RECORD for Tuesday, June 8, pages 7294 to 7302.

During the debate Senator LUCAS stated, and I quote:

I wish to say, before concluding, that it seems to me this amendment is highly meritorious. Like the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I sincerely hope the amendment may be taken to conference, where serious study can be given with a view to attempting to incorporate in the bill something along the line of the amendment the Senator from Massachusetts has suggested.

Therefore, in the preparation of my amendment I conferred with all interested executives in an effort to carefully prepare this amendment, which, if accepted, even though modified, I trust will meet with the approval of both Houses when the bill goes to conference.

Another reason why I offer this amendment is that during the years 1941 to 1945 we had 117,000 aliens in the services of the armed forces.

This amendment is designed to authorize the enlistment of a limited number of aliens in the armed forces of the United States.

The act of 1894 prohibits the enlistment of aliens, other than those who have taken out first papers, in time of peace. This is suspended during the continuance of the present technical state of war, but the Secretary of the Army has declined to utilize this technicality as a basis for embarking upon any extended project without congressional sanction. In addition, there are certain provisions of appropriations acts limiting payment of salaries, and so forth, to aliens. Most of these have been suspended during the war, but may be revived at any time.

Now as far as availability of aliens is concerned for enlistment, it might be said there are a considerable number of Polish ex-servicemen; and in Britain alone it is estimated there are about 110,000 of these men. How many are in the United States and British zones of Germany who could be enlisted in our armed forces, I am unable to say. But I understand there are thousands of these stateless men and that a great many are being used by our forces for civilian guard duty.

There are also a great number of males from the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—and some from Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, who are most reliable and are potential soldiers. Many of these men have basic military training and are well qualified to serve in our Army.

Senator GURNEY, in the debate on the Selective Service bill in the Senate, said and I quote:

All students of our military policy have been seriously disturbed over the fact that our forces are scattered thinly all over the globe with only a pitifully small number of reserves available in the United States to support the overseas forces.

It is evident the need is apparent.

I might explain that the Lodge amendment would authorize only the Secretary of the Army until June 30, 1950, to accept not to exceed 25,000 enlistments in the Regular Army whereas my amendment would authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, under policies established by the Secretary of Defense, indefinitely to accept enlistments in the Regular Army, the United States Navy, and the Regular Air Force provided the total number of aliens who may be enlisted shall not exceed 100,000 at any one time.

The Lodge amendment would establish a maximum age of 35 years, whereas my amendment would contain no such restriction.

The Lodge amendment would set a minimum enlistment of 5 years, whereas my amendment sets one of 3 years.

The Lodge amendment makes no mention of naturalization, whereas my amendment spells it out and insures an alien after completion of 3 years' honorable service of becoming eligible for naturalization.

The Lodge amendment would suspend until June 30, 1950, the present prohibition on original enlistment of aliens which is now effective in time of peace, whereas my amendment would repeal the prohibition.

These are the basic facts of my amendment and I regret that I had to modify my original amendment on the naturalization section so that it could be considered.

Now in order to foster Americanization and build citizenship, the aliens enlisted would be assigned generally to regularly established units of the Army, Navy, and Air Force rather than creating special battalions or regiments, and so forth of any national groups.

Last Friday, June 11, we passed a bill to take into this country some 200,000 displaced persons who will enter this country without making any contribution to its welfare and without much consideration except for a preliminary examination and a screening.

It is evident, Mr. Chairman, in this debate that is taking place on the floor of the House, that there is a need to supplement our overseas forces with enlistments. Everyone here seems to be talking about a training bill rather than selective service to build up our armed forces. Here we have a potential group of men who are stateless, who are anxious to enlist in the service of the United States, who understand the characteristics and the language of the countries they would serve in; who are potential soldiers and would do a fine job for us; in fact, we are using them right now in a civilian status. I think this amendment bears sufficient importance for us to have the opportunity to tap this reservoir of manpower which is available immediately to supplement our forces wherever the need may be, and I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will give it very serious consideration and support.

I am sorry I had to modify my original amendment because of the fact I felt that if a man was willing to serve for the United States for a period of 3 years that he would be eligible for citizenship and these men are all prospective citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I still feel that we should be able to enlist aliens in the armed forces, particularly for service in other countries, and who, after a 3-year period of service and honorably discharged, and who are found qualified for citizenship, would be admitted as citizens.

This would give these prospective citizens something to work for; and during the 3-year period we would indoctrinate them with the fundamentals of our American way of life and citizenship. If after rendering this honorable service, they are found qualified, they would be in far better physical and mental condition than any dispaced person who is now to be admitted.

Certainly there is no better way to demonstrate a right to United States citizenship than for these stateless enlistees to render such a service to the United States and earn this right.

I sincerely hope it will have the wholehearted support of the entire membership of this House.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to read a letter which came to me a few days after adoption of the Senate amendment. This letter is written by an American citizen whom I do not know. He states:

> History is replete with examples of the hiring of foreign mercenaries. I do not know of one instance where this policy was attended with success, but I do know that it has often been a typical move of decadent governments.
>
> The defense of the United States should rest exclusively upon the people of this country—people who have been reared in American surroundings and who, if called upon to fight, will be fighting for their own homes in the United States. To sprinkle aliens at the squad level among the troops of the Regular Army would be to introduce a policy that can lead only to disaster. National pride alone, I would think, would call for the defeat of this particular provision of the pending bill.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore the fact that during the last few days I have observed there are many who would destroy this bill. I am in favor of the bill. I am not too far removed myself from the draft age. I think any young American who believes in America, who believes in his country, should be willing to serve for 2 years in the armed services of this Nation, particularly to preserve the peace of this world.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest a few moments ago to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY], and I also listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] yesterday and again today. These gentlemen stated that nations like Germany, Japan, Italy, and France that depended upon military conscription went down in defeat. But they did not tell you that these nations had military conscription for lust, for aggression, to keep Hitler and Mussolini in power personally. That is what they had conscription for—to rape the world, to loot the world, for conquest.

Mr. Chairman, let us draw this distinction. We are proposing this conscription in peacetime to protect the peace of the world. Air power is peace power, United States naval power is peace power, a good American Army is a peace force.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am sure the gentleman realizes that conscription in Europe came after the French Revolution and had nothing whatever to do with Hitler, Mussolini, or any other dictator of the modern era.

Mr. DORN. I thank the kind lady; but nevertheless the fact remains that these men did maintain large armies for conquest, for lust, to rape the world.

Mr. Chairman, we are proposing this measure for peace.

I listened the other day with a great deal of interest to the gentleman representing the Twenty-fourth District of New York, the Bronx, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. I thought as they spoke that on that very night in their districts you would find policemen on duty, with uniforms on, wearing a pistol, if you please, not to shoot down people, not to commit murder, but to protect the peace of the homes in that community, to protect the wives and children of that district while they were serving in the Congress down here. So it is with adequate American preparedness. This bill is not for war, conquest, or aggression, but it is for happiness, peace, and tranquil relations among men and nations. Let us this day fight for peace in a time of peace. That is a better policy than fighting for victory in a time of war.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman has seen fit to point out the fact that the police officers in my district wear pistols. What do they wear in the gentleman's district? Powder puffs or what?

Mr. DORN. They also wear pistols. And I would like to say also that in New York you have a State highway patrol, you have a State police system, you have the Federal Bureau of Investigation, you have units of the National Guard, all to protect the people of your community in New York City and preserve peace. And it is further a fact that in nearly every State of this Union the sheriffs are authorized to deputize citizens, if necessary, to protect the people in the communities; in other words, a draft.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Are any of those men drafted, or does the community pay them?

Mr. DORN. I just answered the gentleman's question, that if necessary, in time of an emergency, they can deputize every able-bodied citizen to protect the people in that community. Yes; they are paid.

Mr. BUFFETT. The Committee on Armed Services voted unanimously that there was no emergency, did they not?

Mr. DORN. I do not know about that; I do not think they did. But this is a time of uncertainty. All of us would admit that Russia has a 4,000,000 standing army.

Mr. BUFFETT. And they have had that for 20 years, too, have they not?

Mr. DORN. Yes; but not as strong as it is today. They are increasing their strength daily, while this Nation is becoming impotent, just as the gentleman's party helped it to become impotent after the last war.

Mr. BUFFETT. What would the gentleman rather have, 4,000,000 men or the atomic bomb?

Mr. DORN. That question is beside the point.

Mr. BUFFETT. No; it is not.

Mr. DORN. Yes; it is. What we need is to implement the delivery of the atomic bomb with modern types of aircraft, and you have to have some men in order to do that.

Mr. BUFFETT. We heard this morning that the Air Corps was turning men down all the time.

Mr. DORN. The Air Corps is not all that is necessary. You need all the components of the Army at full strength. What we need is a peace force today. I hope we will give it to our Nation and to the world.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a good deal of regret that I find myself in disagreement with my friend from Pennsylvania. With the possible exception of this one particular item he and I think very much alike on the question of national defense.

I do not think I can add very much to what has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, on this question. But here it is proposed that we employ 100,000 foreigners, aliens, to help defend the United States. I confess that I cannot enthuse over such a proposal, first, from the practical standpoint, which is of the less importance. From a practical standpoint I can imagine the babel of tongues that would prevail in the armed forces of the United States and practically every unit stationed abroad if we had foreigners added to it, speaking four, five, and six different languages. I can visualize the captain of a company of infantry in Germany having to employ interpreters in order to transmit his orders to the enlisted men.

But, more important than that, have we come to the point when we must employ 100,000 foreigners to defend us? Are we to establish a precedent here that will prevail and perhaps become more and more influential as the years go by that the easy way to defend America is to hire defenders, no matter where they come from? It does not present a pretty picture. If you will read history you will remember the utter contempt that was suffered by the British Government, the Lord North ministry under George III, when they hired Hessians. It left a scar that still is visible.

I hope this House will not start any such system as this. To my mind it is un-American.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take any time on this bill, for I am supporting the bill, and I am going to vote for it. It may be that in this instance I may be voting for more than is immediately necessary for my country's safety, but I would rather be safe than sorry. I would rather err on the side of safety. I was put to the same test on the Selective Service Act shortly before Pearl Harbor. For a time I was the only one from our entire Michigan delegation favoring its passage. Later, upon my entreaty, I was joined by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], while 15 Members from my State opposed the bill and made a grave error. You remember that at that time the same people who opposed peacetime conscription before Pearl Harbor asked the same question you heard yesterday in this well, "Who is going to attack the United States?" Within a few months thereafter the Japs attacked us. I am not speculating on who might be foolhardy enough to attack us. I am going to vote to stack our buckshot and be ready. I must vote thus, Mr. Chairman, as long as there are pyromaniacs abroad playing with matches. I had one son in the service as a result of my vote prior to World War II. If need be, I will put into uniform another lad now nearing his seventeenth birthday. The safety of my country demands this of me. I have no choice in the matter. I trust, Mr. Chairman, I may contribute something to this bill which is pertinent and proper in respect to the proposal of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. I think it would be well to permit many of these individuals who served in the Polish Army, for example, to enlist in our armed forces and after such service to become citizens of our beloved country. There are other groups and nationalities, of course, who are worthy. But I want to deal with the valiant Polish soldiers left high and dry in Europe today. They served from the first day until the last. You cannot compare those people with mercenaries. You cannot liken them to the unprincipled Hessians, as somebody has whispered. These are the men who have served their country on the Allied side through the Battle of Poland, above and underground, the Battle of France, and the Battle of Britain. They fought in Narvik; they held Tobruk for 8 months. They battled at Anzio. They left 4,000 of their dead as evidence of their bravery and courage at Monte Cassino. They went the entire length of the Italian boot. Again, they fought in France, Holland, and Germany, and, like Moses, they were then denied the privilege of entering their own homeland, for which they fought and died and where they lost their all.

Those people are as opposed to communism as they are to nazism. They would rather fight a Communist or a Nazi than attend a banquet. These are the kind of people America is made of. These men are heroes in a wholesale lot. They deserve every consideration. They would be a great and a valuable asset to the United States. Permitting them to come into the country after having served a hitch in the United States Army would be a mighty valuable thing for the people of this country. Their service in Germany today would for a certainty add strength and safety to our armed forces and to our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. NODAR].

Mr. NODAR. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, today I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the permission of the House Un-American Activities Committee, a report which it furnished on my request concerning the political background of a group of people who play important roles on the editorial staff of the Queensbridge Home News, a small newspaper distributed free of charge among the residents, numbering several thousand families, of the Queensbridge Federal housing project of Long Island City in my constituency.

This news sheet is the official publication of the Queensbridge Tenants League and the writers in question are officers of that league. The report on their background speaks for itself. I do not believe that they are truly representative of the kind of people who live in Queensbridge, and I do not think that the views they are propagating are representative of the thinking of the majority of the tenants.

However, I feel that the facts about these people should be made known, so that the tenants of the housing project themselves can decide on the basis of the facts whether or not they want this kind of person to speak in their name. It is only fair to point out at this time when many of us in Congress are making a desperate fight for constructive housing legislation, we are hampered by the knowledge that people with backgrounds such as these can gain such control and influence over the tenants in these projects built by public funds. This information can only hinder the adoption of any new Federal housing legislation. None of us are willing to spend public money to house and benefit those with un-American sympathies.

I have had a personal investigation made to be sure that the persons identified in the Un-American Activities Committee report are the same as those listed as officers of the Queensbridge Tenants League. I can verify that although their addresses have now been changed to Queensbridge from their previous residences, they are in fact the same people, who, as the committee states, have engaged in Communist Party and Communist-front activities in some cases.

I believe this information warrants the study and consideration of the Congress as well as by the loyal American tenants of the project.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 1, 1948.

For: Hon. ROBERT NODAR, Jr.

Subject: Jeannette Devausney, Max Diamond, Edward Fodor, Molly Greenberg, Mortimer Greenberg, Miriam Sayer, and Queensbridge Home News.

Jeannette Devausney, chairman of the school committee for the Queensbridge Tenants League, wrote a letter to the Daily Worker, Communist Party organ, complaining about the school situation in the Queensbridge housing project and commenting upon articles by Joseph North which had appeared in the Daily Worker. (See Daily Worker, March 12, 1948, p. 8.)

Max Diamond, according to the Daily Worker of March 12, 1942, was a speaker for the International Workers Order. In the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of June 25, 1942, it was stated: "Our committee has found unanimously that the International Workers Order is a front of the Communist Party. The organization is headed entirely by outstanding avowed members of the Communist Party, such as William Weiner, Max Bedacht, Herbert Benjamin, and Louise Thompson." (See report 2277, p. 19.) Attorney General Francis Biddle, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24, 1942, on page 7688, called it "One of the strongest Communist organizations." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the International Workers Order as a Communist front in its report dated January 3, 1940. In a list of organizations compiled by Attorney General Clark pursuant to Executive Order No. 9835, and released by the Civil Service Commission on December 5, 1947, the International Workers Order was cited as being a subversive organization.

Max Diamond is listed as being a member of the editorial staff of the New York Teacher News, which is the official publication of the Teachers Union of New York (New York Teacher News, February 7, 1948, p. 2.) According to the New York Times of September 24, 1943, page 25, the New York Teachers Union received its charter from the Congress of Industrial Organizations as Local No. 555 of the New York District of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. It was previously affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers as Local No. 5, but was expelled on charges of being Communist dominated at the August 1941 convention of the American Federation of Teachers. The State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, which the Teachers Union joined, later merged with the United Federal Workers of America at a convention held in Atlantic City during the week of April 23–27, 1946, and became the United Public Workers of America. In Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities regarding communism in the CIO, the committee stated they had found Communist leadership strongly entrenched in both the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America and the United Federal Workers of America. (See report 1311, pp. 18–19.)

Edward Fodor was listed as being the chairman of the sixteenth assembly district branch of the Communist Party by the Daily Worker, May 4, 1940, page 3, column 8.

Edward J. Fodor, according to the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, was candidate for Congress from the Eighteenth District, New York County, in 1940, for the Communist Party. (Daily Worker, August 5, 1940, p. 5, column 5.)

In the committee's printed lists of the signers of Communist Party election petitions, compiled from the original petitions, the following names are found:

1. Edward J. Fodor, 58 East Ninety-eighth Street, New York, New York State petition, 1940.

2. Molly Greenberg, 1245 Findlay Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., New York City petition, 1939–40.

3. Mortimer Greenberg, 18 Hart Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., New York City petition, 1939–40.

4. Mortimer Greenberg, 4010 Vernon Boulevard, Queens, N. Y., New York State petition, 1940.

5. Beatrice Laupheimer, 721 Walton Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., New York State petition, 1942.

Miriam Sayer, under the auspices of the Communist Party of Queens County, N. Y., signed a statement to Borough President Burke protesting the denial of the use of the Lost Battalion Hall for the Communist Party election rally. (Daily Worker, December 5, 1946, p. 5.)

We were unable to find any reference to the other members of the editorial board and staff of the Queensbridge Home News, namely, Emlia Mitrand, Jean Sobek, Ruth Kaufman, Meta Goodman, Helen Fodor, Edna Horn, Jean Marin, Muriel Wharton, and Elsie Felipe. We were also unable to find any mention or reference of the Queensbridge Home News in the files of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of California to the amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: Insert *"Provided, however,* That such aliens shall be assigned duty on foreign occupation service only, for the period of their enlistment, except for such domestic service within the United States as may be determined necessary for adequate schooling or instruction."

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking not only in support of my amendment to the amendment, but also in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. As to whether or not there is an emergency now existing in the world, I think one might better direct that inquiry to those now domiciled in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Bessarabia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, or any one of the formerly free lands in the world who had their freedom at one time and in whose parliamentary bodies you could probably have heard very much the same kind of debate as is now going on in this great Chamber. So far as hiring mercenaries is concerned, I think that any argument based on that count does not hold water. As a matter of fact, this great Chamber is distinguished by the picture of a man who might well have been called by some a mercenary. His name was Lafayette. His picture hangs at the left of the Speaker's chair. There are other great names that come to mind, such as those of Pilsudski, Kosciusko, Steuben, and literally scores of other foreign-born men in our Nation's history who have rendered great service to this country, not because of a few paltry dollars that they may have received as payment for their services, but because they believed in the dignity of the human being and his right to live in freedom.

Have we ever before employed the services of any mercenaries in our national history? We certainly did use the services of many thousands of Philippine Scouts. We certainly made allies and agents out of all of the members of all of the partisan movements during the war. We not only paid them money, but we gave them arms and ammunition. Certainly the thousands upon thousands of aliens who were inducted under Selective Service were, to a certain extent and quite literally, mercenaries as the term is being here employed today. I do not think actually that the employment of a hundred thousand men—able-bodied soldiers—who have been driven out of their homes and off their soil, who have made every possible sacrifice in their efforts to retain their freedom, independence, and liberty—I repeat I do not think that the employment of these men could be termed the employment of mercenaries. When they fight for us, as they would under the provisions of this amendment, they would fight equally for their own homes, for their own human dignity, and for the right to sometime return to the lands that were theirs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, and to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, like my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. JACKSON], I, too, rise to speak in favor of the amendment proposed by our amiable colleague of Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. However, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] has now offered an amendment to the Gavin amendment providing that the aliens to be enlisted, be enlisted for the purpose of duty outside the United States except for such time that might be required for training purposes in the United States, and I am in fullest accord with this suggestion.

Both sponsors have foremost in mind the enlistment into our ranks of men who served in the uniform of Poland as our allies in the global war as also other of our allies such as the Czechs and others mentioned in the vigorous statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] in behalf of his amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1948.

The portrait of Lafayette here in the House Chamber was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] and other so-called foreigners were mentioned by him to substantiate the fact that this is not the setting of a precedent for having aliens in our forces. May I also reiterate to the Committee that an alien soldier, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, of Poland, fought for our freedom and died in the battle of Savannah. May I also remind the Committee that another alien of Polish extraction, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, also fought with our Colonial troops and founded the Military Academy at West Point. These men are among the first foreigners in our armed forces and there were many outstanding aliens on our side throughout the history of our Nation. If only the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who spoke in opposition a few minutes ago, would stop and reflect upon the history of the United States instead of the history of early Britain, he will readily associate the names, the heroic exploits of many non-United States citizens who helped win our battles. The record is self-sufficient in denying any need for interpreters to issue orders to available men like the former Polish soldiers who, shoulder to shoulder with our forces and our allies, fought throughout Africa and Europe. Oh, Mr. Chairman, there is so much that can be said along these same lines in favor of these worthy amendments but the time limitation restricts me. We need trained soldiers for our occupation forces; here is an opportunity for immediate replenishment with soldiers who know intensely the meaning of loyalty and freedom. I urge the adoption of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADLAK) there were—ayes 24, noes 53.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 24, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can arrive at some idea of how much more time will be required on section 5.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section 5 and all amendments thereto and all amendments to amendments close at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 5 and all amendments thereto and all amendments to amendments thereto close at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to advise the Committee that there are approximately 20 amendments at the desk. There are remaining approximately 55 minutes under the order just entered. The Chair would suggest that, without objection, the proponents of amendments will be recognized for 2 minutes in support of their amendments, and one speaker in opposition to the amendment.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUBER: Page 21, line 2, strike out all after the comma down through the period in line 6 and insert "The sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this act."

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that there is nothing controversial or complex about this amendment. It simply provides that where one or more members of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty during the last war that the sole surviving son shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this act.

I feel that if we were in actual war and it were necessary to scrape the bottom of the barrel it might be necessary to induct the sole surviving son. But under these circumstances, while we are still at peace, I see no reason why we cannot allow these parents who made so costly a sacrifice to have the solace and consolation of having their one remaining son at their side to carry on the family name. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer the identical amendment just offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER]. I am glad to support the amendment and hope that the committee will accept it. The bill as presently presented provides for the assignment to noncombatant service within the United States of the sole surviving son of any family who lost one or more persons during the fighting in World War II. This amendment will give such persons complete exemption from the bill. I believe that that is the least we can do for these families. There is no point in taking such a boy away from his family for noncombatant service. If the boy wants to serve he will enlist. On the other hand, if he or his family have any other desires they should be respected, and the boy given complete exemption.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the author of this amendment whether this is the surviving son amendment?

Mr. HUBER. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that this was my own original amendment to the bill. I have no objection to the amendment. The committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] to offer an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin: On page 15, line 7, strike out all wording on lines 7 and 8 following the comma and insert "or who are recognized by the officials of their church or synagogue or sect as having given a definite and acknowledged intention of entering into full-time religious work, shall be exempt from service (but not from registration) under this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is largely by way of clarification. It pertains principally to those individuals of the Protestant or Jewish Church who are studying for and intend to enter the ministry. I am a Catholic myself. Most people who enter into the studies for the priesthood in the Catholic Church enter into regular religious preparatory schools of instruction, but it is my understanding that many individuals who enter into the Protestant and Jewish ministry take a regular formal course such as any student might take and do not enter into the regular ministry until after they have completed their college education; but they take the college course with the view of entering the ministry and have made arrangements with their church leaders to that end. I think there will be something in the way of discrimination against people in that category if we do not adopt this amendment, discrimination against people who in good faith enter a regular college having made arrangements with their church superiors to enter into religion thereafter.

My amendment merely takes care of those who have made arrangements with officials of their church, synagogue, or sect to enter into the ministry. Under this amendment they would be exempt as are those who enter regular institutions.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. This amendment, of course, would make clear the fact that those who are in schools studying for the ministry would be exempt from the draft, but it would also make clear that those in the Catholic religious orders, for instance, known as lay brothers, should also be exempt; and that has always been our intention, and it is now in this Selective Service Act that they should be exempt.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman's amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] for 2 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that today on the floor a very distinguished gentleman made the statement that in our Foreign Affairs Committee executive session this morning Mr. Marshall made the statement that there was no danger of war.

Under the rules of the House and the committees an executive session is supposed to be sacred. I have always tried to follow that rule. I am not going to say anything about what Mr. Marshall said in the committee, but I can tell you what he did not say. He did not say that there was no danger of war.

In addition to that, I called him up this afternoon and he empowered me to make the statement that in his judgment it seems to be quite clear that recessions—in other words, that is a diplomatic phrase which means backing away—from our present line of action for the security of the United States would be most unfortunate and might lead to what we are trying so hard to avoid—that is, war.

That is the position of Secretary Marshall that he empowered me to present to the House at this time and to say once again he did not make the statement before our committee that there was no danger of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Page 10, line 3, after the comma after the word "served," insert the words "provided such unit is reasonably accessible to such person without unduly interrupting his normal pursuits and activities, including attendance at a college or university in which he is regularly enrolled."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, and I feel quite sure the same is true of the gentlemen on the other side, we have no objection to the amendment and will accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK:

On page 9, after line 3, insert:

"(2) That, except as otherwise provided in this act, no person who served honorably on board any vessel (i) in the United States Army Transportation Corps, or (ii) owned by, chartered to, or operated by, or for the account of the United States Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, in areas which the Maritime War Emergency Board determined to be hazardous and subject to enemy activity, for a period of 18 months or more, between September 16, 1940, and September 3, 1945, shall, without his consent, be liable for induction for service under this act except that such exemption shall terminate upon a declaration by the Congress after the date of enactment of this act that a state of war or national emergency exists."

On page 9, line 4, change "(2)" to "(3)."

On page 9, line 13, change "(3)" to "(4)."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is both simple and meritorious, and it also promotes the national defense. I hope it will be accepted by the Committee.

Except on declaration of war or national emergency, this amendment exempts from liability for induction merchant seamen who served 18 months between September 1940 and September 1945 in areas which the Maritime War

Emergency Board determined to be hazardous.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman who has contributed more to the upbuilding of the American merchant marine than any other Member in this House.

Mr. BLAND. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it would only exempt from induction into the armed forces men whose contribution to our recent war effort was so outstanding that special provision was made for their exemption from military service during the recent war and during the immediate postwar period.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. BLAND. Since that is the purpose of the amendment and since I am heartily in favor of the pending bill, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman kindly explain the mechanics by which these individuals are singled out, and their heroism and outstanding service identified, as against another boy who worked alongside of them but who was not picked out.

Mr. BUCK. The Maritime War Emergency Board classified every seaman as to whether his service was hazardous or not. Every man who served in the merchant marine can be sufficiently certified as to this point.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. The Merchant Marine Commission granted certificates of outstanding wartime service which was accepted by the selective-service boards throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all recognize the importance of the merchant marine service during the period of the last war. It presented many hazards to the persons involved. But, I think the question of recognizing civilian service during World War II and placing such service alongside of those who were in the armed forces is a question that the Congress has disposed of in the past. If we are going to recognize one class of civilians who served in the last war I think we should recognize other groups. Let us not forget the civilian employees of the State and War Departments who were in London during the war raids and were constantly subjected to V–I and V–II bombs. Let us not forget the members of the American Red Cross who served in the last war or the war correspondents.

Let us think of the members of the FBI. Let us think of the civilian employees in the Office of Strategic Services who exposed themselves to extreme dangers behind the enemy lines, and let us think of the State Department employees who were interned in foreign countries at the outbreak of the last war. If we are going to recognize one group, let us go all the way down the line. For that reason I oppose this amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is an outstanding Member of Congress who has served in both world wars, and who has been very much interested in veterans' legislation throughout all of these years. This proposition has been presented to the Congress and has been considered by Congress on several occasions as to whether service by the men who served in the merchant marine would be classified as military duty. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would not agree that the Congress has always taken the position that service on merchant vessels, even during wartime, should not be classified as military duty?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUCK moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I utilize this device to obtain time on an amendment for the introduction of which I have been constantly on the floor for the past 2 days. Now, when time comes to consider the amendment I am given 2 minutes to present it, and that notwithstanding the fact that we have had frequent 5-minute speeches both yesterday and today when no amendments were even pending.

This amendment recognizes that seamen aboard ships sunk from under them in the icy waters of the North Atlantic or aboard torpedoed tankers, necessitating their jumping overboard into pools of burning oil, have already risked their lives for their country just as fully as men in front-line trenches. As a matter of fact, the casualties, proportionately, among the men of the American merchant marine who served in the hazardous waters covered by this amendment were greater than among the men of the armed services.

A second feature of this amendment is that it will contribute to the national defense. In both world wars the bottleneck was ships and men to man the ships. If this amendment is adopted, the trained seamen who will be needed in the event of another emergency will be available to man ships rather than be landlocked in Army camps. We would be contributing to the defense of the Nation by keeping these merchant seamen available for use on merchant ships when and as emergency arises.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAVENNER. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is just a matter of simple justice, and is thoroughly meritorious. I know the men who served in the merchant marine during this war were serving in an essential arm of the national defense, so recognized by the Congress. The mere fact that the Military Establishment has prevented them from getting their due recognition in various matters of legislation is no reason why the gentleman's amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Does the gentleman think the veteran is so narrow that he does not want to recognize bravery in other men?

Mr. BUCK. I never thought so.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the withdrawal of the motion, and ask recognition in opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, there are none of us who would say that the merchant mariner did not do a good job during the war. However, I feel that this amendment should be defeated for what I believe to be a fundamental reason. At the outset of the war the merchant mariner could have been taken into the armed forces. He could have been taken into the Navy or the Naval Reserve. But he and the unions which represented him objected most violently, and there are Members here of the former Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which handled maritime affairs, who can confirm that.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield for a correction.

Mr. BRADLEY. After extensive hearings, we found that President Franklin Roosevelt was the one who directed that the men should not be taken into the Navy.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, I never knew Mr. Roosevelt to be too violently opposed to unions.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I think it proper to say that I have twice served in the merchant marine as an ordinary seaman, once in 1920, and once during this war, on a so-called tanker run to Bristol, known as the high-octane run. I have also had an opportunity to examine the files of the War Shipping Administration and the resolutions of all of the unions at the time they were asked whether or not they would be willing to be taken in as part of the armed forces. In every case with suspicious unanimity all those resolutions were adopted, along the same line, and in every case they decided that they were proud of their civilian status, as they put it. They refused to accept discipline, they refused to accept the wearing of a uniform. For that reason, they having had their opportunity to become a part of the armed services and having rejected it, and being unwilling

to assume the responsibility of serving in the armed forces of this country, I am not in favor of this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The question before the Committee is whether or not the Committee shall rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. The gentleman is not talking on that, he is talking about something else.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out opens up the whole bill.

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with what the gentleman has said. They had their choice. They chose to be civilians, and they served at a rate of pay far in excess of service personnel. I wish those of you who may be inclined to vote for this amendment would ask some member of the Navy who served as a member of the armed guard aboard one of these ships, serving there at regular service pay with these civilian crew members who were drawing many times a month what he was, what he thinks about this amendment.

This is the difficulty about this situation. If we recognize the merchant mariner as a veteran of the last war, there is no end to which we must not go. He is going to get the advantages of the GI bill of rights, he is going to get veterans' benefits, and he is going to get everything else. I do not say he should be deprived of that, but I do say that those things have been granted on the theory that a man serving in the Army at low service pay had lost a great deal of what he would have otherwise made in a civilian occupation. These men did not. If you bring them in under the veteran set-up, there must be a reevaluation of what they have lost compared with what the men who went into the service lost. You cannot do it here on the floor of the House. If that is going to be done—and I do not have anything to say against the service of these men because many of them served wonderfully. But if you go into this, you are starting to recognize the merchant mariner as a veteran, and you are going to have to give him all of the veterans' benefits. When you do that you must reevaluate the situation and make sure that he is not getting a tremendously lot more than the boy who fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr BURLESON. Is it not a fact also that they will be drawing other veterans' benefits besides seamen's pay and retirement and so forth?

Mr. KILDAY. The merchant seamen received many more times what a veteran received for his service in the armed forces of the United States while he was on active duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 12, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish the Clerk to report them together?

Mr. POWELL. No, Mr. Chairman. Do I have equal time on each of the amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman at this time to offer one amendment on which he will be recognized for 2 minutes.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Page 8, line 16, insert a new section as follows: "(b) No person who does not desire to serve in a unit of the armed services because of segregation shall be taken for induction."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment to you because, as I have intimated before on the floor within the past few days, it is in accord with the platform promise of the Republican Party of 1944. I have never read that platform promise for the RECORD. I have only referred to it. I will read it now so that it will be a part of the RECORD here today.

In 1940, and again in 1944:

We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes in our armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and we pledge the adoption of corrective legislation.

In view of the fact that the Armed Services Committee, representing the Republican majority of the House, is determined not to put anything into this bill guaranteeing a minimum of their platform pledge, I think it is important, therefore, that since they have broken their word to the 15,000,000 Negroes to whom they gave their word, that there ought to be something here to protect those people from the hypocrisy of the Republican Party.

This amendment would do this. I respectfully urge you Representatives that in all fairness to your conscience this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL) there were—ayes 7, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. For how long will I be recognized on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized for 2 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I say that since the motion was made there has been a preferential motion debated and considered which took up time that was not originally planned for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes that, but the motion that was entered was not a motion for fixed debate for a certain period of time but to close debate at a certain definite time by the clock.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But there has been some time taken out on the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Unfortunately, that is true, but that does not come within the order of the Committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LECOMPTE: Section 5, (D) strike out all of (d) (1), page 11 and in lieu thereof insert the following: "Persons who on the effective date of this act, or who, prior to the date they are ordered to report for induction for service under this act, are members of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve Corps, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, or the Public Health Service Reserve, and are not on active duty, and who serve therein for a total period of 6 years, during which they satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, shall be exempt from service by induction under the provisions of this act, but not from registration."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, the chief purpose of this amendment is to protect the strength of the National Guard. Down through the years the National Guard and the other organizations mentioned have been vital to the defense of our country. In effect, all this amendment does is to give an opportunity to young men to enlist in the National Guard between the time of the enactment of this act and the time of reporting for duty. I believe the National Guard should have a chance to recruit and bring the guard up to strength during that period. Down through the pages of history the National Guard has covered itself with glory and the men of the guard have poured out their blood on every battlefield. We have been told repeatedly that there are not less than 100,000 young men coming of age in the United States each month. If that is the case, there is certainly no great scarcity of manpower. I believe we will serve our country if we protect the strength of the National Guard.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the authorized strength of the National Guard is 250,000. The limitation on the guard and other organizations in the country is 350,000. This bill today protects all men who are in the National Guard. It permits all young men to enlist in the National Guard up to the date of enactment of this act, and hundreds of them are doing it. It also protects all young men up until they are 18 years and 6 months old who enlist in the guard, and thereafter be deferred. It permits veterans with

less than 12 months' service to to enlist in the National Guard and be deferred.

Also available to the guard are all other veterans not liable to the draft.

From these figures it is clear that the Guard has a tremendous pool from which to enlist more than its requirements. With the threat of induction facing the young-age group and the veteran with not more than 12 months' service, the problem will not be how to get more people in the guard but how to decide who will be admitted, and thereby escape induction. To enlarge this group could only aggravate a problem already serious, and seriously deplete the pool for this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. As I understand the amendment, it merely holds out to the person who is apprehensive that he will be drafted the opportunity to enlist in the National Guard and that the period of enlistment is for 6 years, whereas the period of service under the bill is only 2 years. I think the gentleman's amendment is stronger than the committee bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It does hold out an inducement for them to enlist in the National Guard for 6 years in preference to going into the Regular Army for 2.

I do not know why the committee cannot accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of New York) there were—ayes 53, noes 9.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] to offer amendments. The Chair is advised the gentleman has two amendments pending and would like to have them considered together. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE:

On page 12, lines 22 and 23, strike out the word "continuance" and insert after the word "or", the following: "elect to continue."

On page 13, line 3, strike out the word "continuance" and insert after the word "or", the following: "elects to continue."

Page 13, line 7, strike out "not less than 3 years" and insert "for the same period of time as is required of an inductee under the terms of this bill."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes in support of his amendments.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the committee will indicate that he is willing to accept these amendments, as I understand the committee is, I will not take my time.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. CROW. Does the gentleman intend to strike out the word "continuance" on page 13, line 2, or the word "selected"?

Mr. TEAGUE. I wish to strike out the word "continuance."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I have discussed the amendment with members of the committee on this side and as far as we on this side are concerned we will be pleased to accept it.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this side of the aisle feels the same way. I wish, however, the gentleman from Texas would make a short statement of explanation.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in our colleges which have the senior ROTC, the War Department allocates to those colleges contracts which generally determine the number of men to take the last 2 years of ROTC training. In many schools like Clemson, VMI, VPI, Texas A. and M., and others, there are more men who desire to take military training than the colleges have contracts and, therefore, they cannot take all who elect to take this training. This amendment permits those men to take military training as part of their college work and to complete their course. These men may receive a Reserve commission although they have not received pay for their training. I do not know about all of those schools, but, for example, in Texas A. and M. this year about 200 more men took military training than the college had contracts for.

Mr. Chairman, in order to make proper provisions for those completing the basic course of ROTC in our colleges and who are eligible for advanced work in the senior division, I believe it advisable to provide deferment to them if they take the advanced ROTC course as an elective subject when sufficient contracts are not available at the college to take care of the demand of the students. These men taking the course as an elective will receive the same training as those under contract but will not receive the 80 cents per day subsistence nor will they receive the $83 uniform allowance.

The same provisions of section 5 (e) (2) would apply to these men such as signing for 2 years of active duty upon completion of the course if a commission is tendered to them. These officers would render very valuable service as training officers of our inductees and in established units as they would have been trained along with the officers taking advanced work in the senior division.

The Reserve Section of the Department of the Army advises me that a man taking the entire ROTC course and meeting all the prescribed requirements such as having attended summer camp, would be tendered a commission in the Reserves. In the past 3 years there have not been a sufficient number of eligible applicants to fill the Reserve officer quota.

I offer an amendment which is at the desk. I would like to explain the necessity of making ample provisions in the Selective Service Act of 1948 to continue and to expand the present Reserve officers' training program of the Army, Air, and Navy. Section 5 (e) (2) on page 12 of the bill provides deferment to those in the senior division of the Reserve training program and requires 2 years of active duty for these men upon graduation. However, those who enter the senior division of Reserve officers' training after enactment of this bill are required to serve 3 years on active duty upon graduation. I am very much concerned about the effect this will have on our entire training program to require an additional year of service for this latter group.

Mr. Chairman, we should not penalize this group of future officers in training under the Reserve officers' training program as we can produce first-class officers by this method for only about $2,100 per officer whereas it requires an expenditure of something like $45,000 to train a young man to be an officer at West Point or Annapolis.

Most of us realize the importance of having a strong reserve force and to keep this force large and strong we must add to it ever year by encouraging full participation in our military program in colleges and universities. I urge the Members to accept this amendment to require only 2 years of active duty for all graduates of the ROTC program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 15, line 17, after the word "activity" insert "in study, research, or medical, scientific or other."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment just puts into the House bill, in order to show the desire of the House to have it in the bill, the language which is now in the bill of the other body. The President will be empowered then to defer young men who are engaged in special study in research, engineering, or medical activity instead of leaving it open in the general words used in the House bill entitling to deferment for "other endeavors."

I respectfully submit to the committee that this amendment ought to be accepted. In this age when scientific and atomic means are the vital preparations for national security, and when in the last war we used up men who were scientists and prospective scientists, we should forward rather than retard the effort to preserve and effectively utilize this national resource by givin_ the President the necessary instructions as to our desires. My amendment leaves it in his authority but expresses the will of the Congress.

We must be wise in mobilizing a military force. Every man should be husbanded for his maximum contribution to the Nation. Scientific brains are difficult and expensive to train, and take special aptitudes. I believe the maximum contribution to the Nation is to let these young men complete their studies

and not to interrupt them and divert them for a considerable time to other duties. I ask that the committee accept this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this bill as far as it affects scientists were adopted after consultation with the head of the Bureau of Scientific Research and we followed very fully their recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ISACSON:

On page 21, line 6, add the following new section 6 and renumber the sections that follow accordingly:

"SEC. 6. No member of the armed forces shall be discriminated against in any manner because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion by (1) any officer or employee of the United States, of any State or any governmental subdivision thereof, of any Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, (2) any other member of the armed forces, (3) any common carrier, (4) any hotel or other place of public lodging, (5) any restaurant or other place engaged in the business of serving food or drink to the public, (6) any place of public amusement, or (7) any business or service engaged in commerce.

"(b) The penalty provisions of section 12 of this act shall be applicable to any violation of this section by any person enumerated in (1) or (2) of subsection (a), by any firm, company, or business enumerated in (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), or by any officer or employee, of any such firm, company, or business acting in the scope of his employment."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with certain rights and consequences which flow from the induction of Negroes into the armed forces of the United States. I submit that there are other sections in this bill which deal with the same subject, and it is therefore germane. I might also add that the amendment was considered in the Senate and was held to be germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Whatever action was taken in another body does not control the action of this body.

The Chair is prepared to rule. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] clearly goes beyond the scope of the bill. It purports to impose sanctions on persons who are not members of the armed forces, such as common carriers, and other classes. Therefore, the Chair holds that the amendment is not germane and sustains the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROW: Page 8, line 5, after the semicolon, add the following: "Cadets, in recognized senior and basic ROTC colleges and schools, this to include Army, Navy, and air ROTC colleges and schools."

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the purpose of this amendment is to exempt the cadets at our recognized military colleges from the effect of this draft. I am talking particularly about colleges like VMI and Pennsylvania Military College, where they have actual military training all through their college years. I graduated from PMC myself.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would confer the same consideration on State colleges where military science and tactics are taught as the bill does at West Point and the Naval Academy?

Mr. CROW. No; I do not believe that is correct, unless the State college is a recognized ROTC college.

Mr. VINSON. If it is recognized, it is then given the same benefit as the bill gives to the midshipmen and the cadets?

Mr. CROW. That is right, if they are entitled to a commission when they graduate from that school. They get military training that would qualify them for that purpose. I do not think they should be required to register under this bill. My reason for that is this: The basic men taking the course are not exempt. At the end of the second year you are not going to have any men going into the third or fourth class years. They will all be drafted.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman's ability and his interest in good legislation. I wonder, however, if he has studied the language of subsection (e) on page 12 which I think largely does what the gentleman is seeking to do.

Mr. CROW. I might say to the gentleman that I have an amendment to strike out that section completely, because I think the cadets in the ROTC should not be subject to this draft.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I believe that under the terms of section 5 (1) (1) there is a provision that the President may determine certain classifications which he could defer by order; is that correct, may I ask one of the gentlemen on the committee?

Mr. KILDAY. In section 5 (1) (1) that power is granted to the resident.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is that for the purpose of permitting the President to exempt persons such as those who are engaged in study to become scientists and technicians?

Mr. KILDAY. It is a general provision under which persons in critical occupations would be deferred. Then there is a second sentence in that same provision which would take care of those who are studying. At one time the committee thought of setting out in words the categories of essential personnel who should be deferred, and deferred while they were continuing their education, but when we got to that point we found it was not possible for us to sit down and pick out all of them in advance. Some might have been overlooked. We hoped this would take care of all of them.

Mr. HINSHAW. In the consideration of the National Science Foundation bill by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it was found there is a very great shortage in the United States of qualified scientists and technicians in the scientific fields. We need those men worse than we need soldiers. I trust that the language of the bill will permit the President of the United States to order the exemption of persons who are bona fidely, and by certification of the heads of the institutions in which they are studying, training to become scientists. We are 15,000 men short in the scientific field. Even Britain in her dire distress of the recent war had the good sense to exempt scientists and highly qualified students of science from military service. It is more important to the defense of the United States today that we fill the voids in the ranks of our scientists than that we employ men of that type of mind to fill the ranks of foot soldiers. I trust that the advisers to the President appreciate the facts in the matter and that they will advise him accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS, of Florida: Page 18, line 1, strike out beginning on page 18, line 1, "(2) any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act after the beginning and prior to the end of one of his academic years, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the end of such academic year or (B) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act prior to his graduation from such college, university, or similar institution of higher learning shall upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the twenty-second anniversary of his birth or (C) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest, provided such person agrees in writing to serve in the armed forces of the United States for a period not to exceed 1 year subject to call by the Secretary of the Army,

the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this amendment only provides the same treatment for the boys who are still in college as this bill gives the boys attending high school. In other words, you cannot induct a boy attending high school until he graduates or becomes 20 years old or quits school. I have just applied this to the boys who are in college. In other words, if a boy starts his college career and wants to complete it, this just says that if he is inducted, upon request his induction will be deferred or postponed until he finishes his schooling, becomes 22 years of age, or ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is earliest.

That takes care of this situation. Most high-school boys are through high school by the time they are 20 years of age. The general average of the ages of the boys who enter college is 18 or 19.

This amendment provides that they may complete their courses provided that they enter into an agreement as provided in another section where they take ROTC training, and provided they agree in writing that as soon as the Secretary of War, Navy, or Air Force calls them for service, then they will serve for 1 year. That is the only thing it provides. It simply prevents a boy being interrupted in trying to get a college education. So what are you going to do by that? You are going to give that boy an opportunity to get an education, and at the same time you are going to save the Government a lot of money, because the minute they take these boys away from school and they serve 1 or 2 years, the Government is going to be called upon to send them back to school, just as they do with the boys now, and possibly this Government will do it. But if you let them complete their education now, or up until the age of 22 years, they pay for their own schooling, no preference is shown and no discrimination, for all must serve the same length of time in Army forces. Just an opportunity to educate himself at his own expense before entering in his country's service.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee gave considerable consideration to the subject matter of the gentleman's amendment. High school students are not to be taken into the armed forces until they graduate. All college students are exempt providing they are in the ROTC, otherwise they are deferred until the end of the college year. The bill is a very narrow bill, covering all those who not only may be inducted, but those who may enlist or want to enlist. The committee thought that if we went so far as to exempt all college students, it would be committing a highly preferential action which would benefit only the sons of wealthy men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the following is an excerpt from a letter received from the commander of one of the Reserve units in my district:

It so happens that at present I am the commanding officer of the Howitzer Company, Second Battalion, Three Hundred and Ninety-eighth Parachute Infantry Regiment, One Hundredth Airborne Division, which is the Reserve outfit assigned to Webster County. We got a bunch of ambitious boys here and signed up 72 enlisted men and 3 officers, making us the largest outfit in the whole State, bar none. On second thought, I believe we are the largest in the division, which covers West Virginia, Kentucky, and part of Ohio or Indiana.

Here are our gripes:

1. According to information from higher-ups, we signed up some Navy and Marine veterans, and some new recruits, mostly 17 years of age. So far, however, these men have not been assigned a serial number, have not been recognized in any way, and do not know their status. What's more, they have not been issued any uniforms, and must attend any formation in Navy blues, Marine uniform, or civvies, as the case may be.

2. The Army has plenty of uniforms, equipment, and arms rotting in storage, but we cannot get any. We are supposed to have in our outfit all the weapons in the whole State, but they are inadequate for even our one company, to wit, 5 M1 rifles, 11 carbines, 8 obsolete 1917 Enfields, 2 pistols. In addition we practically stole from an exhibit, one BAR, three magazines, and two mortars. No uniforms at all have been issued. No equipment at all has been issued. We received five rounds of ammunition (carbine) per man during all of last year and up to date.

3. We get no pay for training. The boys have been turning out on their own time, with patriotism as their only incentive, with one exception; a week-end contact camp in Charleston this March.

4. The Army does not have enough money to let us train our men here, with expense ridiculously low by comparison, but has enough money for the officers to attend five contact camps in the last year; we officers had two week-end camps at Fort Knox this past year, but the men could not go; there is a 12-day summer camp at Fort Bragg in July, for officers only. What we want to know is: Should the Army finance vacations for a lot of brass or use the same money training the enlisted men at home? The officers of our outfit here are refusing to go where our men cannot go.

5. We have to beg storage and training space from the county court and from the sheriff. Although requested, the Army has done nothing to rent training space for us—and an ideal space is available.

6. The Army has done nothing to rent or lease us space for a range. Finally a local citizen, himself a veteran of World War I, gave me a lease on land suitable for a range, for use of our outfit. Now the Army will do nothing to help us develop it.

7. We had two unit instructors, Maj. Daniel Gallagher and later Maj. Mack C. Shelley, both of whom had plenty of initiative and were a big help to us. Now these men have been absorbed into the limbo of West Virginia military district headquarters in Charleston and we have no commissioned unit instructor at all.

We would like to ask that you take two steps for us:

1. Prod the Army high brass into establishing policy and taking direct steps to remedy the defects we complain of, except where such defects are caused by insufficient legislation.

2. Where lack of legislation is the cause, push action in the House that will cure the defects we complain of.

Mr. Chairman, under the law, Congress had established a policy that all the men in the armed forces, after their release following World War II, were to be transferred to the Reserve organization for a period of 10 years. This provision of the law was deliberately ignored by the Army. No explanation has been given for this action, nor can an explanation be given. One is led to the inescapable conclusion that the Army did not want a large or an active Reserve.

The hearings on H. R. 6401 disclose that General Marshall, in 1944, told General Reckord of the National Guard that the National Guard and the Reserve should be set up on the basis of a universal military training program.

I believe all recognize the fact that the world is in an unsettled condition; the United Nations is not functioning; postwar problems have not been settled; peace treaties have not been written; and it is necessary for this Nation to be strong until the various problems are settled.

We must be strong from both a military and an economic standpoint. From a military standpoint, we must have an active, strong Reserve, an active, strong National Guard, and an adequate Regular Army—all organized into combat teams and groups. We must maintain our strength from an economic standpoint. Current revenues will have to meet current expenses. With the size of our present national debt, we cannot afford deficit spending. For this country to go over the brink in that respect would be more disastrous in many ways than anything any foreign power might be able to do to us.

We are now considering H. R. 6401, providing for the conscription of young men between the ages of 19 and 26 into the armed services. We have no right to draft them unless there is a very real emergency and the Army cannot get them in any other way.

Up to the time this bill was presented, I thought that we could tolerate peacetime conscription, provided it gave us the military strength we needed and was within our ability to finance. After studying the bill, it is hard to imagine a worse draft bill, from the standpoint of the interest of all components of the armed services, this bill will virtually eliminate the National Guard and emasculate the Reserve force. Instead of building up those organizations, upon which we must depend if we are to have a healthy, strong national-defense program, it goes a long way to destroy them.

Maj. Gen. E. A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, in a telegram dated May 3, 1948, stated:

The enactment of H. R. 6401 as now drafted will mean the complete dissolution of the National Guard of the United States by June 1950. The security of the Nation cannot be assured by destroying its reserves. If there is a possibility of war, the measures proposed are utterly inadequate. If there is

no possibility of war, then the measures proposed are excessive.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate and I have read in the report where it is stated this bill would strengthen the Reserve and the National Guard, but upon examination of the provisions of the bill itself I find that no recognition is given to enlistment of a man in the Reserve or National Guard where he serves two or even three enlistments. If such a provision was contained in the bill, thousands or even tens of thousands of our young men would go into the Reserve and National Guard and be trained in their home locality by Reserve officers and National Guard officers. Such training, of course, would be under the supervision and direction of the Regular Army.

The proposed legislation makes a young man who is attending college and who may be taking ROTC work subject to the draft and 2 years of service. The only attempt to make any provision for the Reserve is that after a man has served 2 years he is given the option to join the Reserve until he is 35 years of age or stay in the Army for 3 years.

The Army has not changed its position on a civilian Reserve, and until it does so the Reserve will probably receive no better treatment than that indicated in the letter to which I have referred.

I will freely admit that I am friendly to the Reserve and friendly to the National Guard. I am likewise friendly to our Regular Army. We need all three—all three need to be strong. Our program for national security and national defense should be so coordinated and organized that the strength of all three is simultaneously built up. H. R. 6401 fails to accomplish that very essential purpose and therefore it should be rejected and a program written which will accomplish that objective.

Again we must look at this matter from the standpoint of whether or not we can finance it. We will have approved already for expenditure this year over $17,000,000,000 for our armed services. The enactment of this legislation will build our total military budget for 1949 to over $21,000,000,000. This is more than we can expend without either raising taxes or going into the red. We will accomplish nothing by a collapse of our economy.

I have urged and still urge providing adequate air power. The Congress has taken the necessary action to accomplish that purpose. We should put additional emphasis on the stock piling of strategic materials. Very little, if anything, has been accomplished in that all-important program.

A system of registering of our young men on arriving at the age of 18 years should be established.

We must build up our Reserve and National Guard and train a specialized Regular Army. All must be accomplished within our financial ability. The Reserve and National Guard can be trained at a fraction of the cost as proposed in H. R. 6401. The training can be identical, it is only a question of locale of training. If a well-balanced program for the civilian and professional components of the Army was worked out, I believe the Regular Army would get all of the men it needs through voluntary enlistments. If not, then in that event, conscription could be placed in effect, provided the world situation warranted it.

If a conscription program is to be placed into effect, then that program should include the conscription of the necessary men for the Reserve Corps, the National Guard, and the Regular Army. A balanced program will include all three. A large professional Army cannot and will not give the Nation the security it needs. That security will come only through the organization and training of the civilian components of the armed services.

This proposed legislation will not give this Nation the security we need and will not give our Nation a well-balanced defense program. To adopt it as an expediency, in my judgment, is not sound. Rather must the legislative branch of the Government insist upon the Army carrying out the policy established by the Congress in building up the civilian reserve components, instead of a large professional Army. The Army has failed to follow this clear, defined policy. I have spent some 20 years in the active service of the National Guard and the Army of the United States, over 5 years of that service was during World War II. I believe position action is indicated at this time, but that action must be to build a sound and strong national defense and we will not have such a defense without a strong and well-trained civilian reserve.

From a national defense standpoint this bill should be sent back to the Committee on Armed Services and there the program should be revised and reformed to build up simultaneously the Reserve, the National Guard, and our Regular Army.

Mr. Chairman, if this is done we will get the men we need without conscription.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROW:

On page 14, after the new section (g) add a new section (h), as follows:

"(h) (1) The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized and directed to accept enlistments for periods of 1 year in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, or the United States Marine Corps, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively, from among qualified male persons between the ages of 18 and 19. *Provided*, That no person who is enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection (h) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any place outside of the continental limits of the United States; and no person who is enlisted under the provisions of such subsection in the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, or the Air Force of the United States shall be assigned to duty at any naval or air force installation which is located on land outside of the continental limits of the United States.

"(2) Each person who hereafter is enlisted under the provisions of subsection (h) (1) above and who meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces shall, upon discharge from such enlistment under conditions other than dishonorable, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States and shall serve therein for a period of 6 years or until sooner discharged. Each such person shall so long as he remains a member of such Reserve component, be liable to be ordered to active duty only in time of war or national emergency as declared by the Congress and shall not be subject to any further service under this act."

Reletter latter paragraphs correctly.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely adds to the bill, what I believe is a very good provision which is found in the bill as passed by the other body. Nothing in this bill authorizes an 18-year-old boy to enlist. Under the bill he has to wait until he is 19 years of age, and then he is drafted. I have a son. My son is not going to be drafted. I myself would rather have him go out and enlist. I think if the committee wants to get more men into the armed services, this provision will do it. It will give men 18 years of age the authority to enlist. After that person has served 1 year, he will go into the Reserve Officers' Corps for a period of 6 years, after which he is exempt from the provisions of this act.

I think the committee should accept the amendment. I hope it will.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to say, solely for myself, but as a member of the committee, that I highly approve of the amendment which the gentleman has offered.

Mr. CROW. I thank the gentleman. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. This would just about cut the pool of men in half. The total pool, 18 to 19, is 640,000, estimated. The total group, 19 through 25, would be 660,000. So, in effect, this amendment would just about cut the pool of available men for occupation forces in half.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of New York) there were—ayes 54, noes 43.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. SIKES and Mr. CROW to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 86, noes 67.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to be offered to section 5, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. No bounty shall be paid to induce any person to enlist in or be inducted into the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded

as bounties within the meaning of this section. No person liable for service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the armed forces of the United States; and no person liable for service in such forces under section 4 shall be permitted to escape such service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of such service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such service or liability therefor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: On page 21, after the period in line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Any person who registers as required by the terms of this act, or any person who hereafter voluntarily enlists in the armed forces of the United States under the terms of this act, shall be afforded an opportunity to state in writing over his signature whether he has a preference to serve only in a unit all of the enlisted personnel of which are of his own race. Such opportunity shall be afforded at the time of registration in the case of those registering under the requirements of this act, or upon enlistment in the case of those who are not in the service on the date this act takes effect. Any such person who expresses such preference shall thereafter, upon induction, be assigned only to units of a type consistent with his preference. The right to express and the effect of expressing any such preference shall be clearly explained to each person who hereafter registers under this act or who enlists in the armed forces of the United States under the terms of this act. As used in this section the term "unit" means a group of persons serving in the armed forces who (1) share the same housing, messing, or sanitary facilities, or (2) participate jointly in recreational or social activities. For the purposes of this subsection, an individual's race shall be determined in accordance with the more detailed classification as to race used by the Bureau of the Census in connection with the taking and preparation of statistics of the Sixteenth Census of the United States. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the assignment of any individual who belongs to a race comprising less than 1 percent of the population of the United States to units containing enlisted personnel of the most numerous race in the United States, if the Secretary of the armed force concerned has determined that it is impracticable to organize units all of the enlisted personnel of which are of such individual's race.

"(b) Any commissioned officer of the armed forces who knowingly and willfully denies to any person his right to express a preference upon enlistment as provided by subsection (a) or assigns any person after induction to any unit in violation of the provisions of such subsection shall be guilty of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman and shall be subject to trial and punishment under the appropriate article of war or article for the Government of the Navy."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I have no intention to weaken this bill or to delay its passage or to destroy it. As a matter of fact, I will probably support this measure on final passage. It appears that the draft is necessary in order to maintain the military strength that we must have in order to preserve our national security. But let me remind you that this is a very serious business that we are about today. Peacetime conscription is not a typical American institution and we only resort to it in times of dire emergency when our country is facing a crisis such as it faces today, and such as it faced in 1940.

Many times on the floor of this House I have heard the distinguished minority leader, I have heard the distinguished majority leader, I have heard other distinguished Members of the House, and, in fact, the President of the United States, talk about maintaining and preserving the dignity of the individual in this country. We hold that to be the democratic way and this amendment does that very thing. Remember that every man you draft into this Army under the pending bill is an individual. He is not just another soldier. He is a man with a life, a soul, and a mind of his own. It is our duty to provide as much for his comfort and as much for his convenience as we possibly can in order to preserve and to bolster the morale of the men in the armed services. This is a debt that we owe to him.

This amendment does not compel segregation in the armed services for those who do not want it, but it does for those who do want it. As a matter of fact, it applies to the Negro just as much as to the white man, and if they have pride in their own race they will insist on being assigned to units composed of members of their own race.

You are going to draft a lot of men out of the South into this Army. These boys are not going to be satisfied, they are not going to be happy, and they are not going to do their best work in an army in which they are not segregated because, thank God, they are proud of their race and believe in protecting and preserving the integrity of their race. Be not deceived—those from the North feel the same way.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Is it not true that the Negro boy from the South will be just as anxious to be in a camp where segregation is practiced as the white boy?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course he will. Under my amendment, if a man does not care about being in a segregated unit, it gives him an opportunity to be in a nonsegregated unit merely by failing to express a preference, but for the boys who do want to be in a segregated unit it provides that right. That is the American way—to give them freedom to choose their associates.

There is a sound basis for this amendment, and I would like to read to you some statements that General Eisenhower made before the Committee on Armed Services of the other body on the subject of segregation in the United States Army:

It has been the problem, of course, that has been with the Army ever since it has been with the country. We must never forget that in a very definite way the Army is merely one of the mirrors that holds up to our faces the United States of America. It has never been easy to solve because you have certain incontrovertible facts that you must walk right up to.

One of them is that there is race prejudice in this country, and when you put in the same organization and make live together under the most intimate circumstances men of different races, we sometimes have trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. General Eisenhower said further:

I personally have always stood since that time for organizing the Negro down to include units no larger than platoons. It does create certain social problems on a post, because you always have men that do not like to mingle freely between the races, and therefore if you have a dance for your soldiers, you have a problem.

And listen to this:

Now, if you are going to go further, here is the problem you run into, Senator. In general, the Negro is less well educated than his brother citizen that is white, and if you make a complete amalgamation, what you are going to have is in every company the Negro is going to be relegated to the minor jobs, and he is never going to get his promotion to such grades as technical sergeant, master sergeant, and so on, because the competition is too tough.

If, on the other hand, he is in smaller units of his own, he can go up to that rate, and I believe he is entitled to the chance to show his own wares.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had 30 minutes to talk on this amendment, because I sincerely believe there can be no conscientious opposition. It is my firm belief that the adoption of this amendment will strengthen rather than weaken the bill. It will bring about a better Army, a more satisfied Army, and will provide for higher morale among the members of our armed services.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I was interested in what the gentleman read from General Eisenhower's statement. Of course, that was all for the present system that exists in the Army of having races in their own units. So there is not in that anything that would indicate that there would be a departure from the present system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would agree that it is not as bad as it might be, but the gentleman knows, they do not segregate them in the armed forces. He knows that.

Mr. KILDAY. So the gentleman has raised a question that does not exist.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, certainly, it exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] insist on his point of order?

Mr. DURHAM. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 24, noes 88.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. POWELL objected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) The selection of persons for service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe from the persons who are liable for such service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for service under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations.

(b) Quotas of men to be inducted for service under this act shall be determined for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia, and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the armed forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. Until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known, the quotas may be based on estimates, and subsequent adjustments therein shall be made when such actual numbers are known. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 7 be considered as read.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: At the end of line 12, page 23, add the following and number the succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 8. (a) The training under this act shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

"(b) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act is being given, as the Secretary of National Defense may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of such persons who are receiving training under this act and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of persons who are being trained under this act, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person in any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Secretary of Defense or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

"(c) The sale of or dealing in, beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange, canteen, ship's store, or Army, Navy, or Marine transport or upon any premises used for military or naval purposes by the United States is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provision of this subsection."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that the provisions thereof are not germane to the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the committee in charge of this bill approved practically all of the amendment I am submitting under what is known as the Towe bill. The remainder of this amendment was enacted by Congress in 1901.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that the Towe bill was a training bill and had no military obligation. This bill is to build up an Army.

Mr. REES. That is an interesting observation from a very distinguished member of the committee. I see no real difference. Why not be practical. Is it not a fact that these boys under this bill are to go into training? I just do not see how you can say my amendment was needed for the 18-year-old boys you proposed to put into training camps and then suggest it is not needed for the 19-to-21-year-old boys under this bill.

This measure has been talked about as a training bill, so a large group of young men could have training in the armed forces, in event they may be called later on. It is also mentioned as a sort of preparation bill, not for immediate emergency but in the event of an emergency later on. You also refer to it as an Army bill. My understanding is that you are putting these men in training for a year, or 2 years, we do not know what decision will be finally made. The House, by a definite decision, has said by its vote it should be 1 year. You may overrule the decision of the House and bring back a bill for 2 years' service. If this is a training bill, 1 year is enough. It has already been stated that even in European countries the period of service in peacetime is 1 year.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield again to the distinguished chairman of the committee who approved this language in the Towe bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I understood the gentleman from Kansas was opposed to the Towe bill.

Mr. REES. That is not the question presently under consideration. Neither is the Towe bill. Please do not sidestep the issue. If the committee was for the proposal, then he should be for it now. In fact he should recommend it in this bill. We are presently talking about one feature of this legislation. If you are going to approve this bill, I think the chairman ought to accept this amendment and permit it to remain in the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the gentleman support the bill if this provision is in it?

Mr. REES. I am not sure of that. I do not know what this bill will look like when this House is through with it. I am interested in putting safeguards in it where they are needed. There are a good many Members of this House wondering about this measure. The gentleman, in his opening presentation, seemed to indicate there may be an emergency. He wants the bill passed right away. Later he, himself, proposed an amendment that, as I understand it, says in substance the bill will not become effective until about the 1st of November of this year. I refer to the extra 90-day period of extension approved by the distinguished chairman. I am informed another amendment will be offered to postpone the effective date until January 1949.

In any event, I want this protective language in this bill. If you are going to have the bill enacted into law, it ought to have this important amendment in it. This amendment ought to have the support of the Members of the House. There should be no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is interested in hearing the observations of the gentleman from Kansas on the point of order. The gentleman from Kansas is now speaking on the merits of the amendment.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how a point of order could lie against this proposed amendment. It is within the broad scope of this legislation. Certainly, if you can pass a law to take these boys from their homes in peacetime without their consent, then you can provide for protection in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear from the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, in another section of the bill on page 37, it is specifically stated that there may be a determination of the location of the camps. It seems to me this is directly along the same line.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question and call his attention to a matter which I think has something to do with making his amendment germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman to engage in debate on the merits of the amendment, but the Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman discuss the point of order.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, that is what I am addressing myself to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will state his observations.

Mr. FOLGER. In speaking of training, the bill states, *"Provided further,* That the number of persons who are serving on active duty for training purposes." If this is not a training bill, I do not know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] rise?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is germane to the purpose, intent, and policy of the bill. The bill proposes, not a system of volunteers but a plan of induction for taking young men from their homes and placing them in military-training camps. Certainly it is within the jurisdction of the Congress, where it invokes conscription for the assembling of great masses of young men in military-training camps, as this bill specifically provides, to prescribe the circumstances and conditions under which they shall be trained. I think it is significant, as has been mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that this same committee, in reporting out the so-called universal training bill, carried identically almost word for word the language of this amendment, showing that there is a policy and a need for setting up the circumstances under which these young men shall be trained. This amendment states that when these men are taken from their homes and from the moral influence of their own parents and are concentrated in military-training camps, there shall be thrown around them some degree of protection comparable with that which they enjoyed in their own homes before they were taken into service.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is germane to the purposes, the policy, and the provisions of the program to be set up.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] rise?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a brief observation.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains a provision with reference to medical service to protect the health of these inductees. By the same token, the gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment to protect the health of these men. If the reference to medical service was germane, then the provision with reference to these surroundings is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further?

Mr. REES. Just one thing further, Mr. Chairman:

Page 37, paragraph 9, it will be observed that authority is given to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; giving all the authority with respect to the location of these camps. It seems to me that well within the provisions of this act can be included the provisions of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASE of South Dakota.) The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] has made the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is not germane to the bill. Several of the Members who have spoken have called attention to other provisions in the bill. The Chair must remind the Committee that the provisions in the bill as reported by the committee were made in order by a special rule adopted by the House of Representatives. There may be provisions in the bill which would not be germane if offered as an amendment by individual Members, but are in order in the bill because they were made in order by the rule adopted by the House.

So every amendment offered must stand on its own bottom as to whether or not it is germane.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment includes such language as "It shall be unlawful to maintain certain institutions," and further on says, "Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisons of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor" and so forth. In that respect it seems to the Chair that the amendment goes beyond the provisions of the bill, imposing penalties and sanctions on persons outside the armed forces.

Therefore, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified by striking out beginning with the words "Any person, corporation, partnership"——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that the gentleman prepare the amendment and offer it in the regular way.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: At the end of line 12, page 23, add the following, and number succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 8. The training under this act shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

"(b) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act is being given, as the Secretary of National Defense may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of such persons who are receiving training under this act and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of persons who are being trained under this act, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person in any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Secretary of Defense or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes.

"(c) The sale of or dealing in, beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange, canteen, ship's store, or Army, Navy, or Marine transport or upon any premises used for military or naval purposes by the United States is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provisions of this subsection."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, this great committee which brought this present legislation before the House saw fit at one time to approve it. It was part of the bill that was submitted by this committee.

Now, the only slim excuse that is given by one of the distinguished Members is that since the other bill was a so-called training bill for 18-year-old boys and older, that there is a difference with regard to training boys 19 years old and over. If they were right after giving consideration to that particular feature of the bill, if they were right in their judgment then they cannot reverse their judgment now and still be right, as I see it. In any event, we have this matter before this Committee for consideration.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In just a moment. It is a matter for this Committee to determine. The legislation is here, whether or not you are willing to protect these boys who are in these training camps as provided under the terms of this amendment.

In 1917 the Congress passed an act which was a great deal more severe than

this as far as that is concerned, in an attempt to protect the boys in these training camps.

This is an extremely important amendment and you are going to find out I think that it is going to be difficult to explain why you are not willing to protect these boys in these various camps throughout the country when you have a chance to do so. This is not a question of whether you believe in drinking or not, this is a question of whether you believe in protecting the boys against a number of things included in this proposal.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Florida, who I am sure is familiar with this amendment, sympathetic to it, and I know he is for it.

Mr. SIKES. I am sure my distinguished friend wants to be fair and I would like to tell him that I am in sympathy with the purpose he has in mind.

Mr. REES. That helps a great deal. I do appreciate his support.

Mr. SIKES. I wish the gentleman would point out, however, that in the training bill where the language the gentleman has sought to incorporate in this bill is already included the training program is set up for many hundreds of thousands of boys and young men most of whom are fresh out of high school. They will be in special encampments, not in military camps. They will not be in the service and the committee sought to establish safeguards around them which it did not feel were absolutely necessary to be included in a service bill which would bring in a relatively much smaller number of people and induct them into units already in existence.

I bring that up for the information of the gentleman. I am in sympathy with what he is trying to do.

Mr. REES. The committee thought there was something to be gained playing one against the other. I do not see anything especially different in the need to protect these young men in either instance.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman explain to the Committee that the second paragraph of his amendment goes much further——

Mr. REES. Yes; that is right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment—goes much further than the original bill.

Mr. REES. I might explain to the Committee that that particular paragraph was passed by the Congress in 1901.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And was repealed.

Mr. REES. No, not repealed. There was a tax act passed by Congress in 1933 in which an interpretation was given but not to the extent that it was repealed. I will explain that later. It is still on the statute books. The gentleman can look and find it for himself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's amendment would prevent a soldier of the United States getting a glass of beer in Germany?

Mr. REES. Oh, I do not think so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course it would.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the report of the President's Commission on Universal Military Training entitled "A Program for National Defense."

That report made certain recommendations with regard to the responsibility of Congress toward trainees. It seems to me that if those recommendations are good with respect to trainees, then they are just as important with regard to men who come under the provisions of this bill. I quote from those recommendations:

> We must admit at once that a serious moral problem is presented by the very removal of a boy of 18 from the normal influences of his home, church, school, and local community, and his comparative isolation in a camp with large numbers of other men under an entirely new and different environment.
>
> • • • • •
>
> We believe the key to this problem lies in the following directions:
>
> • • • • •
>
> (7) Limitation of the opportunities for the purchase by trainees of any alcoholic beverages, including beer, through (a) prohibiting the sale thereof to them on any military, naval, or other camp reservation, or in any post exchange, ship's store, or canteen, (b) declaring "off-limits" to trainees all taverns, taprooms, and similar facilities whose principal business is selling alcoholic beverages, (c) soliciting the assistance of local communities in this program, and (d) making it a Federal crime knowingly to sell such beverages to any person in training.

The ages of trainees, as defined in the Towe bill—H. R. 4278—are from 18 up to 20.

The Towe bill contains a paragraph on alcohol—page 7:

> (3) No person, corporation, partnership, or association, or agency shall sell, give, or in any way supply any intoxicating liquors to any trainee in training in the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association or agency violating any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

In H. R. 6401 you are drafting 19- and 20-year-olds. Both of these ages would be protected by law in their own States against the sale of alcoholic beverages. If you draft boys under age, you owe them all the protection which the President's Commission recommended for trainees, whom your own bill defines as 18- and 19-year-olds.

Furthermore the draft bill as it passed the Senate—S. 2655—has in it a provision for enlisting 18-year-olds voluntarily and training them along with the Regular Army. Should this provision prevail—and we hope the House conferees will resist it—you would have trainees, exactly the class for whom the President's Commission recommended all these safeguards, to protect.

With regard to the third section of my amendment and to which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has seriously objected, this is the text of the law now in section 1350, title 10, United States Code, passed by Congress in 1910, dealing with the Army and is as follows:

> No. 1350. Sale of intoxicating liquors: The sale of or dealing in beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange or canteen or Army transport or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States, is prohibited. The Secretary of War is directed to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect. (February 2, 1901, ch. 192, No. 38, 31 Stat. 758.)

This law was nullified by the Army's accepting the definition of Congress in a tax law passed in 1933, to the effect that 3.2 beer was nonintoxicating. The theory is that the 1933 law being of later date, superseded the 1901 act as above quoted, so the act was never repealed, but an interpretation placed by the Treasury Department nullified it. I should also add that the 1901 law applied only in areas actually being used for military purposes.

There is also the acute problem of the immediately surrounding territory. In the absence of prohibitory statutes, various kinds of taverns and unnecessary joints of that kind have sprung up in the immediate vicinities of these places.

The 1917 law gave authority to set up zones in the phrase "in or near military camps." I am informed that zones 5 miles in width were set up around the camps under this authority and the courts upheld them against cases brought by irresponsible tavern keepers.

In this connection, it might be well to remind you of the statement made by General Marshall regarding these taverns which were hastily built in the neighborhood of World War II draft camps almost before the camps themselves were in existence, and to the detriment of organizations like the YMCA and the Salvation Army and the WCTU and other organizations which were trying to set up recreation centers and "cookie jars" there: Here is what General Marshall, now Secretary of State, said:

> Here we have on the one side a sordid business for the accumulation of money, and on the other the interest of every parent in the United States who has a son in the Army, not to mention the responsibility of the War Department to develop an Army of the highest quality. This situation must be brought under control before it grows serious.

Unfortunately it was not brought under control, and the sordid business, to which General Marshall directs attention, flourished to the detriment of the men and boys in the Army camps, as well as their families. This was not the fault of the boys. It was the fault of men and women who failed in their duty to provide decent protection against an unnecessary, sordid situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. PACE. In support of the amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Was not the gentleman from Georgia recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked for what purpose the gentleman rose. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] was on his feet, but the Chair did not see him. When the Chair saw him he gave prior recognition to the chairman of the committee.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, those who have attended the meetings of the House for the last few days will be compelled to confess that there are serious misgivings on the part of many Members as to the advisability of the pending legislation. I find that the same is true in every part of this country. The mothers and fathers all over this country are concerned. I do not think they object to their boys' serving their country when really needed, but they are concerned about the circumstances under which they will be trained and under which they will serve. When a boy volunteers for the armed service with his parents' consent, regardless of age, then he and the parents accept the conditions as they find them.

It is quite different under legislation of this character, where without the consent of the father or mother, a representative of the Government comes and knocks on the door and tells them: "I want your boy 12 months or 2 years; I am going to take him out from under the moral influence which you have exercised over him for the last 19 years; I am going to throw him into camp with all kinds, from all sections."

If it were my boy, and that is the only way I can look at the boys of other fathers and mothers, it seems to me I would ask: "Well, are you going to try to help carry on the training that I have given him? Are you going to try to protect as far as you can the moral principles which I taught him? Are you going to try to keep him away as much as you can from the temptations that I have tried to guard him against?"

Is that so bad? Is that wrong when we are here about to vote to go and take that son? The least we can do is to throw up such safeguards as reasonable practices will permit.

We are asking no more in the adoption of this amendment than has been done in the past. It has been proven to be practicable, and the most I can say is if you write this amendment into the bill, when it becomes law there will be at least a little consolation to those mothers and fathers whose sons must go to training, whose sons must meet new surroundings and, on the whole, the mothers and fathers of this Nation, in my opinion, will find more acceptable the action of the Congress which is now contemplated.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, when I made my motion there were four Members seeking recognition. I wish to modify that request to permit those four gentlemen to speak for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there were five Members standing.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Then I will modify my motion that they be permitted to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Then I withdraw the motion.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRYSON. Has it not been the rule, when such a motion was put, that the time would be equally divided between the Members standing?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the motion to close debate in 5 minutes, and there were five Members standing when the gentleman was recognized on the amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I appreciate the statement just made by the Chairman, but I do think that, if the Chairman will let his mind go back, he will recognize the fact that he had already said to the gentleman from Georgia that he might be recognized, so that the motion made by the gentleman from New York actually applied to the time subsequent to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that at the time he recognized the gentleman from Georgia for 5 minutes there was no objection made.

The Chair will state that those Members who desire to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point may do so at this time.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I will support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. It would do much to relieve the concern of the parents of the young men who might be drafted under the bill now before the House. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has stated the situation. I will not repeat his arguments. I add the following: Germany was a nation which made liquor freely available to the young men in her armies; we have twice defeated Germany. Italy subscribed to similar principles, and the attitude of that nation toward vice included legalization, and state-supervised bordellos; and Italy has twice within my lifetime come out rather badly in armed competition with the clean-living young men of America. France's code on the issues involved in this amendment might possibly coincide with the opinions of Members who will vote against it, and we have twice had to put American men into uniform to save France. Finally, the protections desired by this amendment were the protections given the soldiers of the United States in World War I, and while I may be slightly prejudiced on that subject, I thought the American soldiers did pretty well in World War I, in competition with soldiers from nations which would not approve of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. I say again, Mr. Chairman, that I will vote for the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that time on this amendment has been limited to 5 minutes, 1 minute for each of only 5 Members. I make this brief observation. I have tried over the years to assist many veterans in the preparation of their claims for disability compensation. Many times it has been heartbreaking to receive a report from the Veterans' Bureau that the claimants disability was due to misconduct and under the law no compensation can be paid.

It is my wish that we protect the men trained under this program if possible from ever facing such a tragic situation as I have referred to. I urge the adoption of the Rees amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, we are advised that this is to be the last week of activity prior to adjournment or recess. In view of this, I am particularly interested in knowing what is to become of the National Land Policy Act, H. R. 6054. This bill, as you know, calls for a policy of permanent conservation of all our basic agricultural land and water resources.

We have listened to much talk on the necessity for sound conservation and I am sure that we are more or less agreed that it is really needed. However, unless this talk is reduced to action our national resources will continue to face steady depletion. Without an adequate program of conservation our food production resources face the constant threat of dwindling below that standard which guarantees the physical and economic well-being of all the American people. When we stop to realize the enormity of this fact, the importance of such a program is forcefully brought to our attention.

I have been in touch with most of the groups who are interested in conservation in my own State of Rhode Island.

Without exception they are strongly in favor of a National Land Policy Act. The Rhode Island Wildlife Association, which is composed of groups and individuals vitally interested in all aspects of conservation, had this to say about the bill:

> The history of the development of every nation is written in the landscape. * * * Not until this Nation adopts a policy based on the wise use of our living resources will we be able to begin to check the forces of our own destruction. Our soil is the source of our very existence; it is the basis of our whole social and economic structure. * * * We firmly believe that H. R. 6054 recognizes these truths and furnishes the necessary measures to erase the writing on our landscape. It provides the requirements for a sound policy for wise land use necessary to stabilize national economy and to insure our future welfare.

The Rhode Island Federation of Garden Clubs, the Federated Rhode Island Sportsmen's Clubs, the Association of Soil Conservation Supervisors, as well as hundreds of individuals who are aware of the urgent need for conservation are all strongly in favor of such a bill.

Why, then, in the face of all this necessity should the Republican leadership refuse to take direct action. The hearings on this bill have been completed but to date nothing is being done toward bringing the bill out. I, personally, would like to have the opportunity to vote for this bill here on the floor and I am sure that the majority of you hold the same thought. I am afraid that we are not going to have that opportunity, however, for it is my opinion that this bill is going the way the rest of the beneficial legislation has gone under the leadership of this Congress.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rees amendment to throw around these young men to be drafted in the service under this bill the best moral, physical, and spiritual protection possible. The fathers and mothers of these young men want their boys protected, as much so as possible, from the pitfalls that are thrown their way. They want their sons to come back from the camps as clean and strong as when they went away. We are living in a day when our young men are subjected to temptations and evils which many of us escaped in part and everyone knows that evil men and women prey upon these young men in camps.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the least we could do in enacting this legislation is to try to minimize the opportunity which such evil men and women might have to debauch these young men. We owe that to their parents. We owe that to the young men. We owe that to our Nation.

The evils which this amendment seeks to prevent are destructive and do not help in building the finest manhood and character. Men meeting the great issues of life in this hour of destiny need the strongest bodies, the clearest minds and resolute hearts to cope with a world situation making this legislation necessary.

Many of these young men will come from homes of the highest Christian teaching. Is it not the obligation of the Nation to clothe them with every protection possible? I regret, Mr. Chairman, that debate was shut off on such an important question. But let me appeal to you to take the proper steps to do something about this problem now. I hope the committee will give this great question the proper consideration. This amendment should have your approval.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the Members of Congress who has resorted to weakening amendments in an effort to pass a selective-service act. It has been my intention all along to vote for the pending bill, H. R. 6401. I sincerely hope and earnestly urge that protection be thrown around the young men who are to be called from their homes to military duty by minimizing or eliminating the temptations so often thrust upon them to become users of intoxicating drinks. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], is certainly in the right direction. And I call upon each of you to support that feature of this extremely important and too long delayed measure so vitally needed for the preservation of our free Government.

This amendment—the Rees amendment—would reenact provisions of law which were enacted in 1917 and operative in World War I. The law of 1917 provided that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army is authorized to make such regulations governing the prohibition of alcoholic liquors in or near military camps and to the officers and enlisted men of the Army as he may from time to time deem necessary or advisable: "*Provided*, That no person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, or have in his or its possession any intoxicating or spirituous liquors at any military station, cantonment, camp, fort, post, officers' or enlisted men's club, which is being used at the time for military purposes under this act, but the Secretary of War may make regulations permitting the sale and use of intoxicating liquors for medicinal purposes. It shall be unlawful to sell any intoxicating liquor, including beer, ale, or wine, to any officer or member of the military forces while in uniform, except as herein provided. Any person, corporation, partnership or association violating the provisions of this section or the regulations made thereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Articles of War, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both."

Under this law of 1917, the Secretary of War did fix zones of about 5 miles in width for both alcohol and vice (which was included in another section of the 1917 law). As a result of this policy adopted both by Congress and by the War Department, Secretary of War Newton D. Baker said, such a physically sound Army was produced as never before had been known in the history of the world.

When World War II was about to break upon us, even before the draft camps themselves were built or finished, taverns and honky-tonks moved into their immediate neighborhood. Gen. George C. Marshall, then Chief of Staff of the Army, was greatly concerned. He said:

> Here we have on the one side a sordid business for the accumulation of money, and on the other the interest of every parent in the United States who has a son in the Army, not to mention the responsibility of the War Department to develop an Army of the highest quality. This situation must be brought under control before it grows serious.

Great efforts were made to obtain the voluntary cooperation of local communities. Some communities took this responsibility seriously, and after a number of them had voted dry and the chairman of Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, who had piloted the draft bill safely through, had introduced a bill to reenact legislation similar to that of 1917, the brewers made a specious effort to clean up some of these taverns—those in the vicinity of communities that had voted dry or were preparing to vote dry. But many communities not only failed to cooperate but actually cooperated with the taverns in exploiting the draftees. And the brewers went about from camp to camp and staged beer parties, with the consent of camp commanders.

A bill introduced in the House by the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee which set up a zone for vice similar to that provided for in the 1917 legislation passed the Senate, after having passed the House, on June 30, 1941, and was signed by the President a few days later and became law. All this time we were not at war. It was not until December 7, 1941, that the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor. But Congress continued to temporize with the Sheppard bill and the Senate finally sent it back to committee.

Meanwhile, in May 1941 the Brewers Digest joyfully announced:

> One of the finest things that could have happened to the brewing industry was the insistence by high-ranking Army officers to make beer available at Army camps. * * *
>
> The opportunity presented to the brewing industry by this measure is so obvious that it is superfluous to go into it in detail. * * *
>
> Here is a chance for brewers to cultivate a taste for beer in millions of young men who will eventually constitute the largest beer-consuming section of our population.

The brewers got their chance, and presently they were using up our scarce tin making tin cans to ship beer in badly needed space on planes over to countries where there were plenty of alcoholic beverages, but no milk and no airplane parts and tank equipment, the latter of which

were badly needed by some of our young men in uniform in the north African campaign and elsewhere. They tied up freight traffic to ship Milwaukee beer to Maryland and New York and Pennsylvania which had beer of their own, and later on the War Food Board had trouble with them when they insisted on using up grain and rice that were needed for food.

The public and Congress were told that the purpose of putting beer in the camps was to keep the young men in them so that they would not be drinking in worse places, or drinking stronger beverages. But, when they found Congress was not going to interfere with the beer, presently the Army began giving shots of whisky to fliers returning from training flights or combat missions.

Either the camp beer led to the drinking of stronger alcoholic beverages in those places it was supposed to keep our soldiers out of, or the beer itself was not so harmless as it was represented to be, because we now hear that the Veterans' Administration has a hospitalization problem connected with alcoholism in World War II veterans that is going from bad to worse. A Washington dispatch published in the Chicago Daily News on November 21, 1947, stated:

ALCOHOLICS BURDEN VETERAN HOSPITALS

WASHINGTON.—Veterans' Administration hospitals are being burdened seriously, and, in most cases, needlessly, with alcoholics.

Thousands of ex-servicemen who drink excessively because they enjoy whisky—not because of physical or mental complications—occupy beds needed for men with more legitimate ailments.

There are 17,000 veterans awaiting hospitalization, though not all of them require it immediately.

The alcoholics are legitimate patients in the sense that the large increase in their numbers has caused VA to recognize alcoholism as an "official disease."

Dr. Paul R. Hawley, VA medical director, who says the problem "is increasing by leaps and bounds," estimates that VA will treat 10,000 alcoholic cases this year.

There were 6,459 last year and 3,529 in 1945.

About two-thirds of this year's cases, Dr. Hawley estimates, will be uncomplicated—those without any demonstrable mental illness; the rest do have an accompanying mental disease.

All are classified as neuropsychopathic cases.

The average cost to VA of maintaining one such patient is $8.70 a day. Thus the expense of caring for the two-thirds group, who stay anywhere from 5 to 30 days, runs into thousands of dollars.

Only a comparative few of the alcoholic cases have a service-connected mental disability, according to Dr. Hawley.

VA hospitals are finding that the great majority of the patients entering with cases of uncomplicated alcoholism stay only long enough to sober up and then demand their release. They cannot be detained against their will, so VA can do little for them.

Using standard treatments for the more serious alcoholic cases that may be hospitalized as long as a year, VA tries hard to help them. But Dr. H. J. Tompkins, assistant chief of the neuropsychiatric division, points out that there is no known cure.

As for the two-thirds group, who refuse lengthy treatment, Dr. Hawley lays much of the blame for their numbers on local communities. He contends that the latter are not doing enough to help their alcoholics reform.

As soon as they find an alcoholic is a veteran, they ship him to a VA hospital.

Also, Dr. Hawley charges, too many judges are giving alcoholic veterans a choice between treatment in a VA hospital and a jail sentence.

So then this is the picture of the actual results of putting beer in our camps in World War II. Sick veterans, who could be helped, are being crowded out of veterans' hospitals by the great and ever-increasing number of alcoholics who came out of that policy in World War II.

By reason of the circumstances hereinabove referred to many of our church and educational officials as well as parents and other individuals, have protested against compulsory military training since they fear the safety of young men to be inducted because of the great temptations to drink.

We are spending thousands upon thousands of dollars which will soon run up into millions and millions. And our actual reserve of battle-trained men upon whom we might have to fall back in case of actual total war, is not so strong as we thought. Because we did not take any proper precautions to protect them against the saboteurs who are as bad as or worse than the Communists—the brewers, distillers, and tavern-keepers who persuaded somebody high up in authority to let them put beer in our camps.

Now we are again being asked to draft young men, many of whom will be only 19 and 20 years old. If this bill is accepted and becomes law, we will also be setting up training camps for 18-year-old volunteers right along with the Regular Army. We can take time by the forelock and avoid a repetition of those conditions which so aroused our citizens, and for which we are now paying so dearly, by providing in this bill proper protections against what General Marshall called "a sordid business for the accumulation of money."

If we do not do this, how many of these young men, on whom we are relying to form our permanent Reserve force, will be capable and ready for duty when and if the real call comes?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, there should be no question about the adoption of the first two paragraphs of the amendment. They will give assurance to the families of young men inducted into the services that Congress expects the military authorities to make a sincere effort to maintain as decent and wholesome an environment as possible around the camps. The proponents of the amendment do not expect the authorities to do more than reduce to a minimum the hazards to health and morals that are incident to military service, but the families, and the men themselves, are entitled to that degree of protection. Individual character is not maintained by external controls. Men must be fortified from within, but our official action in recognizing the evils enumerated in the amendment and equipping the Department to deal with them will inspire greater confidence in this legislation.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], I believe it is germane because we are duty-bound in the drafting of the young men of our country to provide them with that which is necessary to maintain mental and physical well-being. It certainly becomes our obligation to make sure that the camp surroundings are such that will not injure the morals of these young men. Therefore such restrictions provided for in this amendment are essential and therefore germane. It also gives solace and consolation to the parents of these young men in knowing that a guiding hand is constantly at their side as a result of this amendment. We must never forget that these boys become our charges and we must look at the whole picture as if all these boys were our own sons. When one looks at this picture from this viewpoint one cannot help to vote for this amendment, for all of us surely are interested in seeing that these boys are returned home as pure and innocent as they have left.

Insofar as the restriction on the sale of beer is concerned, I believe it is going too far. A glass of beer with meals or as a refreshing drink during off hours does no harm but serves at times a useful purpose. I therefore am in favor of deleting this paragraph from the proposed amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I inquire as to whether or not this amendment may be divided and an opportunity given to the members of the committee to vote separately with respect to the first paragraph and separately with respect to the second paragraph.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the parliamentary inquiry. The request comes too late, Mr. Chairman. The amendment has been considered as a whole, and the request to separate it should have been made earlier.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that under the rules of the House a division of a question may be asked for at any time, if the question is divisible, before the vote.

The Chair has examined the amendment and notices that it is in three paragraphs labeled subparagraph (a), subparagraph (b), and subparagraph (c), each one of them being substantive in form, and each one of them could be voted on separately, if it is so demanded.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask that a separate vote be taken on the second paragraph as contrasted with the third paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman so demands.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The first paragraph is not part of my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman demands, a separate vote can be taken on the second paragraph. The vote will come on the first paragraph first.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. Do I understand that we are now limited to 5 minutes or less on this very important amendment dealing with the welfare and the morals of the boys of this country?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that is not a matter within the control of the Chair. The committee, by vote, has determined the amount of time to be allocated on this particular amendment.

The question is on the first part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each portion of the amendment be again read by the Clerk before it is voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) The training under this act shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first portion of the amendment.

The first portion of the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act is being given, as the Secretary of National Defense may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of such persons who are receiving training under this act and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of persons who are being trained under this act, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person in any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Secretary of Defense or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes. Any person, corporation partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the second portion of the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS of California and Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 98, noes 3.

So the second portion of the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the third portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

(c) The sale of, or dealing in, beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange, canteen, ship's store, or Army, Navy, or marine transport or upon any premises used for military or naval purposes by the United States is hereby prohibited. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would that language pertain to the camps and the soldiers already over in Europe?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has heard the amendment read. The Chair cannot interpret the amendment for the gentleman.

The question is on the third portion of the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 57, noes 55.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. ANDREWS of New York, and Mr. REES.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 54, noes 72.

So the third portion of the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POWELL moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the enacting clause stricken out.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, in speaking on this preferential motion, I wish to indicate in closing a few things.

First, we are not going to have a vote here today. This brings our debate under the 5-minute rule to an end. There is not going to be a vote because we will ask for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill. Therefore, I am asking that all those who supported the amendments which I compiled shall withdraw them except the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who is going to advocate the abolition of the poll tax for members of the armed forces; the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] has an FEPC amendment; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] an antidiscrimination amendment.

Let us not feel that because we have passed the Shafer amendment that it will be in the final bill when it is returned from the other body. The conferees have already planned to take it out.

Finally, I would like to announce that I have the pledge of a couple of men in the other body that they will filibuster the conference report on Saturday. Senator WHERRY has just announced that if there is a filibuster the Senate will adjourn, nevertheless, even if the draft bill is not reported out. Therefore, I am happy to announce that the probability now is that there will be no draft. If such is true I will be very happy. At any rate I wish to thank all my colleagues who supported me so ably. It was a great fight. The brass hats thought they could ram this down our throats. We licked them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ISACSON: On page 22, line 18, after the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That there shall be no segregation or discrimination on account of race or color or religion."

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, both Democrats and Republicans have admitted on this floor today that the armed forces of the United States are practicing discrimination, segregation, and Jim Crow against the Negro people.

It has been argued that General Eisenhower supports segregation and Jim Crow. Well, I do not.

The amendment that I have offered will end, once and for all, the practice of racial discrimination, of segregation, and of Jim Crow in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there are some in whose hearts there are festering sores of bias and bigotry and prejudice.

There are some whose souls deny the brotherhood of men, regardless of race or color or religion, and their equality before God. There are some whose minds, in some distorted manner, cling to the false and unscientific Nazi doctrine of white supremacy, of the inferiority or superiority of certain races.

My amendment cannot purify such hearts. My amendment cannot cleanse such souls. My amendment cannot improve the minds to which I have referred. A long process of education and reeducation is necessary for that purpose.

What my amendment can do is to establish by force of statute and by force of law that bias and bigotry be not translated into the practice of discrimination or segregation or of Jim Crow in the armed forces of the United States.

Very soon the two old parties will convene in convention, and when they convene in convention there will be a great to do made about a plank in their platform to end discrimination. Similar planks have existed in the past, in both the Democratic Party platform and the Republican Party platform. The place to enact a real plank against discrimination—the place to enact a real plank against segregation—the place to enact a real plank against Jim Crow is not in the halls of a convention, but right here on the floor of Congress where it will have meaning and where it will be enacted into the law of this country.

If the Democrats and Republicans do not vote for my amendment—let them not flock to Philadelphia and mouth their hypocritical protestations against

discrimination, and with tongue in cheek, support a meaningless resolution against discrimination.

Now is the time and this is the place to end discrimination and Jim Crow.

This is the time and the place to stand up and be counted.

Yes, soon, on the streets of New York and in the cities of this Nation, Democratic and Republican politicians will by vying with each other in phony pious protestations of their friendship for the Negro.

You have seen it happen before. You will see it happen again. Once more the political candidates of the Democratic and Republican Parties will try to outshout each other that their very best friend is the Negro.

They cannot promise too much for the Negro—just before election time. They seem to think that the Negro, like themselves, will forget those promises as soon as the votes are counted.

But the Negro people want performance, not promise.

They want action on my amendment which will eliminate discrimination, segregation, and Jim Crow; and assure them full civil rights.

The armed services of the United States discriminated against Negroes before the war. They discriminated all through the war. They are still discriminating.

When the Governor of one of our States—New Jersey—under the provisions of a new constitution, attempted to abolish segregation in the National Guard, the Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, wrote to him that "for the present" the Jersey National Guard could have nonsegregation but that in the Regular Army and all other National Guard units the old Jim Crow policy would continue "in the interest of national defense."

National defense of what? Do Mr. Truman's Cabinet officers believe that democracy can be defended with a policy borrowed from Adolf Hitler's book? And does Mr. Truman himself believe that? If he does not, why does not he make his orders stick? He has the authority of Commander in Chief of all the armed forces. He could abolish Jim Crow overnight, as the New Jersey Governor did, if he really wanted to.

The answer is that the President of the United States is talking double-talk. He is bidding for Negro votes on the one hand, and on the other quietly assuring the white-supremacy boys that there is no need for alarm because nothing drastic is going to happen.

Now let us compare Mr. Truman's policy of strong talk and weak action with the Democratic platform of 1944, upon which he was elected:

> We believe that racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develop, and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights that are guaranteed by our Constitution. Congress should exert its full constitutional powers to protect those rights.

Fine words. But the Democratic Party had its tongue in its cheek when these words were written and adopted. There was an election coming up then, too.

When the Republican politicians sat down to write their platform in 1944, they went the Democrats one better. Here is what the Republicans said:

> We pledge an immediate congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation, and discrimination against Negroes who are in the armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and the adoption of corrective legislation. We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

That statement proves either that the Republican Party cannot remember a pledge for more than 2 years or that the pledge was phony when it was written, or both. For the fact is that the Republicans have controlled Congress since 1946, and where is the permanent FEPC? Where is the corrective legislation to end discrimination in the armed forces?

The Republicans have done no better than the Democrats, because there is no real difference between them.

Last December Grant Reynolds, chairman of the Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Training and Service, went to Washington with a distinguished delegation of Negroes to ask that Jim Crow provisions be stricken from the universal military training bill.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee told the delegation that he was in favor of "limited segregation, in keeping with Army policy."

Mr. Reynolds commented:

> If this is a sample of Republican thinking, then it is well that Negroes know it now.

Mr. Reynolds was right. You can search the Republican record from now until election day, and you will find nothing to show that the Republican Congress has tried to carry out its platform pledge. That pledge was a lie when it was written.

Let me now cite an example of Democratic double talk that affects the lives of the entire Negro population of New York City.

In June 1946 the Department of Justice took what seemed to be a very brave step. It filed a complaint against some of the biggest banks and insurance companies of the Nation, charging them with conspiring to keep New York Negroes in ghettoes—and very high-priced ghettoes, too—by refusing mortgage loans to Negroes and by putting pressure on landlords to keep Negroes or Spanish-speaking tenants out of so-called white areas.

These un-American activities were undertaken, the Department charged, through the Mortgage Conference of Greater New York. The members of the conference included such leading banks as the National City Bank, the Chase National Bank, and the Manufacturers Trust Co., and such big insurance companies as Mutual and Prudential.

It may have been only a coincidence that the complaint was filed just a few months before the congressional election of November 1946. J. Francis Hayden, head of the Antitrust Division's local office, promised that the case would come to trial by last fall.

But 20 months have now passed. The case has not come to trial. The attorney in charge said recently that it may not be possible to act before early summer, or perhaps later. This delay is very gratifying to the mortgage conference—whose attorney, incidentally, is none other than A. A. Berle, Jr., the head of the so-called Liberal Party in New York—but it is bad news for the Negroes who are jammed into the worst and most expensive housing in the city.

Even New York City can hardly be proud of its record on Negroes. In many ways we are following the pattern of the South.

How often do you hear the voice of a Negro telephone operator?

How often is your check cashed by a Negro bank teller?

Where, outside of Harlem, do you find Negro pharmacists, Negro hotel clerks, Negro secretaries, Negro insurance agents, Negro mechanics, and Negro teachers?

How many railroads employ Negro ticket agents?

Few of the white people in New York know what most of the Negroes know—that Jim Crow trains leave Pennsylvania station every day. There are Jim Crow sections on all of the reserved-seat trains to the South.

It took Billy Rose to tell New York that when Negroes go to the box offices of the legitimate theaters, there are no orchestra seats available. And anybody knows that Negroes are not wanted at the tables of the better restaurants.

Mayor O'Dwyer could do something about these conditions if he wished to. He evidently finds it more expedient to play the role of the double-talking Democrats.

A couple of years ago the Research Institute of America made a survey that "flabbergasted" a lot of big sales executives. The researchers investigated the buying habits of a cross section of Negroes in Washington, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. Then they compared the preferences of the Negroes with the preferences of white families in two other cities, Milwaukee and Omaha.

It came as quite a shock that the Negroes used more Maxwell House coffee than any other brand, more Gold Medal flour, more Aunt Jemima pancake mix, more Red Heart dog food, more Colgate's toothpaste. In Washington the favorite soap among Negroes was Ivory, in Baltimore Octagon, and in Philadelphia Fels Naptha. The most popular cigarette was Camels, the most popular liquor blended whisky—though it turned out that Negroes drank just a little more Scotch per capita than the whites did.

Evidently it had never occurred to the great geniuses of American merchandising that there is no real difference between Negroes and whites—except that the Negroes have always got a raw deal from the whites and the two old political parties.

I find no evidence today that either the Democratic or Republican Party can recognize the simple truth that the Negro deserves equal treatment.

I look above me as I speak to you and I see the drab grayness of the ceiling of this Chamber. Then I turn to my right and hanging on the wall I see the beauti-

ful painting of the Father of our Country, George Washington. That portrait is not composed of just one color; that portrait has red, and blue, and green, and gray. It has all the pigments, and the shades, and the tints of which an artist is capable. When all those colors were put together there was achieved a masterpiece, a portrait, a painting of which we are all proud.

So with our Army and so with our civilization—it takes a combination of all colors in complete harmony to achieve perfection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in spite of the harsh words and, to my mind, the unjust accusations and insinuations made by the gentleman from New York, I will concede——

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not at the moment. I will ask the gentleman something in a minute.

I concede his sincerity, his loyalty to this country, and his lofty purpose; but I think he does not know just what will happen if we follow through on the theories he seems to be supporting.

The gentleman spoke of that portrait of Washington which hangs on the wall to my right. He called attention to the many colors shown and how all blended together into a beautiful whole, and I assume from his illustration that he believed that, if there was a mingling of the blood of the black, the brown, the yellow, and the white races, the result would be something admirable, beautiful, desirable, and an improvement upon the human beings who now populate the earth.

But one or two things he forgot. One was that the background in the portrait and which sets forth the majestic figure of the father of his country so well was not a mixture of colors, but that the various colors each retained its own characteristics, reflecting light and shadow in its own way.

Taken as a whole, with each color playing its part, the result is magnificent. It is magnificent and beautiful and satisfying to the eye because the artist had the power of selection and the ability to apply each in its proper place.

Had all of those colors been put in one pile on the artist's palette and then, with a wide sweep of the arm, thrown against the canvas, the result would have been something like what we will get if ever the practice of a mingling of the blood of the races prevails in this or any other land.

Nor was there in that commanding figure of Washington a blending of the blood of various separate and distinct races.

The gentleman referred to Washington and to the Negroes who fought side by side with him through the eight long years of bloody war. He made no mention of the fact that in Washington's day and in Washington's household the Negro was a slave.

He made no mention of the fact that for many long years the opportunity of the Negro to do other than serve was denied him, that his ambition was throttled, that he was treated many times kindly but nevertheless always as an inferior.

The gentleman said nothing of that bitter war wherein the blood of hundreds of thousands of white men was shed to make the Negro free. He said nothing of the cost the white man paid in that war to throw open the gates of opportunity to the Negro.

He said nothing of the fact—perhaps he did not know—that in my home, in my town, in my district and State, schools, churches, places of public amusement, bathing beaches, and means of transportation are open to people of all races and creeds—that there is no discrimination—yet he would deny freedom of choice to conscripted men and by law force one upon another by his amendment.

I would be the last to deny to the Negro, or to any other man, equality of opportunity. In my humble opinion, because white men were responsible for bringing Negroes to this country, the Negro should be given, on every possible occasion, in every possible way, more than equality of opportunity—and that because it was so long denied him.

In my humble judgment, however sincere the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] may be, the thing he advocates will lead ultimately not only to the destruction of this Republic but to the destruction of our race—I mean the human race as it exists today.

The gentleman wants, does he not, not only equality of opportunity, but he is talking about the intermingling of the races?

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, but just for a question. That is what you want, is it not?

Mr. ISACSON. I asked——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, are you or are you not?

Mr. ISACSON. I asked the gentleman to yield for a question, not for him to ask me one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I yielded to the gentleman to ask him a question. You answer that question. I will ask it again. My question is whether or not you are for the intermingling of the races.

Mr. ISACSON. The intermingling of races is a personal matter for the individuals concerned and not the proper subject for legislation. Now, will the gentleman answer a question for me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If you make it short. But before you ask that question, let me call attention to the fact that your answer to my question is proof of the unsoundness of the position you take in offering this amendment.

Your statement just made is that, in your opinion, whether the members of the races intermingle is a personal matter, the decision of which rests with the individual. I agree with that particular statement. That is, the right of the individual to choose his own associates is the foundation of the argument which I make.

But the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] would deprive the individual of his personal choice, deny him preference. It would take all of the drafted men regardless of race or color and force them to live and fight together in one unit.

If the question were left to me I would say let the men who are drafted decide as individuals whether they prefer to fight with black, brown, yellow, or white buddies. Or, if they so elect, let us have mixed companies or regiments or divisions, where those who prefer to march shoulder to shoulder with others in a unit made up of all races or more than one race will have that privilege.

In Michigan it is the law that there shall be no discrimination in transportation. We get along fairly well, but I think the ideal situation would be, for example, on the trains, if we had one coach for the Negro, one for the white, and one where all races, colors, and creeds could, if they desired, ride together. Then each would have an opportunity to select his own companions, and certainly, under that kind of situation, no one would be forced, at least to any great extent, to travel with people who to him were objectionable. We have on all trains separate accommodations for smokers and nonsmokers.

Now for your question.

Mr. ISACSON. The gentleman, on page 8394 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I hold in my hand, made the statement:

> While perhaps the brown or the yellow or the colored race has been advanced in some way by association and intermarriage and interbreeding with the whites, the over-all result and the average on the whole has been lower and downward.

My question is: Is there not implied, is there not implicit in this statement the Nazi idea of white supremacy and the inferiority of the other races?

Will you answer that question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I will if you will sit down.

I in no way subscribe to the Nazi idea of the supremacy of any race. Each race is endowed with certain characteristics. In each, certain traits and ambitions exist and each follows its own pathway down history's corridors. The result, whether it be good or bad, is open for all to read.

It is not my purpose nor my desire to sit in judgment—to dogmatically state that one race is superior, another inferior.

The answer to the forced and indiscriminate intermingling is that wherever you have indiscriminate crossing of strains or species, whether it is of plants, flowers, fruits, animals, or human beings, the ultimate result has always been to advance perhaps to a slight degree the merit of some species, but to make less desirable the larger number.

Mr. ISACSON. Are you saying that the white race is the upper race and the colored is the lower?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. ISACSON. Answer that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have answered.

Mr. ISACSON. Is the white the upper race and the colored the lower?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, sit down.

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I am talking about facts.

Mr. ISACSON. Why do you not answer the question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I claim no superiority for the white race. I make no charge that any other race is inferior—as to what is good or bad, as to what is desirable or undesirable each individual and each nation must judge—no people has been more caustically criticized and ridiculed than white Americans. The Chinese, I am told, because of our impatience and energy, think we are a nation of fools. The fact is that from our standpoint and judged by our standards, the white race for some reason or other, I do not know what it is, it is not due to anything the individuals of the white race have implanted in themselves, it may be due to something that God planted there, but the fact is they have made greater advancements along the lines we think worth while than any other race—advancements in what we call civilization, in the establishment of governments which endure, in mechanical inventions, in a freedom to hold each his own religious views, to follow his own way of life.

Nowhere at any time, from the days of the Garden of Eden right down to the present moment, at least so far as we know, have any people ever had and been permitted to enjoy to as great a degree any of the things which we at least consider desirable, as do we here in America.

We have no way of knowing whether the black, the brown, the yellow, or the white race was first upon this earth. We may assume that they were created at approximately the same time; that each has had equal opportunity in his own land to do the things he wished to do. As to which was the better way, as to which reached the more desirable end, the individuals of each race must judge for themselves.

The picture the world over is open to all and, from the standpoint of the white race, it may be said, if it is not presumptuous or offensive, that the white race is better satisfied with what it has done, is doing, proposes to do, than it is with the pathway pointed out by any other race or any member of any other race.

In what I have said or propose to say, there is no claim from me that the white race is the superior race. My position and my contention is that there should be no forced intermingling of the races; that each should have equal opportunity to enjoy all the rights created, all the privileges granted, by our Constitution.

My contention is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON] violates that conception of liberty and freedom of individual choice which he just a few moments ago insisted should be left to each individual.

Mr. ISACSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I have said I did not care to yield. If the gentleman wants to observe the rules of the House he will not continue to interrupt.

Mr. ISACSON. Are you refusing to yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is my point, and anyone who will read the theory of Mendel will find that the monks established the soundness of the theory I have called to your attention by experiment; they demonstrated the correctness of that theory by the crossing of flowers, fowls, and animals. They did not try human beings. You can breed upward, yes, by selection, but where you force indiscriminate intermingling, that is bad, unwholesome, and destructive.

As I said the other day, God He made us white, He made us black, He made us brown, He made us yellow and neither you nor I can do anything about it except to give equality of opportunity to all.

No, I do not subscribe to the theories nor the practices advocated by Hitler, by the Nazis, nor by the Communists. Nor do I subscribe to the more recent theory of Morgenthau.

Apparently, because Hitler persecuted and murdered the Jews, Morgenthau called for, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and, motivated by revenge rather than the practice of a policy which Hitler should have followed, would have us ape Hitler and exterminate the Germans.

We should be able, if we are intelligent beings, to have a choice as to whether we shall live at peace with our neighbors or whether we shall have continual war.

The people of middle Europe, many races, many creeds, are crowded together. Each clings to its own ideas, its own practices, its own religion. Each is intolerant of others, and the result has been fighting and war all down through the centuries.

The fighting and the warfare may be due to the fact that people with different views, different desires and aspirations, are forced to live together, become impatient and intolerant.

In my humble judgment, forcing our drafted men, where they are of different races, have different ways of life, to live together day and night, where each irritates the other, is not conducive to an effective military force.

Throughout our history, Americans have always been charitable, tolerant, considerate, of those individuals who were their neighbors and who were less fortunate, either from a material or an educational standpoint. It has always been an American characteristic to give a helping hand to the so-called underdog.

The soundness of that view is illustrated here in Congress every day when opportunity arises. Every Member of this House knows that most of our legislation is based, not upon strict equality of treatment, but upon helping him who needs it most. The poor man's income tax is always assessed on a lower percentage basis than that used to fix the tax of the higher income groups.

For my own part, I would give not only to the Negro but to the individuals of every race who have not made in every way as great an advancement as has the white race not only an equal opportunity, but I would give to him a better opportunity. I would give to the one less able to pull the load, whether it was in the industrial or the educational field, the longer end of the lever, and that regardless of color, creed, or race.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous censent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that a serious proposal such as the one advanced in the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. ISACSON] should receive the treatment which has been accorded it by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The gentleman from Michigan indulged in the same treatment of a serious proposal when he dealt with a similar amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. It is perfectly all right to try to be smart-alecky about this proposition, it may bring about a laugh, and certain gentlemen on the floor of this House may enjoy it; but I do not believe serious or decent Americans, confronted with the serious problems of today, enjoy that sort of conduct. I do not believe that such conduct and those statements are in keeping with the best democratic traditions of either this Nation or of this House.

The doctrine that has been advanced here by the gentleman from Michigan is a doctrine of insult to the various races that compose this great Nation. When he speaks of an inferior race, what is it? When he speaks of a superior race, what is it?

Contemporary history has demonstrated conclusively that only Nazis, those who imposed on this world the most barbarian rule ever conceived by man or devil, were capable of talking of superior races or inferior races or of denouncing the intermingling of races.

In the Bible it is said that God made man in his own image. That is the essence of all democracy. That is the essence of civilization as we know it and as we try in our small way to live it. That democratic principle was carried out in the Declaration of Independence when the men who conceived this Nation and this Republic and its democratic institutions said that all men are created equal. They did not say that all men are created equal except Negroes.

They did not say that all men are created equal except Jews. They did not say that all men are created equal except people of races whose skins are not white. When they said that all men are created equal, they put no exceptions in that declaration.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I decline to yield. I am trying to make a serious effort here and in all earnestness, and I am speaking from my heart.

They placed no exception in that Declaration of Independence, and it is only when men in this Nation have at-

tempted to place exceptions in that proposition that democracy has been negated.

What is the proposition that is advanced by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISAACSON]? It is a very simple one. It is one that would apply the Christian doctrine, that Biblical doctrine, to the armed forces. It is one that would apply the fundamental doctrine of democracy of our Declaration of Independence to the armed forces of these United States. When bombs are dropped and bullets are exploded from guns, they do not differentiate between white and black. They mow them down equally. When sacrifices are made for this country, there is no choice for either black or white; the sacrifices are made by both. Yet here you say that there must be discrimination and there must be denial of equality to those men whose skin happens to be black. America revolts against that. America's revolt against that will be stamped by the events of today and tomorrow.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I think there is nothing more important today than that the minority groups in our country feel that they are an integral part of the community and the Nation. If they are made to feel that there are walls between them and the majority in the community, they may become receptive to those influences which tend to divide a nation. In time of war, the Negro has been a part of our Army and he has served magnificently. When you measure his contribution in terms of his limited opportunity for education and in terms of the discrimination and segregation that he has suffered in his home community, his service and devotion to the defense of his country is surpassed by no one.

The Negro soldier fought in World War I and World War II for a liberty that he only partially enjoys. The injustice of calling men to fight for freedom while subjecting them to humiliating discrimination within the fighting forces is at once apparent. Furthermore, by preventing entire groups from making their maximum contribution to the national defense, we weaken our defense to that extent and impose heavier burdens on the remainder of the population.

I made a study when I first came to Congress of the record of the Negro soldier in this world war. I made it because on the floor of the House I heard some speeches that deeply disturbed me. So, I went to the trouble of going to the War Department, to the Navy Department, to the merchant marine, and to the Air Force, and gathered the materials that they had. This had never been done before in this country. There was no official record of the contribution that the Negro soldier had made in time of war.

I put a research woman to work on this material for several months. Then, while Congress was on vacation and others rested, I sat down and for weeks closeted myself with this wealth of loose material gathered from all branches of the service in order to compile it. I worked to get it into orderly form so that the Nation would have a record for all time in the official document of this country of the participation of the Negro soldier in the defense of our country and in the cause of freedom for all men.

The Army so appreciated this record that they have used it many, many times since. The documentation of the Negro soldier's contribution in World War II is to be found today in the libraries of the country.

I wish I could tell you of the Negro soldiers who have been wounded and are now in hospitals who wrote asking for that record. I wish I could tell you what it has meant to them that a Member of Congress said only, "Well done." I did not dress up the record, I did not give any opinions of my own. I just culled the facts and put them where they could be kept for all time.

Through our Army we export democracy wherever that Army goes. How can we—a democratic people—tell our story to the world unless we practice true democracy in the ranks of the men who represent us?

This is not, as the committee has said, a bill to meet an immediate emergency of war. It is a bill to bring up to authorized strength the number of men we need in the armed forces to meet our commitments in the occupied territories. If we send out an Army in which there is segregation, what do we tell the other peoples of the world? What are we saying?

Aside from the injury we do to the promotion of democracy in the world, what do we do to ourselves as a Nation when we go into a community and draft men into an Army where discrimination and segregation are condoned? What do we do to these drafted men when discrimination and segregation are allowed to continue here at home? How does a drafted man who is asked to defend liberty in the world feel when he cannot get a meal in a public eating place, when he cannot go to a theater—when he hears of Negroes who are not permitted to enter colleges and universities?

How does a wounded Negro veteran feel when he may have to be hospitalized some place far from home—away from his family and friends? Hospitals, too, practice segregation and discrimination. Segregation and discrimination breed suspicion, sullen distrust, hatreds, and widespread violence.

I could go on for hours with wicked and specific cases of discrimination and segregation. What are we doing to this group of citizens in our country who represent 14,000,000 people?

Congress has never passed legislation requiring a segregated Army. The policy is purely administrative. But the President's Committee on Civil Rights specifically recommends unequivocal legislation to end the pattern. Said the committee's report:

> Legislation and regulations should expressly ban discrimination and segregation in the recruitment, assignment, and training of all personnel in all types of military duty. Mess halls, quarters, recreational facilities, and post exchanges should be nonsegregated. Commissions and promotions should be awarded on consideration of merit only. Selection of students for the Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academies and all other service schools should be governed by standards from which considerations of race, color, creed, or national origin are conspicuously absent. The National Guard, Reserve units, and any universal military training program should all be administered in accordance with these same standards.

In the last war a very small proportion of Negroes were used in combat duty. Negroes with doctor-of-philosophy degrees from our major colleges left the Army with the rank of private or sergeant after being used as truck drivers and gravediggers. A large amount of bitterness felt today is among the educated and intellectual Negroes who were drafted into the armed services and then relegated to labor battalions where none of their training was utilized.

I give you another thought: It is nonsense when the gentleman from Michigan talks about the superiority of the white people and cites as his example the fact that their governments have survived the longest of any governments in history. What about the Chinese? Does he consider that they are white people? I do not know what he considers they are. They have survived quite a long time in the world. What about the people of India? Are they white people? I do not know what the gentleman from Michigan considers the Indian people. They have survived quite a long time, too. India and China both have handed down cultures which have contributed much to the progress and enjoyment of man everywhere.

This is a very serious matter we have before us. It is not a matter to be disposed of lightly. I know there are problems. You in the Southern States have your problems. But the question of national unity goes further than the problems of the Southern States. The question of national unity is a problem of the 48 States of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISAACSON].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On that, Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 18, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 8. (a) Any person inducted into the armed forces under this act for service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of service under section 4 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. The Secretaries of Army, Navy, or Air Force shall furnish to the Selective Service System hereafter established a report of separation for each person separated from active duty. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the armed forces under this act for service shall be given a

physical examination upon separation and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That such statement shall not contain any reference to mental or other conditions which in the judgment of the Secretary concerned would prove injurious to the physical or mental health of the person to whom it pertains.

(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such service, has left or leaves a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, (2) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (3) makes written application for reemployment within 90 days after he is relieved from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year—

(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories, or possessions or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia, such person shall be restored to such position or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay;

(B) if such position was in the employ of a private employer, such employer or his successor in interest shall restore such person to such position, or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should be restored to such position or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

(c) If any such person is not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such period of service, but is qualified to perform the duties of some other position, then, in the case of paragraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b), he shall (and in the case of paragraph (C) of subsection (b) it is hereby declared the sense of Congress that he should) be employed at such other position as may provide the nearest possible similarity in seniority, status, and pay.

(d) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) or of subsection (c) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of service in the armed forces, shall be entitled to all promotions, increases in pay, vacation rights not otherwise regulated by law, and accumulations of seniority to which he would have been entitled had he been working for the employer during his period of service in the armed forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer, and shall not be laid off or discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

(e) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b), subsection (c), or subsection (d), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action: *Provided*, That any such compensation shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions. The court shall order speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof to specifically require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits: *Provided further*, That only the employer shall be deemed a necessary party to any such action.

(f) In case the United States Government or any of its Territories or possessions, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b), subsection (c), or subsection (d) of this section and section 9 (b) (4), the United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed, upon finding that such failure or refusal is in violation of the said provisions, to require specific compliance with such provisions and to require compensation to any person entitled to the benefits of such provisions for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with said provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment or from unemployment compensation, including readjustment allowances. The United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to issue rules and regulations giving full force and effect to the provisions of this act governing restoration, and such rules and regulations shall have the force and effect of law; and it shall be mandatory for the agency concerned to take such corrective action as the Commission recommends: *Provided*, That where any agency refuses to take the corrective action recommended by the Commission, the district court of the United States for the district in which the person entitled to such benefits was employed shall have jurisdiction, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by such person so entitled, to require specific compliance with the recommendation of the Commission and the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section by, and to enter judgment against, the United States Government or any of its Territories or possessions, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, to compensate such person for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with said recommendation and provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment or from unemployment compensation, including readjustment allowances: *Provided further*, That any such compensation directed to be paid by the Commission or the court shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such recommendation or provisions, and shall be paid by the head of the governmental agency concerned out of appropriations currently available for salaries and expenses of the agency, and such appropriations shall be deemed available for such purposes. No fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits. The court shall order speedy hearings in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar.

(g) The Director of Selective Service shall establish adequate facilities to render aid in the replacement in their former positions of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the armed forces of the United States.

(h) Any person who, subsequent to the effective date of this act and while it remains in effect, enters upon active service in the armed forces of the United States and is released under honorable conditions from such active service shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits and other rights of this section, except that the 90-day period prescribed in section 8 (b) shall commence (1) in the case of enlisted personnel, from the date of termination of the first enlistment (excluding extensions thereof) entered into subsequent to the date of enactment of this act; (2) in the case of officer personnel, from the date of the third anniversary of reporting for active service subsequent to the date of enactment of this act; and (3) in the case of officer and enlisted personnel who are discharged or released from active service prior to the afore-mentioned dates, from the date relieved from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year.

(i) As between two or more persons entitled to be restored to the same position under the provisions of this act or of any other law relating to similar reemployment benefits, the person who left such position first shall have the prior right thereto, without prejudice to the rights of the other person or persons to be restored to a position of like seniority, status, and pay with the employer, if such position exists and is not occupied by a person having greater seniority.

SEC. 9. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Selective Service System, and a Director of Selective Service who shall be the head thereof.

(2) The Selective Service System shall include a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, and the local boards, appeal boards, and other agencies provided for in subsection (b) (3) of this section.

(3) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year.

(4) The functions of the Office of Selective Service Records (established by the act of March 31, 1947) and of the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System and the Director of Selective Service, respectively. The personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System. The Office of Selective Service Records shall cease to exist upon the taking of effect of the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That, effective upon the termination of this act, and notwithstanding such termination in other respects, (a) the said Office of Selective Service Records is hereby reestablished on the same basis and with the same functions as obtained prior to the effective date of this act, (b) said reestablished Office shall be responsible for terminating any other outstanding affairs of the Selective Service System, and (c) the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such reestablished Office of Selective Service Records.

(b) The President is authorized—

(1) to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act;

(2) to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State director of the Selective Service System for each State, Territory,

and possession of the United States and in the District of Columbia who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System. The President may order to active duty with their consent and assign to the Selective Service System those officers of the Selective Service section of the State headquarters and headquarters detachments of the federally recognized National Guard of the United States and members of other Reserve components, and may employ such number of civilians as may be necessary for the administration of the national and of the several State headquarters of the Selective Service System.

(3) to create and establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out its functions with respect to the registration, examination, selection, assignment, delivery for induction, and maintenance of records of persons registered under this act, together with such other duties as may be assigned under this act, and shall provide for the classification of registrants under this act on the basis of availability for service. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the Director determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation, such intercounty local board within its area to have the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have the power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, service under this act, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local boards shall be final, except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from service under this act, and the determination of the President shall be final. No person who is a civilian officer, member, agent, or employee of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, or of any local board or appeal board or other agency of such Office or System, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from service, as provided for in this act, by reason of his status as such civilian officer, member, agent, or employee;

(4) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That the compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the armed forces, or any Reserve component thereof with his consent, or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 9 (b) (3)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the armed forces or Reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States;

(5) to utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof and the District of Columbia and volunteer welfare organizations in the execution of this act;

(6) to purchase such printing, binding, and blank-book work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, as amended, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such equipment and supplies for the Selective Service System as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, with or without advertising or formal contract;

(7) to prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the armed forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this act, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this act;

(8) to procure such space as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and Public Law 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, by lease, pursuant to existing statutes. The provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S. C. 278a), shall not apply to any lease entered into under the authority of this act;

(9) to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this act, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, for temporary use thereof, by donation or lease, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended.

(10) to utilize, in order to provide and furnish such services as may be deemed necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this act, personnel of the armed forces and of Reserve components thereof, with their consent, and such civilian personnel as may be necessary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946" (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.), with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees.

(c) The President is authorized to delegate any authority vested in him under this act, and to provide for the subdelegation of any such authority.

(d) In the administration of this act, voluntary services may be accepted.

(e) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(f) The Director is authorized to make final settlement of individual claims, for amounts not exceeding $50, for travel and other expenses of uncompensated personnel of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, incurred while in the performance of official duties, without regard to other provisions of law governing the travel of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

SEC. 10. Under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, all funds appropriated for operation and maintenance under this act are also available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial, of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this act, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

SEC. 11. Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this act, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said act, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this act, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this act, or rules or regulations made pursuant to this act, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere in any way by force or violence with the administration of this act or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit such offense, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this act unless such person has been actually inducted for the service prescribed under

this act or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this act. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this act, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

SEC. 12. (a) Nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119 (e)), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the act of August 2, 1939 (53 Sat. 1148), entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this act or the regulations made pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections.

(b) All functions performed under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (50 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such act.

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 604 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191), nor the provisions of section 4 of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), all of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, including specifically article IV thereof, shall continue in effect and be applicable as to all persons in the armed forces of the United States including all persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this act, until such time as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is repealed or otherwise terminated by subsequent act of the Congress: *Provided*, That wherever under any section or provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed while this act is in force by any person inducted into the armed forces under this act, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

SEC. 14. With respect to the persons inducted for service under this act there shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the armed forces to which they are assigned. Section 3 of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following: "Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), as amended." The act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), is hereby made applicable to persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this act.

SEC. 15. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted or enlisted into the armed forces of the United States for service under this act, or to members of the Reserve components of such forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, who, prior to their induction, enlistment, or commencement of active duty, were receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation.

SEC. 16. Any person inducted into the armed forces for service under this act shall, during the period of such service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is otherwise entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence or furlough for longer than 1 day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election.

SEC. 17. (a) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required by the armed forces, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry.

(b) Compliance with all such orders for products or material placed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the manner of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, as ordered by the Secretary of Defense, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment for the armed forces, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of Defense, then, and in either such case, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces to manufacture therein such product or material as may be required for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

(c) The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant.

SEC. 18. (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this act upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 3.

(b) It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President.

(c) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, except that, whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in such forces, and their Reserve components, may be suspended by the President to such extent as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

SEC. 19. When used in this act—

(a) The term "between the ages of 18 and 31" shall refer to men who have attained the 18th anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the 31st anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

(b) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "armed forces shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard (when during World War II it served, or when in the future it shall serve, under the Department of the Navy).

(d) The term "district court of the United States" shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(e) The term "local board" shall be deemed to include an intercounty local board in the case of any registrant who is subject to the jurisdiction of an intercounty local board.

(f) The term "Director" shall be deemed to mean the Director of the Selective Service System.

(g) The term "organized unit" or a Reserve component shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof are entitled to receive pay for attendance at not less than 24 drills or training periods throughout the year.

SEC. 20. (a) Except as provided in this act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this act shall be in force.

(b) All of the provisions of this Act, except the provisions of sections 1, 2, 4 (b), 4 (e), 8, 9 (a) (4), 14, 20 (b), and 22, shall become inoperative and cease to apply 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, except as to offenses committed prior to the termination date.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 21. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495).

SEC. 22. The Congress declares, in accordance with traditional military policy as ex-

pressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the civilian components of the armed forces, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of the Nation, be at all times maintained and assured. To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever the Congress shall determine that troops are needed for the national security in excess of those of the regular components of the armed forces, and those in active service under this act, the civilian components of the armed forces, or such part thereof as may be necessary, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

SEC. 23. No person shall be inducted under this act within 90 days after the date of its enactment. Otherwise this act shall be effective upon its enactment.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 26, lines 6 and 7, after "be" in line 6 and running into line 7 strike out "laid off or."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, so far as we are concerned on this side of the aisle, we accept the amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, there is one phrase in H. R. 6401 that has not received the consideration by the Congress its importance deserves. Superficially it appears to be unimportant. Carefully analyzed it becomes apparent that it may be destructive of one of the most valuable rights of an employment relationship.

Section 8 (d) of H. R. 6401 provides that a person who leaves a position to enter the armed forces pursuant to the provisions of these bills and is subsequently restored to such position shall not be laid off or discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

Except for the phrase "laid off or," this same language was contained in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. It is pertinent to ask why this new phrase was inserted.

Under the 1940 act the Director of Selective Service urged upon employers and veterans that discharge without cause included lay-offs. This interpretation of the law came to be known as the doctrine of superseniority. It was vigorously supported by Selective Service until it was repudiated by the Supreme Court in the case of Fishgold against Sullivan Dry Dock & Repair Corp. In the course of its opinion the Court said:

Thus when Congress desired to cover the contingency of a lay-off, it used apt words to describe it. If it had desired to enact that, so long as there was work, no restored veteran, regardless of seniority, could be temporarily laid off during the year following his restoration, when the slackening of work required a reduction in forces, we are bound to believe that it would have used a word of the kind which it had itself recognized as being descriptive of that situation.

In effect, the Supreme Court said that if Congress had intended that returned veterans must not be laid off within 1 year, it would have said so.

The new legislation includes lay-offs within the statutory prohibition. The bills generally use language which has a commonly accepted meaning in employment relations and we must assume that the term "lay-off" must be accepted to have that meaning. If it does, then Congress by enacting the proposed legislation without change will have established the unjust and inequitable principle of superseniority. Why is it unjust?

Millions of veterans of World War II have now returned to private employment and have reestablished their places within the framework of established seniority systems. It is unthinkable that Congress could intend to enact legislation which would place these veterans of the shooting war in an employment status inferior to that of men to be inducted under the pending legislation. That would be the effect of the creation of "super-seniority rights." It would mean that when an employer must reduce his forces he may not lay off an employee who was restored to his position under this legislation for 1 year, even though it required him to lay off veterans of the last war who have greater seniority.

The sponsors of this legislation may argue that the added phrase "laid off or" is not intended to establish superseniority. If this is true, then there appears to be no reason for its inclusion. The only basis for such an argument would be that the new legislation does not refer to all lay-offs but only to those which are without cause. What constitutes cause? The term "discharge without cause" is one commonly used and understood in employment relations; but the term "laid off without cause" is unheard of and without any understood meaning. By the use in this one instance of language which is foreign to the terms used in employment relationships, Congress may deprive veterans of World War II of their means of livelihood even though they have already endured heavy financial sacrifice in the service of their country.

There is no reason why persons inducted under this legislation should have greater rights to their jobs than the veterans of the last war. There is no excuse for tampering with language which is just and fair and reasonable and which through numerous court decisions now clearly describes the rights of veterans. At best, the phrase "laid off or" is confusing, ambiguous and out of place. In view of the history of the 1940 act, it is more probably an attempt to put over on Congress the doctrine of superseniority.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER on page 41, line 22, after the word "act", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following:

"(a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by any governmental agency exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than intra-agency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or interagency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.

"(b) The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate and to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in comformity with the spirit, intent, letter, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the 15th day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. If sooner approved by either committee, it may go into effect immediately upon such approval. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance; *Provided*, That in the event of conflicting committee actions, the earlier action shall govern.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of Congress."

Mr. SCRIVNER (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the amendment be considered as read, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. It was printed on page 8391 of the RECORD on Tuesday. It was presented to the Committee on Armed Services for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, as I have just stated, this amendment was presented to the Committee on Armed Services for consideration in connection with this and other similar legislation. It was printed in full on page 8391 of the RECORD of Tuesday so that the Members might all have an opportunity to read it and study it. The amendment may be a little long. But after some of the remarks made here today about the men who will administer this legislation, then

certainly you will want something like this in the bill. Why does this come about? You will all recall that during the war under the Selective Service Act and under the direction of the Selective Service Director, General Hershey, there was in that act an amendment called the Tydings amendment which specifically set out in very simple language what deferment should be granted to farm labor. We all remember that the Director did not pay much attention to the language in the bill or the edicts of Congress, and upon at least two occasions it was necessary to call Director Hershey before committees of the House and tell him again that we meant what we said. The second time it had no effect at all, and we found ourselves in the position of being compelled to enact a law to override and wipe out a regulation made by the Director of Selective Service, which was contrary to the spirit, letter, intent, and purposes of the act. If anybody knows what this bill means, and what our intent is, certainly the Committees on Armed Services know. If the regulations made thereunder are in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of the act it will take a very short time for this committee or any subcommittee thereof to make that determination. If they are not, then they should not take effect. Then this committee and the committee in the other body should then say, "Mr. Director, that regulation is not in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purposes of this act, and therefore we say, 'No'." If no action is taken by either committee within 15 days, then it is considered that the Committee on Armed Services have read it over and that it is all right.

There should be no delay. A good regulation would not be hard to sell and committee approval could be almost immediately obtained. It is only the poor ones, the ones in which sometimes they seek to usurp some power here and make unusual use of it that would be blocked. I could show you any number of cases, not only Selective Service, but OPA, and every agency of Government that has to do with the administering of laws we pass, by regulation. There will be the argument made that then Congress is taking on a judicial garb. But these regulations have the force and effect of laws—why should we not consider them? I would prefer to have Congress act as legislator and interpreter of that legislation than I would have any bureau downtown or any bureaucrat acting not only as judge but also as legislator and also as administrator. They are acting in a triple character. I will trust Congress, but not the bureaucrat. At this late hour, I will say quite frankly that I am not optimistic about the adoption of this amendment. However, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the House should have the opportunity—if it sees fit—to regulate the regulators.

In order to expedite time, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Of course, this is an attempt to bring back to Congress the administration of the law that we are passing. Under our system of government we have a division of powers, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. The Congress has all that it can possibly do in passing laws, and cannot possibly administer those laws. This is an attempt to bring into the Congress the administration of laws that we have passed.

Now, we complain bitterly at times about the executive assuming some of the powers of the legislative branch of the Government. Here we are attempting to do exactly the thing we complain about the executive department doing. I think if we attend to our own business we have all we can possibly do.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCRIVNER) there were—ayes 27, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of committee amendments that are purely clarifying.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that they be reported en bloc and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments en bloc, without objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 41, line 21, change the number "50" to "60."

Page 32, line 6, after the word "each" insert "headquarters in each."

Page 49, delete section 22 and insert in lieu thereof a new section 22, as follows:

"SEC. 22. The Congress declares in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured. To this end it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the Ground Forces and the Air Forces, and those in active service under this act, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists."

Page 49, strike out section 23 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 23. This act shall be effective upon its enactment."

Page 48, strike out lines 8 through 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof a new subsection (g) as follows:

"(g) The term 'organized unit' when used with respect to a Reserve component shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services which, through inadvertence, I am sure, he failed to answer before. My question relates to lines 19 to 24 on page 8 and to lines 14 to 20 on page 9 of the bill.

Due to some news report apparently a good many young men who have served for 12 months or more after September 16, 1940, in the armed forces, but also after September 2, 1945, are confused as to whether under the bill they may now be drafted.

The question is: Will that service relieve them from service under subsection (b) of section 5 of this bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. September 2, 1945, refers only to the Allied forces.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, if a man served after September 16, 1940, and up to now, for 12 months or more, he is covered by the provisions of subsection (b) of section 5 of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Under the provisions of this bill he is exempt.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps you have not beheaded this monstrous and queer animal, but certainly you have dehorned it, you have torn the very heart out of it, until I suspect there are few Members in this House who know that is going to be in the bill. You have passed amendments sugar coating a bitter pill in an election year to make the medicine more palatable, but I warn you now when this bill goes to conference if we unfortunately pass it here, again I shall be very much a lone wolf as often I have been—providing I am one of the conferees and I am not sure of that yet, and it will be thrown back into your laps with all its sugar-coating and its nice trimmings.

The only way to get rid of this is to defeat it. I want you all to bear that in mind.

Who really wants this bill? The military wants it. Generals and admirals—and I do not criticize them. They have a vested interest. In peace time they are interested in pay and promotions, many stars and much braid, and to command great bodies of men. I do not think we would be any different in their position.

Do the churches of America want this, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish? No.

Does education want it, the colleges and universities? No.

Do the farm organizations of America want it? No.

Does organized labor want it? No.

Do the fathers and mothers want it? No.

Does the youth of America want it—this uncertainty in any form that you pass peacetime conscription? No, they do not want it.

And when you get back to campaign among your people—oh, yes, emergency. While you are back there wanting to be reelected the Congress has recessed for 6 months.

An emergency! You have taken my boy Joe from the farm and Bill from the factory, and we were depending on his support and help here. You take him out of the college, the university. This is a great emergency. The fact that the

committee itself wanted to extend the time 75 or 90 days, it makes no difference which, is a frank confession that there is no emergency.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. If there is such a great emergency how come that the President is out on the west coast?

Mr. SHORT. Well, I was coming to that.

You, my colleagues, will be told, "You Congressmen voted an emergency, now you are back shaking our hands, but you are taking our boys."

The President is riding across the country at the taxpayers' expense in a political campaign under the cry of emergency.

Oh, emergency! Emergency! How many crimes have been committed in thy name?

Mr. Chairman, I feel sorry for the draft boards of this country that will be forced to draft 250,000 men out of more than 2,000,000 and when we get back here in the new Congress we do not know whether we will be or not. But when we come back we are going to get letters from Bill Smith and Joe Jones saying, "Why did you not take my neighbor's boy instead of taking mine?"

Members of Congress, think it over; think it over. God help you to use a little of the common sense which the good Lord and your parents gave you. Kill this bill. Bury it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER: Amend H. R. 6401, on page 43, line 1, by inserting after the period the following: "Section 22 (b) (relating to exclusions from gross income) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out 'January 1, 1949' wherever occurring therein, and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1951.' Section 10 (b) of the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 384, 80th Cong.), entitled 'An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II' is hereby amended by striking out 'January 1, 1949' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1951'."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I make a point of order against the amendment. It has to do with the revenue laws and should be considered by the Ways and Means Committee. The amendment may be very meritorious but it is clearly out of order on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, first I make the point of order that the point of order of the gentleman comes too late.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, no. I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that the gentleman from Minnesota was on his feet as was the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Chair was endeavoring to recognize either of the gentlemen.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a minute or two on the point of order.

Section 14 of the bill provides for the pay and allowances of the members who will be inducted under this bill. My amendment has reference to their pay and allowances and merely seeks to maintain the same rate of pay as is now in existence for the men in the armed services whose rate of pay will be changed in January next.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Committee on Armed Services should support this amendment. I want to call attention to the fact that the only purpose of the amendment is to maintain the same salaries and allowances that the men are now receiving under the terms of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has examined the text of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. Clearly the amendment proposes to legislate on the Internal Revenue Code which is legislation that would be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Therefore the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

PAY OF SERVICEMEN SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO INCOME TAXES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, under existing law, these men who would be drafted—who would be called upon to sacrifice 2 years of civilian life to the military service of their country, with all this means in disruption of their education, careers, and personal plans—would, after January 1, 1949, be subject to Federal income taxes, and would have withheld by the finance officer a portion of their monthly base pay.

Imagine what a contribution to morale that will be to the men drafted in the next few months who would for a short time receive their full pay and allowances. Then, after next New Year's eve, they will be told that their Uncle Sam is making a cut in their pay by the amount of the income-tax liability. Mr. Chairman, that is a hang-over they will long remember—even those who strictly abstain from intoxicating beverages.

And the soldiers and wives who have voluntarily undertaken the military life, either temporarily or as a career, may very well feel that their Government has broken faith. The articles of partnership under which they began their service will have been broken, and it is only to be expected that they will be sorely discouraged by this breach of faith. At the present time, compensation received for active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States below the grade of commissioned officer or commissioned warrant officer is excluded from gross income for Federal income-tax purposes.

Section 14 of H. R. 6401 provides that persons inducted for service under the act—

Shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the armed forces to which they are assigned.

Mr. Chairman, this section, dealing with the pay and allowances of servicemen, should, in my opinion, be amended to insure that the existing modest pay and allowances of these servicemen, as well as the servicemen who have volunteered, are not diminished by application of the Federal tax laws.

I have prepared an amendment, which I shall offer at the proper time, to amend section 14 of H. R. 6401 to continue for another 2-year period the existing exemption of the military pay of noncommissioned military personnel. And, Mr. Chairman, it seems only fair that, pending the completion of a study now under way by the Advisory Committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense on the revision of the scales of military pay and allowance of both enlisted men and officers, the existing tax treatment should be continued for officers as well as enlisted men for another 2 years. Accordingly, my amendment would continue for another 2 years the existing tax exemptions and exclusions, under which enlisted men are fully tax-exempt on their military pay, and officers have the benefit of a special exclusion of the first $1,500 of their military pay.

The following table summarizes the base pay and taxes of enlisted men, effective January 1, 1949, unless my amendment is adopted:

	Base pay		Total tax per year	Monthly withholding
	Per month	Per year		
Private	$75	$900	$37	$2.80
Private, first class	80	960	44	4.00
Corporal	90	1,080	63	5.10
Sergeant	100	1,200	82	6.90
Staff sergeant	115	1,380	108	8.10
Technical sergeant	135	1,620	141	11.70
Master sergeant	165	1,980	197	16.50

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDIS: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"No person shall be required to register, and no person shall be inducted, under this act until such time as the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States Delegate to the United Nations organization unanimously agree that everything possible has been done by the Government of the United States to secure the abolition of compulsory military service in all the major nations."

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that this bill is unconstitutional. I want to quote from Daniel Webster in the House of Congress on December 9, 1814:

Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained that you may take children from their parents and parents from their children and compel them to fight the battles of any war which the folly or the wickedness of government may engage in?

Mr. Chairman, this bill is an attempt to exercise the power of forcing the freemen of this country into the ranks of

the Army. It is in no way connected with the militia, nor, included within any of the powers which Congress possesses over them. We have the power to enact laws for the organization and discipline of the militia. We can call into service any portion of the militia of the States and govern them during the continuance of such service.

The services of the men to be raised under this bill are not limited to repel invasion, suppress insurrection or execute the laws; but for the general objects of war. The administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the Regular Army by compulsion.

I know Congress has the power to raise and support armies. Congress also has the power to borrow money. How is it to exercise this power? Is it confined to voluntary loans? Congress might resort to forced loans, if you can have peacetime compulsory military training, if you resort to forced loans in America, and if you make men work, then you have a dictatorship.

I would like to quote once more from Daniel Webster. The same situation exists today as it did in 1814.

> It is time for Congress to examine and decide for itself. It has taken things on trust long enough. It has followed Executive recommendation till there remains no hope of finding safety in that path. What is there, sir, that makes it the duty of this people now to grant new confidence to the administration, and to surrender their most important rights to its discretion? Of what merits of its own does it rest this extraordinary claim?

Compulsory military service would result in greater restrictions over the lives and activities of our people, would impose heavy burdens on them, causing greater taxes and profound changes in their way of life. Compulsory military service has long been customary in many European states and elsewhere, but has been contrary to American tradition since the founding of our Republic. It has never prevented war in Europe or elsewhere, but on the contrary, cause suspicion and fears to grow between nations and inclines the rulers of men to war rather than to peace.

An agreement between the nations of the world to eliminate systems of compulsory military service would itself be greatly conducive to that restoration of peace which is so profoundly desired by all the plain peoples of the world, and would release their energies and resources for rebuilding their war-devastated countries. World-wide abolition of compulsory military service in no way precludes the maintenance of national or international military forces adequate for safeguarding national or collective security.

Therefore, before the United States adopts peacetime compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States Delegate to the United Nations organization, should be urged to work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be eliminated from the policies and practices of all major nations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Landis amendment and the oft-repeated quotation from Daniel Webster, I want to say that while Daniel Webster was recognized as a great constitutional lawyer his interpretation of the constitutional powers and obligations were given more than a century ago. I believe they do not apply with the same force today as when originally given. The Constitution is a growing thing and the pronouncements of the greatest constitutional lawyer stating his views a hundred-and-thirty-odd years ago may not be a correct interpretation. I respect Daniel Webster as the great expounder of the Constitution in his day and for his time, but that is not to say that he would have the same views today, or, if he did, that such would be the correct view today.

As an instructor of our youth in civic obligations and duties, I have always believed and taught the following, as is a quotation from an elementary textbook which I prepared more than 20 years ago. It will be seen from the quotation that my view differs materially from the view of Daniel Webster as quoted by the gentleman from Indiana. The quotation is as follows:

> The Constitution (the State and the Federal combined, or either alone) is very powerful, both to give and to take away, to protect and to require. It saved a young New England hobo, alone and friendless, from prison when he was wrongfully accused of stealing automobile tires. It took a student from a quiet home in Arizona and called upon him to give up his life on the battlefield of France.

Mr. Chairman, I have had little to say in this debate on renewing Selective Service—perhaps too little—but I have had plenty to think, and they are heart-piercing thoughts. I do not believe, and I cannot believe, that our national security is hazarded by any possible foe today as much as it was hazarded in 1940 when war had actually broken out and the flame of World War II had started. I know that some regard the danger greater. If I thought that the situation today is anything like comparable, or that our risk was as great now as in 1940, I should be equally willing now as then to take every possible step toward insuring national security. In my opinion there is no military force threatening us today with conquest and enslavement as there was pushing abroad in the world in 1940. Without doubt there is a foe to hazard us, but it is a foe that cannot be met in this way by the passage of this bill. We must ward off this foe in an effective way.

It seems that we lack consideration. I cannot search the heart of my colleagues, but I have sad and painful memories of 1940 and 1941. At that time, as now, I feared militarism and hated the very thought of peacetime conscription, but I voted for the Selective Service Act in 1940 and did it because I felt that the very safety of my country depended upon it. I had two sons who donned the uniform of our country, and I thought and hoped it was only for a period of one years' training, as it was then universally considered—and then what? Those votes will stand forever in our memories, burned in with white heat.

On August 12, 1941, a bill was brought into this chamber to extend the term of service and to authorize the President to send our men overseas, if need be. That vote I shall never forget. Before the vote was taken that day I went to the majority leader's desk and I asked my Democratic colleague in charge of the bill: "My God! Is this bill necessary?" Said he: "John, I have a son in uniform. If I knew that the passage of this bill today meant his death in battle, even so I must vote for it for our national safety." The vote was taken. There were 203 yeas and 202 nays. There are many who believe that the successful outcome of the recent war hinged on that vote. All I know is that it was a cruel vote. I voted "yea" on that roll call. I do believe that the very safety of my country depended upon that vote, but it has cost my family untold anguish and my own flesh and blood paid the price of that conviction.

Is the situation today comparable? If I could feel that it is, or be convinced that the danger to America from abroad is as great, my vote would be the same today as on August 12, 1941. I feel confident the danger from abroad today is exaggerated but we cannot be sure, we cannot know, and we cannot jeopardize our country. And in addition to our sworn constitutional duty—our patriotic duty—we have international commitments we must carry out and an obligation to those now abroad carrying out those obligations. It is with a heavy heart and a sense of duty that I shall vote for this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened now for many, many weary hours to the debate on this bill. I came here hoping I would be able to have my conscience appeased and be able to support some type of legislation. As matters now stand I could not under any circumstances support the legislation pending before this House, and I am going to vote against it. I am going to vote against it because I would not dare go back home and face the people I represent and say I voted for a bill in the shape this bill is in at the present time.

I am acting under no illusions about it because the committee is letting almost every Member of the House offer his favorite amendment to this bill, to make him feel good and weight it down with a lot of sugar-coating, as the gentleman from Missouri said. You know and I know that when this bill comes back from conference, if we pass it, it will come back stripped of all these amendments, and it will be the bill the Committee on Armed Services wants. I for one do not

intend to vote for a bill under those circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here 10 years now. I was here in 1938, 1939, and 1940. I remember the debates and the fights in the well of this House during those years when we were in session until 2 o'clock in the morning and 1 o'clock in the morning. I cast those votes, the same as many of you did during those years, and you are still here and so am I. When they called me an isolationist and called me a Hitlerite, as they will call you a "Communistite" or something else if you do not go along with everything that they ask for, why, I survived. The people I represented said they wanted me to vote honest convictions. My majority jumped from 17,000 to 26,000 to 40,000 in the face of that sort of behavior. I want you to know I have just come back from my people, and have attended a State convention of the people of the my State. You will face the issue if you vote for this bill. You will face those people when you go back home. When you vote for the kind of bill that is submitted here today with an amendment that the committee unanimously submitted, even though the chairman stated in the well of the House that he himself was opposed to the committee amendment, what kind of a bill do you expect to get back from the conference?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman think we have reached the point where we want to transplant the Prussian philosophy from Potsdam to the Pentagon?

Mr. KEEFE. I am not thinking of transplanting the Nazi philosophy. What I am thinking of is the American philosophy and the maintenance of the American philosophy.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has stated the problem before the House absolutely correctly. The committee has accepted many amendments, knowing that they will be thrown out in conference. The bill that is passed by the House will not be the bill that will come back from the conference. The whole thing is a subterfuge and I do not think we should be a party to it.

Mr. KEEFE. In the interest of trying to get something done instead of carrying on this spectacle here in the House on this bill, why not bring this bill to a vote? Everybody knows how they are going to vote on this bill. Why carry on this silly thing of presenting all these amendments and having the bill sugarcoated? Let us vote on this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Will the Chairman advise the Committee how many amendments are on the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that eight amendments are on the Clerk's desk at this time. And 2 more have just been added, making 10.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill and all sections thereto and all amendments thereto close at 8 o'clock.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 8 o'clock, 10 minutes to be reserved for the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REED of New York and Mr. PLOESER) there were—ayes 112, noes 45.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if I do not have the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had been recognized but yielded to the gentleman from New York, so the time has come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was assured it was not coming out of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I specifically stated in the parliamentary inquiry that the time was not to be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. COOLEY. Otherwise, I would never have yielded the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman at this time under the agreement reached.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the ruling of the Chair on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have listened with great interest to this debate. Rather substantial and persuasive arguments have been made, both by the proponents and opponents of the pending measure. While I had not intended to speak or to say on the floor of the House anything further than that which I have already said concerning the pending bill, I feel constrained to do so, since listening to the speech of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. As he spoke I was mindful of another day, March 12, 1940, when the selective service bill was before the House and when the gentleman from Missouri entertained exactly the same views as he entertains at the present time. He was just as vociferous and perhaps far more eloquent than he is today in his denunciation of the bill providing for selective service, upon which a final vote was taken on August 12, 1940. I wonder now what would have happened had his views prevailed on August 12, 1940, when selective service was continued by the bare margin of one single vote. We all know that had the gentleman's views prevailed at that time our armed forces would have been completely demoralized and our Nation would have been defenseless when the Japs struck Pearl Harbor only a few short months later. I might even say, "Isolation, isolation, oh, what crimes have been committed in thy name."

The gentleman from Missouri asks who was for this bill. He said the churches are not for it; the colleges and universities are not for it; the mothers and fathers are not for it; the farm organizations and labor organizations are not for it. Certainly none of these organizations are for war. I might ask the gentleman who and what organization in America is for war. The fact remains that we had a war and glorious and gallant victories were won. The institutions of America were saved, and brave men died on crimson seas and on the altars of freedom throughout the world.

If this were only a peacetime military conscription bill and I so regarded it, I would certainly not vote for it or give it the benefit of my support, but, gentlemen, we are not living in normal times. Our armed forces are not at home on American soil. The documents of peace have not been drafted. Only the cease-fire order has been issued. We are certainly not too far removed from at least the possibilities of conflict. Our armies are scattered throughout the world and American men are in distant lands. Certainly the young men of America do not want to abandon the vocations and avocations of private life and to be inducted into the armed services and to cross the seas and to serve and to suffer the hardships of military life in the distant outposts in different parts of the world, where the Stars and Stripes have been planted.

While I appreciate the inconvenience and the burdens of military service even at this hour, even after the victories have been won and men have by the millions been maimed and murdered, I am not unmindful of the blood that has been shed and of the lives that have been lost in the cause of freedom. We are not now about to draft men from their peaceful pursuits merely for the purpose of training them for combat. If this were merely a training bill, perhaps 6 months would be sufficient. If this were a draft bill preparatory to war, perhaps even 2 years would be long enough. In time of war men were inducted for the duration, and only God knew how long that would be. The men we are now about to bring into the services will stand guard in the graveyards of the living dead, where their brethren fell on foreign shores, and where they rest tonight beneath the Stars and Stripes in the cemeteries of the world. Yes; cease-fire orders have been issued, and the men now going into the service will not be shot and maimed and murdered unless the victories won on the battlefields of the past are imperiled. While we are thinking about the effect that this will

have on the youth of America, let us contemplate the lives of those who died in the uniforms of their country. Yes; let us realize that the world is far from peace.

I am thinking now, ladies and gentlemen, not only of those Americans who sleep in the graveyards of the world, but of those Americans who tonight are separated from their homes and loved ones and who stand watch on distant battlefields. Yes, I am thinking of those 5,000 American boys in Trieste and of the 10,000 in Berlin, and of the other thousands of boys who served their country in Vienna, of those who served mid the shambles of Tokyo and Yokohama, and of those who tonight are looking on the gray ashes of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, who want to come home to their mothers and fathers, to their loved ones, their wives and their sweethearts. Who is going to relieve them if we do not provide replacements?

Just last fall I traveled through the countries of Europe and about a year ago I went with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], a very pleasant and charming companion, into other parts of the world. Yes, and I have visited our troops in the islands of the Pacific, and I can tell you that I did not see a single American boy who did not want to come home. How can they come home if we do not furnish the necessary replacements?

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] asks who is for this bill. My answer to him is that every military man in America—in the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps, in the National Guard and the Reserve Corps. Yes; every man from the Commander in Chief down to the last private who is now on duty across the sea. Yes; every man who has faith and confidence in those to whom we actually entrusted the destinies of this Nation in the cruel hours and in the uncertain months of a great conflict in which our Nation's greatest victories were won. Can it be possible that all of these men are warmongers? Is this great Armed Services Committee of ours so dumb that they would be duped and misled? If I were not convinced that this bill were necessary and absolutely essential to the safety and security of my Nation, I would oppose it.

We were told—and I still believe—that the Selective Service was the democratic way of raising an army. The rich and the poor, the black and the white, the high and the low, from all walks of life, wore the same uniforms and they fought for the same righteous cause. We are now told that American patriotism can be bought for a price. The opponents of this bill say that if we will pay men enough they will volunteer for the armed forces. We are told that the dollar sign will attract men and that in pursuit of proper pay they will be willing to abandon their homes and firesides and flock into the services, to be shipped across the sea and to serve in foreign lands.

I am willing to provide adequate and substantial pay for every man who wears the uniform, but is it worth more to serve in the postwar period, when the shooting is over, than it was to serve when the world was on fire and human blood was running in rivulets and making crimson the seven seas? The fighting men of America never went on a strike and they never failed to fight because of the lack of pay. I am willing now to increase the pay, but I am not willing to increase it merely for the purpose of attracting men in the armed services. Can the Nation ever in war or peace afford to pay the members of our own forces according to their own talents. Those of professions bled and died with those in the lowly walks of life in times of war, and this has always been true, and I am sure that it ever shall be true. The rich and the mighty, the weak and the poor all rally to the standards of freedom when our way of life is challenged. By the method we are now about to employ the men to be drafted will come from the homes of the rich and the poor alike, and they will serve together, to the end that the victories which have been won shall not be lost, and the men who have died shall not have died in vain.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. REED of New York. It is perfectly obvious to me and to every man in the House that I offer this amendment to obtain time. It will be the first time that I have taken the floor on this bill so I have no apology to make. I will probably take no more time than this 5 minutes.

I know something about the American boy. I have worked with them and I have trained them over a great period of years. I know something of their ideals when they come under proper influences at home and go to the right kind of colleges and schools.

I think the most important thing about this whole conscription bill is this: First, that it is not necessary; and, next, it is taking the boys at a very formative age and destroying certain ideals that have been inculcated in them under proper home influences and school influences. You cannot tell me that if a boy is taken for 2 years or even for 1 year and put under Army control, as this bill proposes, that his whole outlook on life and his whole attitude toward this Republic will not be changed.

I knew a boy before this last war who came from a fine American home, trained in the best American tradition, he was drafted, taken from school, and was killed in the service. He excelled in his classes and in athletics, was a fine oarsman. When he was killed some of his buddies got together and went up to Canada, where the tragedy took place, to see if they could find something he had left that they might bring back to his parents in their distress. What did they find? They found this little document up there entitled "My Guide," and they took it back to the old folks in Pennsylvania. Let me read it to you:

MY GUIDE

To respect my country, my profession, and myself. To be honest and fair with my fellowmen, as I expect them to be honest and square with me. To be a loyal citizen of the United States of America. To speak of it with praise and act always as a trustworthy custodian of its good name. To be a man whose name carries weight with it wherever it goes. To remember that success lies within myself, in my own brain, my own ambition, my own courage and determination. To expect difficulties and to force my way through them; to turn hard experience into capital for future struggles.

To steer clear of dissipation and guard my health of body and peace of mind as a most precious stock in trade.

Finally, to take a good trip on the joys of life, to play the game like a man; to fight against nothing so hard as my own weakness, and to grow in strength a gentleman, a Christian.

There is America! Preserve that part of America. Do not take them into the Army during the formative age of their lives.

This bill should be killed here and now.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. In answer to our good friends, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who pointed out that I led the fight against the extension of the draft that carried by only one vote, we were told then that this was a peace measure, this would insure peace. I told you that it was another step leading us inevitably into war.

Well, the fact of the matter is, they got the draft law that was going to keep us out of war and insure peace. They repealed the arms embargo, they repealed the Neutrality Act, they armed merchant vessels, and all of the rest of it. They carried every measure they wanted; and we were not kept out of war, and today the whole world finds itself in wreck and ruin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time be divided among those who have amendments on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

The question comes up, Shall you implement the foreign policy of the United States by real action and by having a force that will be respected wherever our boys may be? Or shall you immediately at the close of this debate abdicate everything and side with people who have been

called isolationists and probably yet proudly wear the badge? Or shall you take the challenge as the United States did early in 1941, when this House of Representatives, by a vote of one person, decided to continue the draft?

I was one of those fellows who registered in the draft for World War II and later volunteered, but I had no such resentment the way these people talk here. And, believe you me, while in the Navy I was glad to serve and proud to be with those fellows. I did not think that we were rising then to our opportunities and our responsibilities when we had many people in the country saying: "Just sit down and fold your hands; Hitler will take care of himself; so will Tojo; so will the Emperor."

It did not work out, and Pearl Harbor happened. I am not one of those who wants to push militarism, but I do want to defend the United States of America, and I want our forces to be protected wherever they are.

You are not playing fair with the boys at Trieste, as the gentleman from North Carolina said, unless you give them adequate backing. You are not playing fair with the people who are clear out in Yokohama and Tokyo, Berlin and Vienna, unless there are replacements for them. You are not playing fair with the boys wherever they may be away from this country unless you give them more than a token force and a token backing by those of us in civilian life.

I hope the preferential motion will be voted down.

May I finish by saying that wherever our Army is, I want to see them well taken care of. I want to see our foreign policy well implemented.

In closing, may I ask the Armed Services Committee why our occupation policy in Japan is so fixed that the Coca-Cola Co. gets twice the number of yen when it changes its dollars into occupation currency as the missions of our churches and our educational associations? Why are they given the first priority by the State Department and the occupation forces when our people who are the missionaries and educators have to pay $1 for 50 yen? What is it that the Coca-Cola Co. has? What is this inside track? What is the inside track that the other commercial firms have over the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish charities so these worthy church activities have to pay the highest rate of exchange there is?

If we are going to have a draft policy, we better straighten out some of the Army occupation policies. I would like to see the Armed Services Committee and State Department look into this portion of the Japanese occupation, and let the American people know the full facts. This discrimination against our churches and charities should be changed at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER: Page 44, line 2, after the period, insert "*Provided*, That no person inducted into or enlisted in the armed forces for training and service under this act during the period of such service as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator, or Member of the House of Representatives shall be required to pay any poll tax, or other tax, or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair has examined the amendment. It seems to deal entirely with persons who are inducted or enlisted in the armed forces under this act. The Chair holds that the amendment is germane and overrules the point of order.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this was a part of the Selective Service Act that was passed during the Second World War. The other body incorporated it in the bill that it acted upon favorably only last week. I am sure you all understand it. It provides that any person who is inducted under this law is not subject to a payment of a poll tax or any other tax during his period of service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 106, noes 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments I have on the desk be read successively and that we consider them together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER: Page 44, line 11, after the period, insert "under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claims of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purpose of this section a business enterprise shall be determined to be 'small business' if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated."

Page 46, after line 10, insert the following:

"(d) (1) The President is empowered through the Secretary of Defense to require all producers of steel in the United States to make available to individuals, firms, associations, companies, corporations, or organized manufacturing industries having orders for steel products, or steel materials required by the armed forces, such percentages of the steel production of such producers, in equal proportion, deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of orders for such products or materials. Compliance with such requirement shall be obligatory on all such producers of steel and such requirement shall take precedence over all orders and contracts theretofore placed with such producers. If any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refuses to comply with such requirement, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant or plants of such producer, and, through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces, to insure compliance with such requirement. Any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refusing to comply with such requirement shall be deemed guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

"(2) The President shall report to the Congress on the final day of each 6 months' period following the date of enactment of this act the percentage figure, or if such information is not available, the approximate percentage figure, of the total steel production in the United States required to be made available during such period for the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials required by the armed forces, if such percentage figure is in excess of 10 percent."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, these amendments fit in with the committee amendments which are part of the bill, and part of the draft legislation in World War I and World War II. So far as I am concerned, we will accept the amendments.

Mr. VINSON. There is no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: On page 44, line 11, after the period add a new subsection to read as follows:

"SEC. . (a) Every contract entered into by the United Sttaes for the supplying of goods or services to be used by, for, or in connection with any person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under the provisions of this act shall specify, as a condition thereof, that the company or individual with whom the contract is made shall not discriminate in the employment of any person, or in the terms and conditions of employment of any person, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, and shall specify that a breach of such condition shall result in the termination of such contract. It shall be the duty of every contracting officer making a contract on behalf of the United States for the supplying of such goods or services to terminate immediately any such contract when he is satisfied that the condition prescribed by this section has been breached.

"(b) No member of the armed forces or person in the employ of the United States shall procure any goods or services to be used by, for, or in connection with any person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces of the United States under the provisions of this act from any company or individual which discriminates in the employment of any person, or in the terms and conditions of employment of any person, because of his race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment goes far beyond the realm of this legislation. It reminds me of the Englishman shingling his house. He said there was such a fog that the first thing he knew he had shingled 15 or 20 feet out on the fog. This amendment goes so far from the purposes of this legislation that I cannot understand why anybody would offer it who knows anything about the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is germane. Section 17 (a) deals with procurement and purchase of materials. The amendment simply specifies what kind of contracts must be entered into in the procurement of materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the amendment and is inclined to believe that under the broad purposes of the bill the amendment is in order. It seeks to effectuate portions of the declaration of policy and relates to persons and duties within the scope of the bill. The Chair accordingly overrules the point of order.

Under the order of the Committee heretofore entered, the last 10 minutes were to be reserved to the members of the committee. Therefore, the Chair is unable to recognize the gentlewoman for debate in support of her amendment.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California.

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I offer would require fair-employment practices of any company or individual selling goods or services to the Government under any selective-service program.

Mr. Chairman, when we draft men to serve in the Army—even though the draft is not necessitated because of a war emergency—we propose to put this Nation on a war basis.

President Roosevelt issued an Executive order before our entrance into World War II reaffirming a policy of full participation in the defense program by all persons, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, and directing certain action in furtherance of said policy.

Executive Order 8802 read in part:

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the national defense program by all citizens of the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders; and

Whereas there is evidence that available and needed workers have been barred from employment in industries engaged in defense production solely because of consideration of race, creed, color, or national origin, to the detriment of workers' morale and of national unity;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and as a prerequisite to the successful conduct of our national defense production effort, I do hereby reaffirm the policy of the United States that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries or Government because of race, creed, color, or national origin, and I do hereby declare that it is the duty of employers and of labor organizations, in furtherance of said policy and of this order, to provide for the full and equitable participation of all workers in defense industries, without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin;

And it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for defense production shall take special measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin;

2. All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all defense contracts hereafter negotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any worker because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The need for unity and justice is as great today as it was when President Roosevelt issued his Executive order.

The Republican platform included an unequivocal endorsement of permanent FEPC legislation. I regret that the leadership of this Congress has not seen fit to allow FEPC legislation to come out of committee so that the House and Senate might vote on it.

FEPC has met the fate of all other needed social legislation—housing, price control, health, old-age pensions, education, and anti-poll-tax and antilynch legislation.

The Republican leadership now has the opportunity to at least support and pass this amendment which will guarantee fair employment practices in those plants which will supply materials for the men who will be drafted under this bill.

That is the very least that can be done for the Negro soldier.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. DOUGLAS) there were—ayes 28, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MITCHELL: On page 48, line 19, after the word "act", insert these words "or at such earlier time as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress for that purpose."

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order heretofore entered, the committee reporting the bill was entitled to 10 minutes. The chairman of the committee has advised the Chair that he would be content with 5 minutes. It is now 5 minutes before 8 o'clock, so the chairman of the committee is entitled to the remaining time to close debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], a member of the committee, for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. According to the clock I am looking at, there are only 3 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understood according to the agreement that the committee had 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advised the gentleman from New York that he had 10 minutes remaining before the 10 minutes had begun to run. The Chair understood the chairman to say that he would be content with 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understand that I still have 5 minutes remaining myself. I then yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], who has a very important announcement to make about the court-martial bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that he has consumed part of the time of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the motion was carried to close debate at 8 o'clock, is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There are only 2½ minutes left until 8 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be an opportunity to vote on amendments when the time has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to try to lecture the House, as the gentleman from Missouri has done. We in the House who were here in 1939 and 1940 remember the many lectures we received. What we are facing here is something realistic. It is realistic because most of you Members have voted for a budget for 1949 of $17,500,000,000.

Initial 1949 budget request	$10,600,000,000
Supplemental 1949 request	3,200,000,000
Amount shown in United States Budget for UMT	500,000,000
Initial 1949 budget request and supplement for stock piling	700,000,000
Additional amount for new aircraft approved by Congress	800,000,000
Additional amount required to implement H. R. 6401	1,700,000,000

Which makes a total of $17,500,000,000.

You gentlemen here in the Congress have voted for this. You have voted for the material. You have voted for those supplies. You have voted for everything except the personnel to carry out this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

In accordance with the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] for the balance of the time, 2 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. There are not 2 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is keeping time by the clock at the back of the Chamber.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, in general debate I indicated that at the conclusion of the reading of the pending bill, I would offer the military justice bill as an amendment. Since it is not essential that it be offered in order that it become a part of the bill we are now considering, I will, in the interest of saving time at this late hour, not offer the military justice bill as an amendment. It is not necessary for the reason the other body has adopted the military justice bill as it was written by the House as an amendment to the Senate bill. If I were to offer the bill, which is 47 pages long, as an amendment at this time, and unanimous consent were not obtained to dispense with reading it, the reading clerk might have to read the entire bill. Furthermore it would then be open for amendment as each section would be read.

We can save all of this time because when the House conferees meet in conference with the Senate conferees, if this bill is passed, the House conferees can simply agree to the Senate amendment. The same result will be accomplished as if we attached the military justice bill to the pending bill at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has expired.

All time has expired under the order heretofore entered.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point in the order in which they are handed in.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know at this point what has happened to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked, "What emergency makes this action necessary?"

Mr. Chairman, it is common knowledge that the emergency which compels this action is that we have a President who has so mismanaged our foreign affairs since the close of World War II that he has not only come close to losing all for which World War II was fought but has also brought us close to the brink of another war. For a strong President diplomacy is sufficient but a weak President needs a big Army. That is the emergency and I do not believe we are going to improve permanently our prestige among foreign nations until we permanently improve our President. That is the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide that by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress the bill if enacted into law could be terminated without consent of the President at any time.

A BANKRUPT FOREIGN POLICY REQUIRES MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, since 1919, as a member of the American Legion I have urged adequate national defense for this country. I contend today that world conditions require a strong defense system. The question before the House turns upon the method we ought to use in order to secure the manpower to equip such a system. I am unalterably opposed to drafting men for military service in time of peace. So far in this debate there has been no showing of need for a 2,000,000-man peacetime Army. Nor has there been a showing that it is impossible for the armed services to recruit a sufficient number by voluntary enlistment. In fact the record shows that mental and physical standards have been raised to such a high degree that four out of five boys are being rejected. Further, there is no evidence in the record to show that we need 2,000,000 men in the services except a statement in the majority report that it is necessary "in order to provide the Nation with minimum adequate security" and then the committee fails to prove its contention.

I am quite certain, Mr. Chairman, that we can build an adequate defense for this country, first, by adopting and promoting a sensible recruiting program and, second, by placing the responsibility for a strong Reserve system upon the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, with proper pay schedules for each group. It is in the American tradition that in time of emergency this country relies upon civilians—a civilian Army—to defend our homes and institutions. Let us not depart therefrom.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is much more important than the drafting of our young men for military service, important as that is. As I see it, the President and the State Department are here confessing that our foreign policy is a bankrupt institution. We are here considering a call for soldiers who will be trained to fight an enemy somewhere in the world. A call such as that comes when diplomats fail—when our State Department seeks to bolster its position by a show of force. Passage of this bill means that troops will move at the command of the President.

Our foreign policy, Mr. Chairman, started in a tail spin at Teheran; it was accelerated at Yalta, and it crashed at Potsdam. Today we are reaping the evils of a bankrupt foreign policy which the unfortunate Mr. Marshall inherited from his predecessors. He is doing his best but it is not enough in view of the international debacle.

We were told, Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the European recovery program that it was imperative that we vote the requested billions as that was the only alternative to many more billions for increased armament. The ultimatum was: Take ERP or a large standing Army, Navy, and Air Corps. But here we are today, Mr. Chairman, after having voted for the European recovery program, asking for that huge defense force, notwithstanding. Does that make sense? Who lied? Who fooled the American people—or did they? Not only is the President asking all these things but he will soon enter into military alliances with the 16 European countries. This is now our foreign policy—a world WPA, military alliances, and military conscription.

We are engaged in a power program to augment our futile foreign policy and if continued it will lead us to the same identical place where other countries have gone which embraced the principle of force and that is: straight to destruction. If we adopt this legislation we must follow through and approve economic controls, manpower controls, and the regimentation that goes with dictatorial power. There will be no escape from that kind of situation. We need only look to the history of empires to discover that they lead down blind alleys and the enslavement of their people. Is that what we fought two world wars for? Is this the liberty and freedom we hear so much about from official Government papers?

Mr. Chairman, we must turn from the wild embrace of force and build a strong constructive foreign policy by strict adherence to principles that have made this country the greatest, most productive on earth. We must seek peace by reliance upon law—international law—and not upon the whim, the will or capriciousness of individuals. Leagues of nations, world government, or united nations do not hold out hope for a peaceful world as we now realize.

The way to a just and lasting peace must come through individuals who will at all times under all circumstances say "and my neighbor."

The Bible has this to say, Mr. Chairman, about my theme:

> Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit, saith the Lord God of Hosts.

Might is only temporary, but the spirit remains forever.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that we cannot obtain the increased armed strength we need without a draft law.

To me the most amazing thing about this long debate is that no one is seriously challenging our need for increased manpower in our armed forces. Section 2 of the bill states the increased numbers needed for adequate armed strength. They are: Army, 837,000; Navy and Marine Corps, 666,882; Air Force, 502,000; total, 2,005,882. Amid the avalanche of amendments in the past few days it is

significant that not one was offered to reduce these increased numbers. Where did these numbers come from? Why, from the despised and derided brass and braid, our generals and admirals, who recently had something to do with winning two wars at once. Why did no one challenge these figures by amendment? Because none of us except expert military men know exactly how to figure our manpower needs to fit our security problem. Why did we all accept without formal challenge these estimates that are over four times our prewar peacetime strength? Because we all know that, whatever this is now, this is not peacetime. Members have misquoted Secretary Marshall as having said there is no danger of war. Of course, he did not say this. I venture to say no Member of Congress thinks this. No Member in his right mind would vote to sustain the largest Navy on earth, to build a 70-group air force, if he thought there was no danger of war. During this debate many Members have tried to measure this danger in words, the danger from Soviet aggression. The acts of this House speak louder than the words of any Member our collective measure of the degree of danger; we have voted for a great Navy, a 70-group air force, a modern Army, and have accepted without amendment an increase to over 2,000,000 men for these forces. This is not a peacetime force. This is not peacetime conscription we are considering.

This force will require about 900,000 new men next year, to replace expiring enlistments and provide the necessary increases. The Army say they cannot obtain them by recruiting alone. If I thought, as some of my colleagues do, that the Army was deliberately sabotaging its own recruiting program, deliberately jeopardizing our national defense to put over the draft or UMT, I would immediately demand the court martial of the responsible officers on charges of treason; I would certainly vote against any appropriations at all to be handled by such traitors. I do not believe these charges. I know the weaknesses of our military men; they make mistakes, they are often inefficient and wasteful, but whenever I have tested them they have been trying hard to get physically sound recruits with at least a fifth-grade mentality. I have checked on generals, captains, and recruiting sergeants, and they cannot get enough recruits now. In 1940 and 1941 and during the war I thought volunteering had nothing to do with the draft. In the last 2 years I have realized that I was wrong and that the possibility of being drafted stimulates volunteering. I do not blame our boys and young men. They have grown up during a period when their country used selective service in time of need, and they naturally think that if there is need for them their Government will put selective service in force. It is quite possible that, with the draft law on the books sufficient volunteers will be obtained, but they will not be obtained otherwise. It is interesting to note that those who approve volunteering and oppose the draft here and all over the country are not taking the lead in any recruiting drives.

The same patriotic spirit is necessary to make either conscription or volunteering work, for conscription, to be successful, must be largely voluntary, and recruiting, to be successful, must have an element of popular compulsion behind it. Our young men will respond willingly as soon as we set up a fair selective service system; we must first discharge our responsibility by voting whether we believe they are needed or not.

We must do more than prepare to wage war. We must continue to wage peace. There is pending in the House a bill to strengthen the United Nations. In paragraph 5 of section 1 of that bill we say the policy of the United States must provide for pressing for agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter, and for agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complaining nations against violation and evasion.

We should enact that bill. First, however, we must prepare to lead through strength. We must enact this draft law.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I said I would vote for this bill if the Shafer amendment were adopted.

The Shafer amendment provided that no person should be registered or inducted under this act until January 31, 1949, and then only after the President, with the concurrence of the Congress, should find that sufficient voluntary enlistments had not been provided by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign.

The amendment went on to say that this intensified campaign was to begin at once:

(a) The base pay of enlisted men was to be increased 10 percent for all grades.

(b) The passing mark on the Army Classification Test was to be reduced 10 points.

(c) Two-year new enlistments were to be accepted for all age groups suitable for military service, with enlistment privileges at least similar to those now provided for longer term enlistments.

(d) One-year and two-year reenlistments were to be accepted, with proportionate payment of any reenlistment incentives, and other privileges similar to those now provided for longer term reenlistments.

Regular monthly reports and consultation on the methods and results of the intensified campaigning were to be furnished by the armed forces to a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee established for that purpose.

The Shafer amendment was passed, but it has been changed in two major respects: The base pay of enlisted men has not been increased; and Congress has passed the buck to the President to make the final decision as to the need for a peacetime compulsory draft.

I cannot vote for the bill in its present form.

Many men are dropping out of the Army today because they cannot support their families on Army pay and because they cannot find homes for their families near Army barracks.

High prices and housing are contributing factors to the shortage of manpower in the Army. We are indeed asked to pay a high price for the failure of this Congress to pass adequate housing legislation and for its failure to check inflation.

Moreover, if a draft is to be passed—and I am willing to vote for it when the need has been irrefutably proved—Congress should review the volunteer program of the Army itself. Congress should itself determine whether or not a peacetime draft is necessary. In a matter of such great importance I do not believe we can refuse to shoulder this responsibility which is rightfully ours. Indeed, to seek to do so is to play the cheapest of political tricks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, under the request of the gentleman from New York, would it be possible for me to insert my remarks in the RECORD at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the imposition of a peacetime draft on the people of the United States. I am disappointed that the Congress did not adopt my amendment to the measure now under consideration which would have drafted excess profits at the same time we drafted boys for the armed services. Why do we think it right to draft our manhood and wrong to draft the profits which will follow as a result of this military program? Surely, if an emergency exists which calls for the drafting of our youth, no one should expect to make excess profits out of such a crisis. Everybody in this Chamber knows that my amendment represented the wishes of the great majority of our citizens. The way to stop wars is to take the profits out of war.

It has been said that we do not have time to enact a tax measure such as I have proposed. My answer is that we have plenty of time because we have the remainder of this year to enact such legislation. We do not need to adjourn on June 19, and we should not, because we have this and too much other unfinished business before us.

We have just finished a war. What did our victory—I use the word advisedly—cost us? On one side we have a total cost of $326,000,000,000 in cash, plus the dead, the wounded, and the missing; on the other, the huge profits made by our large corporations, which exceeded $56,000,000,000 in cash plus the power to dominate the lives, the welfare, and the security of our people.

What will this selective-service program mean to us? It will mean more power and money for the armed forces than they ever dreamed of having in peacetime in this Republic.

The cost of selective service and UMT to our spirits, our psychology, and our ideals will be staggering. Arnold Toynbee, the great historian, has shown that whenever the most powerful nation in any civilization has turned militaristic, it has after a brief burst of glory collapsed. That has happened 16 times to

the 16 major civilizations of the earth during the past 6,000 years. The danger we face in turning from personal independence and initiative to mass conscription is plain for all to see.

What will be the cost of this program? As I understand this measure, $2,149,000,000 would be expended for the training equipment and the initial machinery setting the program in operation, and $3,900,000,000 for reequipping the 25 divisions of the Army. These items are in addition to the $11,000,000,000 budget appropriation, the $3,400,000,000 supplementary appropriation, and the $822,000,000 Air Corps appropriation. Thus, the military budget for 1949 is seen to be more than $21,000,000,000. And yet we refuse to draft excess profits!

To indicate just how much money this is let us take just three billion of the twenty-one billion dollars and see what our Government could do with it in useful purposes for the people of the United States.

With $3,000,000,000 the United States Government could do the following things each year:

First. Construct one 10-room, modern school building in every county in the United States, a $50,000 library in every county and a $150,000 hospital in every county.

Second. Employ 10 doctors and 10 nurses full-time for schools and public-health services in every county.

Third. Purchase 10 modern school busses in every county, maintain 1 psychiatric clinic in every county and provide 10 full-time recreational workers in every county.

Fourth. Bring all schools of the counties up to a reasonable standard of efficiency, provide free education for 3,000,000 children under 18 not now in school, pay all expenses of a 3-year post-graduate course for 10,000 students each year and erect a $750,000 trade and technical school in each congressional district.

Fifth. Pay 1 year's expenses of 900,000 boys at college or technical schools.

Sixth. After all these expenditures have been made the Government would have $15,300,000 left over the first year. In subsequent years, as the counties caught up with their needs in buildings, buses, and so forth, not more than $2,000,000,000 a year would be required.

It is my belief that the passage of the selective service bill of 1948 would be one of the most tragic errors which could be committed by the Congress. Let us look at the implications of this bill from the perspective of an enlightened American citizen. We believe that this radical departure in American history—the imposition of peacetime military conscription and the expanded military program of which it is a part—will be interpreted by all nations of the world to mean that this country expects war. And so the fateful game of threat and counterthreat, bluff and counterbluff continues. The bill provides another lap in the spiraling armaments race which will bring the world crashing down on our heads.

This program is based on the hopeless assumption that the world is irrevocably divided into two power blocs, and that consequently we must abandon all semblances of peaceful relations with the other half of the planet. Less than 3 years after the completion of the most devastating of all wars, this program gives support to the charge that the United States has rejected the notion of world cooperation in favor of the long outmoded fallacy that military preparedness, advisable as it may be, can guarantee peace. The United States must not turn its back on cooperation and the United Nations as a means of insuring peace.

The proposal to establish selective service and eventually UMT in this country is another useless but highly dangerous attempt at insurance. It is useless because it would train millions of young men in the techniques of fighting the last war. It is dangerous, not only because it is provocative, but because it would train the young men of this Nation to think in terms of war rather than in terms of peace and to accustom themselves to authoritarian command rather than to the independent spirit of free citizenship.

I am not suggesting that we should be so foolish as to disarm ourselves unilaterally. We did that once, with disastrous results. We must remain strong in scientific research, in polar aviation, and wherever strength would count in an atomic war, until we can bring about universal disarmament. But I am suggesting that we make it much clearer than we have to date that we desire to disarm, and that we look to the United Nations to take over the job of policing the world—as I have constantly urged through the creation of an international police force—at the earliest possible moment. I am suggesting that we stop thinking in strategic terms which are now meaningless. And, above all, I would like to suggest that we, as responsible public officials, think more about how to prevent the next war and less about what we should do if war comes. The greatest danger of an atomic war is the widespread acceptance of its inevitability.

It is my belief that we would be remiss in our duty to the common people of this country if we did not point out the grave effects of the system of conscription on our political institutions. We must emphasize again that this is a permanent system. Let no one be deceived into the belief that this proposal for peacetime conscription is intended to be a temporary measure merely because the bill contains an expiration date. On the contrary, the record of the hearings before the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress is replete with forthright statements from authorized spokesmen of the National Military Establishment that this program is designed to remain in effect indefinitely until universal military training is adopted as the permanent law of the land. We must then anticipate the growing importance of the military bureaucracy in political affairs.

We do not shirk our obligation to expose what we consider to be the effect of this new pressure group on the processes of American democracy. Any increase requested in the appropriations for the Military Establishment, any extension of the term of service, any proposal to increase the scope and numbers of the vast military hierarchy, will have the support of a Nation-wide organization. It would be a long step away from democracy to create a Nation-wide bureaucracy, financed from public funds, and under the domination of the Military Establishment, which through its influence in elections could decide the limits of its own activities. There is, I believe, no more sinister indication for the complete submergence of American political and economic democracy than the permanent system of military training provided by this bill.

In my judgment, the United States should not begin a permanent peacetime conscription policy. No spokesman of the national defense establishment has suggested to the committee that we are today facing a crisis comparable to the 1940 situation when the draft was instituted for the only time in our peacetime history.

The considerable degree of hysteria prevalent today is in large measure due to the propaganda efforts of the armed services themselves. As pointed out by the Harness committee report, Secretary Royall admitted that the Army was spending large amounts of the taxpayers' money to obtain a permanent system of conscription. The proponents of conscription imply that the United States is helpless and unprepared. On the contrary, the inescapable facts are quite different. We have the greatest Navy in the peacetime history of the world; we have a splendid Air Force; we have the leading position in the field of ultramodern weapons of destruction, the atomic bomb, bacteriological warfare, and other developments almost too terrible to contemplate. And, finally, our industrial position is incomparably superior to any possible combination of other nations.

We have taken all steps necessary to provide the United States with an adequate defense against any enemy. The most modern weapons, the greatest Air Force and Navy in the world, the possession of the newest and most effective atomic bombs, and a modernized ground and service force backed by the productive resources and manpower of the United States are a formidable defense.

The men needed to complete our Ground Forces can be secured, just as those of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are being kept at peak requirements, through voluntary enlistments. Backed by a Reserve force and a National Guard brought to full strength, the Army will be of such size and quality as to meet all our defense requirements. Ample evidence is available to prove that no compulsory peacetime draft is needed to build up the Army to required strength.

I do not believe that we are warranted in taking such a fatal course through the passage of H. R. 6401. America is populated by many peoples, most of whom came to the New World to escape the tyranny of the Old—to escape this very Prussianism which it is now proposed to fasten upon these United States for all time. Millions of Americans have fought

and died to avoid just such slavery as it is now proposed that we legislate into existence. The compulsory peacetime draft will wreck the institutions upon which America is founded.

I am opposed to the measure before us and shall vote against it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the Clerk's desk, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 48, line 24, insert the following new section and renumber the succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 21. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Commitee on Military Policy (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of 18 members, as follows: (1) Three members who are members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, two from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (2) two members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (3) two members from the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman; (4) two members from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (5) three members who are members of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, two from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (6) two members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (7) two members from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; (8) two members from the Education and Labor Committee of the House, one from the majority and one from the minority, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee.

"A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the military policy of the United States with respect to (1) its capability to enable the United States to discharge its international responsibilities; (2) the dominance of civilian control in the military policy; (3) the training and orientation in citizenship of the personnel of the armed forces; and (4) the participation of personnel of the armed forces in the foreign and domestic affairs of the United States, and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of the military policy of the United States.

"Upon request the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over the military policy of the United States and shall make reports to the Senate and House of Representatives from time to time concerning the results of its studies together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Director, at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to the actions of the committee.

"(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman."

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The Clerk has read sufficient to demonstrate clearly that the amendment is not germane and there is no use taking up time to read any more of that stuff into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Clerk should read through this paragraph. It is not in order to interrupt in the middle of the reading of the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I do not need any advice from that source.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

(The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and not in order on this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment appoints a watchdog committee to do the one thing that the American people want to see done, and that is to see that the civilian and not the military are dominant in the military policy of the United States. It is germane to the bill also because it seeks to provide for the coordination of the military and the foreign policy of the United States, and for the training of selectees not alone in military matters, but in citizenship and the purposes for which they are being called upon to serve.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman's amendment, in my opinion, is very unheard of. It is the first time I ever heard of a congressional commission being set up with the appointments to which the Speaker of the House did not have anything to do.

Mr. JAVITS. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the committee proposed in my amendment is set up exactly as the Joint Committee for the European Recovery Program was set up according to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has examined the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York. The subject matter of the gentleman's amendment proposing the creation of a special congressional committee comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules which, of course, makes the amendment not germane and not in order.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAND: On page 47, line 19, subsection (c), strike out all of lines 19 to 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The term 'armed forces' shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard, but the provisions of this act relating to induction shall not apply to service in the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating under the Treasury Department."

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am including the following statement in the RECORD as a matter of legislative information, and as a basis for subsequent action by the Congress. I want to emphasize that the statement was not made to the House prior to the consideration of the amendment to which it refers, nor was any statement made, because at the time the amendment was offered, the House had forbidden all debate on all pending amendments so that the amendment was voted upon without a word of explanation in support of it. Under the circumstances, it is remarkable that it received as many votes as it did.

The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations concerned with the Coast Guard, and a Member who is thoroughly familiar with the problems of the Coast Guard, and other Members were prepared to support this amendment had the opportunity been afforded.

Following the defeat of the amendment, I submitted a memorandum to the conferees in a last effort to save the United States Coast Guard from the great injury done to it by the bill passed by the House. In the event that the conferees do not correct this blunder, my statement is herewith included in the

RECORD for the basis of further legislative action correcting this unfortunate situation. The explanatory statement follows:

Section 19C of the House bill reads as follows:

"The term 'armed forces' shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard (when during World War II it served, or when in the future it shall serve, under the Department of the Navy)."

The effect of this language is to deny that the Coast Guard is an "armed force" in time of peace.

In fact, the Coast Guard has been an armed force since the eighteenth century, and in law it is specifically defined as an armed force.

Fourteen United States Code 1 provides that:

"The Coast Guard shall be a military service and constitute a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States at all times."

The adoption of the language presently in the House bill will be accepted as an expression by Congress that the Coast Guard is not part of the military forces of the United States. This will have the following results:

1. It will throw into endless confusion all legislation which deals with the Coast Guard as an armed force (and I know of no legislation which does not so regard it).

2. It will have a serious effect on the morale of the present personnel.

3. It will seriously affect voluntary enlistments in the Coast Guard.

Fearing these consequences, the Secretary of the Treasury, on May 3, proposed an amendment as follows:

"The term 'armed forces' shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard, but the provisions of this act relating to induction shall not apply to service in the Coast Guard while the Coast Guard is operating under the Treasury Department."

On the same date, May 3, 1948, the Secretary of Defense replied to the Secretary of the Treasury in full as follows:

"I have your letter concerning the definition of the term 'armed forces' in the selective-service bill.

"It seems to me that the reasons you have advanced for including the Coast Guard, along with the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, are persuasive. In view of the fact that the House committee voted this morning to report out its bill on this subject, H. R. 6401, I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your letter, together with a copy of this reply, to Senator GURNEY for his consideration in connection with the final preparation in the Senate of the Senate bill.

"Particularly in the light of the language of 14 U. S. C. 1, I do not see that there can be any real question concerning the propriety of including the Coast Guard in the manner in which you have suggested."

The bill was not changed, and it came to the floor with the incorrect language used. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, I conceived it to be my duty to offer the amendment in behalf of this service. I presented the amendment in advance to both the majority and minority managers and their staff, together with a memorandum explaining its purpose, in the not unreasonable hope that the committee would accept the amendment, but they did not.

I remained on the floor continuously during the consideration of the Selective Service Act awaiting the opportunity to present the amendment, which did not occur until the final moments of consideration of the bill since the amendment was germane to page 46. The Committee of the Whole finally limited debate on all remaining amendments to 20 minutes, with the result that eight amendments, including this one, were left on the Clerk's desk without any opportunity for explanation, debate, or discussion. I, nevertheless, offered the amendment, which was read without explanation, and inevitably defeated, since few understood its purpose.

In my opinion, the language remaining in the House bill and not amended, as suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury and agreed to by the Secretary of Defense, will do a great and unwarranted and undeserved injury to one of our five armed forces.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], the able and hard-working chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, has offered his amendment. It is most important that it be adopted and that the Coast Guard be considered a component part of our military forces at all times, in peace as well as in war. I need not tell the House of the fine record made by the Coast Guard in World War II. In accordance with the law, the Coast Guard was then a part of the Navy, as it is in every war. With the return of peace, the Coast Guard reverted to its status in the Treasury Department, for the enforcement of laws and the protection of life and property. But despite the fact that it is under the Treasury, it has a military function and is part of the military services, for title 14, chapter 1, section 1, United States Code, provides:

The Coast Guard shall be a military service and constitute a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States at all times.

In keeping with its motto, Semper Paratus, the Coast Guard is always prepared for military action, and to maintain a status of military readiness. It is vital to our national security that this be recognized, which this amendment will do.

Appearing before the Treasury Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee a few weeks ago, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder said:

In the event of a national emergency the Coast Guard would again operate as part of the Navy. I have already spoken of the duties performed by the Coast Guard in World War II—duties which were assigned to that service because of its experience and special skills. Should war come again I have no doubt that the Coast Guard would be called upon to carry out the same difficult and necessary tasks. The services that the Coast Guard provides to this country in peacetime would overnight become vital war duties. In addition, national defense plans call for the Coast Guard assuming in time of national emergency additional roles, particularly with respect to our port and harbor facilities. All of these considerations make it imperative that Coast Guard vessels and establishments be manned by the requisite numbers of officers and men, and that the plant and equipment of the service be maintained in good working condition.

Congress just this week appropriated the necessary funds to permit the Coast Guard to carry out its duties; funds which will permit the service to maintain a full state of military readiness. But funds for such purpose are worthless without the men: men to perform the normal duties of the Coast Guard and carry out the assignments Coast Guard has received, under the mandates of Congress, from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, such as the maintenance of ocean weather stations, which this House approved yesterday, the operation of loran stations and high-frequency direction finders, and the establishment of other aids to navigation as well as protection against sabotage. Our highest military authorities have decided that of all military branches, Coast Guard alone is equipped and prepared to perform these important and necessary defense and security functions. Congress has granted the funds and authority, but without this amendment it may not be possible to get the men to do the job. The Coast Guard feels that the bill as presently written will have an adverse effect on recruitment. Capt. A. C. Richmond, the very able and competent Chief of the Planning and Control Staff of Coast Guard, and possessor of an outstanding war record, made this statement before the appropriations subcommittee last month, in answer to a question:

The selective service bill, as now being considered by the House, might have a very bad effect on the recruitment program for the reason that the committee, in reporting it out, and I believe feeling that they were doing the Coast Guard a favor, changed the original definition of armed forces therein to include the Coast Guard, but in such a way that it appears that the Coast Guard is not a military service in peacetime. The net result might be, if that is enacted in that form, men will be reluctant to enlist in the Coast Guard because they might be afraid of being charged with the epithet of "draft dodgers."

Captain Richmond said further:

It seems to me that an expression of opinion by the Congress, even though it is only a definition for a specific act, that in peacetime we are not a part of the armed services might have an undesirable effect.

Nothing would be more unjust than to call a man enlisting in the Coast Guard a "draft dodger." It would be not only unjust but untrue. To define the Coast Guard as anything but a military service at all times would be contrary to existing law. To deprive the Coast Guard of the requisite number of men to carry out the national defense functions assigned to it by Congress and other branches of the service would be to endanger the national security. This amendment would eliminate a possible injustice, would be in keeping with existing law, and would make possible the recruitment of manpower for the promotion of our national defense and security.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is so important that I must ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAND) there were—ayes 48, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk introduced at the request of a member of one of our hard-worked draft boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 35, line 11, after the semicolon add the following: "Each member of civilian local boards and civilian appeal boards may be paid for services rendered under this act a compensation of $1 per hour for each full hour over 16 hours in each calendar month that he is actually present at the office of the board and wholly engaged in the duties prescribed by this act for members of civilian local boards and civilian appeal boards, in no case to exceed $6 per day and $100 for any single calendar month; the determination of the amount and time of payments shall be made by the State director, whose decision shall be final, upon submission of sworn statements by the members claiming such compensation in such form and at such times as the State director shall direct."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I give my support to this bill. It is a proper and necessary step for the prevention of war, and a wise and a prudent safeguard for our country if it is ever attacked by a foreign aggressor. Failure to enact it before adjournment would be a national and international calamity. I have always believed in the wisdom and propriety of Polonius' advice to his son, Laertes:

Beware of entrance to a quarrel; but being in, bear't that the opposed may beware of thee.

UNIVERSAL HOPE FOR UNIVERSAL PEACE

The fondest hope of the human race is that there may come an endless era of universal peace, the fulfillment of the scriptural prophecy that men will "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." For centuries, idealists have dreamed, poets have sung and saints have prayed that there would dawn a day—

When the war drum throbs no longer
And the battle flags are furled
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world.

That prayer is in the hearts of millions of men and women whose homelands have been seared by the flames and riven by the plowshare of war; mothers and fathers in every American State, whose sons have left the crimson dew of their lifedrops on the battle-stained soil of other lands. It is a sublime ideal, a beautiful dream, and there might be hope for its realization if human nature were susceptible to change. The stark truth is that human nature has changed little, if any, as the human race has staggered through centuries of recorded and unrecorded time.

We saw the ideals of peace, of which Woodrow Wilson was the inspired voice, blasted by partisan prejudice and personal hatred. We witness now a dire threat by the narrow, selfish, ambitious Soviet power to the efficacy of the United Nations as an instrumentality of peace. The forces of reaction and isolation at home attempt to administer a lethal potion to the reciprocal trade program, which is the basis of our best hope for international good will. No, human nature does not change, and until the hearts and minds of men composing nations can be purged of such attributes of character as intolerance, prejudice, hatred, selfishness, cupidity, greed for power and lust for conquest, in one fateful hour the most solemn covenant may become a mere scrap of paper and the most fraternal treaty dissolve into a rope of sand.

"A RESPECTABLY DEFENSIVE POSTURE"

The only language which totalitarian peoples understand and ambitious dictators respect is the language which, when translated literally, means the irresistible power of invincible armed force. Long before the time of either Frederick the Great or George Washington, a philosopohical German named Clausewitz wrote a book in which he correctly described war as a special form of politics, a violent means of political expression. Independently, and separated as widely as the poles in ideologies, both the father of Prussian militarism and the Virginia farmer who became the father of this Republic comprehended and interpreted war in accordance with Clausewitz' definition. Frederick founded the ambitious, aggressive, grasping, ruthless, truculent militarism that drenched Europe with blood and tears under the iron hands of Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm, and the slimy, grisly, unspeakable Hitler. George Washington's concept of the Clausewitz philosophy found expression in what he called a "respectably defensive posture," a citizen soldiery organized and trained in the art and science of war, a citizen militia drilled and trained in time of peace as the surest preventive of war and the most dependable bulwark in the event of attack.

WASHINGTON'S WISE COUNSEL

Washington's own countrymen have for the most part ignored his sage counsel. The next war was in 1812. American land forces were ignominiously defeated. Detroit was surrendered in disgrace without the sound of a gun. The city of Washington was captured and the National Capitol was burned. President Madison's escape to the Virginia woods—was obliged, literally, to "take to the tall timber"—and the queenly Dolly Madison saved the White House silver. Practically the only bright record on land in that war was made by citizen soldiers from States that had heeded the wisdom of George Washington, who adjured his countrymen to prepare in time of peace against the danger of future war. The militiamen from Kentucky marched behind Gov. Isaac Shelby and Col. Richard M. Johnson to fight under Gen. William Henry Harrison, and end at the Battle of the Thames the reign of terror of the redoubtable Tecumseh. The militiamen—citizen soldiers—from Kentucky, went down the Kentucky, the Ohio, and the Mississippi to New Orleans; fought beside the Tennessee Militia; under the leadership of "Old Hickory" Jackson, humble veterans who had gained martial renown under the Iron Duke; and defeated on the heroic plain of Chalmette, the last attempt, until the ambitious rise of Hitler and Stalin, at foreign domination of American soil. The hills and valleys of old Kentucky echoed with the victory song:

There stood John Bull in martial pomp,
And here was Old Kentucky.

FIRST WORLD WAR

Little Switzerland, the freest country in Europe, model land of liberty and democracy, did adopt George Washington's recommendation that was unheeded by his own country, and provided military training for every able-bodied citizen. When the flames of war swept over Europe in 1914, little Switzerland placed in the field in 4 days a trained, equipped citizen army of 300,000 men, and through 4 years of devastating war maintained her neutrality without the firing of a gun or the tread of a hostile footstep on her land.

In that war not an American-made airplane ever flew over a German line. Less than 500 American-made field guns ever reached the battle front. Thousands of the rose and expectancy of America's young manhood went into battle; marched to death as to a picnic; fought amidst entanglements of barbed wire; fell in the bloody inferno of No Man's Land—thousands of our bravest and best—who did not know how to load the French rifles our Government placed in their hands. Then the United States disbanded its armed forces, and sank its battle fleet, while the Japanese tore up their blueprints, of which they retained copies.

There are those who apparently still think they can build a Chinese wall around America; that America can withdraw like a terrapin in its shell; or, like an ostrich, hide its head in the sand. Some seem to believe that we can piously proclaim that we do not want war and be safe from attack. Others know that we ought to have the greatest air force in the world; the most invincible Navy on the oceans of the earth; the authorized legal strength of our armed forces; and ought to train America's young manhood, not as a part of the Regular Army, but as a part of their educational equipment as American citizens, according to a program supported by the great organizations of American servicemen and their women's auxiliaries, recommended by the President's patriotic commission,

and urged by the President in an able address to the Congress; but they do not want this Congress to vote on it. They do not want us to meet our solemn responsibility as Representatives of a great free people who believe in preparedness and self-defense.

LITTLE BOY BLUES

Our earnest hope and fervent prayer ought to be that these little boys that prattle at our knees, these Little Boy Blues, wearing their little soldier suits and their little sailor suits, these Little Boy Blues with their little toy swords and their little toy guns, may never have to march to a carnival of carnage. We ought to make sure that never again will an American mother's son charge into battle without knowing how to load his rifle.

DEFENSIVE PREPAREDNESS; NOT OFFENSIVE MILITARISM

If the United States had maintained a trained, well-equipped citizen soldiery since the turn of the century we would never have been involved as a belligerent in either world war. Surely a generation that has lived through two world wars ought to have learned a lesson. Some know all of those things but think it is indiscreet, inexpedient, and unwise for them from the standpoint of personal or party politics, to advocate such a preparedness program in election year. I have never known the meaning of the word "discreet" or "expedient" in the performance of my duties during more than 20 years as a national legislator. As a consistent, constant advocate of adequate preparedness as the best insurance against war—defensive preparedness, not offensive militarism—I have said on probably a thousand rostrums since the First World War that there ought to be emblazoned in the corridors of every public building in America, inscribed on the walls of every schoolroom in America, and, I would now add, engraved on the desk of every Congressman in both House and Senate, George Washington's words of wisdom:

One of the most effectual means of preserving peace is to be prepared for war.

Let us not dally or doubt, falter or fail, in this hour of our country's need.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, today we are faced with the critical and far-reaching issue of a peacetime conscription in the United States. We must consider deeply the individual rights of a free people, and we must, for just as strong a reason, carefully weigh the absolute essentials of a constant defense and the future security of our people and our country.

It is fundamental that our armed forces should be improved and modernized to the extent that our country may be adequately and continually defended from any type of attack.

Is peacetime conscription required at this time for an adequate and modernized system of national defense for our country? That is the question. Let us look at the available facts. If there are any undisclosed facts they should be bared to the Congress now.

In reading from the committee report on page 4, I find that we now have approximately 1,211,818 men in our armed forces as of March 1, 1948—469,496 in the Army, 351,181 in the Navy, 317,102 in the Air Force, and 74,039 in the Marines.

We now have the largest and strongest Navy in the world, in fact, our Navy is at least equal to the strength of the combined navies of all the rest of the world.

From the hearings on this proposed legislation and from the committee report, the facts show that our great Navy can be adequately manned without peacetime conscription. This Congress has recently passed legislation to increase our Air Force to a 70-group corps. Again I am unable to find facts to show that peace-time conscription is required to man this mammoth and modernized force.

I am very well aware that our armed forces need many infantrymen as a part of a modernized Army. Air bases and beachheads are vital to our national defense. We must never ignore the major necessity of our foot soldiers.

The facts disclose that the duties of the Infantry do not carry as much glamor and appeal to our young men who wish to volunteer as do the Navy, Marines, and the Air Corps. It is a fact, that under present Army requirements and inducements we have been unable to secure ample enlistments for the Army. The testimony reveals that the Army needs some 300,000 men to carry out our present program of defense. Since the facts reveal that we do not need peacetime conscription for an adequate and modernized Navy and Air Corps, the issue boils down to one simple question: Should we, at this time, have conscription to increase our Infantry? That is the issue gentlemen. May I ask two questions at this point?

Is there any immediate danger of our country being attacked by any foreign power? Is there any other alternative to secure 300,000 additional men for our Army than by selective service? It is true that no man can be sure of the answer to the first question. Gentlemen, I do not believe that our country is in any immediate danger of war nor that any country is immediately capable of waging war against us. The evidence before us does not disclose a national emergency. I further believe, very firmly, that our Army enlistments could be sufficiently encouraged to meet current quotas under our modernized program. Army enlistment requirements should be liberalized and attractive inducements should be offered to Army volunteers.

Regimentation of our people, in time of peace, is a very dangerous Government policy. We in America have strived to forego such practices. Our citizens have always taken pride in their individual rights as set forth in our great Constitution. Only in case of a national emergency should these rights be infringed by forcing our young men into the Army.

Therefore, gentlemen, I am constrained to vote against military conscription, at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 671, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill will have to be laid aside until the engrossed copy can be provided.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 239. An act relating to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and postgraduate school; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HAWKES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6772) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment numbered 40 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Army.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labor.
6. Department of the Navy.
7. Department of State.
8. Post Office Department.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. Federal Communications Commission.
11. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
12. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Army.
3. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labor.
6. Department of the Navy.
7. Department of the Treasury.
8. Department of State.
9. National Archives.
10. Office of the Housing Expediter.
11. Federal Security Agency.
12. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
13. Veterans' Administration.
14. War Assets Administration.

WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DONDERO submitted a conference report and statement on S. 418, an act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JENSEN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2376. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2759. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building at Bunker Hill, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committe on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; and

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States naval hospital, United States naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements; and

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 3689. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer;

H. R. 5883. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6623. An act to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, Friday, June 18, 1948.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1655. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to aid the settlement and development of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1656. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of claims of the cities of Nantucket, Mass.; and Buffalo, N. Y.; and Greensboro-High Point Airport Authority, of Greensboro, N. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1657. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated June 17, 1948, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 718); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1658. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated June 17, 1948, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 719); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1659. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated June 17, 1948, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1943 and 1944 (H. Doc. No. 720); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6465. A bill to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey; without amendment (Rept. No. 2386). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DEVITT: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6959. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6958. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill., without amendment (Rept. No. 2390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on survey and study of the postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 2391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 2392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 2395). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company; without amendment (Rept. No. 2396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 6973. A bill to appropriate $800,000 for the construction of a building at Knoxville, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 6974. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6975. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6976. A bill to create a National Economic Commission, to establish procedures for the formulation and achievement of national economic goals for the making of voluntary agreements in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 686. Resolution providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 687. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate the murder of George Polk; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. Res. 688. Resolution paying tribute to the Members of the House of Representatives, employees, Press and Radio Gallery; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. Res. 689. Resolution to establish a select committee to be known as the Committee on Housing; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 6977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 6978. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6979. A bill for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6980. A bill for the relief of Tamara Boks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2105. By the SPEAKER: Petition of New York Teachers Chapter, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2106. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Isaac De Haan, Corsica, S. Dak., and 14 others, urging the defeat of any legislation proposing the establishing of a universal military training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2107. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 17 members of the Winfield Township WCTU, of Butler County, Pa., opposing the Towe bill, H. R. 4278, or recommending prohibiting the sale of beer to trainees, especially those under the age of 21 years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2108. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted at Twenty-third Annual Convention of Central Retail Feed Association, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring a change to the hundredweight system for grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2109. Also, resolution adopted by Upper Mississippi Valley Water Use Council at its meeting held in Dubuque on June 4, urging Congress to adequately support the United States Geological Survey's program of water investigations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2110. Also, resolution adopted at Twenty-third Annual Convention of Central Retail

Feed Association, Milwaukee, Wis., endorsing legislation to bring into the open all groups whose aim is to overthrow our constitutional form of government; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2111. Also, resolution adopted at Twenty-third Annual Convention of Central Retail Feed Association, Milwaukee, Wis., endorsing all legislation which is designed to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation from competing with private business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in these days when men freely judge and condemn each other, remind us all of the Great Assize before which we must all someday appear.

Thou knowest whether we have been voices or merely echoes, whether we have done Thy will or our own or, worse still, have done neither.

Teach us, O Lord, that only Thy "Well done" will afford peace and everlasting happiness.

May we strive for that rather than the approval of men, which is but for a little while. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 17, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. TIBBOTT, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, and Mr. NORRELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, the calendar will now be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1504, House bill 5882.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Umstead
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Feazel	Martin	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

DONATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes was announced as first in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when this bill was reached on the last call of the calendar, I objected to it. I understand there is a possibility of good in it. I should like to ask for the RECORD an explanation of the bill. The bill was reported by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is not present at the moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily and placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have the bill go over until the Senator from Connecticut comes to the floor. I simply desire an explanation for the RECORD, and then will probably withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. BALDWIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that the Senate return to consideration of House bill 5882, Calendar No. 1504, which, when reached on the calendar, was passed over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is the bill I asked to have passed over on the last call of the calendar. It would appear that agencies of the Government, if they undertake to dispose of surplus property even if for worthy purposes may sooner or later be found to be yielding to pressure to give away material belonging to the agency, even though some other agency of Government wants to purchase it at the same time. I should like to know if it is the understanding of the Senator from Connecticut that agencies of the Government having such surplus property will take pains to ascertain that the material which they propose to give away is not needed by some other agency of Government before completing the transaction or giving away the material.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the bill uses the word "obsolete" so I assume that with the use of that word there is implied that the material which the Government agency would give away to educational institutions would be material that could not be used either by that agency or by any other Federal agency. Certainly it was our purpose that the uses to which the Government could put the property would have been exhausted before it would be turned over to an educational institution.

Mr. AIKEN. With that explanation, Mr. President, I have no objection to passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "such", to strike out "facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in lieu of the committee amendment which I understand is agreeable to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi offers an amendment which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out in line 7, on page 1, it is proposed to insert the following: "facilities located June 1, 1948, on lands owned by or held for the use and benefit of institutions eligible for donations."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I understand that purpose of this amendment to be that facilities which have previously been turned over to educational institutions, such as buildings and structures, are to be included as a part of the equipment covered by the bill. In effect, this is retroactive, so as not to raise the question that such facilities could not be legally turned over, by reason of the fact that they were not included in the terms of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I respectfully submit that I do not believe the amendment is in line with what we had in mind in the Armed Services Committee when we reported the bill, and I regret that I must object to the amendment, because I believe that it would make possible the donation of substantial facilities worth a great deal of money, for which the educational institutions should pay at least 50 percent of their appraised value. I shall object to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The amendment to the committee amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over and go to the foot of the calendar.

The bill (S. 843) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

UNITED STATES RADIATOR CORP.

The bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp., of Detroit, Mich., was considered, order to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I inquire what happened to Senate bill 2644, Calendar No. 1507?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill went over and went to the foot of the calendar.

JURISDICTION OVER OFFENSES COMMITTED ON STANDING ROCK INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (S. 543) to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on Standing Rock Indian Reservation was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on that portion of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation which lies within the State of North Dakota, and on the State of South Dakota over such offenses committed on that portion of such reservation which lies within the State of South Dakota, to the same extent as their courts have jurisdiction generally over offenses committed within said States, respectively, outside of Indian reservations: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall deprive the courts of the United States of jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians on said reservation, nor shall anything herein contained deprive any Indian of any protection afforded by Federal law, contract, or treaty against the taxation or alienation of any restricted property.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2076) to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2736) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2779) to create a Government corporation to operate cafeterias and conduct certain other activities in Government buildings and on Government property, was announced as next is order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS HOUSING

The bill (H. R. 5710) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill is similar to Senate bill 2736, Calendar No. 1547, which just went over.

Mr. CAIN. It is a companion bill. We would much prefer to have the Senate take action on House bill 5710, to which an amendment has previously been offered and which lies on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 5710?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. The bill with the amendments has two parts. The body of the bill conveys title to the educational institutions of America on whose property there exists today temporary war housing. The total number of housing units involved approximates 129,000. By virtue of an existing statute, if this property is not disposed of through conveyance to the educational institutions in question it must be removed and destroyed by the 25th of July, 1949. The Defense Homes Corporation is deeply interested in this disposition recommendation. The Committee on Banking and Currency in its entirety thinks that we have an excellent opportunity now to dispose of property which can fully be utilized by American educational institutions everywhere. The amendment to the bill proposes to convey title from the Defense Homes Corporation to Howard University, of two dormitories which are known as Slowe and Carver Halls. The Defense Homes Corporation, as most Senators know, is presently in the process of liquidation, and to dispose by conveyance of this property will not only be of assistance to Howard University but will hasten the liquidation of the Defense Homes Corporation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand that this particular bill covers all temporary housing wherever it may be on the campuses of the colleges?

Mr. CAIN. On the campuses of the colleges on land owned and leased by American educational institutions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, this bill relates to temporary buildings which will have to be removed by a certain date in 1949, unless the action proposed by the bill is taken.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; unless the action proposed by the bill is taken.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As a matter of fact, many of the buildings involved are of a temporary construction, and it would cost the Government more to move them than it would to leave them where they are.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that if this property is conveyed to American educational institutions the institutions will assume the burden of maintenance and repair, and the Senator from West Virginia is conclusively correct when he understands that a great deal of money will be spent by the Federal Government for the maintenance of the property.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency I wish to join with the Senator from Washington in recommending the passage of the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. It is a fact also that there will be need for this housing next year as well as this year.

Mr. CAIN. There is a very pressing need for the property in question at the present time, and the American universities can quite properly continue to have a fine use for the property for several years in the future.

Mr. WATKINS. Does this apply to private schools as well as public schools such as State universities where these buildings have been placed?

Mr. CAIN. It so happens, I have been informed, that the buildings in question are only situated on the property of public institutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on the last call of the calendar I asked that the bill go over. In the meantime I have had a careful examination made of the bill and its effects. I find that it will not conflict or interfere with other pending legislation on the calendar, and that adoption of the bill would have a beneficial effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington wish to offer amendments to the bill?

Mr. CAIN. An amendment was previously offered. I have a copy of the amendment, and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment to House bill 5710.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is this amendment represented by Calendar No. 1546, Senate bill 2076?

Mr. CAIN. It is Senate bill 2076. The amendment in fact I may say to the Senator from Kentucky is Senate bill 2076.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. It is offered as an amendment just as it was reported from the committee and is on the calendar?

Mr. CAIN. Word for word.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under those circumstances, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point and the reading of it will be waived.

The amendment is as follows:

SEC. 5. The Defense Homes Corporation is authorized to convey, without reimbursement therefor, to Howard University, a corporation organized pursuant to an act of Congress, all of its right, title, and interest in certain lands in the District of Columbia, together with the improvements constructed thereon and the personal property used in connection therewith, and commonly known as Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall, 1919 Third Street Northwest, and George Washington Carver Hall, 211 Elm Street Northwest: *Provided*, That no employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia who, on the date of approval of this act, is a tenant of either Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall or George Washington Carver Hall shall, unless quarters were assigned to such tenant on a transient basis or on the sole basis that the tenant was enrolled at an educational institution, be evicted from such halls within 4 years after the approval of this act, except where such tenant commits a nuisance or otherwise violates any obligation of tenancy.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Defense Homes Corporation to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the Defense Homes Corporation's net investment in these properties as of the date of transfer, as determined by the President of the Defense Homes Corporation, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Treasury in like amount as of the same date.

SEC. 6. The right, title, and interest in any lands, together with the improvements constructed thereon, which are conveyed pursuant to the authority granted by section 5 hereof, shall revert to the United States upon a written finding made by the President prior to July 1, 1963, that the property is needed by the United States in connection with a national defense emergency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington is agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5710) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2076 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CAIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAIN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. FULBRIGHT conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL PLANTS

The bill (H. R. 6096) to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for production of products from agricultural commodities was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATERNITY LEAVE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 784) to provide maternity leave for Government employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL and Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service, but I have noted with great interest and admiration the fight which has been made by the able chairman of that committee [Mr. LANGER] in behalf of the bill to which objection has just been made, to grant maternity leave to women who are Government employees.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this is a humane measure. Surely the Government of the United States should not lag behind many private enterprises which grant such relief to their women employees.

I do not know what may be in the minds of Senators who objected, but I hope the Senator from North Dakota will find a way to bring this measure to a vote in the Senate. I do not know of anything that is a greater expression of governmental leadership in humane legislation than this bill. I commend the Senator from North Dakota for his fight. I hope he will be able to obtain consideration of the bill and that it will be possible for the Senate as a whole to vote on the measure.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I can assure the distinguished Senator from Florida that when I come back in January this will be the first bill I shall reintroduce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am one of the Members of this body who asked that the bill go over. The reason I feel that the bill is not practicable is that under the present law an employee is now granted 26 days annual leave. In addition, he is allowed 15 days sick leave, making a total of 41. This bill proposes to allow 60 days additional leave as maternity leave, making a total of 101 working days out of each year. The average number of working days a month in the Government service is 20. That means that in a maternity case a Government employee can have 5 months of the year off with pay. I do not feel that it is practicable for any Government agency to operate if it allows 5 months off with pay every time an employee has a child.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6116) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "by", to strike out "July 31" and insert "April 30"; and on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "August 9, 1948" and insert "April 30, 1949."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2279) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO CHEYENNE, WYO., FOR PARK PURPOSES

The bill (S. 2820) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public park and golf course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, there is before the Committee on Finance

House bill 5734, which is the same as Senate bill 2820, Calendar 1601. I move that the Senate Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5734, and that the Senate immediately proceed to consider the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate Finance Committee is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5734, a bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand that Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That the city of Cheyenne shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property, to be determined by the Veterans' Administration."

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I realize that time does not permit us to oppose this amendment. What the amendment does is to call upon the city of Cheyenne to pay 50 percent of the appraised value of this land, which the city of Cheyenne originally gave without cost to the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration is unable to utilize or improve the land, and the city of Cheyenne has agreed to make improvements by making a park around the veterans' hospital in Cheyenne, or on the outskirts of Cheyenne.

It seems hard on the city that it should have to pay for land which it is going to improve for the benefit of the veterans. However, it is impossible to get this bill through without accepting the amendment, so I will accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is with reluctance that I have decided not to object to the amendment. It is apparent that it is an amendment which the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming would prefer not to accept, but which he feels impelled to accept under the circumstances. Let me say that we are establishing no precedent so far as the Senate Committee on Finance is concerned, and at the first opportunity for debate on the subject, there will be plenty of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2820 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6759) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I give notice of my intention to move to bring this bill up at the earliest possible moment.

The bill (S. 1333) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3934) to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid treatment centers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

DEPORTATION PROCEDURES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2755) to amend the act of June 11, 1946, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator who objected withhold his objection temporarily so that an explanation may be made?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this is an immigration bill, under the general immigration and naturalization laws. It has been indicated that in dealing with cases for deportation there may be some question about the proper procedure under the Administrative Procedures Act. The purpose of this bill is to permit the Immigration and Naturalization Service to have its own employees conduct the first hearing and make recommendations in deportation cases, rather than have the cases held up for the full process under the Administrative Procedures Act. Unless this bill is passed several thousand cases will be held up for hearing, and no action can be taken on them. The purpose of the bill is simply to expedite the hearing. I do not think it has any other effect.

Mr. President, I have made the explanation. If the Senator wishes to persist in his objection, I cannot stop him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2755?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1988) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS IN PARK COUNTY, WYO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1821) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let the bill go over.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection for a moment, I should like to make an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho withhold his objection for that purpose?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I explained this bill at the previous call of the calendar, at which time the distinguished Senator from Oregon asked to have an opportunity to consider the bill. He has since examined it, and has now removed any objection that he had to it.

This bill provides for a conveyance of 80 acres of land in section 36, township 58 north, range 100 west, from the United States of America to the State of Wyoming. Section 36 is one of the school sections which were reserved for the support of the public schools when Wyoming was admitted to the Union.

In 1915 the State of Wyoming issued an oil and gas lease on the 80 acres of the east half of the northeast quarter. Development proceeded on that 80 acres, oil was produced there, and royalties in excess of $19,000 have been paid.

The Government of the United States sued the State and its lessee; and on June 2, 1947, the United States Supreme Court, disregarding the rights created in Wyoming by the Congress, as well as the equities in Wyoming under the surveys, decided that the United States should have ownership.

Section 3, article IV of the Constitution still provides that Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States. Wyoming as a matter of right and justice is entitled to the entire section. However, under the circumstances, in order that it may recognize its long-existing lease and contract, Wyoming now is willing to accept the 80 acres. This bill is for the purpose of conveying those 80 acres to the State of Wyoming.

I hope the Senator will not object. A similar bill has been passed by the House, and is now on the calendar. It is House bill 4462, Calendar 1685, which I would ask to have substituted for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the Calendar.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2686) to establish the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other

purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the author of the bill whether it authorizes an extensive program and what the cost of the program under the bill is likely to be. I take it that the bill carries out the action of the House of Representatives, in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill this year, in setting up a separate administration for the Navajos.

Mr. WATKINS. The purpose of the bill is to expedite the administration of the affairs of the Navajo and Hopi Indians. They are in a deplorable condition, as the public has been informed in recent months by the press of the country. We have found that by reason of the red tape and ruts in which the Indian Bureau has been involved in recent years, it has been almost impossible to get under way a program to rehabilitate the Indians. This bill would change the administration of the affairs of this group of Indians, and would provide a new administrator for them.

These Indians are the most primitive Indians we have in the country. More than 60,000 of them are there in one group, and they require special attention and treatment.

This bill would authorize an appropriation of $25,000,000 for educational purposes, and also would authorize an appropriation of $250,000 for relief. The bill provides for the transfer of the administration of these Indians from the Indian Bureau to a special administrator who will be required to live on the reservation and direct its affairs, and he would be given the power to exercise all the functions and activities which the Indian Bureau as now constituted is authorized to exercise regarding them.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that the $25,000,000 for education would be for operating expenses, or would it be for building new schools?

Mr. WATKINS. The bill provides for a comprehensive program to take care of the Indian children who are not now in school. There are 14,000 of them, as the Senator probably will remember, who are not now in school, although our treaty with the Indians calls for a school teacher for each 30 pupils and a school room. We have not kept our treaty obligations.

Mr. BALL. The testimony before the committee was that it is very hard to keep them in one place long enough to send them to school.

Mr. WATKINS. More than 30,000 of these Indians will, of necessity, have to be transferred from the reservation to other places to live.

Mr. BALL. Do I correctly understand that the $25,000,000 to be authorized under the bill will be for the purpose of building new schools? It will not be for annual operating charges; will it?

Mr. WATKINS. No; it will not be for annual operating charges. It has to do not only with buildings on the reservation itself, but with buildings in white communities where probably many of the Indians will have to go to make a living and to establish homes in the future.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say I think it is true that the tribal council has requested this type of program and has asked that the bill be passed.

Mr. WATKINS. They have requested in substance this type of program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, under this proposed legislation, will the Bureau of Indian Affairs lose all jurisdiction over this particular Indian tribe?

Mr. WATKINS. The Indian Bureau will lose all jurisdiction; the tribe will be placed under a special administrator.

These Indians have special problems. We hope the Indian Bureau then will spend its time in liquidating the affairs of the Indians in the United States, and will go out of business in 10 or 15 years.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, they are not doing that very rapidly, because in the recent Interior Department appropriation bill the Bureau of Indian Affairs had an appropriation approximately double the appropriation for that agency only a few years ago; and in the bill we approved a few days ago there was provision for an appropriation of approximately $10,000,000 for the Navajo Tribe.

I am just wondering whether we are going to continue to give millions of dollars to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the relief of the Navajos, and then under this new agency provide additional millions of dollars for those Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. No; we shall transfer all matters and functions relating to this group of Indians to the new Administrator, and we hope that will make it possible for the Indian Bureau to go out of operation in a few years.

The purpose is to make the Indians American citizens, with all the rights and liabilities of citizens, as soon as possible. This Administrator will have that special job and will not have anything else to do.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How long has the Indian Bureau had charge of the Navajos?

Mr. WATKINS. For more than 60 years—ever since the Navajos were conquered by our armies and were placed on the reservation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. And yet now they are in such dire straits that it is necessary to have a new agency to take care of them.

Mr. WATKINS. The committee is convinced that it will be better to have a new administrator for them, so that the Indian Bureau will not go on forever handling their affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

SALE TO THE CROW TRIBE OF INTERESTS IN ESTATES OF DECEASED CROW INDIAN ALLOTTEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2352) to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior with the consent, in writing, of the tribal council representing the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation, is hereby authorized and directed to sell and convey to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., for public purposes, to wit: A site for a county hospital for said county upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe—ten acres from the north one-half of section 30, township 2 north, range 11 west, Indian meridian, and more definitely described as follows:

The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 30, township 2 north, range 11 west, Indian meridian: *Provided*, That out of the proceeds of such sale the sum of $1.25 per acre shall be credited to the general fund of the United States Treasury and the balance shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribal fund of Indians of the said Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, and to provide for the sale of certain lands to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6457) to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MRS. PEARL SCOTT LOUKES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2551) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "northeast", to strike out "quarter of the" and insert "quarter," and on page 2, line 2, after the figure "3", to strike out "all of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes, for the following-described lands in the State of Montana: The southeast quarter, section 12, township 7 south, range 27 east; lot 4, section 7, township 7 south, range 28 east; the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, section 11; the west half of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter, section 16; lots 1, 2, and 3, northeast quar-

ter, east half of the northwest quarter, the east half of the east half of the west half of the northwest quarter, section 17, lots 1, 2, and 3, section 18, township 7 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, containing approximately 628 acres.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF POST OFFICE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 5750) to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEASE OF LAFAYETTE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The bill (S. 2706) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to lease for commercial purposes for periods not exceeding 10 years and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, such space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building, as was leased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for commercial purposes on July 30, 1947, the date title to such building was transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States of America by section 306, title III, Public Law 268, Eightieth Congress. The rentals received pursuant to this act may be deposited into a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury, and notwithstanding the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 303b), shall be available to pay the cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair of the space so leased and for the establishment of necessary reserves therefor: *Provided*, That except for such necessary reserves, the unobligated balances of rentals so deposited into the Treasury shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts.

ISSUANCE OF PATENTS FOR CERTAIN LANDS

The bill (H. R. 6090) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3190) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill contains a large volume of amendments. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? This is a long bill, containing 475 pages.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished Senator I shall not take much time, and that we shall not spend much time on the bill.

The House has sent to the Senate the revision of title 18. It was my privilege and duty to appoint a very distinguished subcommittee to go over the matter. The subcommittee was headed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

The purpose of the bill is to codify and revise the laws relating to Federal crimes and criminal procedure.

With the amendments proposed by the committee the bill includes all pertinent laws to January 5, 1948, and is made effective September 1, 1948.

The bill makes it easy to find the criminal statutes because of the arrangement, numbering, and classification. The original intent of Congress is preserved. A uniform style of statutory expression is adopted. The new Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are keyed to the bill and are reflected in part II of title 18.

Obsolete and executed provisions are eliminated. Uncertainty will be ended and there will no longer be any need to examine the many volumes of the Statutes at Large as the bill, upon enactment, will itself embody the substantive law which will thus appear in full in the United States Code.

It is one of the constructive things we have been endeavoring to accomplish, and I think the bill accomplishes it. I should like to see the amendments adopted en bloc. If any further specific information is desired, I shall ask the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri to explain it, but I think, in view of the fact that the work has been gone into by some of the best experts in codification in America, in conjunction with the House committee, the committee has proposed a number of amendments, most of which are insubstantial, some of which are substantial. They will necessitate, I assume, if we pass the bill, a conference with the House. I hope the measure can be disposed of without a great deal of debate. As I said, it is along the line of bringing together the Federal criminal statutes into one place, so as to avoid the necessity of going from one volume to another in order to ascertain what the criminal law of the Nation is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

There being no objection, the amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Page 3, following "13. Laws of States adopted for areas within Federal jurisdiction." insert: "14. Applicability to Canal Zone."

Page 5, line 4, after "States" insert: ", except the Canal Zone."

Page 8, after line 15, insert:

"§ 14. Applicability to Canal Zone.

"In addition to the sections of this title which by their terms apply to and within the Canal Zone, the following sections of this title shall likewise apply to and within the Canal Zone: 6, 8, 11, 331, 371, 472, 474, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 488, 489, 490, 499, 502, 506, 594, 595, 596, 600, 601, 604, 605, 608, 611, 612, 703, 756, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 915, 917, 951, 953, 954, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 1017, 1073, 1301, 1364, 1382, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1546, 1584, 1621, 1622, 1761, 1821, 1914, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2199, 2231, 2234, 2235, 2274, 2275, 2277, 2384, 2385, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 3059, 3105, 3109."

Page 91, strike out "610. Contributions by national banks or corporations." and insert: "610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations."

Page 104, strike out lines 4 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"§ 610. Contributions by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations.

"It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"For the purposes of this section 'Labor organizaiton' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

Page 117, line 8, strike out all after "receiver," down to and including "System," in line 15.

Page 118, line 18, strike out all after "care," down to and including "institution," in line 23.

Page 134, line 19, after "both" insert:"; or if he negligently suffers such person to escape, he shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Page 158, after line 12, insert: "While any foreign government is a member both of the International Monetary Fund and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, this section shall not apply to the sale or purchase of bonds, securities, or other obligations of such government or any political subdivision thereof or of any organization or association acting for or on behalf of such government or political subdivision, or to making of any loan to such government, political subdivision, organization, or association."

Page 367, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, and insert: "The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States.

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

Page 415, line 10, after "Zone," insert "District of Columbia."

Page 415, after line 17, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 416, after line 21, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 448, lines 24 and 25, strike out "the Revised Statutes (1 U. S. C., sec. 1)" and insert: "Title 1 of the United States Code."

Page 456, strike out lines 3 to 21, inclusive.

Page 456, line 22, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 457, line 3, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 457, strike out lines 8 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 20. This act shall take effect September 1, 1948."

Page 457, line 16, strike out "22" and insert "21."

Page 463, about middle of page, strike out:

"July 3	128	4, 5	40	755, 756	16	705, 706"

Page 467, below middle of page, strike out:

"June 20	634	4	49	1556	16	705
Do	635	1, 2	49	1557	22	248"

And insert:

"June 20	635	1, 2	49	1557	22	248"

Page 470, after

"June 8	178	1, 2, 3	59	234, 235	18	241, 241n, 242"

insert:

"July 31	339	9	59	51	6 31	804b"

Page 471, at the end of the schedule of repeals on this page, insert:

"1947—						
Apr. 16	39		61	52	18	411
May 16	73		61	97	18	744h-1
June 21	111		61	134	18	244
June 23	120	304	61	159	2	251"

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will presently name the conferees.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been credibly informed that the House will accept our amendments. In view of that information, I ask that the action taken to rescind on my motion to appoint conferees in respect to the bill (H. R. 3190) be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The bill (S. 2764) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky offers an amendment which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 14, after the word "buy", it is proposed to strike out "July 31, 1949", and insert "April 30, 1949."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I request an explanation of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the bill proposes to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. That section, among other things, authorizes the Alien Property Custodian to return property to an alien if he deems that the alien was a persecutee. It has developed that some of these persons to whom property would be returned are dead, and there are no known heirs. In such case I assume the property would escheat to this country.

The bill provides that the President may designate approved organizations under certain limitations and conditions, and that such organizations may receive the property of a deceased persecutee alien and use it for the benefit of the group to which the persecutee belonged. I think it is a very humane measure. It was introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(h) The President may designate one or more organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons, who, if alive, would be eligible to receive returns under the provisos of subdivision (C) or (D) of subsection (a) (2) hereof. An organization so designated shall be deemed a successor in interest by operation of law for the purposes of subsection (a) (1) hereof. Return may be made to an organization so designated (a) prior to July 31, 1949, or 2 years from the vesting of the property or interest in question, whichever is later, if the President or such officer or agency as he may designate determines from all relevant facts of which he is then advised that it is probable that the former owner is dead and is survived by no person eligible under section 32 to claim as successor in interest by inheritance, devise, or bequest; and (b) after such later date, if no claim for the return of the property or interest is pending.

"No return may be made to an organization so designated unless it files a claim on or before January 1, 1952, and unless it gives assurances satisfactory to the President that (i) it will use the property or interest returned to it for the rehabilitation and resettlement of persons who suffered substantial deprivation of liberty or failed to enjoy the full rights of citizenship within the meaning of subdivisions (C) and (D) of subsection (a) (2) hereof, by reason of their membership in the political, racial, or religious group of which the former owner was a member; (ii) it will transfer, at any time within 2 years from the time that return is made, such property or interest or the equivalent value thereof to any person designated as entitled thereto pursuant to this act by the President or such officer or agency; and (iii) it will make such reports and permit such examination of its books as the President or such officer or agency may from time to time require.

"The filing of a claim by an organization so designated shall not bar the payment of debt claims under section 34 of this act."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 33. No return may be made pursuant to section 9 or 32 unless notice of claim has been filed, (a) in the case of any property or interest acquired by the United States prior to December 18, 1941, by August 9, 1948, or (b) in the case of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941, by April 30, 1949, or 2 years from the vesting of the property or interest in respect of which the claim is made, whichever is later: *Provided*, That return may be made to successor organizations designated pursuant to section 32 (h) hereof if notice of claim is filed by January 1, 1952."

PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (S. 2080) to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is identical with Calendar No. 1764, House bill 5053.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask that the House bill be substituted for Senate bill S. 2080, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5053) to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2080 is indefinitely postponed.

CODIFICATION OF TITLE 3 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The bill (H. R. 6412) to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN ARMY EQUIPMENT TO NEW MEXICO MILITARY INSTITUTE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2698) to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "authorized", to insert "upon the request of the institution"; in line 7, after the word "institution", to insert "to Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., to Norwich University, Norwich, Vt., and to Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va."; on page 2, line 1, before the word

"together", insert "except those used in the remount breeding program"; in line 3, after the word "by", insert "each of the"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "military institute" and insert "institutions"; and in line 5, after the word "purposes", to insert "*Provided*, That the receiving institution in each case agrees to arrange for the proper pension and old-age care of the donated horses."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, nothwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, upon the request of the institution, to transfer without reimbursement, to the New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, N. Mex., a tax-supported State institution, to Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., to Norwich University, Norwich, Vt., and to Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., all horses, except those used in the remount breeding program, together with their records and equipment, property of the United States Army, located at and utilized by each of the said institutions for military training purposes: *Provided*, That the receiving institution in each case agrees to arrange for the proper pension and old-age care of the donated horses.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2860) to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CONNALLY and other Senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS IN PARK COUNTY TO WYOMING

The bill (H. R. 4462) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, this bill is identical with Calendar No. 1661 (Senate bill 1821) to which the Senator from Idaho made objection. The Senator now advises me he withdraws his objection. I ask for the consideration of House bill 4462.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill H. R. 4462?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I originally objected to the bill. I have gone into the matter with the Senator from Wyoming and I find that what the bill is designed to do is to correct what amounts to an error in a survey line, which, after all, is an error on the part of the Federal Government. Therefore, I shall not object.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1821 is indefinitely postponed.

STAMPS TO COMMEMORATE THE THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ANNAPOLIS, MD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 223) to authorize the issue of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance in May 1949 a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The bill (S. 2816) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this bill is identical with Calendar 1811, House bill 5861. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the House bill in lieu of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5861) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2816 is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSPORTATION BY VESSELS OF CANADIAN REGISTRY BETWEEN HYDER, ALASKA, AND POINTS IN UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 4690) to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRACY MARILUCH

The bill (S. 2050) for the relief of Gracy Mariluch was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Gracy Mariluch, of Paris, France, whose brother is an American citizen, shall be deemed, for the purpose of the immigration laws, to have been born in France rather than in Spain where her parents were temporarily residing at the time the said Gracy Mariluch was born.

FRANTISEK JIRI PAVLIK OR GEORG PAVLIK

The bill (H. R. 1409) for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFONSO FELICE

Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1301) for the relief of Alfonso Felice, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "Felice" and insert "Felici"; on page 1, line 8, to strike out "Felice" and insert "Felici"; and, beginning in line 10, after the words "United States", to insert "upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed not to issue orders and warrants of deportation in the case of Alfonso Felici, any previous or existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Alfonso Felici should be deemed to be lawfully admitted as a resident of the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felici."

MRS. HARRY A. LIGHT

The bill (H. R. 4587) for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDMUND HUPPLER

The bill (H. R. 4047) for the relief of Edmund Huppler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The bill (H. R. 5886) to amend sec. 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSE BABACE

The bill (S. 1872) for the relief of Jose Babace was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel any deportation proceedings which might arise in the case of Jose Babace (Irigoyen), Minden, Nev., legally admitted but who has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

ENGEBERT AXER

The bill (S. 2054) for the relief of Engebert Axer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Rev. Engebert Axer, Society of Jesus, as of September 26, 1937, the

date on which he was originally admitted to the United States as a student.

DR. CHUNG KWAI LUI

The bill (S. 2360) for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Dr. Chung Kwai Lui as having entered the United States in 1936 for permanent residence, upon the payment by her of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui. The Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for the first year that a quota number is available.

WISIA PARYZENBERG

The bill (S. 2075) for the relief of Wisia Paryzenberg was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause to be issued to Wisia Paryzenberg, of Warsaw, Poland, the orphan niece of Dr. Joel Mosko, of Denver, Colo., a visa permitting her immediate entry into the United States for permanent residence as a nonquota immigrant. Upon the issuance of such visa, the said Wisia Paryzenberg shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, notwithstanding any provision of the immigration and naturalization laws.

MILO JURISEVIC ET AL.

The bill (S. 2235) for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the aliens Milo Jurisevic; Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, wife of the said Milo Jurisevic; Svetozar Jurisevic and Radmila Jurisevic, son and daughter, respectively, of the said Milo Jurisevic and the said Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, all of Fresno, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, on October 23, 1946, to the United States for permanent residence.

BASQUE ALIENS

The bill (S. 1973) for the relief of certain Basque aliens was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Jose S. Algarra de Carlos, Domingo Aslain Hualde, Patricio Asiain Hualde, Cipriano Aznarren Udi, Gracian Azparren Gazcue, Pedro Aspiroz Echechuri, Anastasio Barbarena Elizegaray, Melchor Burusco Domench, Pedro C. Cemborain Garmendia, Angel Dufur Iturri, Bernardo Dufur Iturri, Primitivo Egoscue Seminario, Modesto Elgorriaga Exposito, Felipe Errea Huarte, Esteban Erro Inda, Ambrosio Esnoz Recalde, Lino Goicoa Arozerena, Alberto Ibarregui Iriberri, Pablo Inda Sagardoy, Felipe Itturri Castilla, Francisco Jorajuria Andiaarena, Joaquin Juanarena Dufur, Francisco Larrea Ibarrola, Manuel Lecumberri Barber, Silvestro Martinez Exposito, Serpio Mendiguia Lerumbe, Jose Moulian Mendia, Jose Narvarez Berendiain, Antonio B. Nuin Exposito, Jose Ochandorena Petricorena, Jose M. Ochandorena Petricorena, Primitivo Olondriz Echeverria, Mateo Pedroarena Barberena, Leandro Urritia Villanueva, Pedro Valencia Llorente, Prisco Villanueva Montoya, Marcelino Villanueva Urrutia, Salvador Viecay Oroz, Demetrio Zubiri Uriz, Pedro M. Recalde Iribarren, Celestino Arozarena Elizagaray, Jose Betelu Zubiriaga, Dionisio Betelu Zubiriaga, Fermin Jorajuria Andiaarena, Thomas Iriarte Lerindegui, Miguel Redin Equiza, Miguel Inda Juandeaburre, and Jose Zubiri Coni, as of the respective dates of their lawful temporary entry into the United States in 1944, if they are found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas: *Provided*, That if the Attorney General finds that Cipriano Asnarren Udi is otherwise entitled to the benefits of this act, he is authorized and directed to accord him such benefits, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, insofar as it relates to illiteracy. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien named herein from the quota of the appropriate country for the first year that the said quota is available.

GROWERS FERTILIZER CO.

The bill (H. R. 1930) for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM R. RAMSEY

The bill (H. R. 2551) for the relief of William R. Ramsey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DENNIS STANTON

The bill (H. R. 2732) for the relief of Dennis Stanton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUMNER COUNTY COLORED FAIR ASSOCIATION

The bill (H. R. 2918) for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE CLEVE WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 2372) for the relief of George Cleve Williams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETROL CORP.

The bill (H. R. 3499) for the relief of Petrol Corp. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM J. BURNS INTERNATIONAL DETECTIVE AGENCY

The bill (H. R. 4441) for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2850) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officials, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2851) to authorize temporary increases in the salary rates of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE, ETC.

The bill (H. R. 5047) to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia was considered ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASED PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS

The bill (H. R. 6295) to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CAIN subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. I inadvertently failed to hear the call of Calendar 1711, House bill 6295. May I ask what was done with that bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to inquire if that bill can be reconsidered for the purpose of my asking that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to enter a motion if he wishes to do so.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which House bill 6295 was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

REIMBURSEMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR SPECIAL POLICE AND FIRE ASSIGNMENTS

The bill (H. R. 6452) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6087) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia" was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INSANITY PROCEEDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6598) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF BARBERS IN THE DISTRICT

The bill (H. R. 4635) to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRACTICE OF CHIROPRACTIC IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6327) to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6454) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, some time ago Congress passed an act which provided for an increase in retirement allowances for members of the FBI. There were two reasons behind that action. One was to keep young men in the service, and the other was to provide for a little extra retirement pay for those who have hazardous occupations. This particular bill would extend the same privileges to the Narcotics Division of the Treasury Department and, I think, also to those who have to deal with immigration and who are in a position of hazard. The annuity would be based upon 2 percent of the employee's average salary for 5 years next preceding his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of service not to exceed 30 years. If we are to keep men in the Federal service to perform these particularly hazardous jobs, we have to appeal to a group of younger men. After 20 or 25 years' service they frequently must seek other employment because of their physical condition and age. They are not really suited to deal with some of the tough customers with which they have to deal.

Mr. BALL. The Senator's explanation of the bill is satisfactory, and I agree that it is a much-needed measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROSE MARY AMMERATO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of Rose Mary Ammerato, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 4, to strike out "$5,000" and to insert "$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ANTHONY ARANCIO

The bill (H. R. 700) for the relief of Anthony Arancio was considered, ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

RUDOLPH MAXIMILIAN GOEPP, JR.

The bill (H. R. 3062) for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr., was considered, ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

HIRO HIGA AND KANA HIGA

The bill (H. R. 912) for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa was considered, ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

VITO ABARNO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

KAM FONG CHUN ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 911) for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF SUNDRY VETERANS OF ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 333) for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II, was considered, ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF PARKING LOTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 421) to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EFFECTUATION OF LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND UNITED NATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds of the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to the joint resolution and ask that they be considered en bloc. In this connection, I wish to point out that the two amendments authorize the construction of the buildings to proceed through the borrowing of not to exceed $25,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Unless this amendment is incorporated in the bill, it will undoubtedly be impossible to proceed this year with the undertaking.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from New York.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 9, after "sec. 4.", it is proposed to insert "(a)"; after line 15 to insert:

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $25,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement referred to in section 1 in such manner, and in such amounts, as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest, for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available for the purposes of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement set forth in section 1.

And on page 3, line 4, after the word "Congress", to insert the words "or the making available of funds as provided in section 4 (b) hereof."

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, or the making available of funds as provided in section 4 (b) hereof, to bring into effect on the part of the United States, the loan agreement, set forth below, between the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on March 23, 1948, with such changes therein not contrary to the general tenor thereof and not imposing any additional obligations on the United States or relieving the United Nations of any obligations, as the President may deem necessary and appropriate:

LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

It is hereby agreed by the Government of the United States of America and the United Nations as follows:

(1) Subject to the terms and conditions of this agreement, the Government of the United States will lend to the United Nations a sum not to exceed in the aggregate $65,000,000. Such sum shall be expended only as authorized by the United Nations for the construction and furnishing of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in its headquarters district in the city of New York, as defined in the agreement between the United States of America and the United Nations regarding the headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on June 26, 1947, including the necessary architectural and engineering work, landscaping, underground construction and other appropriate improvements to the land and approaches, and for other related purposes and expenses incident thereto.

(2) Such sum, or parts thereof, will be advanced by the United States through the Secretary of State, to the United Nations upon request of the Secretary General or other duly authorized officer of the United Nations and upon the certification of the architect or engineer in charge of construction, countersigned by the Secretary General or other duly authorized officer, that the amount requested is required to cover payments for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1) above which either (a) have been at any time made by the United Nations, or (b) are due and payable, or (c) it is estimated will become due and payable within 60 days from the date of such request. All sums not used by the United Nations for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1) will be returned to the United States through the Secretary of State when no longer required

for said purposes. No amounts will be advanced hereunder after July 1, 1951, or such later date, not after July 1, 1955, as may be agreed to by the Secretary of State.

(3) All sums advanced hereunder will be receipted for on behalf of the United Nations by the Secretary General or other duly authorized officer of the United Nations.

(4) The United Nations will repay, without interest, to the United States the principal amount of all sums advanced hereunder, in annual payments beginning on July 1, 1951, and on the dates and in the amounts indicated, until the entire amount advanced under this agreement has been repaid as follows:

Date	Amount
July 1, 1951	$1,000,000
July 1, 1952	1,000,000
July 1, 1953	1,500,000
July 1, 1954	1,500,000
July 1, 1955	2,000,000
July 1, 1956	2,000,000
July 1, 1957	2,000,000
July 1, 1958	2,000,000
July 1, 1959	2,000,000
July 1, 1960	2,500,000
July 1, 1961	2,500,000
July 1, 1962	2,500,000
July 1, 1963	2,500,000
July 1, 1964	2,500,000
July 1, 1965	2,500,000
July 1, 1966	2,500,000
July 1, 1967	2,500,000
July 1, 1968	2,500,000
July 1, 1969	2,500,000
July 1, 1970	2,500,000
July 1, 1971	2,500,000
July 1, 1972	2,500,000
July 1, 1973	2,500,000
July 1, 1974	2,500,000
July 1, 1975	2,500,000
July 1, 1976	1,500,000
July 1, 1977	1,500,000
July 1, 1978	1,500,000
July 1, 1979	1,500,000
July 1, 1980	1,500,000
July 1, 1981	1,500,000
July 1, 1982	1,000,000

However, in the event the United Nations does not request the entire sum of $65,000,000 available to it under this agreement, the amount to be repaid under this paragraph will not exceed the aggregate amount advanced by the United States. All amounts payable to the United States under this paragraph will be paid, out of the ordinary budget of the United Nations, to the Secretary of State of the United States in currency of the United States which is legal tender for public debts on the date such payments are made. All sums repaid to the United States will be receipted for on behalf of the United States by the Secretary of State.

(5) The United Nations may at any time make repayments to the United States of funds advanced hereunder in excess of the annual installments as provided in paragraph (4) hereof.

(6) The United Nations agrees that, in order to give full effect to section 22 (a) of the agreement regarding the headquarters of the United Nations referred to in paragraph (1) above (under which the United Nations shall not dispose of all or any part of the land owned by it in the headquarters district without the consent of the United States), it will not, without the consent of the United States, while any of the indebtedness incurred hereunder is outstanding and unpaid, create any mortgage, lien, or other encumbrance on or against any of its real property in the headquarters district as defined in said agreement. The United Nations also agrees that the United States, as a condition to giving its consent to any such disposition or encumbrance, may require the simultaneous repayment of the balance of all installments remaining unpaid hereunder.

(7) The effective date of this agreement shall be the date on which the Government of the United States notifies the United Nations that the Congress of the United States, with the approval of the President, has made available the funds necessary to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

In witness whereof, the Government of the United States of America, acting by and through the United States Representative to the United Nations, and the United Nations, acting by and through the Secretary General, have respectively caused this agreement to be duly signed in duplicate at Lake Success, N. Y., on this 23d day of March 1948.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Representative to the United Nations.

For the United Nations:

TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary General.

SEC. 2. Sums advanced to the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of the aforesaid loan agreement shall be disbursed by the United Nations for the purposes for which such sums were advanced within 90 days after their receipt from the United States. Any funds not so disbursed within that period shall be returned to the United States through the Secretary of State within 30 days thereafter.

SEC. 3. So long as the headquarters district is used as the seat of the United Nations, nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to limit the control and authority of the United Nations over such district as exercised pursuant to Public Law 357, Eightieth Congress: *Provided, however,* That in the event such district is, for whatever reason, no longer used as the seat of the United Nations, the United States shall, in addition to any rights it enjoys under paragraph (6) of the aforesaid loan agreement and section 22 of the headquarters agreement (Public Law 357, 80th Cong.), be entitled to recover from the land and buildings in the headquarters district, in advance of all other creditors of the United Nations, any indebtedness incurred under the loan agreement which is then outstanding and unpaid.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $65,000,000 to accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution. Amounts received in repayment of such loan shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $25,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement referred to in section 1 in such manner, and in such amounts, as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest, for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available for the purposes of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement set forth in section 1.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in House Concurrent Resolution 75, passed unanimously by the House of Representatives December 10, 1945, and agreed to unanimously by the Senate December 11, 1945, invited the United Nations "to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States"; and

Whereas the General Assembly on December 14, 1946, resolved "that the permanent headquarters of the United Nations shall be established in New York City in the area bounded by First Avenue, East Forty-eighth Street, the East River, and East Forty-second Street"; and

Whereas, pursuant to authorization of the Congress in Public Law 357 of the Eightieth Congress, the Agreement Between the United Nations and the United States of America Regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations was brought into effect November 21, 1947, defining the rights and obligations of the United States and the United Nations with respect to the above-mentioned site; and

Whereas plans have been prepared for construction on said site of permanent headquarters of the United Nations to cost not more than $65,000,000, and the United Nations is ready to proceed with such construction as soon as financing can be provided; and

Whereas the present temporary headquarters of the United Nations are inadequate for the efficient functioning of the organization and retention of its headquarters in the United States can be assured only by the erection of adequate permanent facilities; and

Whereas, owing to the current critical dollar shortage, the other member nations are not able to provide in cash at present their respective shares of the cost of constructing the permanent headquarters; other methods of borrowing the necessary funds have been found impracticable; and the permanent establishment of the headquarters of the United Nations in this country will result directly and indirectly in substantial economic benefits to the United States from the expenditures of the Organization and its member nations; and

Whereas, in view of the foregoing considerations, the United States representative at the seat of the United Nations, in response to an inquiry of the Secretary General of the United Nations regarding the possibility of a United States Government loan, informed the Secretary General, with the authorization of the President, by note dated October 29, 1947, that the President would recommend to the Congress the authorization of a loan from the United States to the United Nations for the construction of the headquarters in an amount not exceeding $65,000,000; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations, by resolution of November 20, 1947, authorized the Secretary General to negotiate such a loan with the appropriate officials of the United States Government, expressly recognizing that such loan would require the approval of the Congress; and

Whereas the United States Representative to the United Nations has negotiated and signed, on behalf of the United States an agreement with the United Nations in the form set forth below, providing for an interest-free loan of not more than $65,000,000 from the United States to the United Nations to be repaid in annual installments, and said agreement is, by its terms, to become effective on notification to the United Nations that the Congress, with the approval of the President, has made available the funds necessary to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of the agreement: Therefore be it

MRS. LORAINE THOMSEN

The bill (H. R. 4590) for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen was considered

ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES W. ADKINS AND MARY CLARK ADKINS

The bill (H. R. 2849) for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DOUGLAS L. CRAIG

The bill (H. R. 4452) for the relief of Douglas L. Craig was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH M. HENRY

The bill (H. R. 2734) for the relief of Joseph M. Henry was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JENNESS C. THOMAS

The bill (H. R. 371) for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS ROSELLA M. KOSTENBADER

The bill (H. R. 1642) for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERALD S. FURMAN

The bill (H. R. 4518) for the relief of Gerald S. Furman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH LEE CREGG

The bill (H. R. 564) for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUBREY F. HOUSTON

The bill (H. R. 2889) for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM C. REESE

The bill (H. R. 3937) for the relief of William C. Reese was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN WATKINS

The bill (H. R. 6224) for the relief of John Watkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HORACE J. FENTON

The bill (S. 2504) for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Horace J. Fenton, formerly an associate professor at the United States Naval Academy, the sum of $100 per month for the remainder of his life, beginning with the month in which this act is approved, chargeable to such appropriations as may be made for the payment of retirement annuities to civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy and post graduate schools.

SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS

The bill (H. R. 6089) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (H. R. 4917) to provide benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) to authorize the issuance of a special series of a stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TOBEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

THOMAS A. HANLEY

The bill (H. R. 2552) for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUARDIAN OF ROBERT LEE THREATT

The bill (H. R. 1910) for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF DAVID JEFFERSON JANOW, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 2431) for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH R. PENDLETON

The resolution (S. Res. 256) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 2834) for the relief of Elizabeth R. Pendleton was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2834) entitled "A bill for the relief of Elizabeth R. Pendleton," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and such court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such section and report to the Senate, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

MRS. MARY H. OVERALL AND THOMAS I. BAKER

The bill (H. R. 3427) for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADNEY W. GRAY

The bill (H. R. 581) for the relief of Adney W. Gray was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. CARROLL C. GARRETSON

The bill (H. R. 3261) for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK A. CONSTABLE

The bill (H. R. 2269) for the relief of Frank A. Constable was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

The bill (S. 2869) to amend the act of December 8, 1944, authorizing the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is identical with Calendar No. 1810, House bill 6822, and without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of that bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6822) to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2869 is indefinitely postponed.

TRANSFER OF LAND AT BROWNSVILLE, TEX., TO THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION

The bill (S. 2691) authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is hereby authorized to accept by transfer without reimbursement or exchange of funds, and to assume permanent custody and control over, in connection with the lower Rio Grande flood-control project under the jurisdiction of said United States Section, that portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, described as follows: Tract 1, Fort Brown—A tract containing two hundred and forty-one and six one-hundredths acres in the Espiritu Santo Grant in Cameron County, Tex., out of and a part of the Fort Brown military reservation as shown on map recorded in volume 8, page 23, of the Map Records of Cameron County, Tex.; tract 2 borrow area—A tract containing seventeen and four-tenths acres in share No. 19 of the Espiritu Santo Grant, Cameron County, Tex., conveyed to the United States of America by deed from Carrie M. Combe, individually and as independent executrix of the estate of Frederick J. Combe, deceased, recorded in volume 322, page 352, of the Deed Records of Cameron County, Tex.; both of said tracts being shown on drawing No. 4311-RC-12, San Benito, Tex., January 15, 1947, of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, United States Section, designated "Flood Control Project—Lower Rio Grande, Tex.—Fort Brown Military Reservation" and on field notes attached thereto, which drawing and field notes are on file with said United States Section, and with the War Assets Administration, said property having heretofore been declared surplus to the War Assets Administration; and the War Assets Administration, or other Federal agency in responsible charge, is authorized and directed to transfer said property to the said

United States Section without reimbursement or exchange of funds.

SEC. 2. There shall likewise be transferred to said United States Section, in connection with the transfer of said land, that certain building thereon situate known and numbered as warehouse building 252.

SEC. 3. The improvements on said land, except warehouse building 252, may be sold by the War Assets Administration under its existing authority, for use on the premises where now situated, subject to the provision that such use shall be in conformity with the terms and conditions of licenses to be issued therefor by the Secretary of State under the authority of the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 906, 22 U. S. C., sec. 277e), and provided that such licenses shall not be inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control and the use of said land as a floodway, as determined by the Secretary of State. Any such improvements not sold for use on the premises may be sold by the War Assets Administration for removal from the premises within 1 year from the date of sale. To the extent that any such improvements are not sold under the provisions hereof within a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act, title thereto shall remain in the United States, and jurisdiction and control thereover shall vest in the said United States Section.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of State shall, in order to assure beneficial public use of this land not inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control, grant a license or licenses to the city of Brownsville, Tex., under the authority of the act of August 27, 1935, to use portions of the lands transferred to the United States Section under this act for municipal parks, golf courses, museums, athletic fields, including stadiums, and other public purposes not inconsistent with the primary purpose of flood control and with the use of said land as a floodway, as determined by the Secretary of State and subject to such terms and conditions as may in the opinion of the Secretary of State be necessary to protect the interests of the United States: *Provided*, That application is made by the city of Brownsville for such license or licenses within a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act: *Provided further*, That such license or licenses shall not be inconsistent with those granted under section 3 hereof for the use of the improvements therein specified: *And provided further*, That except for this provision granting to the city of Brownsville a preferential right for 1 year to be granted a license or licenses, nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying or impairing the authority of the Secretary of State over said lands under said act of August 27, 1935.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES FEES

The bill (H. R. 6293) to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF THE ROUGH RIDERS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 305) authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of Rough Riders of the Spanish-American War was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

SURVIVOR ANNUITIES

The bill (S. 2740) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague whether he conferred with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] about this bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; I did not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may explain that the Senator from Maryland introduced this bill, and I was talking to him a moment ago, just before he had to go to a conference, and I volunteered to state his position on the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield, there is on the calendar order of business 1812, a similar bill, which has been reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I am advised that the House will probably accept the Senate version of the bill, and I was about to suggest that House bill 6641 be taken up for immediate consideration, and then I shall offer the Senate bill as a substitute for the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6641) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the text of Senate bill 2740.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "Any such annuitant who died during the period beginning on February 29, 1948, and ending on April 30, 1948, leaving a surviving wife or husband, shall be deemed to have made the election authorized in the foregoing proviso and to have named such wife or husband to receive an annuity as provided in such proviso, but no such annuity shall become due or payable to such wife or husband prior to April 1, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 270 will be indefinitely postponed.

E. BREVARD WALKER

The bill (H. R. 4644) for the relief of E. Brevard Walker was considered for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES D. SIGLER

The bill (H. R. 1220) for the relief of James D. Sigler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD T. CHARETT

The bill (S. 617) for the relief of Richard T. Charett was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mary Signorile, of Stamford, Conn., mother of Richard T. Charett, minor son of Lucien Charett, formerly of the United States Marine Corps Reserve, the sum of $1,140, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for payment of the amounts which would have been payable on behalf of the said Richard T. Charett under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 for the period of his father's active service in the Marine Corps, if timely application for payment of such amounts had been made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contracts to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

WINONA MACHINE & FOUNDRY CO.

The bill (H. R. 1779) for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALAMO IRRIGATION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2049) for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That interest which accrued on said note from August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, in the sum of $1,193.50 is hereby waived and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause the proper entries to be made in the accounting records of the Department of Agriculture to effect such waiver.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MEDICAL CARE FOR PHILIPPINE VETERANS

The bill S. 2861 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senators will withhold their objection a moment, I may say that this bill was introduced at the request of Mr. Emmet O'Neal, the American Ambassador to the Philippines. It relates to hospital care for Philippine veterans who are members of the United States Army. For a long time there has been a question as to how far Filipino veterans of the United States Army should be permitted to participate in the GI bill of rights, and in general the benefits have been denied to them. That question has arisen partly because it was felt that it was difficult to identify a good many of the guerrillas and the bill originally introduced covered a great many different fields. The bill now under discussion has been cut down to one field of assistance for these Filipino veterans, that is, in the field of hospitalization.

There is no question that large numbers of Filipinos were wounded, and this

program will provide approximately 3,000 beds in the Philippines for the care of Filipino veterans. It seems to me they are clearly entitled to such care.

There cannot be any question that there may be benefited some guerrillas who were not regular members of the Army, because after all many more than 3,000 Filipino veterans were wounded. There is no question that from the time action started, on Bataan, many thousands of them were wounded, and many thousands of them require hospital care for injuries actually suffered in the battles of the United States against Japan. It seemed to the committee that the very least we could do was to provide a hospital program for these veterans. They were full-fledged members of the United States Army. They fought for the United States. At the time they fought they were American citizens who were members of our Army, but they have since been excluded by reason of the place of their domicile, and by reason of the fact that it was not considered wise to make the provisions made for American veterans applicable to them; so they have been denied hospital service. Pictures were exhibited to the committee showing the squalid conditions in the hospitals where these veterans are.

I feel that anyone who has investigated this situation would be willing to have the $10,000,000 used for this purpose, which represents a very small fraction of the total veterans' hospital program in the country for the care of these men who fought for the United States.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, section 3 of the bill authorizes grants of $22,500,000.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; $22,500,000. I thought it was $10,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Section 4 provides for payment for a period of not to exceed 5 years for such reimbursement to the Republic of the Philippines, and then provides that the total sum of the grants shall not exceed $3,285,000 a year.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. It was thought that by the end of 5 years we might make some arrangement with the Philippine Government to have them take over the hospitals in some general settlement. For the time being, the hospitals will be operated at a cost of $3,000,000, and $22,500,000 is for the construction of three or four new hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2861) to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment on page 2, line 24, after the word "made", to insert "for a period not to exceed 5 years", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for veterans, as defined in section 2 of this act, who are in need of hospitalization for disabilities, determined by the Veterans' Administration under laws which it administers to be connected with the service described in such section, the President is authorized, subject to the provisions of this act, to furnish aid in the form of grants to the Republic of the Philippines (a) for the construction and equipping of hospitals in the Philippines to be used exclusively for such medical care and treatment, and (b) for expenses incident to such medical care and treatment in either the hospitals so constructed and equipped or other hospitals in the Philippines.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of section 1 of this act, the term "veterans" means persons who served in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area, or other competent authority in the Army of the United States, and who were discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable.

SEC. 3. Any grant for the construction and equipping of a hospital may be made prior to or following its completion: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $22,500,000.

SEC. 4. Grants for expenses incident to hospitalization may be made for a period not to exceed 5 years to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for moneys expended for such hospitalization: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $3,285,000 for any fiscal year.

SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations and impose such conditions on the receipt of financial aid as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and he may delegate in whole or in part the authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or officers of the United States.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

The bill (S. 2795) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be temporarily passed over until we reach House bill 6527, Calendar No. 1765. That bill will be reached in a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 6527 can be taken up at this time in lieu of Senate bill 2795 if the Senator desires to have that done.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6527 instead of the Senate bill.

The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to object, but I should want to speak on the amendment. There is an amendment to the Senate bill.

Mr. TAFT. I was about to move to strike out all after the enacting clause in the House bill and to insert in lieu thereof Senate bill 2795, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio wish to insert the Senate bill, as amended, in lieu of the House text?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, I offer the Senate bill, as amended, as an amendment to the House bill, and in lieu of the House text.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 6527, and to insert the text of Senate bill 2795, as reported with amendments from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am in favor of the purposes of the bill, but the Senate committee adopted an amendment to which I am very much opposed. The situation in my State is as follows. I only cite one outstanding case: At Grand Prairie, Tex., there were, during the war, two large aviation plants constructing airplanes. Workers flocked in from everywhere. The community received school aid from the Federal Government by reason of the increase in population resulting from the war work. Recently, however, the Navy has acquired the properties of the former airplane companies and the plants have been reactivated, and workers are coming from all over the country, flooding in there to work in the plants. Because the property belongs to the Navy the city authorities can derive no taxes from the property for the maintenance of their schools. So we think that is a comparable case to the war situation, because it is a Government activity, it is Government property, it is free of taxes, and we think that school district should be included within the terms of the bill. But under the amendment of the Senate committee it would be excluded. There would be no aid for a situation of that kind. This is an outstanding case, and unless the amendment is rejected the schools in that area will not be able to operate more than 4 or 5 months in the year.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the committee feels very strongly that we should not begin to extend again the business of paying for public schools because of some Federal installation had in peacetime. During the war, because of the tremendous emergency and the great number of camps which were established, as well as the various kinds of plants which were built, we undertook to aid local school districts with Federal money to a certain extent.

The attempt which was made in the language which the committee struck out was that if the Federal Government undertakes a new project, if the Federal Government opens up a new airport, if it starts a new Federal institution within a State, it shall pay the expense of the school districts in the neighborhood which are in some way affected by the tax situation. Certainly I do not think any such general policy should be

adopted through the Federal Works Administration. After all every State comes here begging the Federal Government to establish airports, or erect war plants, and it seems to me that if they want them, and it involves some expense to them, yet there is as against that the tremendous economic advantage which they derive from the establishment of such plants and airports, so the States themselves ought to provide for the payment to the school districts. We have wanted to cut off this program which has dragged on from year to year, which was left over from the war situation, but now it is proposed to open it up again and say that new Federal institutions installed shall begin to pay the cost of the school districts of the neighborhood. Of course the Navy pays for the education of the children of the naval personnel; it pays for the education of the children of its contractors, but when it comes to paying for the education of children of persons who gather around and open stores and generally build up the community, it seems to me the Federal Government should not be involved in any such new program. So the committee feels that the Senate bill should not be amended by reinserting the original provision.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no argument with the Senator about the general policy. I think we ought to get out of this thing as soon as we can. But in the situation I mentioned it is not a case of a new project being established at all. It was a war project, and the Government extended aid to the schools. Now instead of remaining with the Army, the Navy takes over title to the property.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I ask the Senator from Texas where the project is about which he is speaking.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is at Grand Prairie, Tex., which is near Dallas. Two tremendous airplane factories were built there during the war.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I make a comment on that?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. In the town of Stratford, Conn., during the war there was a plant making aircraft. That plant employed 8,000 workers. Most of those workers with their families came into the community to work in the plant due to the war situation, and we were going along very nicely with this aircraft development. The town of Stratford and the State of Connecticut did not ask one nickel from the Federal Government to help with the school program.

Now the Chance Vought Co., which builds aircraft, is going to move to Dallas, Tex., and thus take one of the main industries out of our community and move it to Texas, and the State of Connecticut will be asked to contribute to Federal funds to maintain schools for that particular purpose. Mr. President, I shall vote for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has 2 minutes left.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yielded to the Senator from Connecticut for a question, and we have listened to an oration from him.

Mr. BALDWIN. The question, Mr. President, is whether substantial justice is involved in a situation of that kind.

Mr. CONNALLY. Except for this particular amendment there is no change in the bill. Under the other provisions of the bill aid is given to schools all over the country. In the case I cited the property involved is Navy property. It is owned by the Navy. The Navy pays not one dollar in taxes to the community. Under the bill, if the amendment is defeated, the expenses of education would not be paid by the Government; it would simply mean that the town of Grand Prairie will continue to levy its taxes and attempt to maintain its schools. But it is fair and sound that the Government should contribute something for the maintenance of these schools, because by the ownership of this Federal property engaged in war work—it may be in peacetime, but it is war work—the Navy is carrying on its activities.

I appeal to the Senate to reject the amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in my own State there is a perfect illustration of this problem, involving a new project started since the war. The Army Air Corps is building a $25,000,000 air base in a very small town in northern Maine, at Limestone. It has taken almost half of the geographical area of the town, a town of three or four thousand inhabitants. Obviously it is utterly impossible for this community to furnish schooling for the vast number of children who will come there during the 2 years of the construction period. Following that, when it is determined how much of an Army installation will be there—there may be two or three thousand school children—I assume that the project will be worked out on some equitable basis as between the Federal Government and the town. But in the intervening year or two certainly that little community cannot build the school houses and provide the facilities. It is a perfect illustration of the complete equity of the Federal Government being authorized to take care of a situation such as that.

I hope that those responsible may devise some way in which the problem can be met. If it is not met it will be most unfortunate for everyone concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2795?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2795) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "that" to strike out "(a)"; on page 2, line 5, after "facilities" to strike out the comma and "or (b) have become overburdened with defense-incurred school enrollments as the result of the reactivation or expansion of any defense establishment or the operation of any new refense establishment"; and in line 12, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to make, in the same manner as heretofore authorized, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance that are still overburdened with school enrollments caused by war activities and the transition from war to peacetime conditions and have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, Federal contributions administered by the Federal Works Administrator for the operation and maintenance of their school facilities.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out this act, including administrative expenses therefor, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, not to exceed the sum of $5,000,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments to the Senate bill. Therefore the first question submitted to the Senate will be in connection with Senate bill 2795. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the word "that", it is proposed to strike out "(a)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the comma after the word "facilities," and down to and including the word "establishment" in line 8.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 12, to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas asks for a division. On which amendment does the Senator from Texas desire a division?

Mr. CONNALLY. On the amendment on page 2, beginning in line 5.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Announcement of the vote has been made. Is there objection to returning——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that was the vote on the first amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has announced, in both cases, that the amendments of the committee have been agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. I called for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now asks the Senate if it has any objection to reconsideration of the vote by which the first committee amendment was agreed to, for the purpose of a division? The Chair hears none.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote on the other committee amendment will stand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer. First I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senate still considering Senate bill 2795?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is undertaking to perfect Senate bill 2795 before substituting it for the text of House bill 6527.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is an amendment in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An amendment is in order.

Mr. CAPEHART. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. JENNER] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana on behalf of himself and his colleague will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 12, before the period it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That of the amount herein authorized to be appropriated not less than $14,500 shall be available for contributions to the Charlestown Township School (Pleasant Ridge School), Charlestown, Ind."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall be obliged to oppose this amendment. We could have a great list of special schools if we were to start enacting special legislation for individual school districts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for himself and his colleague [Mr. JENNER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to substitute the amended text of Senate bill 2795 for the text of House bill 6527, after striking out all after the enacting clause in the latter bill. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 6527?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments.

INFLATION INCREASES COST OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think this is about as good an opportunity as any other to invite the attention of the Senate to the underlying cause of these increasing demands upon the Federal Treasury for expenditures for local purposes.

Every Member of Congress knows that bill after bill is presented, and bill after bill is passed, increasing the expenditures of the Federal Government to take care of functions which ordinarily are performed by local government or State government.

The primary reason for this is the fact that Congress has chosen to do nothing whatever about the continued concentration of control over our economy in the hands of a few large industrial and commercial groups.

Another cause is the fact that the Congress has deliberately chosen to do nothing about inflation. I hold in my hand a copy of the Journal of Commerce, published in New York, issue of yesterday. The lead story is devoted to an interview given the day before by President Charles E. Wilson, of the General Electric Co., at a press conference, in which Mr. Wilson undertook to explain why, in his opinion, it has become necessary for the General Electric Co. to increase its prices. Only a few months ago the General Electric Co. filled the newspapers of the country with expensive advertisements announcing a reduction of prices on some products.

I sought at that time to bring about some action by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to look into the method by which the management of concentrated business fixes the prices the public must pay. My efforts to date have been altogether unsuccessful. Now prices are rising again. And Congress is about to adjourn.

According to the New York Journal of Commerce, Mr. Wilson, at his press conference announcing the rise, pointed to what he called two outstanding facts:

1. The company has been hit by an additional $72,000,000 annual bill in the form of higher wages, salaries, materials, and transportation costs, which is being only partially offset by the price rises.

2. The company can hold the line at these new levels only providing expenses, including the costs of parts and components bought from suppliers, don't skyrocket further.

Then the story goes on as follows:

Mr. Wilson made it plain that about the only hope he now saw for resuming the price-cutting trend lay in the direction of technological improvements in production and in distribution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article in the New York Journal of Commerce may be printed at length in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the article which I have just read, it would appear that we can depend only on technological improvements for any fight against inflation, according to Mr. Wilson.

However, I think Mr. Wilson is wrong. It is my conviction, from the information at my disposal, that the profits of the General Electric Co. and of other industrial giants are so great that they can absorb all or most of the increased wages which are necessary if their employees and the masses of the people are to be enabled to continue to purchase the products of industry at steadily rising price levels.

This contention I think is supported by a very interesting article appearing in the United States News and World Report for June 18, on concentration of buying power. As everyone knows, the United States News cannot be regarded as a radical publication. Mr. David Lawrence, whose opposition to radicalism is well known, is the editor of this very valuable weekly magazine.

The article to which I refer shows that 14 percent of the people whose incomes were $5,000 or more received, in 1947, 40 percent of the total money income received by all individuals, before taxes. Even more striking than that is the fact that, according to this article, the top one-fifth of the population received 48 percent of the income, and the top three-tenths received 60 percent. Of course that means that seven-tenths of the people, the vast majority, received only 30 percent of the total money income in 1947. It is this disproportion, this maldistribution of income, which lies at the basis of all economic unrest. This is the underlying fact which makes it absolutely essential that the Congress of the United States take some action to prevent continued rise of prices. Unless it is stopped it will destroy the market upon which General Electric and all the other industrial giants depend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the United States News article on concentration of buying power be published in the RECORD immediately following the article from the New York Journal of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, under the 5-minute rule there is not time for me to discuss this matter as fully as it should be discussed. I am having prepared an analysis of the income and profits of the General Electric Co. I shall seek another opportunity to lay the results of that analysis before the Senate.

I shall do this because I believe that this Congress should not adjourn without taking positive and constructive action to prevent the continuing increase of prices, of which the announcement by General Electric this week is only a single instance. Congress is neglecting its duty to the masses of the people by its failure to do anything about inflation.

It is absurd for Congress to allow itself to be driven to increase Government spending as we do by this bill, reported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] because we fail to do anything about inflation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

EXHIBIT A

GE LIFTS PRICES AS WAGE-LINE FIGHT COLLAPSES—"THIRD ROUND" DECIDES ISSUE AFTER PROLONGED EFFORT TO TURN SPIRAL

(By Shelly Pierce)

A general upward revision of prices is being placed into effect by General Electric Co., Charles E. Wilson, president, announced here yesterday.

Behind that announcement lies a story of a desperate and losing battle by industry to stem the rising tide of inflation by holding the wage line and cutting prices. Such industrial giants as United States Steel, Westinghouse, and General Electric spearheaded the drive.

And yesterday's General Electric announcement confirmed the fears, which had been expressed in many quarters, that the effect of the "third-round" of wage rises would be too much. Speculation was stimulated as to how long Big Steel could hold out against

the demands of the CIO for a reopening and upward revision of its wage contract.

REASONS FOR MOVE

Two outstanding facts were spotlighted by Mr. Wilson at the press conference announcing the rise:

1. The company has been hit by an additional $72,000,000 annual bill in the form of higher wages, salaries, materials and transportation costs, which is being only partially offset by the price rises.

2. The company can hold the line at these new levels only providing expenses, including the costs of parts and components bought from suppliers, don't skyrocket further.

Mr. Wilson made it plain that about the only hope he now saw for resuming the price-cutting trend lay in the direction of technological improvements in production and in distribution.

The price increases announced by Mr. Wilson wiped out partially, and in some cases completely, the two major price reductions announced earlier this year.

IRREGULAR ADVANCES

In a few cases, the advances will exceed the amount of the original announcements.

Fractional horsepower electric motors will remain at a price level 5 percent below the 1947 price, for instance, by virtue of the withdrawal of one of the two 1947 cuts of 5 percent each. Switch gear and distribution transformers have had the price cuts withdrawn.

Certain radio models are higher. For example, a table model television set is now priced at $325 compared with $299.50 earlier this year. But an AM-FM table-model radio remains unchanged at $69.95 compared with $89.15 in December 1947. All standard washing machines are $10.20 higher. But in a long list of such items as electric ironers, toasters, coffee makers, vacuum cleaners, and the like, no changes at all have been made.

It was stressed by the General Electric head that the upward revision of prices will not take the form of a uniform across-the-board percentage rise. Every line, he explained, will be separately considered and prices adjusted in terms of the effect of higher labor, material, and transportation costs. New schedules for certain products have been determined and already put into effect; others are undergoing analysis.

COST FACTORS

Reemphasizing the reluctance with which he announced the collapse of the GE hold-the-line price policy, Mr. Wilson detailed the factors which made it impossible to go on. The recent 8-percent wage rise (9 to 15 cents an hour) was the biggest factor. It was estimated that new wage and salary increases will add more than $50,000,000 a year directly to labor costs.

And it was in giving this figure that Mr. Wilson significantly underscored the fact that the price changes announced and now being computed do not provide for still higher costs which may arise from wage demands upon GE suppliers.

In addition to the wage rises, Mr. Wilson said, there has been added to GE costs some $22,000,000 a year by virtue of higher transportation costs and higher prices for the things that GE buys from its suppliers.

Though Mr. Wilson did not name the motor companies (which announced third-round rises), it was plain that he had them in mind when he expressed the keenest regret over his company's failure to sell at lower prices and resist wage demands.

SOUGHT WIDER MARKET

"We were fighting for a price level that would encourage the widest possible market," he said. "We wanted to provide the needed facilities for more jobs and to reduce the cost of living for everyone.

"Unfortunately, not every segment of industry was able to hold the line and we are now faced with the necessary adjustments due to the cost of doing business.

"During the past several months we have exerted our best efforts within our organization in the communities in which we operate and with other companies and industries to fight inflation with increased production, expanded facilities, and lowered manufacturing costs," he said.

LED MOVE FOR CUTS

The action of General Electric in revising prices now is particularly significant in view of the fact that the company through Charles E. Wilson, president, took the lead in efforts to reverse the inflationary spiral by effecting two price reductions earlier this year. Mr. Wilson said that industry must take the initiative in the matter.

General Electric's efforts to stabilize the price level follow similar attempts early in 1947 by the Ford Motor Co. and the International Harvester Co.

FIRST PRICE CUT

The first price reduction announced by General Electric went into effect January 1 and it ranged from 3 to 10 percent, and averaged better than 5 percent. It was estimated that it would result in savings to consumers of better than $50,000,000 a year. It covered a number of appliances in popular demand such as refrigerators, radios, and television receivers and electric ranges. Prices were also cut on components which were supplied to other manufacturers in order to encourage price reductions on their finished products as well.

The company left a loophole for a reversal of its new policy a that time, however. Mr. Wilson's announcement stated that the company expected to maintain the lower prices unless the company is faced with further increases in labor costs, the situation which has now occurred.

SECOND REDUCTION MADE

Another price reduction was announced effective April 16. This was a 5-percent cut in prices of fractional horsepower motors, switch gear, conventional transformers, lightning arresters, feeder regulators, cutouts, and power capacitors. It was estimated that these reductions would save customers about $10,000,000 a year on a $200,000,000 volume.

The company's annual report said that during 1947, as a consequence of the continuing upward spiral of wages and prices generally, and notwithstanding the fullest possible utilization of advantages offered by large volume, technological improvements, and modern plant facilities, it was impossible for the company to absorb all of the higher operating costs.

EXHIBIT B

CONCENTRATION OF BUYING POWER—TENTH OF FAMILIES WITH THIRD OF INCOME

(Income still is concentrated in the hands of relatively few United States families. Big pay raises won by millions of workers have not produced any real leveling of incomes. Official survey shows this. In 1947, 10 percent of families had 33 percent of total personal income. That is where the big market is to be found for durable goods.)

The big pay increases won by millions of workers in 1947 failed to produce the marked leveling of incomes that many expected. Buying power, as measured by the distribution of personal incomes, still is massed in the hands of relatively few families.

A new Nation-wide sampling survey of "spending units"—households in which incomes and expenses are pooled—makes this clear. This survey is the third annual sampling of consumers, made for the Federal Reserve Board by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center.

As shown by part II of that study, just made public, here is what happened to income distribution in 1947:

High-income people still make up only a small portion of the population, but they account for a major part of the national total of personal incomes.

Above $5,000 of annual income, as the chart on this page shows, there were only 14 percent of the 48,400,000 spending units in 1947. This 14 percent of the people got 40 percent of the total personal income.

In 1946, the survey showed that spending units with more than $5,000 of income made up 10 percent of the population and got 31 percent of the income.

Above $7,500 of income, there were 5 percent of the spending units in 1947. This 5 percent got 24 percent of the personal income.

In 1946, the group above $7,500 of income made up 4 percent of the spending units. This group got 20 percent of the total personal income that year.

Middle-income people, in spending units with $3,000 to $4,999 of income, accounted for 27 percent of the population and 31 percent of the income in 1947.

In 1946, people in this income group made up 25 percent of the population, and got 33 percent of the income.

Low-income people, in spending units with less than $3,000 of income, were by far the most numerous group. At this-income level, there were 59 percent of the spending units in 1947, and they got 29 percent of the total personal income.

In 1946, this group contained 65 percent of the total of spending units, and accounted for 36 percent of the income.

Concentration of income is shown even more strikingly when the population is divided into tenths that are classified according to income received.

The top tenth consists of spending units with more than $5,700 of income. These received 33 percent, or almost exactly one-third, of the total personal income in 1947.

The second tenth—those with $4,200 to $5,700 of income—got 15 percent of the total in 1947.

The third tenth—the spending units with $3,500 to $4,200 of income—received 12 percent of the total in 1947.

Here, then, are 30 percent of United States families or spending units getting 60 percent of the personal incomes earned by the whole population. This 30 percent represents 14,520,000 spending units. The remaining 33,880,000 spending units divide up to 40 percent of the personal income.

The relative share of each tenth of the population from top to bottom was almost exactly the same in 1947 as in 1946.

Thus, even though many families in the lower and middle brackets moved up into higher brackets in 1947, the relative distribution of income among the whole population remained just about unchanged.

Moreover, as the survey report points out, millions of workers, including many who moved into the upper-income bracket, found that their income gains barely kept pace with the rise in the cost of living. This suggests that the market for high-priced goods may not be so broad as might be inferred from the bare figures on income increases.

Income changes in 1947, as reported by the survey, showed this:

About 24,000,000 spending units, or half the total covered by the survey, earned more money in 1947 than in 1946. Only about 9,000,000 earned less.

Personal earnings increased about $20,000,000,000.

The number of spending units earning as much as $5,000 a year increased by about 2,500,000 during 1947. There was a similar reduction in the number below $3,000. Because they are rounded, the official percentage figures on the changes at each income level do not produce exactly these totals.

Despite these shifts, there still were six households with less than $5,000 for every-

one with more than $5,000. There were three times as many below $4,000 as above $4,000, and nearly half again as many below $3,000 as above $3,000. Only one out of 20 spending units had as much as $7,500 of income in 1947.

The top 2,400,000 spending units made twice as much money as the bottom 17,400,000 units.

Occupational groups varied widely in the amount of their pay increases in 1947 over 1946.

This is shown by what happened to the median income of spending units headed by persons in the various occupations. Median income is the middle income for each group—in other words, half earn more than the median, half less. Changes in the median for each group are shown in the chart below.

Business executives, managers, and self-employed persons, got the biggest gains. The median rose from $3,700 in 1946 to $4,500 in 1947. In this group, 45 percent got more than $5,000, and only 30 percent got less than $3,000.

Professional people just about held their own. The median for both 1946 and 1947 was $4,000. Forty percent got more than $5,000, and 27 percent got less than $3,000.

Clerks and salesmen got a $300 gain in median income, from $2,600 to $2,900. In this group, 15 percent earned more than $5,000, and 52 percent earned less than $3,000.

Skilled and semiskilled workers advanced from a $2,700 to a $3,000 median income. Nine percent got more than $5,000.

Unskilled workers got an increase in median income from $1,600 to $1,800. Almost none received more than $5,000, and 86 percent earned less than $3,000.

Farm operators, on the basis of cash income only, had a median of $1,500 in 1947, a $200 advance over 1946. In cash, 8 percent of the farmers got more than $5,000, and 79 percent got less than $3,000. However, this does not accurately picture the condition of farmers, as their nonmoney income is not included.

The big market for new automobiles, new houses and other high-priced goods appears, on the basis of current income, to be among business and professional people.

More than half the spending units headed by these two groups are in the upper 24 percent of the population, which commands 53 percent of the total of personal income.

Professional persons merely held their own in 1947, so far as median income was concerned, yet they still rank next to the business group.

Business executives seem to be the ones who are riding out this period of high living costs most comfortably. Median income of the managerial and self-employed group rose $800 in 1947. The top median increase for any other occupational group was only $300.

This suggests that the most concentrated buying power is to be found among the 50 percent of business managers and self-employed persons whose 1947 earnings were above the $4,500 median for the whole group.

Other points that should be noted in appraising the market outlined by the consumer survey are these:

Median income for all spending units in 1947 was $2,530. It was $2,300 in 1946 and $2,020 in 1945.

Pay increases were reported for 1947 by three-fifths of all spending units with incomes above $3,000. Forty-five percent of those between $1,000 and $3,000 got increases. Only one-quarter of those below $1,000 got raises.

Big gains in income were reported most frequently in the group between $5,000 and $7,500. In that group, 26 percent said they had at least 25 percent more income in 1947 than in 1946. In the group from $4,000 to $5,000, 23 percent had increases of more than one-fourth. The same report was made by 18 percent of those above $7,500, which also was the average for all units.

Big losses in income were reported least frequently by high-income groups. Among those over $5,000, only 4 percent suffered as much as a 25-percent decrease in income last year. Out of the whole number of spending units, 8 percent had decreases of that amount.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or post-war national-defense-incurred, enrollments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming interrupted the Chair's recital of the rather complicated order in connection with House bill 6527 and Senate bill 2795.

Without objection, the arrangement will be perfected as indicated in the previous announcement. That is to say, without objection, House bill 6527 is amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate bill 2795 as now amended.

The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2795 is indefinitely postponed.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS

The bill (S. 2790) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, who is in charge of the bill, whether this bill will be necessary if a housing bill is passed.

Mr. TAFT. It seemed wise to have this bill passed. The most serious check on housing today apparently is the piling up of GI loans in the banks. This bill provides a secondary market for GI housing loans. There is such a provision, on a rather more elaborate scale, in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; but we are not certain whether that bill will be enacted.

I think this particular feature is the most important feature, certainly to veterans, of that bill.

We think this bill should be passed and at least be available for passage by the House if the general housing bill, which probably will go to conference, is not agreed upon or if this particular feature of it should be eliminated. This feature is not in the bill which the House is proposing to pass.

So it seems wise to pass a separate bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, on page 1, beginning in line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 511. (a) The Administrator is authorized under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consistent with this act, to purchase, at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as "par," any real estate loan guaranteed under section 501 or 502 of this title: *Provided*, That, (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its orogin by the lender to whom the evidence of guaranty was originally issued, (2) the original amount of any loan hereafter made shall not exceed $10,000, (3) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase, and (4) the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that at the option of the Administrator the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not in excess of 1 percent per annum of the unpaid balance, as may be provided in such agreement: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par, with the primary right of repurchase reserved to the original mortgagee.

And insert:

SEC. 511. (a) The Administrator is authorized under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consistent with this act, to purchase at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as "par," any real-estate loan guaranteed under section 501 or 502 of this title: *Provided*, That (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its origin by the lender to whom evidence of guaranty was originally issued; (2) the original dollar amount of loans purchased from any seller pursuant to this section shall not exceed 66⅔ percent of the aggregate original dollar amount of all loans eligible for purchase pursuant to this section which such lender has originated, nor more than 66⅔ percent of the original dollar amount of the loans originated by such lender during any one calendar year; (3) the original amount of the loan shall not exceed $10,000; (4) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase; (5) no loan financing the purchase price of a dwelling on which construction is begun subsequent to August 1, 1948, shall be eligible for purchase unless such dwelling has been built and inspected in conformity with minimum construction standards prescribed by the Administrator; (6) the Administrator shall refuse to purchase any loan which in his judgment does not reflect acceptable credit or security standards in its origination; (7) loans made after August 1, 1948, shall be eligible for purchase only if made on standard forms prescribed by the Administrator; and (8) at the option of the Administrator, the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not less than one-half of 1 percent nor more than 1 percent per annum, as may be provided in such agreement. The Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par, without recourse, and upon such terms and conditions, including restoration of the guaranty, as the Administrator may determine.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby further amended by inserting immediately after

section 510 thereof the following new sections:

"SECONDARY MARKET

"SEC. 511. (a) The Administrator is authorized under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consistent with this act, to purchase at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as 'par,' any real-estate loan guaranteed under section 501 or 502 of this title: *Provided*, That (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its origin by the lender to whom evidence of guaranty was originally issued; (2) the original dollar amount of loans purchased from any seller pursuant to this section shall not exceed 66⅔ percent of the aggregate original dollar amount of all loans eligible for purchase pursuant to this section which such lender has originated, nor more than 66⅔ percent of the original dollar amount of the loans originated by such lender during any one calendar year; (3) the original amount of the loan shall not exceed $10,000; (4) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase; (5) no loan financing the purchase price of a dwelling on which construction is begun subsequent to August 1, 1948, shall be eligible for purchase unless such dwelling has been built and inspected in conformity with minimum construction standards prescribed by the Administrator; (6) the Administrator shall refuse to purchase any loan which in his judgment does not reflect acceptable credit or security standards in its origination; (7) loans made after August 1, 1948, shall be eligible for purchase only if made on standard forms prescribed by the Administrator; and (8) at the option of the Administrator, the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not less than one-half of 1 percent nor more than 1 percent per annum, as may be provided in such agreement. The Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par, without recourse, and upon such terms and conditions, including restoration of the guaranty, as the Administrator may determine.

"(b) For the purpose of this section the Secretary if the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums as he may request from time to time between the effective date of this section and the expiration of the period of time in which loans may be offered for purchase pursuant to the terms of this section. Such sums, together with all moneys received by the Administrator under this section, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States in a special deposit account, to be disbursed through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department. On sums so advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury, less those amounts deposited in miscellaneous receipts under subsection (d) hereof, the Administrator shall pay semiannually to the Treasurer of the United States interest at the rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the deposit.

"(c) In order to make such sums available to the Administrator the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, as a public-debt transaction, the proceeds of the sale of any security hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended are hereby extended to include such purposes.

"(d) The Administrator shall from time to time cause to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, such of the funds in the special deposit account referred to in subsection (b) hereof, as in his judgment are not needed for the purposes hereof, and after the last day on which the Administrator may purchase loans under this section, he shall, with due allowance for outstanding commitments, cause to be so deposited all sums in said account, and all moneys received thereafter, representing the repayment or recovery of the principal of obligations purchased pursuant to this section. Interest collected by the Administrator in excess of the amount payable by the Administrator to the Treasurer pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, together with any miscellaneous receipts or credits the disposition of which is not otherwise provided for herein, shall constitute a reserve for payment of losses, if any, and expenses incurred in the liquidation of said loans. Without regard to any other provisions or limitations of law or otherwise except the provisions of this title the Administrator shall have authority in carrying out the functions hereby or hereunder vested in him to exercise any and all rights of the United States, including without limitation, the right to take or cause to be taken such action as in his judgment may be necessary or appropriate for or in connection with the custody, management, protection, realization, and liquidation of assets, to determine the necessary expenses and expenditures and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for and audited, to invest available funds in obligations of the United States, to make such rules, regulations, requirements, and orders as he may deem necessary and appropriate, and to employ, utilize, compensate, and delegate any of the functions hereunder to, such persons and such corporate or other agencies, including agencies of the United States, as he may designate.

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 512. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive as to the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and as to the original amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against a holder, defenses based on the fraud or material misrepresentation of such holder, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, under regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, defenses to payment of any part of the guaranty or issuance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO PROVIDE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4816) to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, on page 2, in line 3, after the words "less than", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANDREWS of New York, Mr. SHORT, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. KILDAY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, Mr. FLANNAGAN, Mr. COOLEY, and Mr. PACE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbian Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof.

and for other purposes, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendment and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

That (a) this act may be cited as the "Selective Service Act of 1948."

(b) The Congress declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

(c) That Congress further declares that such armed strength, to be adequate, requires an increase at the earliest practicable date in the number of persons on active service in the armed forces to not to exceed the manpower strengths authorized in section 2 of this act.

(d) The Congress further declares that if at any time such requisite manpower strengths are not attained and maintained by voluntary means, the national security requires that they be provided through a system of compulsory selective service.

(e) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of such service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selection as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, th enumber of persons on active service in the Army of the United States is hereby authorized to be 837,000; in the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present statutory authorized strength of 666,882; and in the Air Force of the United States, 502,000: *Provided*, That the number of persons provided for in this section shall be construed to mean the daily average number of persons in the armed forces during the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the number of persons who are serving on active duty for training purposes only and the number of officer candidates shall be excluded in computing the number of persons within these authorized strengths or on active service.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 31, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, except those aliens who have not declared their intention to become citizens thereof, who is between the ages of 19 and 26 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this act, shall be liable for service in the armed forces of the United States. The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the armed forces of the United States for service in the manner provided in this act such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain manpower strengths of the respective armed forces not to exceed those authorized by section 2 of this act: *Provided*, That no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act until the President proclaims not earlier than 75 days after the date of enactment (1) that an insufficient number of persons is on active service in the armed forces to maintain an adequate national defense, and (2) that a sufficient number of such persons cannot, in his judgment, be attained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary request for call to active duty. Immediately upon the issuance of such proclamation the provisions of this act authorizing the induction of persons into the armed forces and the ordering of persons into active service without their consent shall be effective, but no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this act prior to 90 days after the date of its enactment: *Provided*, That no person shall be inducted under this act before January 31, 1949: *Provided further*, That no person shall be inducted under this act on or after January 31, 1949, unless the President shall first find that the requisite manpower strengths of the armed forces have not been attained or maintained by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment camaign. For the purposes of such campaign and notwithstanding any other provisions of law (a) original enlistments in the armed forces for periods of 2 years shall be accepted from among all age groups suitable for military service, with such enlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for enlistments for periods of more than 2 years and (b) reenlistments in the armed forces for periods of 1 or 2 years, at the option of the person so enlisted, shall be accepted with such reenlistment privileges as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, which shall be the same or similar to the enlistment privileges now provided for reenlistments for longer periods, and the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force are further directed to report to the Congress before January 31, 1949.

No person shall be inducted for service under this act unless and until he is acceptable to the armed forces for such service and his physical and mental fitness for such service has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

No person shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to public and personal health.

Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this act shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.

No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for service under this act except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the 26th anniversary of the day of his birth.

(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of this section shall serve for a period of 12 months, unless sooner discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) No persons shall be inducted under paragraphs (1) and (2) above until and unless the President shall find, and so advise the President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, not before 3 months after the date of enactment of this act, that insufficient numbers of doctors of medicine, dentists, veterinarians, optometrists, osteopaths, and pharmacists have volunteered for service in the armed forces to maintain the ratios specified in said subsections. Upon such advice to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the authority in said subsections to induct persons into the armed forces shall become effective immediately.

(d) (1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of 19 and 26 shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

(2) Any enlisted member of any Reserve component of the armed forces may, during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *And provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such Reserve component.

(e) The passing requirement for the General Classification Test shall be fixed at 70 points or less. The monthly requisitions on the President under this act by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made.

(f) Each person who hereafter is inducted, enlisted, or appointed and serves for a period of less than 3 years in one of the armed services and meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a Reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, shall be transferred to a Reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component until he attains the age of 35, or until the expiration of a period of 5 years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such Reserve component, whichever occurs first, and shall be subject to such additional service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law for such component: *Provided*, That any person who completes at least 24 months of service in the armed forces under subsection (b), and who thereafter serves satisfactorily on active duty in the armed forces under a voluntary extension for a period of at least 1 year, which extension is hereby authorized, or in an organized unit of any Reserve component of any of the services for which he is entitled to receive pay for attendance at drill or equivalent duty for a period of at least 36 consecutive months, shall, in time of peace, be relieved from any liability under this subsection to serve in any Reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such persons, while in a Reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces in accordance with other applicable laws.

SEC. 5. (a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; members of the Reserve components of the armed forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by

the President, residing in the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for service under section 4 (b).

(b) (1) No person who has been awarded the Purple Heart or who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 12 months or more in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service on active duty with the armed forces or the Coast Guard, or in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

(2) Any person who, for service in the armed forces between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, has been authorized to wear any badge, award, or decoration or other authorized evidence of exceptional valor in the face of the enemy, bravery in combat, or continued service in combat, as determined under regulations prescribed by the President, shall be exempt from induction for service or call to active duty under this act, but not from registration.

(3) No person who has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 90 days or more but less than 12 months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service on active duty with the armed forces or the Coast Guard, or in the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall without his consent be liable for induction for service under this act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, if—

(A) the local board determines that he is regularly enlisted or commissioned in an organized unit of a Reserve component of the armed force in which he served, provided such unit is reasonably accessible to such person without unduly interrupting his normal pursuits and activities, including attendance at a college or university in which he is regularly enrolled or in a Reserve component (other than in an organized unit) of the armed force in which he served in any case in which enlistment or commission in such organized unit is not available to him; or

(B) the local board determines that enlistment or commission in a Reserve component of the armed force in which he served is not available to him.

(c) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty referred to in subsection (b) of this section, no credit shall be allowed for—

(A) periods of active duty for training purposes;

(B) periods of active duty in which the service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized training program, the Army Air Force college training program, or any similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard;

(C) periods of active duty as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of such academies, or

(D) periods of active duty in any of the armed forces while being processed for entry into or separation from any educational program or institution referred to in paragraphs (B) or (C).

(d) (1) Persons who on the effective date of this act, or who, prior to the date they are ordered to report for induction for service under this act, are members of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officer's Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the National Reserve Corps, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, or the Public Health Service Reserve, and are not on active duty, and who serve therein for a total period of 6 years, during which they satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, shall be exempt from service by induction under the provisions of this act, but not from registration.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (b) and except as hereinafter provided, no person who shall become a member of a reserve component after the effective date of this act shall thereby be exempt from registration or service by induction or call to active duty under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That persons who, prior to attaining the age of 18 years and 6 months, are appointed to or enlisted in an organized unit of any of the reserve components of the armed forces mentioned in paragraph (1) of this subsection, which participate in scheduled drills and training periods throughout the year, shall, so long as they continue to be members of any of such components, be exempt from service by induction under the provisions of this act, but not from registration.

(e) (1) Any person who, on the effective date of this act, is enrolled in the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and has entered upon the junior or senior year, or is a midshipman, United State Naval Reserve, shall be deferred from induction for service under this act until the completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long thereafter as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall be required to register under section 3, but after completion or termination of the course of instruction may be ordered to active duty without his consent as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection.

(2) Within such number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, on or after the effective date of this act, is selected for enrollment or elects to continue in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or who is appointed a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and who is selected for enrollment or elects to continue in the course after the effective date of this act, and who agrees, in writing, to accept a commission if tendered and to serve, subject to call by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, for the same period of time as is required of an inductee under the terms of this bill on active duty after receipt of a commission, shall be deferred from induction for service under this act until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long thereafter as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law or of this act except subsection 4 (a) and paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of this section, the President is hereby authorized to order into the active service of the armed forces of the United States, for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months each, members of any or all Reserve components of the armed forces of the United States without their consent who prior to the effective date of this act have had less than 90 days' continuous active service in the armed forces of the United States, exclusive of periods of active training duty: *Provided*, That with respect to ordering members of the National Guard of the United States into the active service of the United States, the consent of the Governor of the State or Territory concerned, in each case, and for the District of Columbia, the consent of the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard, shall first be secured: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not be construed as repealing or abridging any existing law which authorizes the ordering of members of Reserve components into active service.

(f) Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period covered by the agreement but not to exceed 4 months, from induction for service under this act, but shall be required to register under section 3.

(g) The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States.

(h) (1) The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized and directed to accept enlistments for periods of 1 year in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively, from among qualified male persons between the ages of 18 and 19: *Provided*, That no person who is enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection (h) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any place outside of the continental limits of the United States; and no person who is enlisted under the provisions of such subsection in the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, or the Air Force of the United States shall be assigned to duty at any naval or air force installation which is located on land outside of the continental limits of the United States.

(2) Each person who hereafter is enlisted under the provisions of subsection (h) (1) above and who meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a Reserve component of the armed forces shall, upon discharge from such enlistment under conditions other than dishonorable, be transferred to a Reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall serve therein for a period of 6 years or until sooner discharged. Each such person shall so long as he remains a member of such Reserve component, be liable to be ordered to active duty only in time of war or national emergency as declared by the Congress and shall not be subject to any further service under this act.

(i) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, Christian Science Readers and practitioners, and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools, or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, or who are recognized by the officials of their churches or synagogue or sect as having given a definite and acknowledged intention of entering into full-time religious work, shall be exempt

from service (but not from registration) under this act.

(j) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (g)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such services shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.

(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from service under this act in the armed forces of the United States, of those persons whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the persons so deferred.

(k) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act prior to his graduation from such school or institution, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this subsection beyond the date so determined.

(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act after the beginning and prior to the end of one of his academic years, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed (A) until the end of such academic year or (B) until he ceases to satisfactorily pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier.

(l) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant service (which for the purposes hereof includes training for combatant duties) in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially sociological or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any such person claiming such exemption from combatant service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the armed forces under this act, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, be deferred. Any such person claiming such exemption from combatant service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the persons concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommended to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the armed forces under this act, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, he shall be deferred. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

(m) No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from service, under this act, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

(n) No person shall be relieved from service under this act by reason of conviction for a criminal offense, except where the offense for which he has been convicted may be punished by death or by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

(o) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment made or denied under subsection (i) of this section may, within 10 days after such deferment is made or denied, be submitted for review and decision to the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public.

(p) Where one or more members of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this act.

SEC. 6. No bounty shall be paid to induce any person to enlist in or be inducted into the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded as bounties within the meaning of this section. No person liable for service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the armed forces of the United States; and no person liable for service in such forces under section 4 shall be permitted to escape such service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of such service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such service or liability therefor.

SEC. 7. (a) The selection of persons for service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for service under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations.

(b) Quotas of men to be inducted for service under this act shall be determined for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia, and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the armed forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. Until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known, the quotas may be based on estimates, and subsequent adjustments therein shall be made when such actual numbers are known. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

SEC. 8. (a) The training under this act shall be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane.

(b) It shall be unlawful within such reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, cantonment, or training or mobilization place, where training under this act is being given, as the Secretary of National Defense may determine to be necessary to the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of such persons who are receiving training under this act and shall designate and publish in general orders or bulletins, to establish or keep houses of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, or places of entertainment which are public nuisances, or other like facilities detrimental to the health and morals of persons who are being trained under this act, or to receive or permit to be received for immoral purposes any person in any vehicle, place, structure, or building used for the purpose of lewdness, assignation, or prostitution within said distance determined by the Secretary of Defense or to knowingly rent, lease, or permit the use of any property for such purposes.

SEC. 9. (a) Any person inducted into the armed forces under this act for service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of service under section 4 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. The Secretaries of Army, Navy, or Air Force shall furnish to the Selective Service System hereafter established a report of separation for each person separated from active duty. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the armed forces under this act for service shall be given a physical examination upon separation and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That such statement shall not contain any reference to mental or other conditions which in the judgment of the Secretary concerned would prove injurious to the physical or mental health of the person to whom it pertains.

(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such service, has left or leaves a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, (2) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (3) makes written application for reemployment within 90 days after he is relieved from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year—

(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories, or possessions or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia, such person shall be restored to such position or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay;

(B) if such position was in the employ of a private employer, such employer or his successor in interest shall restore such person to such position, or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should be restored to such position or, if such position no longer exists, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

(c) If any such person is not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such period of service but is qualified to perform the duties of some other position, then, in the case of paragraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b) he shall (and in the case of paragraph (C) of subsection (b) it is hereby declared the sense of Congress that he should) be employed at such other position as may provide the nearest possible similarity in seniority, status, and pay.

(d) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) or of subsection (c) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of service in the armed forces, shall be entitled to all promotions, increases in pay, vacation rights not otherwise regulated by law, and accumulations of seniority to which he would have been entitled had he been working for the employer during his period of service in the armed forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer, and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within 1 year after such restoration.

(e) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b), subsection (c), or subsection (d), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action: *Provided*, That any such compensation shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions. The court shall order speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof to specifically require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits: *Provided further*, That only the employer shall be deemed a necessary party to any such action.

(f) In case the United States Government or any of its Territories or possessions, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b), subsection (c), or subsection (d) of this section and section 9 (b) (4), the United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed, upon finding that such failure or refusal is in violation of the said provisions, to require specific compliance with such provisions to require compensation to any person entitled to the benefits of such provisions for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with said provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment or from unemployment compensation including readjustment allowances. The United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to issue rules and regulations giving full force and effect to the provisions of this act governing restoration, and such rules and regulations shall have the force and effect of law; and it shall be mandatory for the agency concerned to take such corrective action as the Commission recommends: *Provided*, That where any agency refuses to take the corrective action recommended by the Commission, the district court of the United States for the district in which the person entitled to such benefits was employed shall have jurisdiction, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by such person so entitled, to require specific compliance with the recommendation of the Commission and the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section by, and to enter judgment against, the United States Government or any of its Territories or possessions, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, to compensate such person for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with said recommendation and provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment or from unemployment compensation, including readjustment allowances: *Provided further*, That any such compensation directed to be paid by the Commission or the court shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such recommendation or provisions, and shall be paid by the head of the governmental agency concerned out of appropriations currently available for salaries and expenses of the agency, and such appropriations shall be deemed available for such purposes. No fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits. The court shall order speedy hearings in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar.

(g) The Director of Selective Service shall establish adequate facilities to render aid in the replacement in their former positions of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the armed forces of the United States.

(h) Any person who, subsequent to the effective date of this act and while it remains in effect, enters upon active service in the armed forces of the United States and is released under honorable conditions from such active service shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits and other rights of this section, except that the 90-day period prescribed in section 8 (b) shall commence (1) in the case of enlisted personnel, from the date of termination of the first enlistment (excluding extensions thereof) entered into subsequent to the date of enactment of this act; (2) in the case of officer personnel, from the date of the third anniversary of reporting for active service subsequent to the date of enactment of this act; and (3) in the case of officer and enlisted personnel who are discharged or released from active service prior to the afore-mentioned dates, from the date relieved from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year.

(i) As between two or more persons entitled to be restored to the same position under the provisions of this act or of any other law relating to similar reemployment benefits, the person who left such position first shall have the prior right thereto, without prejudice to the rights of the other person or persons to be restored to a position of like seniority, status, and pay with the employer, if such position exists and is not occupied by a person having greater seniority.

SEC. 10. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Selective Service System, and a Director of Selective Service who shall be the head thereof.

(2) The Selective Service System shall include a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, and the local boards, appeal boards, and other agencies provided for in subsection (b) (3) of this section.

(3) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year.

(4) The functions of the Office of Selective Service Records (established by the act of March 31, 1947) and of the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System and the Director of Selective Service, respectively. The personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made

available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System. The Office of Selective Service Records shall cease to exist upon the taking of effect of the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That, effective upon the termination of this act, and notwithstanding such termination in other respects, (a) the said Office of Selective Service Records is hereby reestablished on the same basis and with the same functions as obtained prior to the effective date of this act, (b) said reestablished Office shall be responsible for terminating any other outstanding affairs of the Selective Service System, and (c) the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such reestablished Office of Selective Service Records.

(b) The President is authorized—

(1) to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act;

(2) to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State director of the Selective Service System for each headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and in the District of Columbia who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System. The President may order to active duty with their consent and assign to the Selective Service System those officers of the Selective Service section of the State headquarters and headquarters detachments of the federally recognized National Guard of the United States and members of other Reserve components, and may employ such number of civilians as may be necessary for the administration of the national and of the several State headquarters of the Selective Service System;

(3) to create and establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out its functions with respect to the registration, examination, selection, assignment, delivery for induction, and maintenance of records of persons registered under this act, together with such other duties as may be assigned under this act, and shall provide for the classification of registrants under this act on the basis of availability for service. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the Director determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation, such intercounty local board within its area to have the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have the power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, service under this act, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local board shall be final, except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from service under this act, and the determination of the President shall be final. No person who is a civilian officer, member, agent, or employee of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, or of any local board or appeal board or other agency of such Office or System, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from service, as provided for in this act, by reason of his status as such civilian officer, member, agent, or employee;

(4) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That the compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the armed forces, or any Reserve component thereof with his consent or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 9 (b) (3)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officers in the armed forces or Reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States;

(5) to utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof and the District of Columbia and volunteer welfare organizations in the execution of this act;

(6) to purchase such printing, binding, and blankbook work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, as amended, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such equipment and supplies for the Selective Service System as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, with or without advertising or formal contract;

(7) to prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the armed forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this act, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this act;

(8) to procure such space as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and Public Law 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, by lease, pursuant to existing statutes. The provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S. C. 278a), shall not apply to any lease entered into under the authority of this act;

(9) to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge existing installations; to construct, install, and equip; and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances, including the necessary grading and removal, repair, or remodeling of existing structures and installations; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this act, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, for temporary use thereof, by donation or lease, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended;

(10) to utilize, in order to provide and furnish such services as may be deemed necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this act, personnel of the armed forces and of Reserve components thereof, with their consent, and such civilian personnel as may be necessary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the act of May 24, 1946, entitled "Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946" (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.) with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees.

(c) The President is authorized to delegate any authority vested in him under this act, and to provide for the subdelegation of any such authority.

(d) In the administration of this act, voluntary services may be accepted.

(e) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(f) The Director is authorized to make final settlement of individual claims, for amounts not exceeding $50, for travel and other expenses of uncompensated personnel of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, incurred while in the performance of official duties, without regard to other provisions of law governing the travel of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

SEC. 11. Under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, all funds appropriated for operation and maintenance under this act are also available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial, of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this act, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

SEC. 12. Any members of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this act, or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said act, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this act,

or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this act, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this act, or rules or regulations made pursuant to this act, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere in any way by force or violence with the administration of this act or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit such offense, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court material, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this act unless such person has been actually inducted for the service prescribed under this act or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this act. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this act, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

SEC. 13. (a) Nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119 (e)), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this act or the regulations made pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections.

(b) All functions performed under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such act.

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 604 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191), nor the provisions of section 4 of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), all of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, including specifically article IV thereof, shall continue in effect and be applicable as to all persons in the armed forces of the United States, including all persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this act, until such time as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is repealed or otherwise terminated by subsequent act of the Congress: *Provided*, That wherever under any section or provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed while this act is in force by any person inducted into the armed forces under this act, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

SEC. 15. With respect to the persons inducted for service under this act, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the armed forces to which they are assigned. Section 3 of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following: "Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), as amended." The act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148), is hereby made applicable to persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this act.

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted or enlisted into the armed forces of the United States for service under this act, or to members of the Reserve components of such forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, who, prior to their induction, enlistment, or commencement of active duty, were receiving compensation from such person, firm, or corporation.

SEC. 17. Any person inducted into the armed forces for service under this act shall, during the period of such service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is otherwise entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence or furlough for longer than 1 day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election: *Provided*, That no person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this act shall, during the period of such service, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, be required to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 18. (a) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required by the armed forces, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry. Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

(b) Compliance with all such orders for products or material placed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, as ordered by the Secretary of Defense, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment for the armed forces, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of Defense, then, and in either such case, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces to manufacture therein such product or material as may be required for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

(c) The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant.

(d) (1) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, to require all producers of steel in the United States to make available, to individuals, firms, associations, companies, corporations, or organized manufacturing industries having orders for steel products or steel materials required by the armed forces, such percentages of the steel production of such producers, in equal proportion deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of orders for such products or materials. Compliance with such requirement shall be obligatory on all such producers of steel and such requirement shall take precedence over all orders and contracts theretofore placed with such producers. If any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refuses to comply with such requirement, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant or plants of such producer and, through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces, to insure compliance with such requirement. Any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refusing to comply with such requirement shall be deemed guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

(2) The President shall report to the Congress on the final day of each 6-month period following the date of enactment of this act the percentage figure, or if such information is not available, the approximate percentage figure, of the total steel production in the

United States required to be made available during such period for the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials required by the armed forces, if such percentage figure is in excess of 10 percent.

SEC. 19. (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this act upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 3.

(b) It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President.

(c) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, except that, whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in such forces, and their Reserve components, may be suspended by the President to such extent as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

SEC. 20. When used in this act—

(a) The term "between the ages of 18 and 31" shall refer to men who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the thirty-first anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

(b) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "armed forces" shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard (when during World War II it served, or when in the future it shall serve, under the Department of the Navy).

(d) The term "district court of the United States" shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(e) The term "local board" shall be deemed to include an intercounty local board in the case of any registrant who is subject to the jurisdiction of an intercounty local board.

(f) The term "Director" shall be deemed to mean the Director of the Selective Service System.

(g) The term "organized unit," when used with respect to a Reserve component, shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 21. (a) Except as provided in this act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this act shall be in force.

(b) All of the provisions of this act, except the provisions of sections 1, 2, 4 (b), 4 (e), 8, 9, (a) (4), 14, 20 (b), and 22, shall become inoperative and cease to apply 2 years after the date of enactment of this act except as to offenses committed prior to the termination date.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 22. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495).

SEC. 23. The Congress declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both Ground and Air, as an integral part of the first-line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the Ground Forces and the Air Forces, and those in active service under this act, the National Guard of the United States, both Ground and Air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

SEC. 24. This act shall be effective upon its enactment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it has been decided to have a meeting of the conferees at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Did the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Idaho objects?

Mr. TAYLOR. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota can make a motion to that effect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if that motion carries, will it displace the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is purely a privileged matter, and does not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield, on condition that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the motion debatable to exceed 5 minutes, under the rule which we are operating?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This matter is entirely outside the Consent Calendar, and the motion is debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a privileged matter, and the motion is debatable, just as any other motion would be?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. I know that all Members of the Senate are anxious to have the call of the calendar completed. I assume that it will be finished in an hour. That still will allow us to start the conference at 2 o'clock, possibly.

So I ask the acting majority leader if it will be satisfactory for me to withdraw my motion until the end of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that until action is taken on a motion, that is the privilege of the one who makes the motion. Such a course is perfectly agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is in control of his motion, and he can withdraw it if he wishes to do so.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, temporarily I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is withdrawn.

Does the Senator from Idaho withdraw his objection?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to cooperate.

CARL PIOWATY AND W. J. PIOWATY

The bill (S. 2524) for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty are hereby relieved of liability for the payment of (1) any indebtedness, including interest, arising out of war crop advances made by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, to the said Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; (2) any promissory notes evidencing such indebtedness made by the said Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty to the Regional Agricultural Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia; and (3) any judgments, including attorney's fees and court costs, obtained by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, against the said Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty upon any such indebtedness or any such promissory notes. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause any such promissory notes or other evidences of such indebtedness to be canceled and to cause the acknowledgment of satisfaction of any such judgments.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940 AS AMENDED

The bill (H. R. 6507) to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2754) to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to make it plain that this bill is being called because it was put at the end of the calendar at the last call. Therefore it is not a bill in order in serial number, and the Chair wishes to be sure the Senate understands what has been called.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, are there any other bills of the same character coming along?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement was based upon the fact that the Senate would not go further back than Calendar No. 1504. If consideration of the bill which has just been called constitutes a violation of that agreement, I shall be forced to object, regardless of whether any other Senator objects, because there are other Senators who wish to have measures previous to Calendar No. 1504 considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair completely agrees with the viewpoint of the Senator from Nebraska, and recognizes the validity of his objection.

Therefore, under objection, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

POSTHUMOUS CITIZENSHIP FOR VASO B. BENDERACH

The bill (S. 2662) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach was announced as next in order.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in speaking under the 5-minute rule, I wish to say that I desire to have the Senate return to Calendar No. 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will reserve the right to object, and will permit me to speak for 5 minutes on this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. The Senator is speaking under the 5-minute rule, anyway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator repeat his request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar No. 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162, to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington wish to be recognized for 5 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. President, several bills which were passed over at the last call of the calendar are not controversial. Some of them were passed over at the request of certain Senators who since have discussed the matter further, and now do not intend to object. In other words, there is unanimous agreement as to some of the bills.

However, it seems now that because someone got mixed up with oleomargarine and butter, the Senate will give priority to other bills which were placed on the calendar later than the bills to which I have referred, which were reported practically unanimously.

If the Senate is going to take up and pass other bills on the calendar, I see no reason why the Senate cannot go back to the bills I have in mind. They are important, and their consideration will take only 15 or 20 minutes. As a matter of fact, if any priority is involved, the priority should go to the bills which were placed on the calendar ahead of the bills being called today.

I want the RECORD to show that Senate Joint Resolution 162 involves the whole economy of Alaska, and I want the RECORD to show where the objection comes from.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Washington to proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1421, joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162).

Mr. MAGNUSON. I still have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has the floor for two more minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have the floor for 2 or 3 minutes, I think.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see no reason for propounding a unanimous consent request for the consideration of bills not objected to which have been on the calendar for weeks and months, and should have priority. There is no reason why the Senate should not take up important bills behind the bill where the call of the calendar started today. I want the RECORD to show and I desire to know where the objection comes from, to Calendar 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162, which affects the whole economy of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I reserved the right to object, and I feel, because I did so, I should have 5 minutes at this time on the bill, to answer the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico objects to what?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to inform the Chair, so he may be satisfied, I am objecting to the motion of the Senator from Washington. I hope the President understands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico objects. The Chair understood the Senator was objecting to the Senator from Nebraska having the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is the objection to my request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico objects to the request of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a bill that everyone agrees to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The clerk will call the next bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the next bill, after which the Chair will recognize the Senator from Nebraska.

VASO B. BENDERACH

The bill (S. 2662) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach was recognized as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I merely want the RECORD to show that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is making an objection to the consideration of Calendar 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The responsibility will be placed where it belongs.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. Now, that is the answer I would make to the Senator from Washington, in the event he needs an answer. I want to say further we have had the finest cooperation in the Senate and the reason we started with the consideration of Calendar No. 1504, House bill 5882, was because we left off at that number, and because everybody agreed to it in the unanimous-consent order. It is impossible now to go back, regardless of what the bill may be, without violating the confidence under which the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. I know the Senator from Washington is aware of that, and will cooperate with me. If we should go back of Calendar No. 1504, after Senators had relied on the agreement, the procedure would be unfair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The Senator had his 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have 5 minutes more.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield to the Senator. We cannot go back beyond Calendar 1504 without violating the agreement under which the unanimous consent was entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of Calendar 1768, Senate bill 2662?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, of course I understand the position of the Senator from Nebraska. I understand the necessity for propounding unanimous-consent requests, but I also understand the reason we do not go back to certain bills which are important is because the Senator desires to close on Saturday night.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no. That is a very unfair statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a very, very unfair statement. When the unanimous-consent request was entered into, 3 days ago, I believe, the Senator was absent on business; of course, official business.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator could have objected to it then, had he been present, but the Senator knows he has cooperated with the Senator from Nebraska many times, and that there are others who would like to do the same thing he desires to do. But it is impossible to do that and continue to enjoy the confidence the leadership must maintain and must have with every Senator, if certain rights are to be preserved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator knows I discussed the matter with him. I cannot see the Senator's reason. I said to the Senator, "Why can we not go back to bills that are noncontroversial?" The Senator replied, "If we go back to those bills, we might get back to controversial bills, and we have got to close here Saturday night."

Mr. WHERRY. The bill is controversial.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Those are his exact words. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may be allowed to go back on the calendar to the consideration of noncontroversial bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has made his request. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator objects. A bill has been called by the clerk. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill S. 2662?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2662) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Vaso B. Benderach, a Yugoslav flier, who served honorably with the Fifteenth Air Force of the United States, and who died on May 7, 1948, while a patient at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

STEFAN MAGURA AND MICHAL MAGURA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2709) for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the date "1948", to insert "upon payment of visa fees and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stefan Magura and Michal Magura, of Donora, Pa., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of April 29, 1948, upon payment of visa fees and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for Czechoslovakia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HERMAN A. BENNINK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1982) for the relief of Herman A. Bennink, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "act", to insert "and any period of residence of the said Herman A. Bennink outside the United States which is occasioned principally by his specialized study in Holland of the growing of American corn shall be deemed to bring the said Herman A. Bennink within the provisions of section 406 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (relating to loss of nationality by naturalized citizens), Herman A. Bennink, a naturalized citizen of the United States temporarily residing in Apeldoorn, Holland, shall not be considered to have lost his United States citizenship by reason of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act, and any period of residence of the said Herman A. Bennink outside the United States which is occasioned principally by his specialized study in Holland of the growing of American corn shall be deemed to bring the said Herman A. Bennink within the provisions of section 406 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARIS U. YEADON

The bill (S. 2382) for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which excludes from admission into the United States "persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude," shall not hereafter be held to apply to Claris U. Yeadon (nee Claris U. Davis), the wife of Cecil S. Leadon, an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Claris U. Yeadon under this act upon application hereafter filed.

GHETEL POLLAK KAHAN ET AL.

The bill (S. 411) for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old), as having entered the United States on August 21, 1945, for permanent residence. The said Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old), shall not be subject to deportation by reason of such entry.

GEORGE HANIOTIS

The bill (H. R. 4199) for the relief of George Haniotis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COS.

The bill (S. 1691) for the relief of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos. was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is one of the 1,200 bills considered by the committee, and my recollection of this particular bill is that it was referred to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and on his suggestion, a thorough study was made. The purpose of the bill is to confer authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the three different steamship companies the balance of sums deposited by them in 1920. The bills have gone back and forth several times, as I remember. The committee considered the report of the Senator from Nevada, which is rather an exhaustive report for the Judiciary Committee to make on claims. I personally have not become thoroughly acquainted with the facts, because of the numerous bills we have had to consider. I believe possibly the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] may have some of the facts. The purpose of the bill is to confer authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to pay back the balance of certain sums deposited by the three companies when, under the law in 1920, they were building ships for the Government, and it is found that in equity and justice they are entitled to these sums.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the claim has been pending since 1920?

Mr. WILEY. It has been pending back and forth. It was in the Court of Claims. It has been in the courts. A complete recitation of the facts is found in the report.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Treasury Department approve the claim?

Mr. WILEY. My recollection is that some department did not approve it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a reply, before asking that the bill go over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. SMITH. The matter was brought to my attention, and I introduced the bill. I have made an extensive study of the matter and have asked that a statement be prepared so the Senate would

understand a little more of the detail of it. I regret that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is not present, because he attended all the hearings.

Let me state that the purpose of the proposed legislation is to confer authority on the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $384,256.26 to the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos., which sum represents the balance due out of a deposit made in the year 1920 with the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Over a period of years, four separate congressional committees have investigated the merits of this claim and have recommended remedial action thereon. In addition, the claimants have diligently pursued their remedies, both before administrative bodies and in the courts. In one instance it was necessary to take a collateral matter relating to the claim to the Supreme Court of the United States for a final, favorable determination.

The administrative agencies concerned have at various times interposed defenses to recovery by these claimants, and as the claimants have successfully met and overcome each ground of defense, the executive department has come forward with new defenses not previously raised.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. Let me finish the statement, and then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The Congress, recognizing the evident merit of the claim, submitted the case to the Court of Claims for a finding of fact and with special instructions as to the matters of fact to be developed. As a result of this proceeding, and based on the report to Congress, it was made clear that all of the defenses raised by the Government in previous years were without merit and it was so stated by the Court of Claims. This court, however, contrary to the instructions from the Congress, of its own volition, raised a new point and rendered judgment on the case on the theory that it was a matter of res adjudicata.

The Committee on the Judiciary, having taken all the afore-mentioned facts under consideration, are of the opinion that the companies are entitled to the refund in the amount stated in the bill and have so recommended to the Senate.

It will be noted that no allowance has been made for interest or other compensation to the companies for the long withholding of moneys rightfully theirs over a period of years by the Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator, in view of his statement that four separate committees have examined this matter, and recommended action, whether the amount involved in the pending bill is the amount involved in the preceding bills.

Mr. SMITH. That is my understanding, although I am not familiar with all the details. The report of the committee shows the facts in answer to the Senator's question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ROBERT E. GRAHAM

The bill (H. R. 2193) for the relief of Robert E. Graham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EAST COAST SHIP & YACHT CORP., OF NOANK, CONN.

The bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIMITRI PETROU

The bill (H. R. 4881) for the relief of Dimitri Petrou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK, KY.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2096) to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942, relating to Mammoth Cave National Park, in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, since the bill went on the calendar there has been a conference with interested parties, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] proposes an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this authorization be used for road development or construction until after all the lands within the maximum boundaries, as authorized by the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636), have been acquired by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK

The resolution (H. J. Res. 427) correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROHIBITION OF MAILING OF CERTAIN PROPAGANDA

The bill (S. 2339) to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals, unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever knowingly places or causes to be placed in any post office, or station thereof, or street or other letter box of the United States, or authorized depository for mail matter, to be sent or delivered by the post office establishment of the United States, any newspaper, magazine, pamphlet, circular, or other publication, published by or for any agent of a foreign principal, which does not have printed on the first page thereof in legible English characters the statement, "This publication is published by ——, an agent of ——, registered with the Secretary of State under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States and for other purposes', approved June 8, 1938, as amended.", shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. The first blank space within the quotation marks in the preceding sentence shall be filled with the name under which the agent of a foreign principal is registered with the Secretary of State and the second blank space shall be filled with the name of the foreign principal of such agent. As used in this act the term "agent of a foreign principal" has the same meaning as it has when used in such act of June 8, 1938, as amended.

SEC. 2. All matter the deposit of which in the mails is made punishable by the first section of this act is hereby declared to be nonmailable.

RECLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (S. 2677) to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (d) of section 16 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 39, sec. 866 (d)), is hereby amended (1) by inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; (2) by striking out the words "and air mail field railway post offices" wherever such words appear in such subsection; and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Clerks assigned to air mail field railway post offices shall be promoted successively to grade 11; and after 3 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 11 shall be promoted to grade 12; after 5 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 12 shall be promoted to grade 13; and after 7 years of faithful and meritorious service in grade 13 shall be promoted to grade 14. Clerks in charge of air mail field railway post offices with one to four employees and of tours in such air mail field railway post offices shall be of grade 15. Clerks in charge of air mail field railway post offices with 5 to 19 employees shall be of grade 16 and clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 15. Clerks in charge of air mail field railway post offices with 20 or more employees shall be of grade 17 and clerks in charge of tours shall be of grade 16 and clerks in charge of crews within tours shall be of grade 16: *Provided*, That in air mail field railway post offices having 20 or more employees there shall be appointed for each clerk in charge, including clerks in charge of tours and crews, a clerk of one grade lower than the lowest grade clerk in charge in each organization and such clerks shall act as clerks in charge during the absences of the clerk in charge for whom designated: *Provided further*, That in air mail field railway post offices with 19 or fewer employees and having 2 or more clerks in charge regularly assigned a relief clerk in charge may be appointed in grade 15."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (g) of section 16 of such act of July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 39, sec. 866 (g)), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Assistant chiefs of sections in offices of division superintendents and clerks in charge of units in offices of regional superintendents of Air Mail Service, and in offices of chief clerks, shall be of grades 16 or 17: *Provided*, That all clerks in charge and those clerks designated to act as clerks in charge during absences of clerks in charge, in offices of division superintendents, regional superintendents Air Mail Service, chief clerks, class A runs, and terminal railway post offices, shall be required to progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 9 before being eligible to receive the salary provided herein for the various grades of clerks in charge and clerks who will act as clerks in charge: *Provided further*, That clerks in charge and clerks designated to act as clerks in charge during absences of clerks in charge in transfer offices and air mail field railway post offices, and clerks in charge assigned to class B runs, shall be required to progress through the automatic grades to and including grade 11 before being eligible to receive the salary provided herein for the various grades of clerks in charge and clerks who will act as clerks in charge."

REFUND OF TAXES TO BREWERS ON BEER LOST IN BOTTLING OPERATIONS

The bill (H. R. 6808) to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the House, in February, I think, passed a bill to relieve churches of excise taxes on musical instruments, especially church organs. Since the bill was passed, I called it to the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee. I have repeatedly written him about the bill since then, and I have personally conferred with him. I should like to take this occasion to ask the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee how it is that his committee has found an opportunity favorably to report to the Senate a bill to relieve brewers of the Nation of an excise tax, but has found no time to report to the Senate a bill to relieve churches of excise taxes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, there is certainly no desire on the part of the Senate Committee on Finance to discriminate against any church in connection with the tax on church organs, or otherwise. This bill, in substance, takes off a tax on something which does not enter commerce. That is the purpose of the bill. It relieves against taxes on a product which does not enter into commerce, and, therefore, there is no just ground for the tax.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does the Senator from Colorado take the position that there is a just ground to tax church organs now, when the tax was imposed, I think unintentionally, as a war emergency tax?

Mr. MILLIKIN. A tax exists on church organs which go into commerce. The chairman of the Finance Committee has repeatedly stated that he would like to eliminate all the excise taxes, or reduce many of them; but I think all of us more or less agree that once we open up that subject there are a great many amendments ready to pop up.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. May I ask the Senator why we cannot put a rider on any tax bill, if that is the only reason the committee did not report a bill relieving church organs of taxes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe the reason why riders are not put on tax bills is because of a sense of restraint on the part of the Members of the Senate to realize that there is a large field of excise taxes which do injustice, and which ought to be eliminated or reduced when the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I call attention to the fact that I felt that every Member of the Senate would feel so deeply concerned over the welfare of our churches that a bill would be brought out to relieve the churches of the tax on organs. I thought that a decent sense of restraint would apply to the tax on church organs. I have been assured by numerous Members of the House, and even by Members of the Senate, that an amendment would be accepted in conference. I think we are all in favor of repealing the tax on church organs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We are besieged by all sorts of requests to repeal excise taxes. We receive them from trunk and suit case manufacturers, telegraph companies, and various other companies. I think the Senator is to be congratulated on his sense of restraint in the matter. Once we enter upon this field, we will get into a completely uncontrollable situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the Senator's attitude in regard to this subject, but the Committee on Finance has felt that when we get into the field of excise taxes there is no way by which to limit it. We on the committee are all besought to relieve excise taxes on jewelry, furs, leather goods, and many other articles. In the first place, we have no way to consider that subject in the Senate until the House acts on a revenue bill. There is no way to prevent these amendments coming in on the floor, but the committee has felt it would be better to wait until we get the subject of excise taxes generally before us before attempting to relieve any one item from the excise tax.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I can understand the situation, but I thought it would be very well for the RECORD to show it so that the public would understand why it was that we could give tax relief to breweries, and were not in a position to do it for others.

Mr. BARKLEY. That comparison is not precisely accurate. This is a bill which refunds taxes already paid on the products of breweries which are wasted in the process of bottling, so that they never get into commerce, and therefore should not bear the tax.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not wish to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina if there is any explanation which could be made that might satisfy the Senator at this time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not think so, on this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill will go over.

INTERNAL REVENUE TAX ON IMPORTED BEER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6162) an act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "shall," to strike out "also be subject to the war excise tax prescribed in section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code", and to insert "during the continuance of the war-tax rate on fermented malt liquors prescribed in section 1650, be subject to tax at such rate in lieu of the rate hereinbefore prescribed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CHECKAGE OF PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The bill (S. 2180) to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the term "Reserve components" as used in section 6 of the act approved February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 27; 34 U. S. C. 410b), shall include officers on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve established by section 309 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended (34 U. S. C. 855h).

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from February 21, 1946.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITH SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6633) to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Secretary", to insert "after receiving the written approval of the Attorney General as to the titles, leases, and other mutual conveyances connected therewith"; and on page 6, line 11, after the word "Navy", to strike out "and not used and occupied, or if in the event that said Navy shall fail to occupy and actually use said lands for such Navy purposes as are necessary in the maintenance of said United States Navy base within said Eleventh Naval District, then and in that event said lease shall terminate, be canceled and be of no further effect, and the

city shall have the right to immediately reoccupy the lands so abandoned or the use of which by said Navy has ceased: *Provided*, That if and when any waterfront parcel covered by this lease shall no longer be required for naval purposes, its use by another branch of the armed services for purposes requiring water frontage shall be permissible hereunder." and"; and to insert "and shall cease to be used for a period of 2 years by any branch of the armed services of the United States for military or naval purposes, then and in that event, the said lease shall terminate, be canceled, and be of no further effect, and the city shall have the immediate right to reoccupy said lands."; and."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2667) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 2, line 20, to strike out the proviso, as follows: "That the tolls for the use of any such bridge or bridges in any such project may be applied by said Commission, if and to the extent permitted by its contract with the holders of its bonds, to the payment of all or a part of the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls"; and on page 3, line 5, after the word "tolls", to strike out "or the rates of tolls shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide funds not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge or bridges, and any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended and supplemented by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section or of any other act of the Congress, the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey is hereby authorized (1) to fix and charge tolls for transit over any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed by it across the Delaware River in accordance with the provisions of the original compact or agreement between said Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and said State of New Jersey which is set forth in section 9 of said act approved August 30, 1935, as amended, with the consent of Congress by the compact or supplemental agreement which is set forth in the act approved August 4, 1947; and (2) to unite or group any such bridges into a single project for financing purposes and to continue to fix and adjust the tolls for the use of the bridges in such project and pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of said original compact or agreement as so amended: *Provided, however*, That after the cost of any such bridge or of the bridges in any such project shall be amortized, such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, 22 years ago a bridge was constructed across the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Camden. The increased traffic requires the erection probably of another bridge. This bill merely grants authority to do that work. It relates entirely to financing, because it will be a toll bridge, self-liquidating.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AID TO THE BLIND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6818) to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have no desire to object to passage of H. R. 6818. Earlier in the session, I introduced legislation to amend the Social Security Act to provide more adequately for the blind persons of our Nation. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the purpose of this bill, and at this late day I have no wish to jeopardize prompt action upon it. It is my sincere regret, however, that the bill is so limited in scope.

The present law deters blind people from becoming self-supporting because it requires that the amount of income earned apart from the social-security benefits be deducted from the aid received. H. R. 6818 improves this unfortunate provision, but H. R. 6818 must not be considered an adequate solution to the problem of assuring the blind that they may engage in satisfying and appropriate work without limiting their income by doing so. Of the 65,000 persons under the Federal program, it is estimated that only 300 to 400 will gain from the provisions of this bill which permits a blind person to earn $40 per month without reducing his benefits from the social-security program.

When I introduced S. 2590, I felt that a substantial revision in the method of determining social-security payments to the blind should be made. Although I am in favor of H. R. 6818, I still feel that the law should be further liberalized either by the formulas in my bill or by the method which study will show to be most workable, fair, and liberal.

This measure is a short step in the right direction, and I would not imperil the chance of passing it by seeking to amend it when time is so short and human hours are at a premium. I do want to make it very clear for the record, nonetheless, that at the earliest opportunity I intend to press for further liberalization in the law so that blind persons may have every encouragement to be self-supporting.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to the bill. As the distinguished Senator from New York has said, it is a step in the right direction. I also introduced a bill earlier in the session which would be more liberal, and which I hope may be enacted at the next session. I hope the pending bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISASTER RELIEF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2831) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to coordinate emergency activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not object to the consideration of the bill, but as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I may say that it has been called to my attention that the Committee on Public Works has reported an amendment which turns over the administration of emergency aid to the Secretary of National Defense. The Secretary of National Defense has a very limited office staff—in fact, it is too limited even to do the work connected with the national defense. The Committee on Armed Services is considering that subject, and it would be very unwise to impose on the Secretary of National Defense at this time the additional burden which the amendment of the committee would require. I hope the bill may be passed, because I think it has merit, without the amendment transferring the duties from the Public Works Agency, headed by General Fleming, to the Secretary of National Defense, Mr. Forrestal.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, being conscious, like the Senator from Massachusetts, of the very understandable attitude of the Secretary of Defense, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], agreed to offer an amendment which would leave to the President the function of coordinating Federal activities and the selection from within Federal agencies of the particular agencies which in his opinion were best qualified to undertake any disaster work and relief work. He has agreed to offer an amendment which would leave to the President the function of coordinating Federal activities and the selection from within Federal agencies of particular agencies which in his opinion are best qualified to undertake any disaster work and relief.

Mr. President, I offer amendments to change the phrase "Federal Works Administrator" in the title of the bill, and the phrase "Secretary of National Defense" as it is found in several instances throughout the bill, to the phrase "President of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington, as he has just stated them.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 10, before the word "activities", it is proposed to insert "relief."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Washington what the amendment he has just offered would accomplish.

Mr. CAIN. The amendment just offered by the Senator from Washington would charge the President of the United States with the responsibility which was originally assigned to the Federal Works Administrator under the committee bill. The President of the United States in his discretion can select either the Federal Works Administrator or the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Commerce, or the Department of Defense, as he sees fit.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Washington feel that this amendment would authorize the President to designate any other agency of Government to carry out this work?

Mr. CAIN. The bill is so written that whoever is charged with the responsibility of designating particular agencies and selecting others would have that authority, and it necessarily follows that this amendment will give to the President the authority which was intended for the Secretary of National Defense.

Mr. AIKEN. With that understanding I think the bill is all right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I understand, this is an authorization bill.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We expect to offer to the Congress today or tomorrow the bill containing appropriations to carry out this authorization or similar authorizations in disaster areas.

Mr. CAIN. That is the understanding of the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly hope this bill be passed. As I understand this is the only measure we now have which, if passed, will provide some Federal machinery to help in carrying on the work of clearing up and emergency repairing of the damage resulting from the present floods in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and will also provide machinery for giving emergency aid elsewhere in the event disasters result from hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, or other natural disturbances. The provisions of the bill are limited to 1 year because the committee realized that there was not time to work out the program carefully, but it was thought we should give power to the Federal Government to gather the supervision of all its relief activities under one head, and then to authorize the contracting of up to $10,000,000 worth of obligations to meet the cost of immediate relief activities. Without trying at all to go into the permanent reconstruction, this measure will give some Federal assistance not only where it is needed so badly now, but in other places later, if needed during the year.

Last fall in Florida we found that after the terrible flood that occurred, there was needed some machinery through which the various Federal agencies could find unified leadership and could tie together their extremely worth-while activities, personnel, and facilities, and at the same time be supplied with funds to meet the emergency needs.

The bill represents considerable study. It is not in the form we want to make permanent, but it will provide some constructive machinery to operate in this field for the limited period of 1 year.

I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next committee amendment was, on page 3, line 3, to strike out:

(c) reconstruct, repair, restore, or replace facilities owned by Federal departments and agencies, for which purposes funds are not otherwise available; and

(d) make grants to States and local public agencies, including counties, cities, towns, districts, and other local public entities, to assist them in defraying the cost of emergency protection work, and the cost of repairing, restoring, reconstructing, or replacing public facilities owned by them: *Provided*, That no such grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden.

And insert in lieu thereof:

(c) make grants to local public agencies, including counties, cities, towns, districts, and other local public entities, to assist them in defraying the cost of emergency protection work, and the cost of temporary repair, restoration, reconstruction, or replacement of public facilities owned by them and necessary for public health and safety and maintenance of vital public services: *Provided*, That no such grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Governor of the State certifies and the Secretary of National Defense determines that such local agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 12, after the word "this", to strike out "section" and insert "act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 23, after the word "this", to strike out "act; and" and insert "act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 24, to strike out "(e) To prescribe rules and regulations for the administration of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 9, after the word "hereunder", to strike out "in order" and to insert "to the extent necessary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 23, to strike out:

(b) In addition to any such appropriation, authority is hereby granted to the Federal Works Administrator to enter into contracts or otherwise to incur obligations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, for the purposes of this act in amounts not to exceed in the aggregate $10,000,000 at any one time.

And insert:

(b) Authority is hereby granted to the Secretary of National Defense to enter into contracts or otherwise to incur obligations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes in amounts not to exceed in the aggregate $10,000,000, for the purposes of this act when funds appropriated therefor have been exhausted or are determined to be inadequate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 10, to insert a new section 7, as follows:

SEC. 7. The authority contained in this act shall remain in effect until June 30, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2831) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the coordination of emergency and relief activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, and for other purposes."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, Senate bill 2831 has just been passed. I am very glad it was passed, because it is a measure which was reported within the last few days after consideration had been given to it by the Committee on Public Works. It was found, as is shown by the report, that a measure of this kind was urgently needed in order to meet an emergency. The measure does not provide, however, for permanent relief or permanent construction, but its purpose is to meet those needs which arise suddenly throughout the country by reason of natural disasters. I will say that not only will it be of value in assisting in disasters of the nature described, but of disasters of any nature. The bill will be in effect for only 1 year. I am very glad indeed that the report of the Committee on Public Works has been approved by the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from West Virginia, who is chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, and to his colleagues on that committee, and I say it in behalf of the Senators from both Washington and Oregon, that we deeply appreciate the fine and wonderful cooperation which the Senator's committee has given to us in respect to this bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to thank the Senator from Oregon and to say that the measure will be helpful no doubt to the Northwest, but it is a bill which covers the whole country.

MOORE DRYDOCK CO., OF OAKLAND CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 4516) for the relief of the Moore Drydock Co., of Oakland, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. C. HEDRICK

The bill (H. R. 1733) for the relief of G. C. Hedrick was considered, ordered to

a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OTTO KRAUS, RECEIVER

The bill (H. R. 2696) for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHESTER O. GLENN

The bill (H. R. 1076) for the relief of Chester O. Glenn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO WASHINGTON COUNTY, ARK.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2849) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark., which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "directed", to insert "subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe,"; and on page 2, after line 16, to insert a new paragraph as follows:

The deed shall reserve to the United States all interest in and to any oil, mineral, or fissionable material in said land, and shall provide for reversion to the United States if the land ceases to be used for hospital purposes.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed, subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe, to convey by quitclaim deed to Washington County, Ark., without consideration, the following-described tract of land, which is a part of the lands of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Fayetteville, Washington County, Ark.:

A part of the southeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 9 and a part of the southwest quarter of northwest quarter of section 10, township 16 north, range 30 west, fifth principal meridian, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the southwest corner of southeast quarter of northeast quarter of said section 9, running thence north two hundred feet; thence east five hundred and thirty feet; thence north fifty degrees eighteen minutes east two hundred and thirty-four and eighty-three one-hundredths feet; thence east seven hundred and forty-four and seventeen one-hundredths feet to the center of said United States Highway Numbered 71; thence south two degrees two minutes west along center of said United States Highway Numbered 71 three hundred and fifty and twenty-four one-hundredths feet; thence west one thousand four hundred and forty-two and forty one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning, containing nine and eighty one-hundredths acres.

The deed shall reserve to the United States all interest in and to any oil, mineral, or fissionable material in said land, and shall provide for reversion to the United States if the land ceases to be used for hospital purposes.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5040) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6634) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJUDICATION OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military order, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 3, after the words "jurisdiction to" to strike out "adjudicate" and insert "determine according to law"; on the same page, line 7, after the word "otherwise" to strike out "and is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may prescribe,"; on the same page, line 10, after the word "limitation" to insert "as to amount"; on page 2, line 13, after the word "therefrom" and the period, to strike out "Existence or intervention of other causes affecting the damage or loss, including action or nonaction by the claimant or his representatives, shall be considered by the Attorney General in determining the amount of relief that will be fair and equitable according to the facts as they appear in each case."

On page 3, line 3, after the word "or", to strike out "who is otherwise resident in a foreign country" and insert "by and on behalf of any alien who on December 7, 1941, was not actually residing in the United States;"; on the same page, line 15, after the word "amended;", to strike out "and"; on the same page, line 18, after the word "mental", to strike out "suffering" and the period, and insert "suffering; and"; on the same page, line 19, to insert "(5) For loss of anticipated profits or loss of anticipated earnings"; on page 4, line 1, after "(b)", to strike out "Any relative evidence having probative value shall be considered by the Attorney General in his inquiries."; on the same page, in line 10, after the word "General.", to strike out "Any person appointed to examine witnesses may be authorized by the Attorney General to issue subpenas, to procure attendance of witnesses or production of documents, and to appoint an officer to serve the same."

On the same page, line 19, after the words "proof of", to strike out "service, as shall be the returned receipt or telegraph receipt when service is by registered mail or telegraph, respectively. On request the" and insert "service. The"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "shall", to strike out "dispose of" and insert "adjudicate"; on the same page, line 14, after the word "name", to insert "and address"; on the same page, line 17, after the word "case", to insert "and the reasons for each adjudication."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3999) was read the third time and passed.

REFUND OR CREDIT TO BREWERS OF CERTAIN TAXES

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to order No. 1782, House bill 6808, for the purpose of offering an amendment which is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. MILLIKIN] and agreeable to the Senator who objected to the bill when it was reached on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply wish to say that the agreement will confine itself to that amendment, and that I shall object to anything else that comes up in connection with the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If any Member tries to extend the bill I shall vote against such endeavor myself, but I cannot believe any Member will take the position that he wants to tax the church or to prevent the church from receiving the relief it seeks, by trying to place some other amendments on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a few moments ago I objected to this bill. I do not agree to the bill at the present time, but I do want to relieve church organs from the imposition of further taxes. For that reason I am withdrawing my objection at this time, with the understanding that there will be no further amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that since there was objection to the bill insofar as the liquor interests were concerned, I did not object, although I had intended to because objection had already been made. While I regret to see the tax exemption of church organs as an amendment to this bill, I am a coauthor with the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, and hope that the bill will pass. After all, churches need tax relief far more than some others. I had hoped we could have passed a separate bill but we have no chance at this late time in this session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6808?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6808) to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia on behalf of himself and other Senators. Because of the explanation already made, without objection the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

The amendment was as follows:

On page 3, after line 7, to insert:

"SEC. 5. That section 3404 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to manufacturers' excise taxes on musical instruments) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Musical instruments, but the tax imposed by this section shall not apply to musical instruments sold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes. The right to exemption under this subsection shall be evidenced in such manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe by regulations.'

"SEC. 6. Section 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits and refunds) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(i) resold for the exclusive use of any State, Territory of the United States, or any political subdivision of the foregoing, or of the District of Columbia, or, in the case of musical instruments embraced in section 3404 (d), resold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes;'.

"SEC. 7. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be applicable with respect to sales made after the date of enactment of this act."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

ELLEN HUDSON, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2726) for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, deceased, the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Walter R. Hudson as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle, near Pittman, Nev., on April 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUTHER BROS. CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6428) to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Luther Bros. Construction Co., of Fort Worth, Tex., under Reclamation Bureau contract No. 12r-15757 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contracts.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the Luther Bros. Construction Co.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JAMES & PHELPS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2705) to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the district court of the western district of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by James & Phelps Construction Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., Reclamation Bureau contracts No. 12r-15920 and 12r-15994 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contracts.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the James & Phelps Construction Co.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is as follows: This contracting company had a contract to build a portion of an irrigation dam at the so-called Altus-Lugert irrigation project. The name has since been changed to the W. C. Austin project. Because of the failure of the Government to furnish both steel and concrete during the war, the work could not proceed. Under the contract, the Government was to furnish certain commodities. It did not furnish those commodities. The commodities could not be obtained. The purpose of the bill is to reimburse the contractor for the loss. As I understand, the bill is so drawn that the reimbursement may not exceed a certain amount. The amount to be allowed is yet to be determined, in the event that something is to be allowed. This is similar to another bill which passed the Congress a few days ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I understand, the bill only confers jurisdiction upon the district court to hear and determine the claim.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GABEL CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1734) for the relief of Gabel Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss and damages, if any, sustained by Louis E. Gabel, an individual, trading as Gabel Construction Co., of Orlando, Fla., under contract No. NOY-9336 of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Department of the Navy arising out of or attributable to the alleged delay in supplying materials as provided for in said contracts: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction conferred by this section shall be confined to questions of fact.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to Louis E. Gabel, trading as Gabel Construction Co.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, ETC.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEM and Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time on this subject, I should like to make an explanation, if the Senator will withhold his objection for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to do so.

Mr. MALONE. The bill as drafted is designed to supplement the existing Stock-Piling Act (60 Stat. 596, 50 U. S. C., sec. 98 et seq.) by stimulating the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals for stock-piling purposes in the interest of national defense, and to establish a mine

incentive payments division within the Department of the Interior. It is the opinion of the committee that more metal is required immediately for stock-piling purposes and that a long-range conservation development and exploration program is vital to the national defense and security of this country.

The committee is deeply concerned over the reported shortages of strategic and critical metals in the military stock pile.

Mr. President, I defer to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for further explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think it is a matter of common knowledge in the Senate that, practically speaking, we have no stock piles of many strategic materials. We are now at the mercy of importations, with respect to many of those materials. During the war we found that that was a very risky procedure.

I have managed on the floor of the Senate within the past year several bills to remove the duty from importations of certain minerals and metals—for example, zinc and lead. That points up the whole purpose of this bill. It emphasizes our critical domestic shortage of certain strategic materials, including the ones I have just mentioned.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let us bring this bill into perspective with what we are doing in other fields. We are in process of passing draft legislation. We have already made enormous commitments for the maintenance and enlargement of our Military Establishment. We are making extraordinary expenditures in our foreign affairs in the hope that what we are doing along those lines will be an antidote to war.

All the things we are doing are perfectly futile unless they have the support of domestic stock piles and developed mineral resources. In an emergency, with our foreign supplies shut off, we could not move a wheel; we could not get our planes up; we could not make artillery or other armaments; we could not support these programs to which we are committed unless we have the necessary stock piles and developed mineral resources. We cannot rely on foreign imports.

This is a very modest bill intended to stimulate exploration, and to make it worth while to explore and develop strategic materials. I earnestly hope that Senators who objected to the bill will, in the interest of the national defense, and in the light of the emergencies which confront us, withdraw their objection, so that we may build up an adequate domestic supply of minerals and metals, not only useful for our military purposes but, I respectfully suggest, vital to our peacetime economic development.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not a fact that if these strategic metals and minerals were imported into the United States, we should be taking metals and minerals away from foreign countries where they are needed in our program to help them rehabilitate their economies and get on their feet?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It would have exactly that effect.

Mr. McFARLAND. This is the only way in which we can get a stock pile of strategic metals and minerals without hurting our own industry or the industries of foreign countries.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, so far as the amount of money involved in the bill is concerned, it would be entirely inconsequential compared with the loss of only a few ships carrying to us strategic materials in the event of another war, which I hope we shall not have. We learned that lesson during the last war, when ships carrying metals and minerals which we needed in this country were torpedoed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that this metal subsidy is proposed in order to permit the continued exploration and development of known or probably known ores within the United States. As I understand, the subsidy is not to be spent to give those who already have well developed mines additional profits, but it is to be used for the purpose of increasing exploration and development of other mines in the country, mostly smaller mines. As I understand, the additional product to be derived as a result of this subsidy is to be used for stock piling, for the purpose of enhancing the security of the Nation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is entirely correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, am I entitled to recognition under the 5-minute rule? If so, I wish to say that although I do not know which Senator made objection to consideration of the bill, I still hope that the objection may be withdrawn and that action may be taken on the bill.

I shall take only a moment or two to quote from an editorial appearing in the June 15 issue of the Denver Post. The editorial says in part:

> The United States still has huge underground reserves of strategic minerals but most of them are in the form of low-grade ores which are expensive to mine and to treat.
>
> Marginal mines cannot operate profitably at present metal prices. Those prices are set in competition with higher-grade ore deposits in foreign countries. The United States needs all the metal it can get from abroad as well as all the metal it can produce at home.
>
> Yet in the United States 13,000 mines have gone out of production since 1930. Colorado had 313 operating lead and zinc mines in 1939. Today it has only 70. Fifty-two Colorado mines closed in the last half of 1947 following the termination of the wartime premium-price plan for metals.
>
> The failure of Congress to pass the Russell bill or some similar measure, will be a serious blow to the West. The greatest damage, however, will be to the Nation's long-range defense plans.

Mr. President, I certainly hope that the Senator who made the objection will permit this bill to be passed.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGIC ERROR

Congressional proposals to stimulate the mining of strategic minerals have become casualties of the rush to adjourn. In spite of pleas by Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado, the autocratic House Rules Committee has refused to put the Russell premium-payment program for metals on the calendar for the few remaining days of the expiring session.

It seems strange that after voting billions for various defense purposes Congress would not find either the time or the inclination to vote a few million dollars to assure the country of an adequate stock pile of the metals it would have to have if another war broke out.

The Stock Piling Act of 1946 has failed to fulfill its purpose. One reason is that it forbids the stock piling of metals which are in short supply for civilian consumption.

The United States still has huge underground reserves of strategic minerals, but most of them are in the form of low-grade ores which are expensive to mine and to treat.

Marginal mines cannot operate profitably at present metal prices. Those prices are set in competition with higher-grade ore deposits in foreign countries. The United States needs all the metal it can get from abroad as well as all the metal it can produce at home.

Yet in the United States 13,000 mines have gone out of production since 1930. Colorado had 313 operating lead and zinc mines in 1939. Today it has only 70. Fifty-two Colorado mines closed in the last half of 1947 following the termination of the wartime premium-price plan for metals.

The failure of Congress to pass the Russell bill, or some similar measure, will be a serious blow to the West. The greatest damage, however, will be to the Nation's long-range defense plans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to concur in what the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has said with respect to the need for lead in our national defense. We are passing a draft law, which is a very drastic act, indeed, so we know something about the need for national defense. However, we need lead, not only for national defense but for our national economy. As a matter of fact, four factories of the National Lead Co. are forced right now to close their doors because they do not have enough lead to permit them to proceed with production. Not only that, but it is suggested that lead be withdrawn from the manufacture of ethyl gasoline and from the manufacture of batteries. Those are both important considerations to this country.

So I sincerely hope that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] will withdraw his objection, in view of the great need for lead in the national defense, and also the need for lead for our domestic purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the

RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a brief statement on this question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The production of the strategic and critical metals and minerals from the mines of Colorado was necessary to furnish the sinews of war. The same is true of the mines of all the Western, Middle Western, Central, and Eastern States. A large percentage of these mines operated under the premium price plan, which was used during the war to get out greater production of war metals. On no other basis could they have operated.

The Eightieth Congress enacted legislation during its first session to continue this program to supply the metals necessary to meet the industrial requirements of the Nation. At the time, this legislation met the approval of Congress. Unfortunately the President felt that there was no immediate emergency, and also that there were certain objections to the legislation which justified a veto.

However conditions have changed to such an extent that it is obvious that legislation of this nature is vital for the national defense.

In my book a stock pile of critical metals is the most vital part of our national defense and the need for building a reserve of strategic and critical metals for the purpose of meeting any emergency which may confront America must not be lightly set aside. Large appropriations have been approved by Congress for this purpose, but in spite of these appropriations, the stock pile of metals is very low—so low that in the national interest it is highly desirable that we enact legislation to stimulate the production, exploration, and conservation of our strategic and critical ores.

Conditions in the mining industry in my State are such that I feel there is a real need for this legislation today. For example, although the National Lead Co. advises me that it is shutting down four plants by reason of the shortage of lead. The second largest lead mine in Colorado has, within the last month, been forced to shut down. I refer to the Imperious Mining Co., at Creede, Colo. Ores which netted $1 to $3 a ton prior to the war are now mined at a loss to the company of from $2 to $5 a ton. Numerous examples of recent shut-downs of mines producing those metals which are needed, not only for stock-piling purposes, but for industrial requirements, could be given.

Illustrations of the benefits received under this plan are numerous and I desire here to cite only one. In Gunnison County, Colo., is located the Akron mine of the Callahan Zinc & Lead Co., Inc. It would still be an abandoned camp were it not for the benefits derived from legislation such as this. During the administration of the program a prosperous community has developed. There was a very large outlay of capital by the company which resulted in an operation contributing 700 tons of lead concentrates, and 1,300 tons of zinc concentrates per quarter to our peace and security requirements. Without this legislation this community may revert to a ghost town and the Nation lose vital supplies of lead and zinc.

Out of 213 mines receiving benefits in Colorado only 70 are in operation today, and many of these are depending upon Congress to reenact this legislation. This situation prevails throughout the mining camps of other States, and it is well for Congress to realize that in refusing to pass this legislation it is sounding a death knell to the independent small producing segment of the mining industry which, unfortunately, has the opposition of the big low-cost producers such as the St. Joe Lead Co., at Bonne Terre, Mo., and the Kennecott Copper Corp., which has a strangle hold on the copper industry with fabricating plants in Connecticut.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on the point on which the able Senator from Colorado has spoken, I wish to say that my attention has been called to the very critical shortage of lead in the United States.

I wish to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado whether this bill, if enacted, will increase to any appreciable extent, the supply of lead in the United States for commercial uses.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, in my opinion the bill would increase the production of lead to a most appreciable extent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Within what length of time would that increase be obtained? Can the Senator tell us?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say if the administrative set-up provided for in the bill gets under way promptly, mines that have the prospect of successful exploration or development would commence to get busy at once.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand the situation, the bill is not in any sense a subsidy to going concerns or large companies, but in fact is to stimulate production from what are known as marginal mines—the small mines—and also to increase interest in the operation of new mining properties. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The emphasis of the bill is on the encouragement of exploration and development by small mines. Under the formula proposed in the bill, the benefits might reach beyond that; but I repeat the principal emphasis is on the smaller operations.

Mr. President, let me ask the Senator to yield long enough to permit me to make a statement.

If the Senators who have objected will not withdraw their objection, I wish to serve notice now that those of us who are interested in this bill will press to bring up the matter for debate, and we shall ask for, let us say, an hour's time, with an agreement to vote at the end of an hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for making that statement. The Finance Committee went over this bill rather thoroughly and there can be no question as to the need to stimulate the production of strategic and critical ores and metals and minerals in the national defense. This should be done now. We should not pursue the same course that we pursued prior to Pearl Harbor, in reference to the stock piling of critical materials needed for national defense.

This bill is most important, and I am happy that the Senator is taking the position of preparing to have the bill called up at the proper time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the bill is passed over.

The clerk will call the next measure on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. CAPEHART and other Senators. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Has House bill 4044, Calendar No. 1802, been passed over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] would like to have whatever Senator objected to consideration of the bill withhold the objection so that an explanation of the bill can be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to be heard?

Mr. COOPER. I should like to be heard, if there is a chance of persuading the distinguished Senator from Indiana to withdraw his objection.

This bill has been for several months the subject of a great deal of work by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and also by the full Judiciary Committee.

After World War I a Mixed Claims Commission was established to consider and determine claims asserted by citizens of the United States against enemy countries and alien funds held by the Alien Property Custodian. Almost 3 years have passed since the close of World War II, yet there is no agency of the United States constituted to receive claims of citizens of the United States against Japan and Germany, although approximately $260,000,000 of enemy funds are held by the Alien Property Custodian.

This bill proposes the establishment of a commission to which certain types of claims can be immediately referred for determination, and which is directed to recommend to the Congress procedures for receiving, hearing, and determining all types of war claims. The commission would consist of three members, and it would be required to make a first report to the Congress, not later than 6 months after its organization, setting out its recommendations as to the types and amounts of claims which should be considered by it, the priorities which should apply in the payment of claims, and suggested methods of administration and payment.

The bill does not provide for the immediate payment of any claims other than those which I shall now discuss.

The subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee agree that there are three groups which should receive immediate consideration. The first group—some 1,308 in number—is that group of workers who were induced to go to Wake Island, Guam, and other possessions of the United States to construct military installations. They were captured, and those that lived were treated as internees or prisoners of war. The bill provides that they shall be paid under the contractor's cost-plus contract with the Government the amounts which were promised them in their contracts, excluding overtime. In addition, death and

disability benefits are made available under the amended Longshoremen's Act. It is estimated these charges would amount to approximately $2,500,000.

The second group is made up of approximately 13,000 American citizens who were interned in the Philippine Islands and other possessions of the United States.

American citizens in other sections of the world were advised or directed to return to this country by the State Department before the war. Members of this group inquired if they should return from the Philippines to the United States.

They were not told to return, and lulled into security. They were caught when the war with Japan commenced, and for nearly three and a half years lived under most miserable conditions, but gave strength to the people of the Philippines. This bill would give them some relief. Each person over 18 will receive $50 a month and each person under 18 will receive $20 a month for the term of their detention. It is estimated that $20,000,000 would be required.

A third group is comprised of the 29,000 American soldiers who were captured by the Japanese and who were subjected for 3 years to brutal and barbarous treatment in contravention of the laws of war. The committee took complete testimony. General MacArthur's Chief of Staff, General King, testified that it was the design of the Japanese high command to starve these troops. We provide that if the Commission shall determine that the Japanese violated the terms of the Geneva Convention, which Japan announced it would observe, and which guaranteed certain standards of food, that for such violation the Japanese, out of the alien funds, shall be charged $1 a day for the violation. It is a small item in proportion to their injuries, and this item is estimated to cost $40,000,000. None of these claims will be paid from tax revenues of this country. They will be paid out of the Japanese and German funds held by the Alien Property Custodian. These people have waited too long and should have this inadequate measure of consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from Kentucky. I was a member of the subcommittee, which spent many weeks on the bill. We held hearings in Albuquerque, N. Mex., beginning as far back as last December. The hearings were conducted there, for the reason principally that most of the men involved came from the New Mexico National Guard, which participated in the horrible death march from Bataan. All the bill does is to set up a means of procedure whereby the former prisoners of war, internees, contractors' employees and our own American soldiers would have some slight recompense from the Japanese funds amounting to some $270,000,000, now impounded by the Alien Property Custodian.

What we are doing is almost niggardly. We are for instance under the bill giving to the American soldiers who spent from 36 to 40 months under the most horrible conditions ever imposed by one man on another, in Japanese prison camps, compensation at the rate of $1 per day for their subsistence. That would be what it would have cost the American Government had they been in the American Army. We provide that a commission shall be set up similar to the Mixed Claims Commission which was created after World War I, with whom claims may be filed over and above the amounts received under the bill for maltreatment in violation of the Geneva Conference while in Japanese prisons.

The bill has been carefully considered for some weeks by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is not perfect. The beneficiaries of the bill have waited a long time. The contractors' employees should get what they would have been paid had they remained at work instead of being confined in Japanese prisons. We also provide that civilian internees shall have a right to file claims again, over and above the provisions of the Geneva Conference. For instance, if a civilian were kept in an internment camp in Japan and a Japanese guard gouged out his eyes, it is provided that a claim may be filed for the destruction of the claimant's sight, in violation of the Geneva Conference. I could stand on the floor of the Senate for 2 or 3 hours reciting horrible instances of things that would nauseate Senators. It cannot be realized that one human being could treat another the way the Japanese treated our soldiers. The Japanese have $270,000,000 in this country. I think people within the specified groups are entitled to file claims for at least some slight recompense, to be paid out of that amount. I hope no one will object to the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am sure the senior Senator from Indiana would not have objected to the bill if he had understood it. I know the senior Senator wants to do what is right by everyone. I am satisfied he wants to do his share at least to bring about some kind of equity to the men, especially military personnel, who went through the agonies of the damned and who suffered at the hands of the Japanese while in prison.

If the senior Senator from Indiana wants to have it on his conscience, it is all right with me. I know boys in my State who had hot wires driven clear through their feet. I know boys in my State who had nails driven into their heads. I know boys in my State who are blind. They are all former military prisoners of war. They are not only in my State but also in Illinois. In a little town just out of Chicago, in Peoria, in St. Joseph, Mo., in Salinas, Calif., and elsewhere these men can be found. I wish the senior Senator from Indiana would go there and see the agony of those youngsters. Now, because the Committee on the Judiciary dares to advocate the establishment of a Claims Commission through which those boys would receive a little recompense, there are objections to the bill. I am sure if the Senator from Indiana would only go with me, I could take him to 200 of the men within a day, in the city of Albuquerque.

We pass laws here subsidizing industry, subsidizing the farmer, authorizing money for the relief of Europe, but those who suffered in the Philippines must wait; the bill must be subject to an objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are other phases of the bill than those to which the Senator referred, which caused me to object. I was about ready to suggest I should like to talk to the author of the bill and see if it could not be sent to the foot of the calendar for later consideration. However, since the Senator has taken it upon himself to make a speech directed at me, in very strong terms, I am not so sure that I wish to do that. I was not objecting to the phase of the bill to which the Senator refers, but there are other phases of it which I wish to have explained. There is to be another call of the calendar tomorrow, I hope, and I am sure I shall have no objections. If the Senator will only have a little patience and allow the bill temporarily to go to the foot of the calendar, I think we can get it straightened out.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree to that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not know until now that it was a sin to object to a bill, or at least to request an opportunity to look into it, if there was some question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know it is not a sin to object to a bill, but I do think it is a sin to object to a bill that is meritorious without knowing what the bill contains.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The bill will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hardly dare trust myself to speak on this subject. However, the horrors and injuries which my colleague has related are not one-tenth of the story.

I rise to express my thanks to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who took their Christmas holiday period last year to go to Albuquerque, where they heard the most horrifying stories they had ever heard in their lives, stories more horrible than any man had ever heard before. I trust no man will ever hear them again.

I express my thanks and appreciation to the distinguished and able committee which has performed this work and has reported the bill. Tomorrow I hope I may include my thanks to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for withdrawing his objection and permitting the bill to pass.

ESTATE OF L. L. McCANDLESS

The bill (H. R. 915) to confer jurisdiction upon the district court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless,

deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLA L. BROWNING

The bill (S. 2299) for the relief of Ella L. Browning was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ella L. Browning, Bar Harbor, Maine, the sum of $3,552.50, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for damages to a swimming pool and stone terrace wall situated at Pointe d'Acadie, on Mount Desert Island, in connection with experimental work with ordnance materials conducted by the United States Navy at Bald Porcupine Island, Hancock County, Maine, in and after 1943, while such Bald Porcupine Island was occupied by the Naval Establishment under lease (NOy (R)-33877) executed by said Ella L. Browning, on September 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

HAWAIIAN DREDGING CO., LTD.

The bill (H. R. 6186) for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD NATIONAL STEAMSHIP COS.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1774, Senate bill 1691, for the relief of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos. I have conferred with all of the Senators who raised objections and asked to have the bill go over, and I think that now we are in the clear to have the bill passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1691) for the relief of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey if he talked with the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMITH. I did not know the Senator from Minnesota had an objection.

Mr. WHERRY. It may be that I have the wrong Senator in mind. Perhaps it was the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Vermont now assures me that there is no objection to consideration of the bill by any Senator who made objection at the time it was first called on the calendar. I have conferred with every Senator who I was told by my aide had objected. They have withdrawn their objections.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment was, on page 2, in line 14, after the words "Fleet Corporation," to strike out "and (b) an amount on account of interest equal to the interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum upon the aforesaid sum from January 5, 1921, to the date of payment of the aforesaid sum; and (c) an amount on account of interest equal to the interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum upon the sum of $250,000 from January 5, 1921, to October 7, 1935, this being the date on which this sum was returned to the companies by the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, a successor of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, jointly or severally to the First National Steamship Co., the Second National Steamship Co., and the Third National Steamship Co., corporations organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey, as the balance of the refund to said companies and as reimbursement and compensation to said companies the sum total of the following amounts, namely: (a) The amount of $384,256.26, being the balance on account of certain sums deposited by or on behalf of those companies in the year 1920 with the United States Shipping Board and/or United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and on account of certain further sums expended by said companies for and on behalf of the United States Shipping Board and/or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation in the year 1920 in connection with the vessels *Independence*, *Hoxie*, and *Scottsburg*, then owned by the United States Government and/or the United States Shipping Board and/or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALARIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL TEACHERS, ETC.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1708, Senate bill 2850, for the reason that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who had objected, has authorized me to say that he has withdrawn his objection. He thought the bill was a teachers' pay raise bill, which it is not. It is simply designed to correct certain inequities which developed through the operation of the teachers' bill passed by the Congress in 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2850) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officials, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article II of title I of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved July 7, 1947, be and the same hereby is amended by striking out the following words and figures:

"CLASS 13—PRINCIPALS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WITH 16 OR MORE ROOMS, AND PRINCIPALS IN AMERICANIZATION SCHOOLS

"A basic salary of $4,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,300 per year is reached."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CLASS 13—PRINCIPALS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND PRINCIPALS IN AMERICANIZATION SCHOOLS

"A basic salary of $4,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of $100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of $5,300 per year is reached."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (ap) of section 6 of title III of said act is hereby amended by inserting the following at the end of said paragraph: "No longevity increases for placement as provided in this paragraph shall be granted to any probationary or temporary teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, or instructor in the teachers colleges appointed after June 30, 1948, to group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in article I of title I, unless credit for such increases is based upon approved teaching or other service rendered after the master's degree had been conferred upon the appointee: *Provided*, That this limitation on placement credit shall not apply to appointments made from current eligible lists effective on July 1, 1948."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of title III of said act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new paragraph to be lettered "(ar)" and to read as follows: "Every permanent and probationary teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, and instructor in the teachers colleges in the employ of the Board of Education on June 30, 1947, who either possessed a master's degree on June 30, 1947, or shall have received a master's degree during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and whose salary during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, was less than $3,500, shall be entitled to receive in lieu thereof a salary of $3,000 per annum plus longevity increases for placement in group C in salary classes 1 to 8, inclusive, in article I of title I, of $100 for each year of like service in the public schools of the District of Columbia acceptable to and approved by the Board of Education, including military leave and educational leave with part pay, subsequent to probationary appointment and prior to July 1, 1947, but for not more than the fifth year of such service, to be effective as of July 1, 1947, or on the first day of the month immediately following the date on which the master's degree was conferred, whichever is later, and shall be entitled to receive annual increases thereafter in accordance with the provisions of sections 5 and 7 of this act. The provisions of this paragraph shall not operate to reduce the amount of annual compensation of any teacher, librarian, research assistant, counselor, or instructor in the teachers colleges, below the amount of annual compensation received by him during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948."

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (b) of section 21 of title V of said act is hereby amended to read as follows: "After the effective date of this act, the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of the public-school teachers in the District of Columbia,' approved August 7, 1946, shall apply to permanent employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed by this act, and all references in said act to the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, shall be interpreted to apply to this act. Nothing in this subsection shall require the recomputation of the annuity of any person retired under the act of August 7, 1946, prior to the effective date of this act, or of any person retired prior to the effective date of the act of August 7, 1946, whose annuity is computed in accordance with the provisions of that act."

(b) This section shall be effective as of July 1, 1947.

SEC. 5. This act, except as otherwise provided herein, shall become effective on July 1, 1948.

GEORGE BAILEY

The bill (S. 1995) for the relief of George Bailey was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Bailey, of Indianapolis, Ind., the sum of $115.12, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for loss or damages on account of property damage and minor personal injuries to Mrs. George Bailey, sustained as a result of a collision wherein his vehicle was struck by an Army vehicle in Indianapolis, Ind., on November 30, 1945, driven by an enlisted man in the Army of the United States not acting within the scope of his office or employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1666, Senate bill 2686.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall object if we return to all the bills which have been passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is at the mercy of the Senate in that respect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

CHARLES M. DAVIS

The bill (H. R. 4103) for the relief of Charles M. Davis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1802, House bill 4044.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

The bill (H. R. 6860) to amend the Federal Airport Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The bill (H. R. 4962) to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYPRESS CREEK DRAINAGE DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

The bill (H. R. 2395) for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARITAL DEDUCTIONS FOR ESTATE-TAX PURPOSES

The resolution (H. J. Res. 429) relating to the marital deductions for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life-insurance or annuity payments, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CLAIMING CREDIT FOR REFUND IN CONNECTION WITH WAR LOSSES

The resolution (H. J. Res. 428) providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WIDOW OF ROBERT V. HOLLAND

The bill (S. 605) for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force shall cause to be paid, out of funds appropriated for pay of the Air Force current at the time of payment, to the widow of Robert V. Holland (ASN O-32325), late a major in the United States Air Force, who died on December 5, 1947, such sum as would otherwise have been paid to said widow as a death gratuity under the act of December 17, 1919, as amended (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 903), had the said Robert V. Holland died while in a pay status and while holding the rank of major on the date of his death.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION TO ALASKA

The resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the present act will expire on June 30 unless some action is taken. If it does expire, we shall have a critical situation existing with respect to Alaska shipping. However, if the Senator from South Carolina wishes to object and wishes to eliminate Alaska shipping, it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wonder if there is any objection to the joint resolution being placed at the foot of the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will go to the foot of the calendar.

AMENDMENT TO MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT OF MARCH 16, 1934

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2482) to amend sections 2, 4, and 8 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, beginning in line 5, to strike out:

And (3) by inserting before the last period in such subsection the following proviso: "*Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior not to exceed 25 percent, at any one time, of the total of the areas acquired in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be administered primarily as wildlife management areas not subject to the prohibitions against the taking of birds, or nests or the eggs thereof, as contained in section 10 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222; 16 U. S. C. 715i), as amended, except that no such area shall be open to shooting when the population of birds frequenting such areas or in the migrations utilizing such areas is on a decline and no newly acquired or newly established area shall be open to shooting until the same has been fully developed as a management area, refuge, reservation, or breeding ground."

On pages 2 and 3, to strike out sections 4 and 5, as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 8 of said act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and he may cooperate with the appropriate officials and agencies of any country which is a party to a treaty with the United States for the protection of migratory birds in the development and protection of such birds and their habitat, in such manner as he may deem advisable, including but not limited to the grant of funds to carry out such cooperative efforts."

SEC. 5. Section 5 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929, as amended, is further amended by inserting the words "wildlife management and" immediately before the words "inviolate sanctuaries for migratory birds" as they appear therein.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended, is further amended by striking the figure "$1" as it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$2."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended (1) by deleting the words "Not less than 90 percent shall be available", and (2) by inserting the words "wildlife management and," immediately before the words "inviolate migratory-bird sanctuaries" as they appear therein.

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 4 of said act is amended by deleting the words "The remainder shall be available."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451, 16 U. S. C. 718 (b)), as amended."

CANNON VALLEY MILLING CO.

The bill (H. R. 1780) for the relief of Cannon Valley Milling Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUE OF COMMODORE JOHN BARRY

The resolution (H. J. Res. 297) to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE

The bill (H. R. 5252) to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF SECRETARY OF STATE TO PERFORM CERTAIN FUNCTIONS

The bill (H. R. 4330) to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE

The bill (H. R. 4367) authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co. and assignees to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN REGULAR ARMY OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6039) to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, line 10 to insert:

The President is further authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint in the Regular Navy one officer in the permanent grade of admiral from among any officers on the active list of the Regular Navy who served in the temporary grade of admiral from February 4, 1944, to the present date, and commanded a major combatant unit of the United States Fleet in the Pacific Treater of Operations during all or any part of the Second World War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6707) to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the laws requiring retirement of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers because of age shall not apply to officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59). The President may, in his discretion, upon the request of the officer concerned, restore to the active list of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force any officer of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force on the retired list who was appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59).

Officers appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), shall not be counted within the limited number of officers authorized to be serving on active duty in grades above lieutenant general as provided in section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) unless they be serving as Chief of Staff or in command of any territorial or tactical subdivision of the Army or the Air Force.

SEC. 2. In addition to the number of officers authorized to serve after July 1, 1948, on the active list in the grade of General in the Army and Admiral in the Navy pursuant to sections 504 and 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, officers now on the active list of the Army in the grade of general whose dates of rank in such grade are between March 8, 1945, and April 15, 1945, inclusive, and of the Navy in the grade of admiral whose dates of rank in such grade are prior to April 4, 1945, may, at the discretion of the President, be continued in such grades until July 1, 1950, unless sooner retired and the total number of officers authorized by these sections to have the grade, rank, title, pay, and allowances of vice admiral or admiral and lieutenant general or general, is temporarily increased accordingly: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section in no way affect the status of the officer who may be serving as Chief of Staff in the Army on the effective date of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INSTRUCTION AT NAVAL ACADEMY OF CERTAIN PERSONS FROM THE PHILIPPINES

The bill (H. R. 6698) to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the call of the calendar has been concluded. I should like very much if such an order could be entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The call of the calendar has been concluded; and, for the record, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION TO ALASKA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1817, Senate Joint Resolution 219.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina objects.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have been requested to object until the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is back on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the call of the calendar has been concluded, and I think I shall make a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is such a motion in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will not the Senator from South Carolina reserve his objection?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An objection has been made and not withdrawn. Is there any other bill any Senator wishes to have the Senate return to?

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the Senate return to the consideration of the bill, but at the time Calendar No. 1507, Senate bill 2644, was called, it went to the foot of the calendar, and I now ask that I may be permitted to speak 5 minutes regarding the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entirely correct in his statement. The Senator asked that the bill be passed to the foot of the calendar, and the Senator from Maine is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this is a measure reported as a result of the studies of the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board. The bill has been on the Calendar for some time, and there are at least one or two Senators who have some question regarding it, so that I shall not ask for its further consideration at this time. I did wish, however, to explain its purpose to the Senate, with the earnest hope that before the Senate recesses or adjourns there might be opportunity for its consideration.

Mr. President, under the present procedure the development of new types of transport aircraft is utterly impossible so far as private agencies are concerned. At the close of the war, with the optimism which prevailed, certain airplane manufacturing companies and air lines went forward, at an expense of 25 to 40 million dollars, with the development of the so-called prototype plane. They literally lost their shirt. The Government lost its shirt, because the Government was subsidizing the air lines.

It became perfectly evident to those studying this problem that there would be no further development of this type of aircraft unless some form of government development were undertaken, and what is provided in this bill seemed the most practical way.

I may point out that our English friends are now developing an 8-engine jet-type transport aircraft, presumably with our funds, which, if successful, will supersede all current aircraft in overseas work, and long-range craft.

Nothing comparable has been or can be undertaken by any private agencies in this country, because of the expense involved, and the utter hopelessness of coming out even. They could go forward and simply increase their demands upon the Government through the means of the existing postal subsidy, but they fully concur with the representatives of Congress that such a course would not be wise.

Therefore, Mr. President, this bill was developed, with the full cooperation of all Government agencies concerned and of all private agencies concerned, as the only practical means of proceeding. At the present time the Export-Import Bank has under consideration, and I understand possible commitment, a loan of $30,000,000 to the BOAC, or the British Overseas Airlines, for the purchase of 25 Constellations, which will exceed those possessed by any American company, and enable them literally to sweep the skies in this latest type of transport. Meanwhile they are evolving new types.

I am not quarreling with this procedure, although I think it is extremely unfortunate, but I am saying that if the progress of American aviation in this field, both for military and civilian transport, is not to be halted, something must be done. Under the proposal, the prototype will be developed by the Government, and as far as further developments are concerned, it is anticipated that several thousand of these planes would be purchased by private industry, would be used in private industry, and would be instantly available in the event of any national emergency.

This is why it seems so wise that we should proceed in the way suggested, and I hope that before the next 24 hours are passed, we may get an opportunity for the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is not asking to have the bill taken up now?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

CLOTURE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, am I entitled to 5 minutes under the rule?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is nothing before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Am I entitled to time on the bill of the Senator from Maine?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall take this 5 minutes of the Senate's time because it may be the last time for some hours I shall have opportunity to discuss the matter. At least according to the public press, it has been widely proclaimed or advertised that the Senate is to have the public's business blocked by a form of filibuster which in turn would hold up vital national-defense legislation.

I merely wish to point out to the Senate that very early this year, and last year, as a matter of fact, I introduced a proposed change of the Senate rules so that the Senate would be able to guard itself to a reasonable degree against a filibuster of the kind threatened. That resolution was not reported out of the Rules Committee, but a more moderate resolution was, one which had been submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], which left the cloture rule as it is today, except that it provided that it might be applied to motions as well as measures.

Because neither of those measures has been acted upon, the Senate today finds itself in such a position that not even by a two-thirds vote can it apply cloture against a filibuster, unless it is a filibuster on a bill, and not merely on a motion.

It seems to me that in the closing days of a session of the Congress, when representative government itself is on trial, this power to block vital legislation of interest to the national defense, to completely obstruct the legislative processes of government, is too much power for any responsible person to want, and far too much power for any irresponsible person to have.

I certainly hope that at the earliest opportunity in the next meeting of the Senate, either later this year or at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, the Senate of the United States will proceed to amend its rules so that we will not be subject to this type of a situation.

NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar No. 1666, Senate bill 2686, for further consideration. I understand the Senator who objected no longer objects and is willing to have the measure considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1666, which the clerk will again state by title.

A bill (S. 2686) to establish the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with the following amendments:

On page 4, strike out lines 4 to 23, both inclusive.

On page 5, strike out lines 1 and 2.

On page 5, line 5 change "Sec. 6" to read "Sec. 5".

On page 6, strike out lines 3 to 23, both inclusive.

On page 7, line 3, change "Sec. 8" to read "Sec. 6".

On page 7, line 16, change "Sec. 9" to read "Sec. 7".

On page 8, line 11, change "Sec. 10" to read "Sec. 8".

On page 8, line 18, change "Sec. 11" to read "Sec. 9".

On page 8, strike out lines 22, 23 and 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate to be appointed by the Chairman thereof, and two members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Chairman thereof."

On page 10, line 14, change "Sec. 12" to read "Sec. 10".

On page 10, line 14, after the figure "12" insert the following: "(a)".

On page 10, line 19, after the period insert the following: "(b) There is also hereby authorized to be appropriated $250,000 per annum for the relief of the dependent children, the blind, aged, sick, and disabled among the Navajo and Hopi Indians who are needy."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes the peculiar problems of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, growing out of social, political, and geographic conditions which make the planning and development of a program of rehabilitation for these tribes separate and distinct from that of any other Indians. Recognizing further that the reservations of these Indians have insufficient resources to adequately support more than approximately half of their population, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to bring about the assimilation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians into the general population under conditions which will permit the termination of Federal administration of their affairs at the earliest practicable date. To that end, and in order to carry out existing treaties with these Indians and to fully assure the recognition of their rights under the treaties, the provisions of this act are enacted.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NAVAJO-HOPI ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of the Interior as agency to be known as the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration") at the head of which shall be an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 a year. The Administration shall be separate and apart from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Commission of Indian Affairs and shall exercise its powers and duties under the direct supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. The principal office of the Administrator shall be on the Navajo Indian Reservation.

(b) The Administrator may, in accordance with the civil-service laws, appoint in the Administration and in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923 fix the compensation of, a deputy administrator and such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions vested in the Administration, but so far as he deems it advisable may obtain personnel for that purpose by transfer from the Bureau of Indian Affairs of personnel in excess of the needs of that Bureau in the light of the transfer of functions to the Administration under the provisions of this act.

TRANSFER OF POWERS, DUTIES, AND FUNCTIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all powers, duties, and functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with respect to the administration of laws relating to Indians are, so far as they relate to the Navajo and Hopi Indians, transferred to and shall be exercised by or under the direction of the Administration and the Administrator.

(b) All records and property (including office equipment) of the Bureau of Indian

Affairs and all personnel used primarily in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions are hereby transferred to the Administration for use in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions.

(c) The unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions are hereby made available to the Administration for such purpose.

TRANSFER OF HEALTH ACTIVITIES TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

SEC. 5. (a) All powers, duties, and functions, of the Secretary of the Interior, the Office of Indian Affairs, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to the conservation and improvement of the health, including sanitation, of the Navajo and Hopi Indians and to the maintenance and operation of hospitals, clinics, other medical relief activities, and preventive programs on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations are hereby transferred to and shall be exercised by the Public Health Service and the Surgeon General under the direction of the Federal Security Administrator.

(b) All personnel, records, and property (including office equipment and living quarters) of the Office of Indian Affairs used primarily in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions are hereby transferred to the Public Health Service for use in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions.

(c) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use by the Office of Indian Affairs in the exercise of such powers, duties, and functions are hereby made available to the Public Health Service for such purpose.

PROGRAM FOR REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIANS

SEC. 6. The Administrator shall at the earliest practicable date prepare and submit to the Joint Committee hereinafter provided for a program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians in accordance with the policies and purposes of this act. In order to carry out that purpose, he shall proceed immediately to make surveys of existing educational, economic, and welfare facilities, highways, and water supply, and submit a report and recommendations for a long term economic, industrial, and cultural program of rehabilitation on or off the Navajo-Hopi Indian Reservations indicating the possibility of State participation in the program.

EDUCATION

SEC. 7. The Congress recognizes that education is one of the most important and difficult aspects of the Navajo-Hopi problems. Pending the development of a general rehabilitation program, the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator shall utilize to the fullest extent the provisions of existing law for the purpose of improving the educational opportunities of the Navajo-Hopi Indians and in addition thereto the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts with any State for the construction, either on or off the Navajo-Hopi Reservation, of additional school buildings and the furnishing of additional school facilities for the development of a suitable program for child and adult education and on-the-job training. The Secretary of the Interior shall have full authority to enter into arrangements with any such State in order to bring any educational facilities so authorized within the State educational systems, so far as that may be practicable.

ORDERS, RULES, AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 8. All orders, rules, and regulations of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to the powers, duties, and functions transferred under this act which are in effect on the date of transfer are hereby continued in effect until modified, superseded, or rescinded by the agencies to which such transfers are made.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of two members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate to be appointed by the chairman thereof, and two members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the chairman thereof. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs for the administration and rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and to review the progress achieved in the execution of such programs. Upon request the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over any part of such programs, and shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Administrator, at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to his activities under this act.

(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out any program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians developed under the provisions of this act or under other law, including the sum of $25,000,000 for surveys and for the immediate development of an educational program.

(b) There is also hereby authorized to be appropriated $250,000 per annum for the relief of the dependent children, the blind, aged, sick, and disabled among the Navajo and Hopi Indians who are needy.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calender 1802, House bill 4044, to which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] objected.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection, since the bill has been explained to me by the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1802, House bill 4044, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "War Claims Act of 1948."

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the War Claims Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of three persons to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. At least two of the members of the Commission shall be persons who have been admitted to the bar of the highest court of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 a year. The terms of office of the members of the Commission shall expire at the time fixed in subsection (d) for the winding up of the affairs of the Commission.

(b) The Commission may, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, and employees, and may make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Officers and employees of any other department or agency of the Government may, with the consent of the head of such department or agency, be assigned to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The Commission may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the Government, utilize the facilities and services of such department or agency in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

(c) The Commission may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, and may delegate functions to any member, officer, or employee of the Commission. The Commission shall give public notice of the time when, and the limit of time within which, claims may be filed, which notice shall be published in the Federal Register. The limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission shall in no event be later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this act.

(d) The Commission shall wind up its affairs at the earliest practicable time after the expiration of the time for filing claims, but in no event later than 3 years after the expiration of such time.

JURISDICTION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall have jurisdiction to receive and adjudicate according to law claims as hereinafter provided.

EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any person specified in section 101 (a) of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended, or by the legal representative of any such person who may have died, for the amount by which (1) the total sum which would have been payable to such person by his employer (not including any payments for overtime), if such person's contract of employment had been in effect and he had been paid under it for the entire period during which he was entitled to receive benefits under section 101 (b) of such act, exceeds (2) the entire amount creditable to such person's account for such period under the provisions of such section plus any amounts paid to such person by such employer for such period or recovered by such person in any legal action against such employer based upon such person's right against such employer for such period under the contract of employment, including payments in settlement of the liability of the employer arising under or out of such contract. No claim shall be allowed to any person under the provisions of this section unless such person executes a full release to the employer and to the United States in respect to the liability of the employer arising under or out of the contract of employment, except liability for workmen's compensation benefits under the act of August 16, 1941, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1651 and the following), or detention of other benefits paid under the act of December 2, 1942, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1751 and the following). Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified by the Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

(b) (1) The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to cancel any obligation to the United States of any person specified in section 101 (a) of such act of December 2, 1942, to pay any sum which may have been advanced to or on behalf of any such person by the Department of State for the purpose of paying the costs of food and medical services furnished to such person during his period of internment by the Imperial Japanese Government or for the purpose of paying transportation or other expenses of repatriation.

(2) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any person specified in section 101 (a) of such act of December 2, 1942, for the repayment of any sum which may have been paid by such person to the Department of State in settlement of any obligation of the type referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this paragraph shall be certified by the Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

(c) Section 102 (a) of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the proviso in such subsection and by substituting the following: "*Provided*, That the total compensation payable under this title for injury or death shall in no event exceed the limitations upon compensation as fixed in section 14 (m) of such act as such section may from time to time be amended except that the total compensation shall not be less than that provided for in the original enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That any amendment to such act, the effect of which is to increase the amount of benefits payable for injury or death, shall be applied in the administration of this section as if the amendment had been in effect at the time of the particular injury or death and the compensation (except funeral and burial expenses) in any case previously determined shall be adjusted accordingly in respect to the beneficiary entitled thereto under the act."

INTERNEES

SEC. 5. (a) As used in this section, the term "civilian American citizen" means any person who, being then a citizen of the United States, was captured by the Imperial Japanese Government on or after December 7, 1941, at Midway, Guam, Wake Island, the Philippine Islands, or any Territory or possession of the United States attacked or invaded by such Government, or while in transit to or from any such place, or who went into hiding at any such place in order to avoid capture or internment by such Government; except (1) a person who at any time voluntarily gave aid to, collaborated with, or in any manner served such Government, or (2) a person who at the time of his capture or entrance into hiding was (A) a person within the purview of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or (B) a person within the purview of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or (C) a person within the purview of the Missing Persons Act, as amended; or (D) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force.

(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by, or on behalf of, any civilian American citizen for detention benefits for any period of time subsequent to December 6, 1941, during which he was held by the Imperial Japanese Government as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity, or remained in hiding to avoid being captured or interned by such Imperial Japanese Government.

(c) The detention benefit allowed to any person under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be at the rate of $50 for each calendar month during which such person was at least 18 years of age and at the rate of $20 per month for each calendar month during which such person was less than 18 years of age.

(d) The detention benefits allowed under subsection (b) shall be allowed to the person entitled thereto, or, in the event of his death, only to the following persons:

(1) Widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

(2) Widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children in equal shares; and

(3) Child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband.

(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act, and shall be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one.

(f) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions of titles I and II of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended, are extended and shall apply with respect to the injury, disability, or death resulting from injury of a civilian American citizen occurring while he was held by or in hiding from the Imperial Japanese Government, to the same extent as if such civilian American citizen were an employee within the purview of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

(2) For the purpose of determining the benefits extended and made applicable by paragraph (1)—

(A) the average weekly wage of any such civilian American citizen, whether employed, self-employed, or not employed, shall be deemed to have been $37.50.

(B) the provisions of such act shall be applicable whether or not any such civilian American citizen was employed;

(C) notice of injury or death shall not be required; and limitation provisions with respect to the filing of claims for injury, disability, or death shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this section; and

(D) the monthly compensation in cases involving partial disability shall be determined by the percentage the degree of partial disability bears to total disability and shall not be determined with respect to the extent of loss of wage earning capacity.

(3) The following provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended, shall not apply in the case of such civilian American citizens: Section 101 (b), section 104, and section 105.

(4) Rights or benefits which, under this subsection, are to be determined with reference to other provisions of law shall be determined with reference to such provisions of law as in force on January 3, 1948.

(5) The money benefit for disability or death shall be paid only to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall not upon death of person so entitled survive for the benefit of his estate or any other person.

(6) The benefit of a minor or of an incompetent person who has no natural or legal guardian may, in the discretion of the Federal Security Administrator, be paid, in whole or in such part as he may determine for and on behalf of such minor or incompetent directly to the person or institution caring for, supporting, or having custody of such minor or incompetent.

(7) No person, except a widow or a child, shall be entitled to benefits for disability with respect to himself, and to death benefits on account of the death of another.

(8) If a civilian American citizen or his dependent receives or has received from the United States any payments on account of the same injury or death, or from his employer, in the form of wages, or payments in lieu of wages, or in any form of support or compensation (including workmen's compensation) in respect to the same objects, the benefits under this section shall be diminished by the amount of such payments in the following manner: (A) Benefits on account of injury or disability shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the injured person on account of the same injury or disability; and (B) benefits on account of death shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the dependents of the deceased civilian American citizen on account of the same death.

(9) This subsection shall take effect as of December 7, 1941, and the right of individuals to benefits shall be held to have begun to accrue as though this subsection had been in effect as of such date.

PRISONERS OF WAR

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this section, the term "prisoner of war" means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the military or naval forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to

December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which the United States has been at war subsequent to such date.

(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation for the violation by the enemy government by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, of its obligation to furnish him the quantity or quality of food to which he was entitled as a prisoner of war under the terms of the Geneva convention of July 27, 1929. The compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under the provisions of this subsection shall be at the rate of $1 for each day he was held as a prisoner of war on which the enemy government or its agents failed to furnish him such quantity or quality of food. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 7. The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any religious organization functioning in the Philippine Islands and affiliated with a religious organization in the United States, or by the personnel of any such Philippine organization, for reimbursement of expenditures incurred, or for payment of the fair value of supplies used, by such organization or such personnel for the purpose of furnishing shelter, food, clothing, hospitalization, medicines and medical services, and other relief in the Philippines to members of the armed forces of the United States or to civilian American citizens (as defined in section 5) at any time subsequent to December 6, 1941, and before August 15, 1945. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

REPORT WITH RESPECT TO PERSONAL INJURY AND PROPERTY CLAIMS

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall inquire into and report to the President, for submission of such report to the Congress on or before February 1, 1951, with respect to war claims arising out of World War II, other than claims which may be received and adjudicated under the preceding sections of this act, and shall present in such report its findings on—

(1) the estimated number and amount of such claims, classified by types and categories; and

(2) the extent to which such claims have been or may be satisfied under international agreements or domestic or foreign laws.

(b) The report of the Commission shall contain recommendations with respect to—

(1) categories and types of claims, if any, which should be received and considered and the legal and equitable bases therefor;

(2) the administrative method by which such claims should be considered, and any priorities or limitations which should be applicable; and

(3) any limitations which should be applied to the allowance and payment of fees in connection with such claims.

(c) The Commission shall include in such report—

(1) such other recommendations as it deems appropriate; and

(2) such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out the recommendations made in such report.

(d) Such report, with accompanying evidence, shall be printed as a public document when received by the Congress.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to imply that the Congress will enact legislation—

(1) adopting any recommendations made under this section with respect to the consideration or payment of any type of claim; or

(2) making any moneys, including moneys remaining in the War Claims Fund after the making of payments from such fund provided for by this act, available for the payment of such claims.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 9. Not later than 6 months after its organization, and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission shall make a report to the Congress concerning its operations under this act.

REMUNERATION FOR SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH CLAIMS

SEC. 10. No remuneration on account of services rendered or to be rendered to or on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this act shall exceed 10 percent (or such lesser percent as may be fixed by the Commission with respect to any class of claims) of the amount allowed by the Commission on account of such claims. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, pays or offers to pay, or promses to pay, or receives, on account of services rendered or to be rendered in connection with any such claim, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more 12 months, or both, and, if any such payment shall have been made or granted, the Commission shall take such action as may be necessary to recover the same, and, in addition thereto any such claimant shall forfeit all rights under this act.

HEARINGS WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS

SEC. 11. The Commission shall notify all claimants of the approval or denial of their claims, and, if approved, shall notify such claimants of the amount for which such claims are approved. Any claimant whose claim is denied, or is approved for less than the full allowable amount of such claim, shall be entitled, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, to a hearing before the Commission or its representatives with respect to such claim. Upon such hearing, the Commission may affirm, modify, or revise its former action with respect to such claim, including a denial or reduction in the amount theretofore allowed with respect to such claim. The action of the Commission in allowing or denying any claim under this act shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact and not subject to review by any other official of the United States or by any court by mandamus or otherwise, and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for payments in accordance with such action.

AMENDMENTS TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

SEC. 12. (a) The fourth sentence of section 34 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, is amended by striking out "those of other natural persons who are and have been since the beginning of the war residents of the United States and who have not during the war been interned or paroled pursuant to the Alien Enemy Act;".

(b) The Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. No property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the Government at any time after December 17, 1941, pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be returned to former owners thereof or their successors in interest, and the United States shall not pay compensation for any such property or interest therein. The net proceeds remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of this act of any such property or interest therein shall be covered into the Treasury at the earliest practicable date. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of the provisions of section 32 of this act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946."

WAR CLAIMS FUND

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby created on the books of the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the War Claims Fund. The War Claims Fund shall consist of all sums covered into the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended. The moneys in such fund shall be available for expenditure only as provided in this act or as may be provided hereafter by the Congress.

(b) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount which will be required to pay all benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 5 (f) of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, subsequent to payment of all claims certified for payment pursuant to sections 4, 5, and 6 of this act, transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount so certified by the Federal Security Administrator. No benefits shall be payable as a result of the enactment of section 5 (f) of this act until such time as such sum is so transferred.

(c) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount which will be required to pay all additional benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 4 (c) of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount so certified by the Federal Security Administrator.

(d) The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount of all obligations canceled pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (b) (1) of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the total amount so certified.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the War Claims Fund, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this act.

PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS

SEC. 14. In any case in which any money is payable as a result of the enactment of this act to any person who is prevented from accepting such money by the rules, regulations, or customs of the church or the religious order or organization of which he is a member, such money shall be paid, upon the request of such person, to such church or to such religious order or organization.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION TO ALASKA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Senate Joint Resolution 219, Calendar No. 1817.

I ask for immediate consideration of that measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has asked immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 219, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I previously objected to the measure. I now withhold objection so the Senator from Indiana may make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that the bill would extend the provisions of Public Law 12, which expires on June 30, 1948. Unless the law is extended it will, in my opinion, create chaos with respect to Alaskan shipping at a time when we ought to strengthen our Alaskan facilities rather than weaken them. The bill is primarily an extension of Public Law 12. It does not in any way change the substance of Public Law 12. It is a bill on which the committee held extensive hearings. The committee gave much thought and much time to it. It was almost the unanimous testimony of those who came before the committee that the law should be extended as provided by the bill. Such extension was recommended by the Maritime Commission and by other agencies and individuals. I cannot understand why anyone should object to it.

I am glad to yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, following the objection which was raised to Senate Joint Resolution 219 by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], he informed me and other interested Senators that he had entered an objection in the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Because of the importance of the passage of this legislation to Alaska and to the Pacific Northwest in general, I was authorized by my colleagues to endeavor to find the Senator from North Dakota, and find him I did, in fact, in the restaurant, where he was very willing to discuss his objection. The Senator from North Dakota told me that he had been approached during the course of this morning by an attorney from the Maritime Commission who wanted the Senator from North Dakota to object to the legislation. I said, "That sounds very unlikely. It ought to be impossible, because the bill was authored more by the Maritime Commission than by anyone else." The Senator from North Dakota believed he had remembered correctly that the gentleman who had come to him was an attorney, and that the basis of the attorney's objection to the bill was that the Governor of Alaska was in opposition to the bill.

At just about that moment there appeared on my right a Mr. E. L. BARTLETT, who is the Delegate from Alaska, and I was thus able to introduce the Senator from North Dakota to the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, and the Senator from North Dakota said to Mr. BARTLETT, "Are you not in opposition to the bill, as I have been told that you were?" Mr. BARTLETT said, "I was. The Governor was opposed to it. We wanted a different bill, but we would like very much to have this bill in the absence of getting everything we wanted and thought we were entitled to."

The Senator from North Dakota then asked a point-blank question of Mr. BARTLETT: "Can you speak for the Governor, for I still understand that the Governor does not want this bill in any way, shape, or form?"

Mr. BARTLETT's reply, as I best remember, was, "I am not qualified to speak for the Governor of Alaska."

The Senator from North Dakota, out of his willingness and desire to be of cooperative benefit to his associates, said, "Just as soon as I can I will put through a telephone call myself to try to determine from the Governor of Alaska if it is true, as stated by this representative of the Maritime Commission, that the Governor of Alaska is in opposition to a piece of legislation which you tell me the Delegate from Alaska and the Senators from the Pacific Northwest and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Maritime Commission and the shippers up and down that coast have been in complete and absolute agreement on for quite a long time.

As one Senator in company and in concert with my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I know that he agrees with me, that we hope, and hope deeply, that there is no slightest vestige of truth in the assertion made to the Senator from North Dakota that the Governor of Alaska is in opposition to the willingness and desire of people in the United States to be of real service to his Territory.

I am most grateful to the Senator from North Dakota for inquiring of the Governor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to join with my colleague from Washington in this matter. I also cannot help but remark that here is a measure that affects the economy of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. Shipping is not what we would like to have it up there, but there have been arrangements made by the Maritime Commission to continue the present agreements from June 30. The bill would extend that authority only to February 28 of next year, when the Maritime Commission's authority expires, and Congress will have to look at the whole maritime picture.

Alaskan shipping could actually become chaotic if the bill does not pass before June 30. The committee has considered the matter. We have heard testimony. The subcommittee was unanimous in its report. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was unanimous in its report. The Governor of Alaska and the Delegate from Alaska presented certain amendments. Those amendments were not adopted. Now they favor the bill. They would like to have their amendments agreed to.

Mr. President, it is a fine legislative procedure when a committee makes a study of the whole situation as it affects the economy of all of the Pacific Northwest, and reports a bill, that an attorney from the Maritime Commission comes into the picture and makes a statement which would raise objection to the bill on the floor. I cannot help but make such a comment now, because passage of the bill means so much to the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. With the permission of my senior colleague, I should like to address a question in this connection to the Senator from North Dakota, because we do not want, intentionally or otherwise, to do the Maritime Commission an injustice. The Senator from North Dakota told me that he recalled specifically that the attorney who came to him this morning, though he could not recall his name, was an agent from the Maritime Commission. It is difficult for me to believe or understand that, but obviously I can believe that the Senator from North Dakota meant exactly what he said on the basis of what was said to him. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will take another look at his memory as to who this individual was who came to him this morning.

Mr. LANGER. I may state to the distinguished Senator from Washington that what I told him was exactly the truth. I had not heard about the bill until after the call of the calendar had begun. I was called out of the Chamber by a gentleman who said he was an attorney for the Maritime Commission and he said that the bill, in his opinion, was not a good bill for the interests of the people; that the Governor of Alaska was opposed to it, as were some other individuals. I told the Senator from Washington that I would get in touch, by telephone, with the individuals to whom the gentleman from the Maritime Commission referred.

Mr. CAIN. My question was asked in order to be fair to the Maritime Commission, because it is the Commission's bill, and it would be reprehensible for an agent of the Maritime Commission to approach the Senator from North Dakota or any other Senator with such a suggestion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the Senator speak in his own time. I have only 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has only one-quarter of a minute remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I suggest that the Senator from Indiana ask for the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Governor of Alaska came before our committee and

asked that the bill be extended for 5 years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Instead of the temporary period provided in the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has no further time on the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I have no time at all left? I used only a minute of my time to speak.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator spoke and yielded to the Senator from Washington, and the 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from Indiana have expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I consider that this maritime measure is important and that it should be passed. I regret that objection is made. If there is one thing the people in Alaska need, it is proper transportation. I do not know what will happen to Alaska if this bill does not pass.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator wish to answer that question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want the Senator to know that the Delegate from Alaska is seated at the rear of the Chamber. I have talked with him and with the Governor of Alaska. They both approve the bill. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will accept the word of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and of the full committee, and of the Maritime Commission, the junior Senator from Washington, and myself, rather than that of some unnamed agent from the Maritime Commission.

This is vitally important to everyone in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington has already spoken on this joint resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, was objection made to the joint resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection was made.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 16, 1948:

S. 1025. An act to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska;

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho;

S. 1249. An act authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes;

S. 1302. An act to aid the associations, groups, organizations, and institutions encouraging participation of the youth of the country in athletic and sports programs by making surplus athletic equipment available to such associations, groups, organizations, and institutions, and for other purposes;

S. 1551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.;

S. 1675. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Lorraine Burns Mullen;

S. 2201. An act supplementing the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain bridges across streams, rivers, and navigable waters which are wholly or partly within the State," approved April 7, 1938;

S. 2215. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of the heart and circulation, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes;

S. 2455. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft;

S. 2456. An act to provide safety in aviation and to direct a study of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms and other atmospheric disturbances;

S. 2553. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.; and

S. 2593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public-highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.

On June 17, 1948:

S. 153. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to have prepared a replica of the Dade Monument for presentation to the State of Florida;

S. 1504. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline Lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 891), as amended by the act of November 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 1036);

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 891), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 2479. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; and

S. 2496. An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans; and

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, 189, 211, 212, and 214 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 199) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (House Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT ON ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY (H. DOC. NO. 724)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75, enabling the United States to render financial, technical, and material aid to the Governments of Greece and Turkey, I submit herewith the third quarterly report on the activities and expenditures of funds under the authority of this act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

REPORT COVERING WORK OF THE JUVENILE COURT (H. DOC. NO. 725)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the fiscal year 1946–47.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1498.*

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. DOC. NO. 184)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the legislative branch, amounting to $2,689,400, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 185)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $849,739, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 186)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to $6,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 187)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $1,100,000 and authorizations in the amount of $7,500,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency; supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $15,000,000 for the Treasury Department; and supplemental estimates of appropriation in the amount of $3,500,000, and loan authorization in the amount of $25,000,000, for the Department of Agriculture, all for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 188)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, amounting to $245,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 189)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $5,275,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. DOC. NO. 190)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor, amounting to $2,000,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 191)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $1,000,000 fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 192)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, amounting to $1,500,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 193)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $35,000,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 194)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $2,000,000, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 195)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, amounting to $6,730,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (S. DOC. NO. 196)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, amounting to $453,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD AND CITY OF NEW YORK

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 1,

during the calendar year 1946 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 6695. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1767).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements; with amendments (Rept. No. 1768).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6935. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 18, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the professional and scientific service, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 2887. A bill for the relief of Adolf T. Von Ehrenbilt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2888. A bill for the relief of Rev. Jeno Kunos, and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2889. A bill to incorporate the Twenty-ninth Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2890. A bill for the relief of Albert Vita Sciama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2891. A bill for the relief of the heirs of John W. Mitchell; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Tanju M. Ergil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2893. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Buira Sarrate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. KEM introduced Senate Joint Resolution 235, authorizing a study of certain matters looking to the better protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS AND GAME MAMMALS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing that the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a study and report to the Congress, through the Secretary of the Interior, respecting the administration and enforcement of conservation laws and regulations of the Republic of Mexico and the Dominion of Canada, designed to implement the treaties and conventions presently existing between such nations for the protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 235) authorizing a study of certain matters looking to the better protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 264), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 17, 1947 (authorizing an investigation of the appointment of postmasters), is hereby further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 15, 1949."

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. REED, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public services of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

VICTORY AND PEACE—ADDRESS BY JUDGE J. F. T. O'CONNOR

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Victory and Peace delivered by United States District Judge J. F. T. O'Connor at the Coliseum in Los Angeles, May 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WYOMING PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him and certain letters and other material pertaining to the Wyoming plan for veterans in the economic development of the West, which appears in the Appendix.]

WELCOME TO WONDERFUL WISCONSIN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Welcome to Wonderful Wisconsin," prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—LETTER FROM EDWARD A. O'NEAL

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the accomplishments of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, from Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, retired president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHARLES O. ANDREWS

[Mr. HOLLAND, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute prepared by him to the life, character, and public service of Charles O. Andrews, late a Senator from the State of Florida, and a number of other statements and articles in tribute to the late Senator, which appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL GUARANTY OF RIGHT TO WORK—EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Guaranty of Right To Work Called Basic American Need," published in the Detroit Free Press for May 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON SPAIN BY DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Spain, by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas, and World Affairs, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOCTORATE OF LAWS FOR SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, recently the degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon my esteemed and distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] by the University of Arizona. Knowing that Senators will be happy to know of this honor accorded to the Senator from Arizona, I desire to place in the body of the RECORD the citation and grant of the degree, together with the remarks of John D. Lyons, Jr., dean of the Law School of the University of Arizona, in the course of his presentation of the senior Senator from Arizona at the academic ceremonies.

I wish to add, Mr. President, that this is an honor well and amply earned by my colleague. I have now worked with him

in the United States Senate for a period of 7½ years. Our associations have been most pleasant, and I have always considered it an honor and a privilege to be his colleague. Unfailingly kind and considerate of the views of others, he is always willing to be helpful in every way possible. He is a tireless worker and a man of great ability. He is loved by all who work with him.

Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I present this citation, grant, and the statement of Dean Lyons, to be placed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

Without objection, the citation and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Office of the President
Tucson

SENATOR HAYDEN—DOCTOR OF LAWS

Specialist in legislation affecting the Nation's natural resources. Honored citizen and highly respected public official over a period embracing half a century. Devoted statesman whose distinguished public career has been dedicated to the service of the State of Arizona.

I am pleased to confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws, with all the rights, privileges, and honors thereunto appertaining, and as evidence of this to present you with this diploma and invest you with the hood of this degree.

CITATION OF CARL HAYDEN BY JOHN D. LYONS, JR., DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF LAW, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS PRESENTATION FOR THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS CONFERRED AT THE FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA ON MAY 26, 1948

Mr. President, it is my very great privilege to present as a candidate for the honorary degree of doctor of laws one whose long and distinguished public career has been dedicated to the service of the State of Arizona.

A native son, he was born at Hayden's Ferry, now the city of Tempe, and educated at the Tempe Normal School and Leland Stanford University. Thereafter he embarked upon a life of public service which at the close of his present term of office will have embraced half a century, the whole period of our statehood, and a decade of Territorial history.

His fellow citizens have honored him, and honored the democratic process, by electing him successively to the offices of town councilman, county treasurer, sheriff, first Member from Arizona in the United States House of Representatives, and more than a score of years ago, to the United States Senate, where he has since served, and now serves, with notable distinction.

His services to the State have been various and unsurpassed. Particularly as a specialist in legislation affecting irrigation and Federal highways he has played a major role in the reclamation of her fertile acres and in opening her scenic, climatic, and industrial treasures to new citizens and visitors from over the world.

It has been said that a man is not honored by what he receives, he is honored by what he gives. In this high sense he of whom I speak is honored indeed. For though he has received at the hands of the citizens of his State the highest public trust within their power to bestow, he has returned to them the utmost in ability, integrity, and devotion. We hail him as a wise and devoted legislator, and the very prototype of the citizen of a democracy.

Upon recommendation of the faculty of the college of law, the general faculty of the university, and the board or regents of the university and State colleges of Arizona, I present the United States Senator from Arizona, Hon. CARL HAYDEN.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE—ESSAY CONTEST CONDUCTED BY DREW PEARSON

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, every time I rise nowadays I feel apologetic if in any way I waste the time of the Senate or abuse my privilege of free speech on this floor.

At a time like this, when there are vital questions still to be solved and vital work still to be done, I feel that each one of us should be most considerate with regard to the exercise of the personal rights and privileges which are ours, where individual action on our part affects other Members of the Senate and also the Members of the House of Representatives.

I hold in my hand eight very brief statements which are of considerable consequence. They are statements to which Members of both Houses of the Congress may well direct their attention when the opportunity to do so is available. These are the prize-winning essays in the recent contest which was conducted by Mr. Drew Pearson on the subject of how to make democracy live. I understand that more than 125,000 persons participated in this contest and that 152 prizes were awarded. These eight brief essays are well worth reading. Every one of us can obtain a real inspiration from any one of them.

The names of the winners are as follows:

Russell Mitcheltree, of Scarsdale, N. Y.

Mrs. Martha Pitman, of San Jose, Calif.

Perry LeFevre, of Orangeburg, N. Y.

Leonard M. Skinner, of Washington, D. C.

Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, of San Francisco, Calif.

The special veteran's award was granted to Mr. Robert P. Cork, of Greenwich, Conn.

The special college student award was made to Walter H. Mitchell, of Athens, Ga.

The special high school award was made to Miss Carol Breckenridge, of Redwood City, Calif.

Mr. President, I have spoken to the other Senators in whose States these prize winners live; and all of them—the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]—join me as I make this presentation of these particular essays for printing in the RECORD. In presenting them, I again call not only the attention of the Senate, but also the attention of the House of Representatives, to the fact that they are well worth the reading by every American.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Russell Mitcheltree, Scarsdale, N. Y.)

We, the people, can make democracy live, by living for democracy. First, let me—this man, this woman—cherish human freedom. Then let me, by word and example, inspire others to follow democratic ways.

As a citizen of my community, let me respect individual worth regardless of race, creed, color, position. Let me grant each person all his rights—religious, political, social, economic. Let me protect these rights—if need be, with my blood. Working for others, let me work well. Employing others, let me pay well. Applying good will at democracy's roots, I shall nourish life, liberty, happiness.

As a citizen of my country, let me faithfully practice my citizenship, not lose democracy by default. Let me advance these principles of welfare: That government is not a master, but an ever-progressing ally of man in his quest of food, health, home, education, security. That good public servants should be supported and unfit be replaced. That minorities must be heeded, lest unchecked power turn tyrant. That I am personally responsible for making democracy succeed, on election day and every day.

As a citizen of the world, let me help my country to help mankind. Untainted by selfish interest, let us aid any nation threatened or exploited. Being rich in God's plenty, let us feed the hungry. Being strong, let us lead earth's peoples to prosperity and peace.

Thus doing our duty at home and abroad, with justice, wisdom, courage, kindness, we shall win men's hearts and make democracy live.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Mrs. Martha Pitman, San Jose, Calif.)

I can help make democracy live because the best citizen is not the one who knows most but the one who cares most. Being a mother, I can teach my children to care about people, about those values essential to a democracy.

If I show my child that his rights and possessions are respected, if I teach him to take his turn and do his share, if I make him feel loved and valued for himself, I'll be teaching him to believe in the inalienable rights of all people.

I will not train my child in blind obedience born of fear, for that makes dictators possible. I will expect only the conformity suitable to his age. I will not demand acceptance of all my opinions. I will tolerate the stress and strain of disagreement in order to encourage that free expression of ideas which enriches group life, and in order to further the self-discipline required for democratic living. My child can become truly democratic only by practicing that way of life.

By my example I will seek to show my child that democracy is worth all that it costs. I will obey the laws, even those I dislike. I will pay my taxes without evasion. I will be fair to people who differ from me in race, religion, or political philosophy. I will study my Government in order to vote intelligently. I will take time to serve my community.

If we parents care enough, we can make democracy live.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Perry LeFevre, Orangeburg, N. Y.)

Democracy is a way of life for the individual before it can be truly embodied in a government. Its root idea is the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as ye would have them do

unto you." To the degree that each of us embodies this principle in his own life to that degree we can make democracy live. It is our decision and our responsibility. In practice it will come to something like this:

Because I want to be treated as an individual, not as a member of a particular race or class, I will treat others as individuals.

Because I want to be free to worship, to speak and write, to choose my own job, to have a voice in the government of my community and Nation, and to criticize that government, I will strive that others may have that freedom.

Because I want to have my rights and liberties protected by law against those who would deny them to me I will work that others may have this same protection.

Because I want a fair chance in getting an education and in developing my talents I will try to help others to have this opportunity.

Because I want others to recognize my right to follow the dictates of my conscience I will recognize that right for them.

Because I want others to share the responsibility for maintaining these freedoms I, too, will work, strive, and give in order to do my part to make democracy live.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Leonard M. Skinner, Washington, D. C.)

To make democracy live I must begin with myself. Democracy can live only as cooperative individuals work together to give it life. My coworkers must be men of good will, judged by merit alone, not by creed, race, or nationality. I must develop an awareness of and respect for their opinions.

My home must be a democratic one. Each of its members learns to share fairly its responsibilities as well as its privileges. Husband, wife, and children must have time and opportunity to work with democratic organization within the community. Our home should be provided with current reading material dealing with events and issues of the day. At least a part of our radio listening time should be tuned to public affairs discussions.

My city and county governments, so little understood and so neglected, must be purified and strengthened by the zeal of its citizens for a good administration. Let no local election occur without our knowledge of candidates' records and the issues at stake. Then let us have the energy and intelligence to actually vote our convictions and encourage others to do likewise.

My interest in democracy, however, must not be narrow and provincial. My State, my Nation, and my United Nations need my interest and support. I must study the issues and write them my views, protest what I believe to be wrong, commend what I believe to be right.

I can hope, work, and pray for a revitalized democracy, and I can make it begin with myself.

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, San Francisco, Calif.)

Democracy, like good music, does not need argument, it needs rendition. The best way to make democracy live, is to live it.

People are too much concerned about democratic rights; too little about democratic responsibilities. But the rights imply duties, and become empty unless practiced. Democracy is not a fact; it is a task. To make it live, we must:

1. Vote in every election—using our best intelligence, studying propositions and candidates.

2. Exercise our right of petition, letting our legislators and officers of Government know our convictions.

3. Promote community meetings for democratic discussion of civic and world problems.

4. Work through "good government" leagues—exercising eternal vigilance that political performance match profession.

5. Do an honest day's work. Parasites or shirkers fail in their responsibility to a democratic society.

6. Treat every man in personal relationships as an equal—without prejudice and without exploitation.

7. Finally, democracy—like peace—is indivisible. The world cannot long continue half democratic and half totalitarian. To make democracy live here at home, our Nation and we as individuals must use our influence that it live throughout the world.

Democracy begins with the individual; it ends with the world. Each of us, you and I, your next-door neighbor and mine, must practice democracy. We must build little islands of functioning democratic life. The islands will grow and touch other islands, merging into greater units, becoming continents, becoming finally the world. If you and I, the last and least citizen, live democracy day in and day out, democracy will live.

SPECIAL VETERAN'S AWARD

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Robert P. Cort, Greenwich, Conn.)

When a man's car breaks down, he doesn't stand around and talk or indulge in wishful thinking. He fixes it.

When a man's democracy is not functioning as it should, mere talk and wishful thinking will have no more effect than it would have on his car. He must do something about it. And since democracy is a joint enterprise, he must arouse his fellow citizens to the urgency of the particular repair job that needs to be done.

To keep our democracy in good working repair—a dynamic, satisfying way of life—every citizen must first of all keep informed on all government developments, local, State, national, international. He must carefully weigh this information with no prejudice in mind other than the goal of "the greatest good of the greatest number."

Finally, he must go into action. By example and precept, he must strive to overcome that deadly enemy of democracy—the spirit of "let George do it."

There are many ways of going into action. He must take his voting privilege seriously and, if need be, assist others to register and vote. Having voted, he must feel responsibility for keeping his elected administrators and lawmakers informed of his considered opinions. He should contribute, in his own way, to public weal, whether it be through schools, scouts, philanthropies, forums, and the like; or even running for office to expose an intrenched gang of incompetents.

In short, the way to make democracy work is to work at it.

SPECIAL COLLEGE STUDENT AWARD

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Walter H. Mitchell, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.)

Democracy is fundamentally a system of human relations. It is a way of life—a way in which people treat and deal with each other.

It means recognition of the fact that we can expect only as much freedom as we are willing to grant. It means insisting that the other fellow gets his rights just as you get yours. The loss of even one human right endangers all.

Democracy means rule of the majority—but due regard for minority opinion. It means freedom of expression, for if decisions are to be based upon majority opinions the people must know and analyze differing opinions.

For every right there is always a corresponding duty. The right of free speech demands respect for the rights of others. It carries a responsibility for speaking the truth. The precious right to vote carries with it the duty to vote, and to vote intelligently. It is the duty of the individual to keep himself informed because the degree of good government we get depends upon the amount of information we have on which to base our decisions. It is our duty to take a constructively critical attitude toward democracy. Our greatest danger lies in complacency.

With belief in the dignity and worth of the individual and with faith in the ability of men to govern themselves, we, the people, can surely make democracy live.

SPECIAL HIGH-SCHOOL AWARD

HOW TO MAKE DEMOCRACY LIVE

(By Carol Breckenridge, Redwood City, Calif.)

As I read of the struggles to establish our form of government, I resolve to do my best to preserve it. I shall try never to become too complacent. Active, intelligent voting is one of the fundamental duties of all who want to make democracy live. An informed interest should govern my choice of candidates for public office. After election I should write my Congressman in order to let him know how I wish to be represented.

Quite apart from this active participation in making democracy live is another phase of obligation, more subtle, but equally important. It is building up within myself a deeper appreciation of the Bill of Rights and a willingness to make myself worthy of my Government. No system of representative government can be better than the people whom it represents. Therefore, I shall resolve to use my glorious freedom of speech to express only those ideas which will help all mankind, and never abuse it by using words to gain selfish or unworthy aims.

Each individual thinks often of his privileges, but now is the time to think often of one's duties and responsibilities in maintaining our Government. No one is immune to the process of making our democracy live.

MASSMAN CONSTRUCTION CO.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2192, for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of Massman Construction Company, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the message from the House of Representatives on Senate bill 2655 be again laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair again lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives insisting upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be the following: The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a moment on the motion.

In my opinion, this measure is mandatory on the Congress, because of its importance to the national defense. In my opinion, if any debate in the nature of a filibuster now takes place on this simple motion to name conferees, it is not in accord with the best customs of the Senate, the House, or the Congress. If the measure were to be debated on its merits, that would be a different question. It has been debated on its merits. The Senate has spoken. If conferees are appointed and the conference recommendation comes back to both Houses, and there are decisions of the conferees which are not to the liking of any Member or group of Members, no matter what the size of that group, the merits of the question can again be debated. But to use a parliamentary maneuver to stop the naming of conferees is clearly outside the high ideals which the American people hold for the doings of their Congress.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am entirely in sympathy with the point of view of the Senator from South Dakota as he has expresed it. In this connection I point out to him the words of wisdom given us by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] half an hour ago with reference to Senate rules which make such a thing possible. The Senate has made its own bed, and now it must lie in it. I think we need a few horrible examples of filibusters by one, two, three, or four men crammed down our throats to bring the Senate and the country to the realization of the crudeness, rudeness, and wickedness of the Senate rules, and the rules of Congress in general, which allow one, two, or three men to set aside and nullify the democratic processes and keep the representatives of the people from voting on these issues.

Therefore, while I am in sympathy with the remarks of the Senator, we have made our bed, and now we must lie in it. If we want to rectify these things, let us take the bull by the horns and adopt adequate rules, as recommended by the Senator from California and others, and clean house. In that way we can retain the respect of the people.

[Manifestations of applause from the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Demonstrations in the gallery are not allowed under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hope my motion will be agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A conference report is a privileged matter; is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then at this time I desire to call up the conference report on House bill 3566, which is at the desk, and to ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The motion made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] was that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the draft bill, agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate. Is not unanimous consent required to set aside that matter, for the purpose of having the Senate take up a conference report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, unanimous consent would be required for that purpose.

Is the Senator from West Virginia requesting that the motion be laid aside, and that the conference report be taken up?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask that the conference report on House bill 3566 be taken up at this time, and that the pending motion be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask what the conference report relates to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is the conference report on House bill 3566, which amends the immigration laws with respect to reports by the Attorney General upon extension of stays of aliens who are in this country under temporary permits. The conference report has been agreed to by the House of Representatives, and has just been sent to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say I am inclined to think that I shall not object to this particular request to lay aside the motion of the Senator from South Dakota and take up the conference report referred to. But I think it is only fair to point out that I am not going to sit here and have the danger of a filibuster on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota hanging over our heads and in effect placing us in a position—in fact, we actually are in such a position at the present moment, if I interpret the situation correctly—of conducting business in the Senate of the United States by way of sufferance.

We have to face the issue as to whether we are going to go ahead with the appointment of conferees on the draft bill. It is my judgment that there is nothing else that is more important today than meeting this issue, which deals with the national security of our Nation. I speak as one who as a member of the Armed Services Committee was not in complete agreement with every section of the bill as reported to the Senate from the committee; but I sought to have the bill amended in certain respects. I was successful as to some of those amendments, and unsuccessful as to others; but the majority of the Senate ruled as to the type of draft bill which the Senate wished to send to conference; and I intend to support the majority of the Senate in doing all I can to see to it that the draft bill goes to conference, and that we receive from the conference the best military manpower legislation possible, in order to meet what I consider to be a great emergency need confronting our Nation at the present time.

Mr. President, I wish to say now, as I said briefly the other day, that the action we take on this matter will be heard around the globe, and there are millions of people in friendly countries who will look to see whether we are going to keep faith with the promises we have clearly made, it seems to me, and whether we intend to enforce the peace and give the peoples of the world who are making a fight for freedom an opportunity to have success in that fight.

Therefore, although I shall let this one piece of business be transacted, I wish to state that it is the last piece of business I shall allow to be transacted until we meet the question as to whether we are going to agree to have the requested conference on the draft bill which, in my judgment, pertains to the very security of our Nation. It seems to me that now is the best time and this is the best place to fight that battle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I appeal to the Senator from Oregon about this matter. I wish to say here that it was our plan, if I may state it now, to have the Senate adopt two or three conference reports as to which there is no controversy, and also agree to a request for a conference. One of those matters relates to a road bill. I think it will take us only 10 minutes to complete action on the supple-

mental independent offices appropriation bill, which must be passed and go to conference.

Then I would be agreeable to continuing under the program of having debate on the motion to agree to the requested conference.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does the conference report relate to the displaced persons?

Mr. REVERCOMB. This is not the report on the displaced persons bill.

Mr. President, it has just been brought to my attention that the conference report which has been under discussion was agreed to by the Senate on the 15th instant, although it has just been agreed to by the House of Representatives.

Therefore, I withdraw the request.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the draft bill, Senate bill 2655; agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT OFFICES, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to propose one further unanimous-consent request, if I may do so. I feel it is very necessary that the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill be considered at this time.

So I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, to wit, the motion of the Senator from South Dakota relative to having the Senate agree to the requested conference on the draft bill, and so forth, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6829.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—let me inquire whether the proposed action, if taken, would result in the displacement of the business now pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not under the terms of the request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. Will he explain to me just what procedure has to be followed in regard to the conference report to which he has referred in order to have it finally disposed of?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have referred to the supplemental appropriation bill for the independent offices, which is ready for consideration and passage by the Senate. This will be the first time the bill has been considered by the Senate. It is the appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator does not refer to a conference report, then?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I shall later ask unanimous consent for the consideration of other conference reports. They can be taken up at any time, for they are privileged matters.

But this is the last appropriation bill which must be considered, and I thought it wisest to have the Senate consider it now, before entering into prolonged discussion of the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MORSE. If we do not consider the bill now and if we get into a prolonged discussion of the motion of the Senator from South Dakota, we may find ourselves in a position tomorrow or tomorrow night when there will not be time even to take action by way of a conference on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I hope I can at least demonstrate, in a very short period of time, that I can adjust myself to new facts as I discover them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I am not going to object to this one.

Mr. WHERRY. That is wonderful.

Mr. MORSE. However, I am beginning to say I do not like the idea of having to work under the sufferance of what apparently amounts to a threatened filibuster being held over my head.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Oregon. I assure him I shall cooperate with him in every way to expedite action on the question, after the appropriation bill is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to make a 5-minute preliminary statement to explain the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let us have a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. We do not need it. Let us proceed to the consideration of the committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Atomic Energy Commission," on page 3, line 14, after the word "periodicals", to insert "(not to exceed $8,000)"; in line 15, after the word "expenses", to insert "(not to exceed $1,842,000)"; and in line 16, after the word "authorizations", to strike out "$501,850,000" and insert "$521,850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cooper	Hawkes
Baldwin	Cordon	Hayden
Ball	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Downey	Hill
Brewster	Dworshak	Hoey
Bricker	Eastland	Holland
Bridges	Ecton	Ives
Brooks	Ellender	Jenner
Buck	Feazel	Johnson, Colo.
Butler	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Flanders	Kem
Cain	Fulbright	Kilgore
Capehart	Green	Knowland
Chavez	Gurney	Langer
Connally	Hatch	Lucas

McCarthy	O'Conor	Taylor
McClellan	O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Thye
McGrath	Pepper	Tobey
McKellar	Reed	Tydings
McMahon	Revercomb	Umstead
Magnuson	Robertson, Va.	Vandenberg
Malone	Robertson, Wyo.	Watkins
Martin	Russell	Wherry
Maybank	Saltonstall	White
Millikin	Smith	Wiley
Moore	Sparkman	Williams
Morse	Stennis	Wilson
Murray	Stewart	Young
Myers	Taft	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Housing Expediter," on page 5, line 10, after the word "Expediter", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That as to cases involving the functions transferred to the Office of the Housing Expediter by Executive Order 9841, section 204 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be considered as remaining in full force and effect during fiscal year 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have had a conversation with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and he states he does not object to returning to the item of $521,850,000, the total appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission. I ask the Senator if that is correct?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 3, line 16, after the word "authorizations", to strike out "$501,850,000" and insert "$521,850,000" was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote on the amendment will be reconsidered, and the amendment will be considered to be pending at the moment before the Senate. Does the Senator wish to be recognized?

Mr. McMAHON. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, asking him to explain to me, if he will, where the $28,000,000 cut has been made in the appropriation. The Senator stated the House cut the appropriation $48,000,000 and according to the report the Senate committee has increased it $20,000,000, leaving a net reduction of $28,000,000. I should like to ask the Senator how that was arrived at by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. REED. The budget estimate for the Atomic Energy Commission was $550,000,000. The House bill provided $501,850,000. The Senate committee appointed a subcommittee. The full committee, after considering the matter, recommended that the House figure be increased by $20,000,000. In addition to doing that, we removed some restrictions which had been imposed upon the Atomic Energy Commission in the matter of the use of its funds. With the removal of the restrictions and allowing more flexibility to the Commission in the use of its funds, it was the opinion of the subcommittee and the full committee that the Atomic Energy Commission could perform all of its functions with the amount allowed.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in the House it was suggested that the appropriation for basic research should be reduced by approximately 14 percent. Did the subcommittee or the full Senate committee have any deliberations upon that action?

Mr. REED. We are trying to let the Atomic Energy Commission use its funds with the utmost flexibility and in the way it deems best. We have not undertaken to reduce the funds in any particular category by any particular percentage.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that although I am on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I cannot vouch for every dollar in the request for an appropriation. I do know, however, that its budget estimates were arrived at as a result of the Commission conferring with the advisory board provided for by statute under which it operates. The budget was arrived at as a result of conferences between the Advisory Board, the industrial concerns which operate the project, and the Commission itself.

I was disturbed by the House report which had an amazing line in it to the effect that they did not want to interfere with the amount of research, but they thought that the amount of research could be well reduced on items other than those which cover basic research and research for peaceful purposes. Apparently there is a belief in some quarters that we can have research for weapons, for instance, and research not for weapon purposes, and can put them in different categories. Of course the Senator from Kansas knows, I am sure, after listening to the testimony, that that is impossible.

I protest against an uninformed, unconsidered, and what I consider, to be a reckless exercise of power to reduce a budget estimate for an agency of this character, which is as vital, if not more vital to national defense, than any other item in our defense. I cannot help but think of the appropriation which went through the Senate in the naval appropriation bill. It contained $125,000,000 for one airplane carrier. I am informed that that is only a down payment. Before it is fully equipped the amount will be approximately $200,000,000.

I certainly think that this reduction, which unfortunately has been confirmed in part by the Senate Appropriations Committee, is to be very much deplored.

I will say, in conclusion, on my own responsibility that there is no one in this Congress who has considered the budget who has approached the matter with an eye to carrying forward a program which the people in charge of it say is absolutely necessary to our national defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator that I heard much of the discussion concerning the Atomic Energy Commission. I was present when this matter was discussed. The House cut the amount for the use of periodicals down to $50. The Commission last year spent $8,000 for periodicals. The Senate committee restored that amount. The Commission asked for $1,842,000 for travel, and we gave them that, or very nearly that much. The House reduced the appropriation $48,000,000. The Senate restored $20,000,000 of that amount and eliminated many of the restrictions concerning the use of the funds. The Atomic Energy Commission told us that if those restrictions were released and they were given more freedom in the use of their funds, it would help them and would make it less expensive for the Government, in the long run. So, we felt, that by reducing the restrictions and restoring half of what was eliminated by the House we were giving them practically all the money they could use and all they had asked for. The restrictions are very much less, and the funds are within $28,000,000 of what they asked for. In other words, they have the funds appropriated to use for research, housing, and every other incidental administrative expense, without the restrictions under which they have operated in the past few years. As one member of the committee who supported the chairman in connection with the question, ~~I felt~~ we were giving the Commission all they could use or were entitled to use, and that they would be satisfied with the result.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not wish to embarrass the committee or any Senator who is a member of it, but I should like to know how long the budget was considered in the Appropriations Committee. What was the total length of time given for consideration? I do not think it was over 2 hours, was it?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes. There were 2 days of hearings at which all the witnesses were heard. The Atomic Energy Commission, in addition to the cash appropriations is given general contract authorization for $400,000,000, which is the full amount of contract authorization which the Commission requested. That appears on page 12 of the committee's report.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to quote a sentence from the House committee report:

The committee also believes that an adjustment can be made in the item for research in the nonweapon, nonbiological, and nonmedical phases of the research and development program.

In other words, as I read it, they must cut down on basic research out of which possibly new and great discoveries will come forth, and concern themselves only with atomic weapons. With that spirit and that belief, I certainly cannot find myself in agreement. I therefore move that the committee amendment be amended by striking out "$521,850,000" and inserting "$550,000,000" in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$521,850,000," and insert "$550,000,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission," on page 5, line 20, after the word "Commission," to strike out "$63,360,775" and insert "$69,360,775."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,600,000" and insert "$11,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 18, after the numerals "1948", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Commission may expend amounts to acquire the vessels *Mariposa* and *Monterey* and materials and equipment in conjunction therewith on hand or committed for and expend the amounts necessary to complete the vessels, if required for the development and maintenance of the commerce of the United States and for use of the United States in time of war and national emergency, from any amounts available within this limitation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 16, after the name "New York", to strike out "Pass Christian, Miss."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of that committee amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there was estimated by the Bureau of the Budget this year for maritime training the sum of $6,868,000. The House increased that somewhat. In the course of the hearing of officials of the Maritime Commission Admiral Smith, its chairman, appeared and I asked him:

Did you agree with the Budget on the estimate it made originally?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator REED. That you can get along on that?

Admiral SMITH. We can if we leave Pass Christian out of the picture. It was damaged last September by the hurricane. * * * I was not present when that was discussed before the House committee.

Mr. President, Pass Christian was not included by the budget. The Maritime Commission, through its chairman, says they can get along without the school. It is not now in operation. It will take $600,000 to open it up and place it in operation. The cadets at Pass Christian have been transferred to the main cadet school at Kings Point, N. Y., and they are getting along reasonably satisfactorily, I should say.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the House hearings show that the Maritime Commission did request this school. The distinguished Senator from Kansas says that the cadets have been transferred to Kings Point, N. Y., where they are getting along all right. That is a school which cannot be operated the year round. The school at Pass Christian is a school which can be.

Mr. REED. I beg pardon; the Senator from Mississippi certainly does not mean to say that the Kings Point Academy cannot be operated the year round.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the testimony of Representative BOGGS, from Louisiana, before the House committee. Further, on a per capita basis the school at Pass Christian can be operated more cheaply than any other school.

Mr. President, let me state what is involved. A few years ago the United States Government bought a fine hotel on the Gulf Coast of Mississippi named "Inn-By-The-Sea." It was one of the nicest hotels in the southern part of the United States. That hotel was converted into this school. A hurricane occurred last fall which damaged the property. The estimates show that it will take about $75,000 to repair the buildings. The buildings are permanent structures, and the Government today has an investment there of $2,000,000. It is proposed that we junk that investment, when we should operate the school, because, the hearings show, it can be operated more cheaply on a per capita basis than any other school of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. President, in the southern part of the United States, on the Gulf of Mexico, there is the second port of this country, the port of New Orleans, which is served by this school. The great port of Houston, Tex., is served by this school. The great port of Mobile, Ala., is served by this school, and the State of Florida is served by this school.

It seems to me that this part of the Gulf coast area is entitled to this institution, and that it is very poor business on the part of the American Government to junk an investment of $2,000,000 and turn it over to the War Assets Administration where it would be sold in all probability for 30 or 40 or perhaps 50 thousand dollars. It is poor business to junk that school in order to operate a school where it will cost more money per capita to give the students the same training they would get on the Gulf coast, in an area where the climate is ideal, and where all the facilities are available.

Mr. President, I do not ask the Senate to act on my statement alone, but to reject the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we get along with one Army cadet school at West Point, N. Y., we get along with one naval cadet school at Annapolis, Md. Whoever said it was not possible to operate the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy in New York the year round clearly did not know what he was talking about. I was chairman of the Board of Visitors this year. We went to Kings Point last month, spent a couple of days there, and went over the whole training program. The cadets who were at Pass Christian before the hurricane have been transferred to New York, and we have one successful operating merchant marine cadet school.

I do not want to see this property junked, any more than does anyone else. Our committee and the Board of Visitors this year—and, incidentally, there were more Democrats on it than Republicans—are not quite happy about the whole program, and we are holding a further meeting of the Board of Visitors as soon as we are relieved from the present pressure.

The Maritime Commission chairman testified that the Pass Christian School was not necessary, the Bureau of the Budget did not include it in its estimates, and we have provided in the bill the exact amount of money the Bureau of the Budget estimated was necessary for the training school.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator stated that the person who said that the Kings Point School was not operated the year round did not know what he was talking about. The testimony before the House committee appears on page 725 of the hearings on the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill for 1949. I quote from the testimony of Representative BOGGS:

There is a very good reason for this economy. The school—

Speaking of the Pass Christian school—

operates the year round with outdoor activities. They can get out on the Gulf of Mexico and Bay St. Louis and perform the necessary maritime functions in the dead of winter. They cannot do that at Kings Point.

Mr. REED. The Senator certainly is not undertaking to say it is not possible to operate the school at Kings Point the year round. Of course, the climate is more severe in New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. They cannot get out on the sea at Kings Point the year round, and the object of the school is to get maritime training, which can be done on the Gulf Coast.

Mr. REED. The Pass Christian school has been limited in its use heretofore, I think, to the first year of training only. The Kings Point school has a complete course. The Pass Christian institution has been operated on the basis of 1-year students, the first year student course, if my recollection serves me correctly.

The only question is whether or not we wish to spend $600,000 to use a school that is not necessary. The Maritime Commission has testified it can get along without it, and it was not included by the Budget in the estimate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Maritime Commission has recommended an appropriation for this school. The recommendation is in the House hearing, and I submit it is certainly the part of economy to make the appropriation. Here is a $2,000,000 investment which can be put back into its original shape for $75,000, and then we will have a school that will cost less to operate than any other maritime school in the country. If this amendment shall be defeated, and the Pass Christian activity carried on, the Government will actually save money. I

cannot see the point in taking a meat ax and deliberately striking down an installation for no good reason whatever. The program is one which will actually save money to the Treasury. I ask the Senate to reject the committee amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. We have a situation in which the Maritime Commission has asked for a continuation of this school. We have a situation in which the facts show that certainly it is far easier to have a continuous year-around training of all types and kinds at Pass Christian than at the other school. We have the undisputed evidence that the per capita training cost at Pass Christian is less than at any other institution.

No survey has been made and no special inquiry has been made to review those facts. We are called upon now more or less to adopt a change of policy in the few fleeting minutes of the last dying hours of this session of the Congress. This school, as I understand, has one of the very finest records in the Nation, and maritime training was something that came to the rescue and filled in the breach in a most wonderful way during the war. I understand that splendid training has been continued. I believe that if it had not been for the act of God, or the circumstance of a storm which partly damaged this place and requires some repairs, that this matter would never have come up, or that the appropriation for the Pass Christian station would not have been stricken out. The comparatively small sum of $60,000 is required to salvage a $2,000,000 physical equipment.

What is now proposed to be done by the amendment is not based on a complete investigation, not on any determination to change the policy or change the kind of training, not on any rule of necessity. I submit that it is not on the basis of a rule of reason that in the few remaining hours of the present session of Congress, it is proposed to delete appropriations for this school from the bill. I hope the Senate will seriously consider the matter and give due credit to the splendid record made at Pass Christian, and the wonderful advantages that exist there.

As has previously been said, the station serves the ports all the way across from Texas to Mobile, Ala. I hope the Senate will not be too hasty in its action. I hope we will consider the matter seriously, and, in view of the very fine record that has been made, and the very fine service being rendered, the Senate will permit this station to continue. As I understand, $60,000 is required for repair, and of course then there will be another amendment providing $620,000 for operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice on page 8 of the bill that aside from the Pass Christian School there is one at Kings Point, N. Y., and another at Sheepshead Bay, New York, N. Y., one at St. Petersburg, Fla., and one at Alameda, Calif. Did the committee give consideration to those various schools?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. For instance, how does the one at Sheepshead Bay compare with the one at Pass Christian?

Mr. REED. The Sheepshead Bay School is quite a different school and operated for different purposes than the Pass Christian School. The Sheepshead Bay School is what is called a refresher school, where short courses are taken by men already in the service.

Mr. ELLENDER. Which of the schools named conduct the same classes of teaching as at Pass Christian?

Mr. REED. The Kings Point.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that is principally to supply the port of New York?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; that is a United States school.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but it is located there, I suppose, because of the port of New York?

Mr. REED. I suppose it was located near the largest port of the United States so that its cadets could have the advantage of actual training and contact with shipping.

Mr. ELLENDER. Nearby?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Alameda, Calif., school compare with that of Kings Point?

Mr. REED. That is a very similar school.

Mr. ELLENDER. That, I presume, is located near San Francisco and San Diego?

Mr. REED. I am not very familiar with the Alameda school.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows, does he not, that the port of New Orleans is the second largest in the country?

Mr. REED. It is a very large port.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is the second largest in the country. Why would it not be advantageous to have a school developed there so as to train the seamen as is done at New York and on the Pacific coast?

Mr. REED. In answer to the Senator from Louisiana I will say that we are able to train all our Army officers at one academy, that at West Point, N. Y. We are able to train all our naval officers at Annapolis, Md. I do not know of any reason why, by the same token, we cannot train all our merchant-marine officer force at Kings Point, N. Y.

Mr. ELLENDER. Following that argument then, why not strike out all the others and leave just one at Kings Point, N. Y.

Mr. REED. I am not sure that in the end when we come thoroughly to overhaul the matter of merchant-marine training something of that kind may not be done. We are not proposing that now. The Pass Christian School is not in operation. Its buildings were damaged. The Bureau of the Budget did not increase the amount, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission says they can get along without it. That is the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand from the record that the Maritime Commission has recommended it. Is that not true?

Mr. REED. I do not know, but they did not recommend it to our committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it is shortsighted on our part to eliminate the Pass Christian School for the present. Why not keep it in operation so that later on, if it is the intention of the Congress to have but one school, Pass Christian might be selected for the reasons assigned by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in reference to the position of the Maritime Commission with respect to the continuation of the school and its work at Pass Christian, Miss., permit me to say that on page 726 of the House hearings there appears a copy of a letter addressed to Hon. James H. Webb, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C., under date of May 7, 1948, just a little over a month ago. The letter was written to Mr. Webb by Hon. W. W. Smith, Chairman of the Maritime Commission. Among other things Chairman Smith had this to say about the Pass Christian School:

> Your attention is invited to the fact that there have been material changes in the international situation since the Bureau of the Budget acted upon our request for the restoration of the cadet school at Pass Christian. The President has approved a program for building additional vessels which will require additional trained personnel for their operation. Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, in an eight-page statement given before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in its survey of the status of the American merchant marine relative to the world situation presently facing this country, declared that those responsible for the administration of our readiness program are conscious of the necessity of scrutinizing closely the present condition of our merchant marine in order to determine what its shortcomings may be from the standpoint of national security.

Then Chairman Smith proceeded to say:

> In order to carry out, during fiscal year 1949, an appropriate program in the operation of the cadet school at Pass Christian the Commission recommends that the following additional budget provisions should be made:

For a class of 200 midshipmen on a 10-month basis (Sept. 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949)	$500,000
For restoration of the physical establishment	100,000
Total	600,000

There is the recommendation, Senators, of the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, speaking for the Commission a little more than 30 days ago.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it is our policy to build up and maintain a merchant marine. It is necessary for the defense of the country. Is not this installation of great benefit to the port of Mobile, in the Senator's State?

Mr. HILL. The installation is of great benefit, of course, to the port of Mobile, the port of New Orleans, and other ports.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was about to ask the distinguished senior Senator from

Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] if the installation is not a great benefit to the port of New Orleans.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so stated a moment ago in answer to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. EASTLAND. It could not be filled if it were necessary to send to the State of New York for personnel.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that the State of New York is thousands of miles away from the Gulf area. The Maritime Commission recommends continuance of the operation of this school. Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan emphasizes the importance of the merchant marine of the United States to our national security. He emphasizes also the importance of closely scrutinizing the entire question before any action is taken which would in any way be detrimental or harmful to our American merchant marine.

This question came before the House Committee on Appropriations. We know how thoroughly the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations study all questions before them. The subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations held hearings on this subject. It did exactly what the Secretary of the Navy said should be done. It scrutinized this proposal. After the hearings, and after consideration of the facts, the committee recommended continuation of the school.

Why should the Senate, without any opportunity to examine the question fully, overrule the Maritime Commission, the House Committee on Appropriations, and the House of Representatives, without any basis for such action?

What I am pleading with the Senate this afternoon to do is to permit this item to remain in the bill, where it was placed by the House. Then, as the distinguished chairman of the Senate subcommittee has suggested, at some later date the entire program of the Maritime Commission cadet training can be gone into. We can look into the entire situation. But there is no opportunity to do that today. On the other hand, we know that the training at the Pass Christian School is the lowest in per capita cost. We know that because of the wonderful climate, year-round training can be carried on in a way that it cannot be carried on at other training places. We know that the Government has between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000 invested in properties there. If those properties are closed down and turned over to the War Assets Administration, what will that mean? It will mean that they will be sold for probably nothing more than salvage value, which will not amount to a bagatelle. We ought to preserve this property and continue the training. We ought to carry on this program, as the House decided, and as the Maritime Commission has recommended, at least until we have had an opportunity to study the entire subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The argument made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is that the hurricane has closed the school. The cost of restoring it to its original shape is only incidental and minor. The real question at issue is that the school is operated more cheaply, and the men are trained more cheaply than at any other place. We are running off after a minor item, to pick up a dime and put it in our pocket while throwing dollars away with the other hand. It is not economy. It is bad business.

Mr. HILL. If we reject the action of the House, and, without having gone into the subject, proceed to adopt the committee amendment, we shall be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, line 16. [Putting the question.]

Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. HILL addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" have it, and the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a point of order. The Senator from Louisiana was seeking recognition.

Mr. PEPPER. So was the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote just announced be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico asks that the vote just taken be reconsidered. Without objection——

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not hear any Senator vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it is fair to say that the Senator from Florida was on his feet as the Chair was putting the question. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed is reconsidered, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Chair is very kind. The Senator from Louisiana was also seeking recognition. I wonder if I may yield for a moment to the Senator from Louisiana, because I am looking up an item in the record.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I had asked for recognition in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana withdraw his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senator from Kansas to a few paragraphs from a letter addressed by W. W. Smith, chairman of the Maritime Commission, to Hon. HALE BOGGS, a Member of the House, in which he states specifically:

> The Maritime Commission believes that this school should be restored and continued in operation. There has been a change in the international situation which in our opinion makes its operation more than ever necessary. This change has occurred since the matter was considered by the Bureau of the Budget.
>
> Since the hurricane damage occurred, we have maintained a small staff at Pass Christian to salvage as much of the loss as possible. It was necessary to maintain the staff, in any event, for maintenance and custody until a disposition of the property was determined. This staff has accomplished repair work to the extent that only $100,000 additional funds are now necessary to complete the work. Since it would require several months to complete the work and since our next class of cadet-midshipmen is scheduled for admission on September 1, 1948, we would have only 10 months' operation during the fiscal year 1949 and this would require $500,000, so that if the school is to be restored and operated during that fiscal year, an appropriation of $600,000 will be necessary. This information will be made available to the House Committee on Appropriations if that committee so requests.

That letter was dated May 6, 1948. Under date of April 9, 1948, I personally addressed a letter to Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, chairman of the subcommittee on independent offices of the House Committee on Appropriations, which, in a measure, gives my views on this question. I stated to him as follows:

> MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIGGLESWORTH: This is with reference to a proposal to appropriate moneys for the restoration and maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet School at Pass Christian, Miss., which is currently being considered by your subcommittee. I should appreciate it if you would consider this letter as a statement of my views in the matter and include it with other testimony which will be considered by the members of your subcommittee.
>
> The facility at Pass Christian is located between two major seaports, New Orleans and Mobile, and it is only about 300 miles distant from Houston and Galveston. It can be easily reached by land, sea, and air. The climate there is ideal for year-round training and is considered superior to the areas where northern installations are situated. This school is the only one of its type located in the South, and we are anxious it be restored on a permanent status.
>
> Young men who have been trained as cadet-midshipmen proved conclusively their capability to serve efficiently and effectively in the United States Navy, and I understand that about 45 percent of the strength of the United States Merchant Marine Naval Reserve is made up from graduates of the Cadet Corps.
>
> We feel that the added stress that is being placed now on national defense and adequate training should make it imperative that this facility be restored and maintained, and we in the Gulf States are very hopeful that your subcommittee will be able to take favorable action in this matter.

Mr. President, as I indicated a moment ago, we intend to build up our merchant marine. In order to have an effective merchant marine, it is necessary to train cadets. As I stated a moment ago, I notice that near the great port of New York there are two schools; there is one on the California coast; and on the Gulf coast we have five large ports, including New Orleans, the second largest port in the country. I think we are deserving of a school of that type.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate sustain the House in voting on the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the able Senator from Kansas relative to the amendment.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACTIVITIES IN PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a conference report on Senate bill 418.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether he contemplates requesting having the Senate take action on the conference report at this time, or is he simply presenting the report.

Mr. MALONE. I do not insist on action at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say that if the Senator is asking for action on the conference report now, in view of the objection of the Senator from Oregon a while ago, and in view of the fact that he is not now on the floor, I would feel constrained to object to a request for action on the conference report at this time.

Mr. MALONE. I do not ask for action on it at this time; I simply submit it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator the subject of the conference report?

Mr. MALONE. It is the stream-pollution conference report.

So, Mr. President, I submit the report.

The conference report submitted by Mr. MALONE, and ordered to lie on the table, is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) entitled "An Act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes" having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 12, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance."

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "such interstate waters and tributaries thereof", and insert the following words "surface and underground waters."

Page 9, line 11, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$200,000" and insert the figure "$250,000."

Page 11, line 25, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$20,000,000" and insert the figure "$22,500,000."

Page 12, line 25, of the amendment of the House, after the words "study of" insert the word "water", and strike out the word "of" after the word "pollution."

Page 13, line 1, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "interstate waters."

Page 13, line 2, of the amendment of the House, before the word "pollution" insert the word "water", and after the word "pollution" strike out the words "of interstate waters."

Page 14, line 17 through line 23, of the amendment of the House, strike out all after the words "Sec. 9 (a)" and insert the following: "Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b)."

And the House agree to the same.

GEO. W. MALONE,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
TOM PICKETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Kansas for a moment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the Senators who have spoken on it. I have agreed to accept an amendment, as follows: To insert in the bill the sum of $75,000 to be used in the repair of the Pass Christian buildings which were destroyed or damaged by a hurricane. That amount is reported to the committee as being sufficient to put the property in usable condition. Then we shall leave for further consideration the question of operation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Kansas modifies the committee amendment accordingly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that amendment pertains only to Pass Christian; does it?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Kansas kindly tell us what was the House appropriation for the whole maritime training fund?

Mr. REED. The budget estimate for maritime training was $6,868,000. The appropriation for this year was $7,320,000. As the House passed the bill, it provides for an appropriation of $8,131,080.

The Senate committee adopted the Budget figure, and has used the Budget figure, which will be increased by $75,000 because of the agreement just made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator please tell us what reductions will be necessary because of reducing the figure from $8,131,080, as approved by the House, to $6,868,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Senate committee? For example, one of the schools is at St. Petersburg, Fla. There are many other of these training schools. I wonder what the plan or pattern is and what the reason for the action of the Senate committee is.

Mr. REED. The main reason, and the subject of most of the consideration, was the fact that the Budget estimated a certain sum as necessary and sufficient, and the committee has worked under that proposal. Of course, to that sum should be added the amount of the agreement just made.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I realize there are many times when the committee follows literally the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and there are other times when the committee is not very much persuaded by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. I think it has generally been the policy of the Congress to wish to see for itself what are the issues in connection with an appropriation, and to determine for itself what the need is and what the merit is, without slavish, obeisant regard to what the Bureau of the Budget may recommend.

I should like to have the Senator from Kansas tell me how much of a reduction in the training program of the Maritime Commission will be caused by the proposed cut from the House figure of $8,131,080 down to $6,868,000, the latter amount being considerably lower than the appropriation and expenditure for the present year.

Mr. REED. I cannot tell in just what schools and to what extent reductions will be made. Obviously it is impossible to operate as extensively if the appropriation is made as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, instead of as passed by the House. Of course, a larger amount would permit more extensive operations.

How the proposed decrease will affect St. Petersburg, the Senator from Kansas cannot undertake to say. Certainly it will not close down St. Petersburg.

Mr. PEPPER. Then I am afraid we shall have to decide for ourselves whether it will be wise to make a reduction in the amount as voted by the House, or whether we shall say that the amount of the appropriation shall be $6,868,000 simply because the Bureau of the Budget recommends that amount.

The Senator has already said there was no accurate weighing of this program and no determination of where cuts should be made or why.

Mr. President, we have ships laid up in various parts of the United States, and they are available for emergency war use. The Congress is now in the midst of the consideration of a draft bill. We have made colossal expenditures for national defense purposes. Expenditures for maritime training are as much a part of national defense expenditures as any other expenditures we are making, because we cannot fight a war and have a secure country unless we have an adequate merchant marine; and we cannot have an adequate merchant marine unless we have sufficient men to man the ships; and of course they cannot effectively man the ships unless they are trained for that task.

We now have under consideration the maritime training program. I am

afraid that the significance and importance of the maritime to the national defense program has not been fully appreciated.

If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to recall to his mind that last year, had it not been for the House of Representatives, many of these maritime training schools would have been closed. It was only because of the determined fight made by the House of Representatives that, for example, we were able to retain the splendid maritime training school at St. Petersburg, Fla. It would have been closed a year ago if our distinguished committee had been the one to determine whether it should survive or should not survive.

So, when this year the House, again in recognition of the importance of this maritime training program, has tried to provide for sufficient men to man the ships that are stored and also the ships that are being built, we now find that our committee says, "We have simply taken the Budget recommendation, and that is what we are offering to the Senate." When the committee says that, I say that if the House of Representatives—which has been a friend of this program and has made a careful study of it, as the record shows, and has heard the maritime people, who have given their reasons for the continuation of this program without curtailment—recommends a larger appropriation, then I see no reason, simply because the Bureau of the Budget recommends a smaller amount, for us to follow slavishly the Budget recommendation.

It is my opinion that we should support the amount as carried in the bill as passed by the House, and that we should provide for that figure in the bill. I shall address myself to that subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my able colleague.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to ask my colleague if it is not true that the cut made by the Senate committee in the appropriation as passed by the House is a cut of more than 20 percent in the amount of the appropriation for the training program.

Mr. PEPPER. It is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not also true that the European recovery and relief measures which have been passed by the Congress require, among other things, the return to commission and to active work of many ships of the Maritime Commission which have been lying idle.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. The Senator is absolutely correct. Mr. President, in the RECORD, Admiral Knight, appearing before the House committee, testified they would need these men, need them trained, in order to man the ships we are building and those which are tied up today awaiting an emergency. What sort of forethought and foresightedness would we execute and exhibit here if we built the ships and then did not have trained men to operate them? How would it be possible to have a merchant marine and depend upon drawing in men who were not known to be qualified to man those ships to meet the emergency? Why have ships and not have the men to man the ships? Obviously it is a blow at our national security and our national defense, if we do not sustain a program of this minimum financial proportion that may be so meaningful to the security of the country should an emergency occur.

Mr. President, my colleague and I, in our State, and I am sure other Senators in some other States where these different schools are located, have visited the training schools. If they never saw a ship, what the Maritime Commission is doing in making the young men better Americans would justify every dollar of the investment. The young men volunteer. They come into the schools. They are given training in the manning of ships in maritime operation. At the same time, they are given character building; they are given health building; They are better Americans. I never saw a finer group of young men than I have seen in the training schools, who are training themselves to be able to man the merchant marine of America.

Mr. President, there have been many times in our history when we have been short-sighted in our maritime policy. There have been times when we have let our merchant marine shrink to nothing. There have been times when American goods could not be carried in American bottoms, and we were dependent even for the movement of our fighting men upon the ships of our Allies. We have seen the fallacy and the folly of such policies as that in the past few years. Fortunately before World War II we started to build up our merchant marine again. I am afraid there have been some who have been willing to let it disintegrate too rapidly. But what does it mean to have the ships if we do not have the men? And, Mr. President, if we are to have men, we want trained men to man those ships. It is said we had men in the merchant marine during the war. Yes; we had 125,000 of them I believe. They have scattered to the four winds of the country and of the world, and we are not going to call back the old soldiers again; we are training new men to make secure the defense of the country.

The total program as recommended by the House of Representatives for all these schools, for all attributes of the program, would cost only $8,133,000. Yet this cut, as my able colleague has pointed out, means a diminution of 20 percent. That will mean boys will have to go home from the training school. They will not be able to learn the tasks they came there to skill themselves in.

I sincerely hope and believe it is wise policy, Mr. President, I believe it is a sound contribution to the national security, I believe it is good judgment, I believe it is a good investment, to follow again this year as we reluctantly did last year the lead of the House of Representatives, which made a special study of the program, having taken prolific testimony on the subject. They tell us that $8,133,000 is needed. I hope the amended committee amendment will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended. Without objection, it is agreed to. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Chair does not mean that he has disposed of the question to which I was addressing myself without a vote, does he?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. STENNIS. We had agreed on the Pass Christian matter. My inquiry is, Does the amendment now under consideration affect it?

Mr. REED. It does not.

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hayden	Pepper
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Ives	Russell
Buck	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Cain	Kem	Stennis
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McGrath	Thye
Dworshak	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Magnuson	Tydings
Ecton	Malone	Umstead
Ellender	Martin	Vandenberg
Feazel	Maybank	Watkins
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Flanders	Moore	White
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murray	Williams
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hatch	O'Conor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question. There is some little confusion apparently about the over-all appropriation and the amount for the restoration of the buildings at Pass Christian.

I think we all agree that in some appropriate manner there will be $75,000 added to the amount of the committee amendment, will there not, to take care of the restoration of the buildings at Pass Christian?

Mr. REED. There was quite a bit of confusion and I did not clearly understand the Senator's question.

Mr. PEPPER. I merely wished to be sure that we were clear about what the procedure was. The able Senator from Kansas had agreed with the Senator from Mississippi and others interested in Pass Christian School that he would consent to a $75,000 addition, I assume to the amount recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the restoration of the damaged buildings at Pass Christian.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. In order to accomplish that I suppose the Senator would amend the $8,133,000 figure and add $75,000 to it.

Mr. REED. Seventy-five thousand dollars, added to whatever figure is in the bill. I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. PEPPER. Add $75,000 to the figure in the bill?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. That can be voted upon after we determine the larger question or it can come first, whatever the Senator from Mississippi may prefer.

Mr. REED. It has been accepted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there are two problems. One is the operation of the schools, and the other is the restoration of the building. Merely to restore the building does not mean the school will be there, of course. I am sure, if we carry this program forward as we should, what should be done is to add $75,000 to the amount agreed upon for the program. If we agree upon the larger amount, then $75,000 for construction should be added. If we agree to the smaller amount, the same addition should be made to restore the school.

Mr. REED. If the amendment of the Senator from Florida is defeated, as I hope it will be, that will not affect the agreement.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. President, a few Senators have just entered the Chamber. Is it the pleasure of the Senate to have a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to have about 3 minutes to state the case.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I do not know that I have the floor. I think the Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I was saying, before some of the Senators came into the Chamber, that the House of Representatives had made a careful study of the question of the maintenance of the maritime training program. Not only did the House committee make a study, but it took lengthy testimony. I have a great many pages of the testimony here. The House Committee on Appropriations went into detail in connection with the maritime-training program. The House approved an appropriation of $8,133,000 for the entire training program.

With all respect to the Senate Appropriations Committee, when the matter came before that committee the committee took only half a page of testimony. They merely asked the officers regarding the budget estimated. The Budget had recommended $8,686,000. Of course the Maritime Commission spokesmen had to say that they agreed to the Budget figure. They could not say anything else. But they did not say that it was an adequate figure, or that that was the figure which should be allowed.

The question is whether we should take the House figure of $8,133,000, or whether we should take the Budget estimate, with only half a page of consideration and testimony given to the whole subject.

Mr. President, this is a national-defense program. Hundreds of our ships are laid up all over the country for use in an emergency. It is short-sighted not to train the men to man those ships. That is what the program is intended to do. We are making a 20-percent reduction in the training program, which I submit is a danger to our national security and a very serious blow at the efficacy of the whole maritime program and the effectiveness of the maritime strength of the Nation. That is the reason I am contending, Mr. President, that the House figure of $8,133,000 should be preserved and that the Senate committee amendment reducing the amount 20 percent should not be adopted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall take only about 2 minutes, and then I should like to have a record vote.

The subcommittee and the full committee met the Budget's full figure. The Budget rejected some recommendations of the Maritime Commission, but in this bill we gave the full Budget figure for maritime training.

In addition, when Admiral Smith, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, was before our committee, I asked him:

Did you agree with the Budget on the estimate it made originally?

His answer was, "Yes, sir."

I then asked him, "Can you get along on that?"

And he answered in the affirmative. That is found at page 80 of our hearings.

The Senator from Florida is talking about a common seaman school, not an officer school at all, down at St. Petersburg, Fla. They now have a 6-months' course, and probably they can get along with a 3-months' course. The young men go to that school when they are out of jobs.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will sustain its committee on the vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss this amendment, but I do desire, in the closing hours of the session, to call to the attention of the Senate the serious lack of common seamen in the United States. The situation is so bad that we were required, at the last session, to pass a law waiving the prohibition against employing alien seamen to serve on American ships. Many of our ships have to be manned with alien seamen. There is not an officer demand, but there is a demand for common seamen. Whether the school is the answer or whether apprenticeship is the answer, I do not know, but few of our young men are taking to the sea. I do hope we are cognizant of the situation. I am going to vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 4, in the committee amendment, to strike out "$6,868,000" and insert "$6,943,000, of which $75,000 shall be available for restoration or repair of buildings at the training station at Pass Christian, Miss."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that is the committee amendment as amended. I understand the Senator from Florida has moved to substitute some other figure.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; we are merely opposing the committee amendment. The committee amendment would make the cut from the House figure of $8,133,000 to $6,686,000. We are merely opposing the committee amendment. The question is on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official committee business. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—61

Aiken	Green	Revercomb
Baldwin	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bricker	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stennis
Buck	Jenner	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Byrd	Kem	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Capehart	McClellan	Umstead
Connally	McGrath	Vandenberg
Cordon	McMahon	Watkins
Donnell	Malone	Wherry
Dworshak	Martin	White
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ecton	Moore	Williams
Ferguson	O'Conor	Young
Flanders	O'Mahoney	
Fulbright	Reed	

NAYS—19

Downey	Lucas	Pepper
Ellender	McFarland	Sparkman
Feazel	Magnuson	Taylor
Hatch	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Morse	Tydings
Holland	Murray	
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	

NOT VOTING—16

Barkley	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Wagner
Chavez	McCarran	Wilson
Cooper	McCarthy	
George	McKellar	

So the committee amendment on page 9, line 3, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask that the clerk read the language now in the bill, including the agreement reached respecting Pass Christian, so that we may be sure that it is taken care of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 3, it was proposed to strike out "$8,133,080" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,943,000, of which $75,000 shall be available for restoration or repair of buildings at the training station at Pass Christian, Miss."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the junior Senator from Kansas if he desires to have restored in line 16 on page 8, the three words which were stricken out "Pass Christian, Miss."?

Mr. REED. I am glad the Chair called attention to that. The words were stricken out. They should be restored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the light of the amendment just agreed to, the words should be restored. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 8, line 16, was agreed to, is reconsidered, and without objection, the words "Pass Christian, Miss." will be restored.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration," on page 15, line 10, after the word "character", to strike out:

For the purpose of this proviso, training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly in connection with his business or occupation in which he is now engaged or for which he is training shall not be considered avocational or recreational.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, in line 14, after the language stricken, to insert the following:

For the purpose of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly and related aviation courses shall not be considered avocational or recreational when the veteran certifies that he has selected aviation education or training for use in connection with his existing or contemplated business, occupation, or education.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask the junior Senator from Kansas if he will not accept a minor amendment in the committee amendment on page 15, line 17, after the word "certifies" to insert the words "under oath." The reason I ask the Senator whether he will accept that amendment is because there are two schools of thought as to this matter. Some believe the Veterans' Administration has been too strict in construing the language of the existing law, and in its requirements as to those who may take this aviation course, and believe that it should be more liberal. Others believe to the contrary. Those who think it should be liberalized have suggested the language now in the amendment. But if a certificate should be taken as the basis of a man's right to take a course like this, the suggestion has been made that the certificate ought to be under oath.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Rhode Island asks that on page 15, line 17, in the committee amendment it be amended by inserting after the word "certifies" the words "under oath."

Mr. REED. There will be no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment on page 15, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 22, after "part VII," to insert "and payments authorized by part IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 8, to strike out:

SURPLUS-PROPERTY DISPOSAL

Effective August 31, 1948, the War Assets Administration shall cease to exist as an agency of the Government, and its affairs, functions, and responsibilities shall thereafter be disposed of and liquidated in accordance with the following:

(1) All right, title, and interest in surplus real property and all right, title, and interest in notes, mortgages, and contracts of sale or lease in connection with surplus real property shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be held and disposed of by such Corporation in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

(2) All aircraft and aircraft parts shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force to be held and disposed of by such Department in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

(3) All personal property (other than aircraft and aircraft parts), except such as may be necessary to the liquidation of the War Assets Administration or the exercise of the functions transferred herein shall be transferred to the Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department, to be held and disposed of by such Bureau in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

(4) Except as necessary to the administration of the functions herein transferred to the Department of the Air Force, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Bureau of Federal Supply, all administrative property, records, and accounts of the War Assets Administration shall be transferred to the Treasury Department for liquidation of the affairs of the War Assets Administration;

(5) Such administrative property, records, and personnel of the War Assets Administration as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary to the administration of any of the functions herein transferred shall be transferred to the agency to which such function is transferred: *Provided*, That the right to retention in employment by the Government of the personnel so transferred shall be neither greater nor less than such right would have been had the War Assets Administration continued as an independent agency of the Government;

(6) The provisions of section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong.) shall apply to the transfers effected by this paragraph in like manner as if such transfer were a reorganization of the agencies and functions concerned under the provisions of that act;

(7) Priorities and preferences provided for in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall not continue beyond August 31, 1948, as to the disposal of personal property but shall continue as to the disposal of real estate;

(8) The agencies herein authorized to dispose of surplus personal property may, after August 31, 1948, transfer any of such property without charge to any other agency of the Government if such property, by such transfer, can be put to public use by the transferee agency;

(9) The agencies herein authorized to dispose of surplus property shall proceed with due diligence and use all reasonable means within the purview of this act and the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to accomplish such purpose at the earliest practicable date and shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the end of each month as to progress made;

(10) The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may authorize the abandonment, destruction, or donation to public bodies of personal property herein transferred to their respective agencies which has no commercial value or the estimated cost of care and handling of which would exceed the estimated proceeds from its sale;

(11) The Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall not apply to property of the Government which has not been declared surplus under the terms of such act as of the date of enactment hereof and any such property determined to be surplus shall be disposed of in accordance with the terms of other existing law.

For administrative expenses in connection with the functions herein authorized to be administered by the War Assets Administration, the Treasury Department, the Department of the Air Force, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to be available for the same purposes as the appropriation for salaries and expenses, War Assets Administration, fiscal year 1948, and whenever in such appropriation the title "War Assets Administrator" appears it shall be construed to include his successor as to any of the functions herein transferred, $50,000,000, from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, to be allocated as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine: *Provided*, That the sum herein provided may be obligated during the period ending August 31, 1948, with respect to the War Assets Administration, and during the period ending March 31, 1949, with respect to the other agencies involved.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION, SPECIAL FUND

Salaries and expenses: There is hereby appropriated from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, not to exceed $90,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949 for necessary expenses of the War Assets Administration established by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1947; for allocation or reimbursement by the War Assets Administrator to Government agencies designated by the Administrator as disposal agencies by or pursuant to law, and for payment to Government agencies designated by the Administrator for rendering special services in connection with the disposal of surplus property, in such amounts as shall be approved

by the Bureau of the Budget; and for allocation or reimbursement to owning agencies for the care and handling (including pay and allowances and subsistence of military and naval personnel) of surplus property subsequent to the filing of a declaration of surplus covering such property with a disposal agency designated by the Administrator, or, if the Administrator prescribes procedures whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures, such funds to be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; fees and mileage of witnesses at rates provided by law for witnesses attending in the United States courts (28 U. S. C. 600c); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and other special services and reports by contract without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, including real estate brokers and appraisers at rates of pay or fees not to exceed those usual for similar services; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), (not to exceed $73,000); acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; printing and binding; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; procurement of supplies, equipment, reports, and services in connection with the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon determination by the Administrator or by any official designated by him for this purpose that such method of procurement is necessary; purchase and procurement of reports of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; advertising, including radio time; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft in the Territories and possessions in connection with disposal activities and, in the continental limits of the United States in connection with the disposition of aircraft air airports; acquisition of buildings, lands, leaseholds, and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof for the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property; payments to States, or political subdivisions thereof of sums in lieu of taxes accruing against real property declared surplus to the Administration by Government corporations; advance of funds to Administration cashiers and collection officials upon furnishing bond, for the purpose of handling cash transactions and making change at surplus property sales: *Provided*, That any employee of the War Assets Administration is authorized, when designated for the purpose by the Administrator, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit, when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of the War Assets Administration: *Provided further*, That the Administration may procure by contract or otherwise and furnish to governmental employees and employees of Government contractors at the reasonable value thereof food, meals, subsistence, and medical supplies, emergency medical services, quarters, heat, light, household equipment, laundry service, and sanitation facilities, and erect temporary structures and make alterations in existing structures necessary for these purposes, when such employees are engaged in the disposal of surplus property, or in the preparation for such disposal, at locations where such supplies, services, equipment, or facilities are otherwise unavailable, the proceeds derived therefrom to be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, the War Assets Administrator shall establish and maintain a priority for the benefit of small business in the purchase and disposal and distribution and use of surplus real and personal property. The War Assets Administrator shall implement this small-business priority by appropriate regulation, and the relative order of this priority with respect to other priorities established by the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall, with respect to personal property follow disposals to veterans and States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, and with respect to real property, follow disposals to former owners, as provided for in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended: *And provided further*, That section 15 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law and in furtherance of rapid absorption of surplus personal property into the domestic economy, and of disposition of surplus personal property in a manner to preclude insofar as possible financial expense to the Federal Government in the care, handling, and disposition of such property the Administrator may authorize without regard to priorities or preferences disposals of such property in such manner and quantities as he deems requisite to the best interests of the economy and the Government in effecting rapid and inexpensive disposals of surplus personal property, securing the most appropriate fair value under the circumstances, and affording to the extent he deems feasible an appropriate opportunity for the acquisition of such property in accordance with the existing provisions of this act."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want Senators to have a clear understanding of what we did respecting surplus property disposal. The House terminated on August 31 the War Assets Administration so far as the disposal of surplus property was concerned, and it divided up the functions among four different agencies, the Treasury Department, I believe the Public Works Administration, the Department of Commerce, and perhaps one other.

There was unanimous opposition in our committee, and everyone who appeared before our committee was opposed to that proposal, so we have restored the previously existing situation. The House gave the War Assets Administration $50,000,000 to continue until August 31. We have added $40,000,000, making a total of $90,000,000, which met the requests of the War Assets Administration. It is our thought that we should carry on as we are doing now until we get further along in the disposal of property.

The War Assets Administration has always complained of the slowing down in its work of sale and distribution of property by virtue of the many priorities. By the time they got down to the priorities, frequently their buyer was gone. So we have removed those priorities, except that we leave a priority for veterans, for States, and for small business.

Also, in the matter of personal property only, we have given the Administrator some discretion when he can sell personal property at a fair price to the Government and get rid of it. It is highly important that we go along as fast as we can in cleaning up the surplus-property situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the committee was of the unanimous belief that to split up the War Assets Administration at this time would only result in maladministration and loss to the Government?

Mr. REED. That was our opinion, and the basis of our action and recommendation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So the committee amendment is an amendment which is designed to save money to the Government and to prevent inefficient handling of what remains of war surpluses?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator whether or not in his judgment it would be desirable to have a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment?

Mr. REED. I think not. There was no opposition. As a matter of fact, the opinion in the subcommittee, the full committee, and I believe in the Senate, is either unanimous or almost so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like the RECORD to show that there was no dispute in the Senate Appropriations Committee, and that we are unanimous in the opinion that the Senate amendment represents the efficient and economical thing to do.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 18, beginning in line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 28, line 6, after the numerals "1949," to insert "and shall be available for examination of appropriation estimates in the field."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has entered the Chamber. The Senator and I join in offering an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. We have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and I think there is no objection.

Mr. REED. It will be accepted, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky on behalf of himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new heading and a new paragraph to read as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Rural Electrification Administration, fiscal year 1949, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1949, $450,000, such sum to be in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for such fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he will accept it and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 19, after the date "1946", it is proposed to insert the following: *"And provided further,* That such authority to make allowances shall, in the case of vessels of the C–4 type, include authority to make allowances for the cost of converting such vessels to vessels of such other types as the Commission may deem to be desirable for the purposes of the domestic or foreign commerce of the United States or the national defense, in an amount not exceeding 75 percent of the purchase price of such vessel, and in addition to expend out of the moneys herein appropriated for new ship construction, reconditioning, and betterment, such amounts as may be further necessary to accomplish such conversion: *Provided,* That the purchaser shall repay the amount so expended in accordance with the provisions of section 509 of title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and any other provisions of said title to the extent applicable."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Maritime Commission has on hand a number of vessels of this type. It is a unique type, not suitable for either freight or passenger service, as the vessels are now.

Last year when we were handling this bill a desire was expressed on the part of people in the Great Lakes section to get one of these vessels up into the Great Lakes. In last year's bill we inserted a provision which would permit the Maritime Commission to make such adjustments and changes as would accomplish that purpose. This year the question did not arise in the committee. It arose afterward.

I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, to be inserted as he indicates, and take it to conference to see what we can do with it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the amendment constitute legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it is an item of appropriation to carry out the existing law. In other words, it is an item within the general provisions of the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. If I correctly understand, Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas stated that this suggestion was made to him last year in the form of a bill.

Mr. REED. No. When we considered the bill last year we wrote into the bill a similar provision, so far as the Senate was concerned. Last year we had considerable discussion of the methods of disposing of these vessels through the Maritime Commission, and we placed such a provision in the bill.

Mr. McMAHON. How much will this operation cost?

Mr. REED. We are to be paid for the vessels. It will not cost us anything.

Mr. McMAHON. It will not cost the Treasury anything?

Mr. FERGUSON. It will cost the man who buys the vessel. The money will be put up by the Maritime Commission, and then repaid, and the Maritime Commission will get out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Chair announced his ruling, he was misinformed as to the full nature of the amendment. Upon an examination of the amendment the Chair is of the opinion, and so rules, that the point of order raised by the Senator from Connecticut is well taken.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the point of order will not be pressed, because this will be a means for the Maritime Commission to sell one of these vessels for at least half a million dollars. The money to be put up by the Maritime Commission will be repaid, over and above the half million dollars for the vessel. Representatives of the Maritime Commission explained in the testimony that the Commission has on hand a number of these vessels. I do not now recall the exact number, but I think it is either 14 or 17. There is no market for them unless something like this can be accomplished.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not press the point of order. The Maritime Commission has a number of these vessels. I do not know the exact number, but the Commission has a number of them on hand, and anything it can get for them at this time is of advantage to the United States Treasury, and not of disadvantage.

Last year a desire was expressed by people in the Great Lakes area to get one of these vessels up there. Those interested were going to pay half a million dollars, or three-quarters of a million dollars for it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have just looked at the record. The number, instead of being 14, is 44.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Connecticut not to press his point of order. There would be no advantage to anyone in doing so. It would be a disadvantage to the Treasury, in that we would not be able to get rid of one of these vessels which are lying idle and unsalable.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kansas whether they are to be sold under the provisions of statutory law, or whether this amendment relaxes that law in any degree.

Mr. FERGUSON. This provision would relax the law only so far as concerns allowing the Commission to put the vessel back in shape so that it could be used. The sum to be paid by the Commission for that purpose would be charged to the vessel.

Mr. RUSSELL. In addition to the statutory limit of sale?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. This would cut the statutory limit to the extent of the amount necessary to repair the vessel. The Maritime Commission would get the statutory limit less the amount it cost to repair the vessel. However, in this case it would get at least half a million dollars.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, why does not the concern to which the Maritime Commission proposes to sell the vessels buy them as is and itself make the repairs?

Mr. FERGUSON. This is one of the cases in which that cannot be done.

Mr. McMAHON. Why not?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would cost about $2,000,000 to put the vessel in shape and take it where it is to be used.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator's proposal is that we authorize the Maritime Commission to spend $2,000,000; is it?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, it would cost the company $2,000,000, and the Government $1,000,000, making the total $3,000,000.

Mr. McMAHON. So the proposal is to spend about $1,000,000 to put the ship in shape. After it is put in the shape the purchasers want it to be in, how much will the Government receive?

Mr. FERGUSON. $500,000, plus what the Government pays for putting the ship in condition.

Let me read the language of the act which applies:

Provided further, That hereafter the Commission may make allowances to the purchasers of vessels for the cost of putting such vessels in class, such allowance to be determined on the basis of competitive bids, without regard to the provisions of the last paragraph of section 3 (d) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946.

The difficulty is that under the words "putting such vessels in class", although money can be spent for that purpose today, that will not suffice in this instance, because in this case it is desired to make a new kind of vessel out of the ship, so that it can be used on the Great Lakes. That presents a distinction from the work involved in putting a vessel in class. There is a distinction between putting a ship in class and reconverting a ship.

Mr. McMAHON. What is meant by "putting in class"?

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand, "putting in class" means to bring a ship from its present condition up to the standard required under the Maritime Commission Act for operating it in the same category for which it was built.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether it is perfectly clear from the terms of the amendment that it applies to only one vessel.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is all—to 1 out of 44.

Mr. McMAHON. Very well, Mr. President, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6829) was passed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCKELLAR conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes; and

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Ave. NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6633) to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. PHILLIPS of California, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, and Mr. THOMAS of Texas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5904. An act to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6501. An act to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; and

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 129) providing for a joint committee composed of members of the Senate and the House Public Lands Committee to make an investigation of our island possessions in the Pacific and trust territories, and report back recommendations for legislation providing for civil government.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 213) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee, current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes; that the Senate agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that no other business is permissible except by unanimous consent, until the pending business is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so undertands.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the pending business is the motion, are we ready to vote on the motion?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand that the Chair has ruled that no other business can be taken up at this time except by unanimous consent. I was about to move to call up the conference report on the displaced persons bill.

Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that at this time that conference report may be considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the so-called draft bill, agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I intend to speak on this motion. At the time when I announced my intention of doing so, I was taken to task by several Senators who said that I would have to answer for my actions. I am perfectly happy to answer for my actions to anyone concerned, especially the people of the United States. They have a vital stake in the matter now being discussed.

Mr. President, we are considering a fundamental change in our American way of life. Never have we had peacetime conscription. The question is whether our Nation is to be militarized or whether it is to remain a great, free nation, as it has been for, lo, these many years, in fact, since our country was founded.

If speaking out against military conscription and against the militarization of our country carries any blame with it, I am perfectly willing to accept it; but I believe such opposition will be considered a credit to anyone who opposes such a move. I am happy to accept any blame, because I feel it will redound to my credit that I oppose this measure. As a member of the new party that is appearing on the American scene, I am happy to accept responsibility for trying to delay or defeat this peacetime conscription measure. If the two old parties want the responsibility of instituting peacetime military conscription, they are perfectly welcome to it, so far as I am concerned and so far as the new party is concerned.

I hold in my hand a brochure prepared for the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. President. It is a rather elaborate affair. It is getting a little dog-eared now, for I have been quoting from it at length; but it is on slick paper, and it is full of maps, diagrams, charts, and

what have you. It was prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence. I do not believe anyone would contend or could contend that the Office of Naval Intelligence is a "red" outfit of any kind or a Communist-front organization or anything of the sort.

This brochure was not for public consumption. I do not believe it is top secret, or anything of that sort; but it was not released to the press. It is very interesting. Of course, it was meant for the eyes of Senators alone, and the ordinary person was not supposed to see it. Let me read the first paragraph in this book or brochure. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, or it may have been the Finance Committee—I am not certain about that, at the moment—was considering the question of strategic stockpiling; in other words, the accumulation of materials which are scarce in this country. The proposal was that such materials be accumulated so that we would have them on hand in case of an armed conflict. Here is what the brochure has to say in the first sentence:

Realistically—

That means, "Let us not kid each other; this is just between the Navy and the Senators; let us be perfectly frank about this business." That is what that means—

Realistically, all wars have been for economic reasons.

That means that all wars have been fought because somebody expected some material gain from the wars. The last two world wars were fought for economic reasons. The German cartelists and militarists started those two wars in the hope of conquering the world militarily, so they could exploit it economically and become rich. This is what is said here:

To make them—

We will read the preceding sentence again, in order to get the sense of this:

Realistically all wars have been for economic reasons. To make them politically and socially palatable—

"Palatable" is the word, Mr. President. That means so it will taste good, "just like what it ain't"—a sort of cod-liver-oil preparation with vanilla extract in it.

To make them—

Meaning wars—

politically and socially palatable—

So the suckers will like them.

Ideological issues have always been invoked.

What is said there, Mr. President, is that you just cannot get common folks to fight for colonies, for markets, for raw materials, for sources of cheap labor. You just cannot get them roiled up enough to fight; so what is to be done about it? "Ideological issues have always been invoked."

Mr. President, you cannot get folks mad enough to fight for Standard Oil investments in Saudi Arabia; it just will not work. So what is done? Well, to get the common people mad enough to fight a war, they are told the Catholics are going to get them if they don't watch out. If the people live in a Catholic country, they are told that the Protestants will get them if they do not watch out, or that the Jews are going to get them, or the Mohammedans, or at any rate somebody is going to get them. That seems to get folks mad enough to fight. If they think somebody is going to tear down their church or burn their capitol building or something like that, that makes them mad enough to fight. Well, the statement goes on to say, here:

Any possible future war will undoubtedly conform to historical precedent.

Any war that may come will be fought for the same reasons I have enumerated here—for markets, raw materials, profits, cheap labor, Standard Oil investments in Saudi Arabia—something along that order.

Mr. President, I should like to remind my listeners that Russia has very little reason to fight a war for economic reasons. It says here all wars are fought for that reason, and that any future war will be fought for that reason. Russia has much territory. Russia has many people. Russia has great quantities of raw materials. Russia does not want any markets, because Russia does not want to sell anything, it does not have a profit economy. All the Russians want to do is to produce things to be consumed at home. So the Russians do not have that compulsion to fight wars. Nobody gets rich from war in Russia. They shoot profiteers over there, or did until recently. They have now abolished the death penalty in Russia, which is quite a forward step I would say. Of course we continue to hear about all the people that are getting killed or who are going to get killed in Russia. Possibly it was merely said they were going to abolish it; I do not know.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, please?

Mr. TAYLOR. May I yield without prejudice to my rights to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators, I may say to the Senator from Idaho, have inquired as to how long we may run tonight. I am not making this inquiry for any other purpose than to enable me to begin to line up the program. Could the Senator tell me how long he feels he might speak on this subject?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not "feel" right now, I must say to the Senator from Nebraska. I have no idea. I have been thinking this thing over and I cannot arrive at a conclusion in my own mind just what to do. If I thought I could talk long enough so that the folks would have to go up to Philadelphia and just drop the whole business, I would talk that long, but that is quite a way off. I understand they do not have to leave until Monday morning or Sunday night, or some time along there. I doubt very much if I could hold out that long. I think the Lord is on my side, but even he might not sustain me for that length of time. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a further question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator were in my place, what would he tell inquiring Senators about the session tonight?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would pass the buck to TAYLOR, if I were the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield further, I may say I cannot pass the buck any longer, so I may just as well tell all those who are here, and state for the RECORD, anyway, that we expect to stay here late tonight, in view of the Senator's statement—and possibly later than that. We merely want Senators to be prepared.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Nebraska could not be speaking to the Senator from Idaho, could he?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will be here, too, will he not?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know. I say I have been unable to make up my mind just what to do here. The Senator sees that there is much talk about rules and about abusing privileges and one thing and another, unless it is to the advantage of someone to circumvent a rule. But early in the afternoon, shortly after I made an announcement of my intention to speak, I got a hunch, for no good reason—nobody said a word to me; it just dawned on me—that the conferees were not waiting for any authorization, they were conferring. I made inquiry. I am afraid that is what has happened; they have gone into conference without any authorization from the Senate. Some time when I collapse or decide to quit, they will bring the motion to hold a conference out of one hip pocket, and when that is agreed to, they will bring the conference report out of the other hip pocket, and the whole thing will be over. Of course, my scheme had been to talk this afternoon and make them postpone their conference until tomorrow, when I would be rested up and could begin again. I might then last until the Philadelphia convention forced a cessation of things here and moved hostilities hence. But we shall have to make up our mind later about how long we are going to talk. There are some things I want to say about this, anyhow.

I was talking about the quotation from the brochure prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence for the Senate Appropriations Committee which was considering the question of strategic stock-piling. It says:

Realistically, all wars have been for economic reasons. To make them politically and socially palatable, ideological issues have always been invoked.

As I said, Mr. President, you cannot get folks mad enough to fight about markets or materials and cartel involvements all over the world; so ideological issues are raised. As I said, those issues may be with respect to Catholicism or Protestantism or the Jewish question, or Mohammedism—anything to scare the people with something of that kind.

In this connection, Mr. President, it is the same ideology that Adolf Hitler used. He used communism as his bogeyman and was going to defend the world against it. The Germans formed their Axis, and one thing and another. We are using the same old Hitler bogyman—Russia. Watch out, or the Communists

will get you. That does not seem to scare people sufficiently, so every few days, for the past year or two, we have had a new crisis, on paper. I remember the first crisis was when we had to help the Turks and the Greeks. No one got very excited about it, so there was a new crisis brought up. There was an invading army coming down from Yugoslavia which would take over Greece in short order, if we did not get there in time. Of course that army evaporated into thin air. There was a certain date before which we had to pass a bill, or the world would find itself in chaos. We passed the bill, and they finally received their money.

I remember there was some talk about the Russians being in Iran. They were there originally as part of the war strategy. They overstayed their welcome, and the matter was called to the attention of the United Nations. Without even a verbal shot being fired, the Russians packed up and went home. They left the oil there, incidentally. If they were out to conquer the world, I think they would have remained there. I think if I were a Russian and wanted to conquer the world, I would have stayed there. But the Russians went home.

Maybe it does not mean anything; maybe it is not significant. It was a victory for the United Nations that the Russians went home. They did not want to be condemned by this great new organization.

I remember when they were trying to stir the Russian-Iran situation to a crisis pitch. It was said there was an army coming down from Russia. It was mechanized; it had tanks and everything. It was coming right into Iran, according to the big headlines. But that was the last we ever heard of it. The headlines dropped them, and they evaporated somewhere, and never showed up again.

Of course, Mr. President, the press of America is in this propaganda, hook, line, and sinker. They are controlled by the big fellows who expect to profit from the armaments program, so they are glad to blow up these phoney scares. The latest scare we had was the submarine scare. There were submarines everywhere; the place was overrun with them. I was in California at the time the scare started. One paper had a headline reading "Submarine sighted off coast." One submarine was seen close to shore. The others had been over on the other side of the Pacific, but this newspaper found a submarine right close to the shore. After the banner headline clear across the top of the page, it narrowed down to one column, which said: "Thought to be a United States submarine maneuvering."

We are told that Russia has a big land army, and it would appear that it is going to march right across the ocean, and land in the United States. Russia does not have any ships to speak of, so I do not know how her army could get here.

Hitler burned down the Reichstag, blamed it on the Communists, and got the folks really scared. In this country we have one crisis after another. I think it will turn out like a vaccination for smallpox. We have so many crises we will become immune one of these days, and then the Red scare will not work any more. A new crisis is brought up and no one pays any attention to it, like the boy who hollered "wolf" once too often. But that is still their line—"The Communists will get us." Russia is devastated, but fact is not taken into consideration. If they do not get us mad enough to fight through that means, they will produce some day a document saying that the Russians are short of women and they are going to take all our women back to Russia. Then I suppose everyone will be mad enough to fight. If I believed that, I would be mad enough to fight. But I am not sucker enough to fall for that propaganda. We will hear that some of these days, mark my words.

We are getting ready to fight somebody—not "someone" anymore, but Russia. Even our Air Secretary comes to Congress and says that we have planes that can bomb the heart of Russia and return. No longer is it a question of who is the enemy or a potential enemy. It is made plain that it is Russia.

We are getting into an armament economy, turning over a large portion of our productive capacity to the manufacture of guns, tanks, airplanes, spears, and everything else, I guess. The funny part of it is, Mr. President, that we have hundreds of atomic bombs, and recently I learned from very high authority that if 250 of our present-day atomic bombs were exploded there would be no place on earth that would be habitable. We already have it in our power to kill everyone on earth. All we have to do is to detonate atomic bombs in one place, and the whole world will become so radioactive that no one can live.

Yet we are asked to draft our boys and put them into uniform. As I said the other day, I cannot see what difference it makes whether they die in uniform or in their B. V. D.'s. It does not make much difference. We are going to die, anyway. We have the bombs. I do not believe anyone will be able to stop the explosions of them when once we get started. So it strikes me that this draft business is pure idiocy.

If I knew what the conference report contains I might cease and desist. It is all ready, I suppose. If I thought the Senate had accepted the House amendment not to draft anyone until next January, that would be all right, because next January I believe we shall have a Congress elected on a platform opposing peacetime military training, and we can repeal the law before it ever gets started. But inasmuch as I do not know what has been put into the conference report, I shall have to go on and talk for a while.

Mr. President, I have here a copy of today's Washington Star, which contains an article written by Mr. David Lawrence, who is a rather conservative columnist. In fact, he publishes a magazine for businessmen to read. His article deals with the question of conscription. He says:

Delay in draft law unlikely to weaken diplomacy of United States.

We have been told that if we did not draft our boys, Secretary Marshall would be in a weak position. Of course I think he is in a weak position anyhow. He has been, ever since he became Secretary of State. He had no business being Secretary of State in the first place. He was a good general and he should have remained that.

I quote again from David Lawrence, the headline:

Administration failure to show its need leaves Congress hesitant.

In other words, he says that they have not proven or shown conclusively that we need a draft law, so the Congress is not very excited about passing one. He proceeds:

Outwardly the controversy over what kind of a draft bill to pass could be mistaken for a conflict of interest between isolationists and internationalists or between advocates of preparedness and opponents of larger armament.

I am not an opponent of adequate preparedness, Mr. President, but I am opposed to militarizing this Nation, and the scale at which we are going at it now can result only in the militarization of this country. It is sort of like dope, the more you get the more you want. You see, they start building all these billions of dollars' worth of guns, then the profits of the industrialists depend on guns, the wages of the workers depend on guns, then they are for the armament program, and it is more difficult to stop it. Every factory that is opened up to producing armaments makes it that much more difficult ever to get out of the armament business, ever to make a really sincere effort to try to attain peace in the world, because it becomes a vested interest. I am opposed to militarizing this country, getting it into the predicament into which Hitler got the German people, because people's morale and their moral sense of right and wrong become dulled after awhile. They realize that their livelihood depends on guns, and they have to rationalize around until they convince themselves that they must have the guns so that they can make more guns to make more profit, and there you go.

David Lawrence goes on to say:

But no such definitions or cleavages can be justified. The truth is that the President and the Secretary of State have failed to make out a case for the need of peacetime conscription. This means that just ahead of a national election Members of Congress of both parties are hesitant to vote for a draft.

I had not noticed that, Mr. President. I wish it were true. They voted for it, and they will vote for anything nowadays if you just put a little antired label on it.

To return to David Lawrence:

This may be called plain politics, but it is at the same time the manner in which the electorate reacts irrespective of partisanship. There are as many Democrats as there are Republicans who fear the consequences of a draft bill on the attitude of voters.

Many of them are going to be surprised about the consequences of a draft bill in the attitude of the voters. I promise them that.

It isn't as if there were a war in progress into which America might suddenly be drawn. The threat of war with Russia has been dram-

atized again and again but without conviction.

That is David Lawrence I am quoting. He proceeds:

The House of Representatives, during its debate on the draft bill, tossed around one report that the Secretary of State did say war was possible and another that he said there was no pressing emergency. Whatever he said was said in an executive session and serves only to underline how uninformed the American people are as to what is the nature of the military crisis that confronts them.

The diplomatic relations between Russia and the United States have, of course, been strained but the Russian "peace offensive" successfully disseminated the impression that war isn't likely in the immediate future. The American Government's rejoinder to the "peace offensive" was weak and clumsy, and hence the draft bill suffered.

Much more important as an influence in retarding the draft law from being passed in the form desired by the armed services was the propaganda attributed to the supporters in Congress of the 70-group Air Force. Over the protests of the President and his Secretary of Defense, Congress appropriated more money than was requested in order to put into being a 70-group air force.

I may say, Mr. President, that practically every appropriation bill that has come through the Senate the last few days, when so many appropriation bills have been coming through, practically every one that was of a military nature the Senate increased over what the House appropriated. In the past the Senate has been known as the conservative body, as the body more cautious, at least more careful, what they put their name to. It used to be said that the House of Representatives would pass legislation which they knew was unconstitutional, which they really did not want passed. They would pass it so that they could go out and talk to the folks at home about what they had voted for, and they had confidence that the Senate would reject the legislation, or modify it, and make it constitutional, would be more careful and more thorough in their approach. They cannot say that any longer. The Senate "ups" the ante on every item for guns and greater expenditure of the people's money in the European recovery program. Any place they can spend it they are all for spending more.

I now go back to David Lawrence:

The explanation heard in the corridors of the Capitol was that by voting more planes there would be no need of a draft. As a sheer matter of exchange, many Members were willing to spend more dollars than to vote to tear up the lives of the younger generation and interrupt their schooling and their working careers with 2 years of military service.

Those are the words of David Lawrence, not mine, Mr. President, "tear up the lives of the younger generation." I think that is well put.

As it turns out, Congress voted the 70-group Air Force and still has been confronted with a demand for a draft bill. Many Members have hesitated to go along with the peacetime conscription because they honestly believe an air force can do everything.

I believe so, too, Mr. President. In fact, we do not even need an air force. All we need is some bombs, just put them out on a high hill and explode them all, and we have them licked, everybody dies. Of course, we die, too, but we do not get licked. Everybody is dead, so we do not need even an air force.

I should certainly prefer appropriating money for a 70-group air force than to draft the boys.

David Lawrence continues:

They have been told by some overenthusiastic airmen that both an army and a navy is relatively inconsequential and that, if only enough airplanes are provided, American security will be assured.

While we are on the subject of airplanes, I think one of the most statesmanlike proposals that has been made in America for a long time was made by Henry Wallace at the Madison Square Garden meeting a while back, when he offered the suggestion that our airplane factories should be taken over and operated by the Government, because, as Mr. Wallace pointed out, they are not an economic proposition in peacetime. They cannot survive and make profits. The object of private industry is to make profits. The airplane factories cannot do so without orders for military planes, and, of course, when they depend on orders for military planes they will spend a great deal of their money in hiring experts and lobbyists to keep the war hysteria stirred up and try to secure more orders for military planes to manufacture. That being the case, I think the proposal made by Mr. Wallace certainly should be adopted. It would go a long way toward lessening the pressure for war crisis which can only result in war eventually.

Mr. Lawrence in his article continues:

Now, the ground forces feel themselves in need of a draft law to supply the enormous numbers of men needed to handle the installations and mechanical work at the bases where airplanes take off and land.

While the armed services have each been eager to get their necessary appropriations, it does seem nevertheless that not a very strong case has been made for the draft—at least one strong enough to convince Congress, many of whose Members still feel that a mild draft law with a deferred date will accelerate recruiting and bring the necessary personnel into the armed services long before the actual need for war service will arise.

I understand the House measure contains a provision which would defer the draft until next January. That would make it nonsensical for us to pass a draft law now, because we would be passing a law which would take effect during and impose on the prerogatives of the next Congress. The next Congress will convene in the coming January.

The House bill also contained an amendment, if I have been correctly informed, directing someone, I do not know who, to put on an all-out campaign to induce young men to volunteer. I am all for that, Mr. President. Whatever men we need, let us pay them for their service. We do not draft policemen to police Washington, D. C., or Podunk, back home. If we cannot obtain policemen for $1,200 a year we pay them $1,500, or if we cannot obtain them for $1,500 a year we perhaps raise their pay to $2,000 or $2,400. We hire policemen and pay them what they are worth. But when we want soldiers to protect us in peacetime, lo and behold, we will just yank the boys off the street and say, "Get into uniform. Some of us are busy, and we will select you."

I return to David Lawrence and read:

Since war isn't regarded as imminent, a draft law that takes effect after election isn't likely to weaken the diplomacy of the United States. For the important fact psychologically is that there is to be a peacetime draft.

Of course what Mr. Lawrence wants us to do is to pass a draft law and keep it lying around so as to scare the boys by the threat that we are going to draft them if they do not watch out, and if they do not enlist. It would be perfectly dishonest, of course, to pass a draft law and put it into effect in peacetime.

Mr. President, there have been a number of political speeches made on the floor in the last few days. Yesterday the Chamber was well decorated with charts and one thing and another which were placed all about the room. It was the most attractive decoration of the Chamber I have seen. The charts showed how folks voted on various measures—the Democrats and the Republicans. An interesting thing about it was that most of the votes were cast back yonder when Roosevelt was President. Those who presented the charts were not very proud of the votes taken since Roosevelt passed on. It is not the same old Democratic Party that it used to be when he was its leader. That is why I decided to go with Henry Wallace. As I said at the time I did so, I did not leave the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party simply left me. I still believe in the same things I believed in when I was elected on a pledge to support Franklin D. Roosevelt but the Democratic Party has left those principles, so I will stay with those principles even though it is necessary to organize a new party to fight for those principles.

Since other folks have set forth their party platforms, have stated what they believe in, we may as well have the benefit of the record and show what the new party believes in.

First and foremost we believe in keeping the peace. Inasmuch as we have looked and have seen that we have enough bombs to kill everyone in the world, including ourselves, we fail to see the percentage in starting a war. No one is going to win. We are all going to die if a war were to come. In fact I think it would be much more sensible if, instead of spending billions of dollars to draft our boys, and to build tanks—and we are going right on building atomic bombs—we should locate some big caves, perhaps the Mammoth Cave, and put lead doors on the openings into it so the radioactivity could not come in, and if there was any way in the world to purify atmosphere, to take radioactivity out of it—I do not know whether there is, but I guess there is not—we might install machinery to blow fresh air, decontaminated air into the Mammoth Cave, and then select about a half a dozen young couples who have just gotten married, and set them up to housekeeping in Mammoth Cave so when all of the rest of us are killed, they can hold out there for a few years, whatever time it will be until the earth will become decontaminated, and then they can emerge and

proceed to repopulate the earth. That would be a more sensible course to pursue.

Incidentally it would be very gratifying to me if that were done, because doubtless some couples would be chosen from the largest name groups, which would be the fairest thing to do, and they would probably begin with the Browns, the Smiths, the Joneses, and I think the Taylors would get in about sixth, someplace along there, so the name of "Taylor" would be perpetuated after the fracas was all over. I do not set myself up as a candidate for the job, however.

We were saying that the new party does not believe there is any percentage in getting into a war, and that we should keep the peace. We do not believe that there has been a genuine effort made to get along with Russia. Quite the contrary. It is our conviction that the cartelists, the monopolists, and the militarists have taken over the control of the country and that many of them actually want war, and they feel that the Russians do not have the bomb, I guess, and that we can drop 240 bombs, if not 250, and maybe whip the Russians and rule the world and exploit its people.

There are others who want to remain generals and admirals and majors and colonels and monopolists and cartelists, and profit. They want to keep up the war tension so they can go ahead with the armament program. So we do not feel that a genuine effort to keep the peace has been made by arriving at an understanding with Russia. Therefore we contend that the election of Henry Wallace would be practically the only sensible way for us to reach an agreement with Russia, because Henry Wallace is the only man of sufficient stature to aspire to the Presidency of the United States, who has not fallen for the lure of cheap publicity to be gained in the reactionary press by denouncing Russia every day of the week, and trying to blame all our troubles on communism. You can name any prospective candidate you want to and they are all in on this propagandist scare against Russia and denouncing Russia. How does anyone expect them to make an about-face and save face, Mr. President? They cannot do it. Henry Wallace has held himself above those things. It is not because Henry Wallace loves Russia. We see that propaganda everywhere. Henry Wallace would not trade one spadeful of the soil of Iowa, where he was born, for all the ground in Russia. I am confident of that. I know him pretty well. But he has been big enough to resist the temptation to climb on the red smear bandwagon. Believe me, Mr. President, it took some pretty serious thinking on my part to make up my mind to go with Henry Wallace. I knew what the result would be. I was elected to the Senate over what most people would have considered insurmountable obstacles. It is fine to be a Senator. It is the best job I ever had, anyway I look at it—from the standpoint of salary, prestige, or anything else. It is wonderful.

But I have three boys. They must be educated. When I am out of the Senate I do not know what I shall do. I spent my earlier life in the theatrical profession. I cannot go back to it. One cannot drag three small boys around the country. They must go to school. So I do not know what will happen to me when I am out of the Senate.

For that reason it was pretty serious when Mr. Wallace asked me to join in this great effort to save the world from extinction. That is what it amounts to. If I had not thought so, I might not have gone with him. But I felt that that was the issue that was involved; that we were being taken toward a war which could mean only, in all probability, the end of life on this planet. So I joined Henry Wallace. There are more important things than my political security, my political future, or my economic security.

Those things are the welfare of everyone's sons, including my own. That is why I am opposed to the draft bill. It just does not make sense. It only adds to the danger of war. As I have said, we can kill everyone anyway, so why draft the boys and take us along this militaristic road?

However, for the benefit of those who are convinced that we must fight Russia, let me say that I believe that we would be much better off with Henry Wallace as President if it ever came to a showdown and we did have to fight Russia. I am not conceding for a moment that we are going to have to fight Russia. I do not believe we will. At the present time there are millions of American people—and I am one of them—who are not convinced that an honest effort has been made to seek a rapprochement with the Russians. But if we were dragged into a war with Russia this country would be very much divided. There would be a lack of enthusiasm for any such efforts; and that is very important. Napoleon said that morale is to numbers as 3 is to 1. It would be very important that we have a united country in case of war.

If Mr. Wallace were to become President, and he made an all-out effort to reach an agreement with the Russians and failed, then the people of America would know that everything possible had been done in a genuine spirit of cooperation and with a real desire to get along with the Russians. Then the common people would be behind any such effort if it had to come about. We do not have to worry about the monopolists, the cartelists, and the military men. They do not like Wallace, but they would be all for a war even with Wallace running it. So I think the best hope of the American people for peace and the best hope of coming out best is the election of Henry Wallace. I do not know how we are going to come out best in a war; but at least we could all die united under Henry Wallace, in case we got into a fracas.

So for war or peace, I am convinced that Henry Wallace is the best man for the job. Of course, Mr. Wallace's detractors say that he is a "screwball," a seer, and one thing and another. It is said that he could not stand up to Stalin, that Stalin is a smart fellow. Perhaps Stalin is smart, but I contend that Henry Wallace himself is pretty smart.

Henry Wallace was the greatest Secretary of Agriculture we ever had. He did more for the farmers of America as Secretary of Agriculture than was ever done for them before or since. Aside from that, Henry Wallace has done more for the farmers by developing his hybrid corn than has any other person who ever lived in all history. His hybrid corn, with its fabulous yields, has put millions of dollars of actual cash money into the pockets of American farmers during the past few years.

But the hybrid corn which Henry Wallace perfected is like a mule. It will not reproduce. You have to buy the seed from Henry every year. I contend that any man who can figure out a scheme like that is no fool. I never heard of Joe Stalin figuring out anything half that smart. At the same time, it is a very humanitarian thing. Henry has become well-to-do from it, and at the same time it helps the farmers. In fact, Henry Wallace is a successful man by any standard—even the one most commonly applied in these great United States, the one of financial success.

Henry Wallace is a success financially. He is a great scientist. Some will try to prove that he is crazy because he has hobbies, like throwing the boomerang. Throwing the boomerang is no crazier than chasing a golf ball all over. It is smarter, in fact. You do not have to chase the boomerang. You do have to chase the golf ball. Henry Wallace is a good boomerang thrower. One day he threw one which hit a Hearst reporter, and it looked like an accident.

I believe that Henry Wallace can and will reach an honorable agreement with the Russians. We are not for peace at any price. Our detractors will say that we are groveling cur dogs, and this, that, and the other thing. Nothing like it at all. We believe that this can be done honorably, and that the Russians will be glad to go home and stay at home, if we will go home and stay at home, and if they have reason to believe that we will stay home. At the present time, with all our preparations for war, how can the Russians have any confidence that we would go home or stay at home? There are many reasons why they should want to stay at home. They have vast resources. They live better in peacetime than they do in wartime, due to the nature of their economy. They would like to develop their country. So I am convinced that we can have peace honorably, and that is the main objective of our new party.

What will we do on the domestic front? Whenever it has been suggested that we take care of the old people or build schools or hospitals, the argument has always been raised, "We cannot afford it. It will bankrupt the Nation." Is not that funny, Mr. President? But now we can appropriate billions and billions and billions of dollars for armaments, and billions and billions and billions of dollars for Europe, and no one worries as to whether or not it is going to bankrupt us. It is, but people do not seem to worry about it, because they are getting profits out of it, and they do not worry about anything so long as they are getting profits. Their philosophy is to let the next generation take care of the mistakes they make. If they can only get their hands in the old profit

bag and get theirs now, they are satisfied. So they no longer say, "We cannot do these things because it would bankrupt the country." When we start our program for domestic betterment of this great Nation and it is said, "You are going to bankrupt the country," we are going to say "Nuts! We saw what you spent for armaments."

We will call off the armament program as soon as we reach an agreement with the Russians. They will have to call theirs off, too, but, of course, we shall be just as well off relatively if they have no guns and we have none. In fact, we shall be a great deal better off, because then we shall have a few months to live while we get ready. As it is now, everyone can be killed without notice. It is very bad. There is no peace of mind.

The other day I read that our mental hospitals are becoming filled with crazy people. They are all going "nuts" because they do not know what day the bombs are going to drop on them. We should stop spending all these billions of dollars for armaments, and should use some of that money—not all of it—to make ours a better country in which to live.

For instance, suppose we were to use a few of those billions of dollars to have a health program, under which we would build hospitals and would train doctors and would make it possible for poor sick people, or sick people who are poor, whichever way one wishes to state it, to call in a doctor and have a checkup before they get sick, and thus stay well. Certainly it would be better to have such preventive methods used rather than to have people wait until they were really sick before they called a doctor. Would not that be better than this fool draft law which I have been discussing? After all, it takes healthy people to be good soldiers. We found that out in the last war. We could hardly get enough boys to carry the guns that had to be carried. Many of the young men of our country were found to have had rickets or some other disease or trouble which made it impossible for them to carry guns and serve as soldiers.

Mr. President, I remember that when I was in California not long ago I saw piles of oranges 10 feet high and half a mile long—not one pile, but many piles. If someone had taken one of those oranges, he would have been arrested and charged with stealing. Yet we have had many children in our country suffering from rickets. We must not allow that to occur any longer, or else our people will go Communist or something worse.

These big fellows realize that; but instead of seeing to it that the people have enough money with which to buy the things they need and require, they propose an armaments program. They suggest that billions of dollars be used to buy guns. Of course, when great quantities of guns are made, other articles will be scarce: Frigidaires and automobiles, for instance, will be scarce. That is the whole idea behind this armaments plan. Those who are behind it are not afraid of Russia; they know Russia is not able to attack anyone. They are simply using Russia as a bogeyman.

But the new party would have a health program, and would use some of the money—which otherwise would be spent for guns—for the welfare of the people of America. Mr. President, would not that be a good idea? After all, the guns will be useless after the earth is blown up by the 250 atom bombs.

Mr. President, do you not think it will be better to have more schools and better schools and increase the salaries of the school teachers, so that they can live decently and so that the teaching profession will attract our average citizens? What a sad spectacle the situation today is, Mr. President. Almost everyone makes more money than the school teachers do. Not long ago I was in Nevada. There is a great deal of gambling out there. The girls running the gambling tables have to be quick at figures, of course, so as to be able to figure up the percentages. It seems that nearly every one of the girls running the gambling tables in Las Vegas and Reno is a former school teacher. Think of that. That is a sad commentary on present-day America—dissipating our wealth all over the world; spending billions of dollars for armaments that are absolutely useless, because we have enough bombs to kill everyone, in the first place.

Do you not think it would be a good idea to do as the new party advocates? Instead of spending money on useless armament projects, and thus degrading mankind, as they must, with their promise of destruction and the destruction of the morale of the people, do you not think it would be much better to build homes—homes for veterans, at least? Let us not draft any more of our young men until we build homes for the veterans of the last war. The only way they will get homes will be to have the Federal Government build the homes.

Incidentally, Mr. President, where are the homes? Where is the housing bill? Some Members of Congress are greatly worried about drafting the boys, but they are not worried about the housing bill. They have kicked that around and kicked it practically to death, and I guess it has been finished before now.

But, single-handed, I am trying, to stop this despicable business of militarizing our Nation.

The new party would build homes, not only for veterans, but for all Americans who need homes. Only a fraction of the money which is being spent so lavishly and so hopelessly for armament and for so-called aid to fascism all over the world would be required for the building of homes which our new party advocates.

Mr. President, how about some legislation for civil rights?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I am wondering whether the distinguished Senator will permit a vote on the motion to disagree to the amendment of the House to the draft bill, agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and for the appointment of conferees, and then let the conferees work out whatever provisions they might work out, and report to the two Houses. Then the Senator of course could use his own judgment as to whether the conference report would be acceptable.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Nebraska does not have to beat about the bush. Let him find out what the conferees have agreed upon, and write it on a piece of paper, and bring it around here and let me look at it, and if it is O. K., I will agree to let the conferees be appointed, so as to make it official.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is quite an assignment. Of course it is not possible.

I respectfully submit to the distinguished Senator that when the conference report comes back, if the provisions of the report do not meet with the approval of the Senator from Idaho, certainly there will be ample time for him to continue the speech he has already begun, but the procedure I suggest would give us the authority to have the conference report presented as quickly as possible.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what I do not want to have done.

Mr. WHERRY. An additional reason for making this request is that there are five conference reports which should be adopted. One is on the highway bill, another is on the Interior Department appropriation bill, another is on the displaced persons bill, and there are several others. I believe that between the time when a vote would be taken on the motion to disagree to the amendment of the House, agree to the requested conference, and to appoint the conferees on this measure, and the time when the conference report would be presented, there would be ample time to consider the other conference reports.

Thereafter the Senator would have the same opportunity he has now, but we would have expedited the transaction of the work before us, and of course thereafter the Senator could continue to make the speech he is making now. I think that is a very fair proposal, and it should command the Senator's utmost consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no objection to having any measure except the draft bill considered. If Senators wish to lay aside the draft bill temporarily, and take up and pass everything else on the calendar, that will be entirely satisfactory to me, and I shall vote "aye."

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the Senator from Idaho overlooks the fact that until the vote is taken on the motion to agree to the requested conference and appoint conferees, officially there can be no conference on the draft bill. If it were not for the fact that when the conference committee returns with its report, the distinguished Senator will have the same opportunity that he has now, I would not even make the suggestion to him, because I have always cooperated with the distinguished Senator; I think he will agree with me as to that.

I am simply making this suggestion in order to expedite matters generally.

The Senator's speech could be continued or resumed the moment the conference report came back. If the provisions of the conference report are not acceptable to the Senator, of course he can speak in the same way that he is speaking now. In the meantime, the conferees will have concluded their deliberations and we could also have considered and agreed to the other conference reports.

So I submit the request to the Senator. I think it is a very fair proposal, and does not in any way prejudice or take away the rights the Senator has now to oppose whatever is submitted by the conference.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that my object in talking now is to split my remarks into two segments.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the split has already been made.

Mr. TAYLOR. But not enough of a split.

I had in mind talking now; and it was my hope that when, later, the conferees were appointed, they would not be able to get their conference report back until morning. But I think they have "pulled a fast one" on me. I am afraid they have already conferred. As I have said, if anyone wishes to sneak to me a copy of their report, or the main provisions of it, and let me look at it, I may decide to call this off. But until then, I think I shall proceed for a while.

Anyway, I have not gotten into the RECORD all the program of the new party, and I want to get all of it in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was busy. Did the Senator make a proposition? If so, I did not hear it.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I did not proposition anybody. I want to say I have the highest regard for the Senator from Nebraska. In fact, he is such an estimable gentleman I wish he would join the new party. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I tried to accomplish something anyway. I hope the Senator will consider it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Nebraska should make clear what he said.

Mr. WHERRY. I say, I hope the Senator will consider the matter as he proceeds. I am satisfied, I may say with all respect, that the Senator would not be prejudicing his rights, he would have the same opportunity to continue his speech after the conference report comes back, if the conference report comes back. Even though the conference report might not be satisfactory in all its phases, it might appeal to the Senator in such a way that he would feel he could accept it. Until the conference report comes back, I submit the Senator has to anticipate what may happen.

Mr. TAYLOR. My statement was that the Senator from Nebraska was such an estimable gentleman I wish he would join the new party. The Senator perhaps did not hear me say that, for he replied, "I tried." [Laughter.] I simply did not want him to be left on a spot here.

I was discussing civil rights. Nothing has been done, when there are millions of Americans who live from day to day all their lives in an inferior status. They are not Americans; they are second-class citizens. All over this country I have been traveling back and forth, and I wish that people who have race prejudice in their hearts and who feel that Negroes must be kept in an inferior position could have traveled with me and have met the Negroes I have met.

Indeed, Mr. President, in many places I have stayed in the homes of Negroes, for the good and sufficient reason that in many places rooms will not be rented to Mr. Wallace or myself, because we are sympathetic with the Negro people; much less will rooms be rented to anyone whose skin is a little dark.

A very strange thing happened last fall, I believe it was. There was a Negro gentleman who put on a turban, one of those Hindu turbans. He toured all over the South, being received with high honors, bowed to and scraped around, simply because he wore a turban. It was not known that he was a Negro. People thought he was a Hindu. You see, they cannot tell by looking at people, so I suggested, I do not see why they do not just put turbans on all Negroes and let it go at that, and they would all be entitled to equal rights.

But we met some wonderful people, Negroes, all across the country, smart, intelligent, educated. It only goes to show what could be done if all Negroes had equal opportunity. Of course the demagogues get up and say, "Well, I don't want my daughter to marry a Negro." Well, no one is suggesting that anybody's daughter or anybody's son marry a Negro. We merely want them to have equal opportunities at jobs, equal opportunities to get a meal, to go into a place and eat, and just be treated like everybody else; that is all. I do not think that would cause any more intermarriage or mixture of the races than goes on now. But we would have a civil rights program.

The new party would have a civil rights program. In fact, we believe in equality for all Americans. We have several Negroes running for Congressional seats. We have down in Georgia a Negro candidate for the United States Senate. The new party would repeal the Taft-Hartley law and enact sensible labor legislation. Incidentally we ought to have $1 an hour as a minimum wage, which is another thing we advocate.

The new party would take care of our old people with just a few of the dollars we are spending for guns now. We are not suggesting any new appropriations; we would just divert some of these billions that have been appropriated for guns and for European recovery—which they do not need. We would see that our old people under present conditions have at least $100 a month. They should have that much, and we are for it, and we would see that they got it. The new party would formulate a farm program to work through the United Nations. There was a world food program figured out here, and we spurned it, we would not have anything to do with it. We would not make friends by that action, either. Some of the other nations thought very poorly of us. But we would figure out a farm plan, working through the United Nations. In fact, the new party plans to work through the United Nations always, every time there is a possibility to build up the United Nations. We are for it 100 percent. We would work through the United Nations in figuring out a farm program that would not only give our farmers a decent return on their labor and investment, but even more important I believe to the farmers—I have talked to many of them, I was raised on a farm—even more important, at least as important as the fact he would get a decent monetary return, then through the United Nations we could figure it out so the farmer would always know that every mouthful of food he raised went to feed some hungry person somewhere in this hungry world, because there are people all over the world, millions of them, who never have a full belly. We would correct that condition to the best of our ability, while helping our farmers at the same time.

Then of course, Mr. President, we want to assure the American people there would be no Mundt-Nixon bill, there would be no curtailing of civil liberties, anybody's right to speak or to say anything he thought, so long as he did not advocate violent overthrow of the government. If I had my say about it I would see that there was a town hall built in every community in America that does not have one, with a Federal charter, a stipulation, "built by the Federal Government," and anybody could use that hall, just pay for the lights and the heat and a little depreciation, and use it to say anything he pleased at any time he pleased, and be assured of full police protection. That one thing, Mr. President, would do more to head off any foreign ideologies or foreign subversive schemes than any other thing I can possibly think of. As long as we let people blow off steam, and as long as one fellow can go to the community hall tonight and advocate communism, if he wants to, or socialism, and another fellow, the next night, can go there and advocate a certain kind of capitalism, or anything he wants to advocate, so long as they do not advocate changing our government by force and violence, that is the greatest safety valve of all.

Of course people have to have something to eat, a minimum, at least. They must have opoprtunities to educate their children, and must have a fairly decent place in which to live. Those things are minimum requirements, which any government, under any way of life, must provide for if it expects to survive. We could do all of the things I have mentioned, and there would still be billions of dollars kicking around, which we are now spending for guns. We could make substantial payments on our national debt. It is important that the national debt be reduced and paid off as rapidly as possible, because the burden of interest is unbearable. However, instead of paying off the debt, we are spending billions for guns for Europe and are reducing taxes. Of course almost all of the reduction in taxes goes to the benefit of persons with a great deal of money. It is almost criminal, in fact. They do not want the debt paid off. It is the

biggest racket they ever had. So let the debt remain large. Reduce taxes. We could make substantial payments on the debt, and then, after that, out of the billions of dollars being squandered everywhere, we would have enough left to have a real tax reduction. We could see that the common folks received the most of it, the ones who need it the most. They do need it, desperately, Mr. President. Prices are all out of proportion to the amount of wages which workers are receiving. They receive a wage increase, and then the producers raise the prices of their articles sky high, or out of all proportion to the actual cost of the wage increase, and the workers are worse off than they were before. Today I saw an advertisement in a newspaper of a 1949 Ford automobile for $1,995. That is almost $2,000 for a Ford automobile. The Ford Co. used to apologize if it charged $700 or $800.

Another thing which the new party would like to make plain is this: We believe that the Jewish people are entitled to a home land in Palestine, and we would be foursquare on that proposition, instead of shilly-shallying, backtracking, or double-crossing, as we have been in our foreign policy. In fact, this bipartisan foreign policy of ours should be ashamed to go by the name of foreign policy. We control the United Nations because we are dishing out billions of dollars all over the earth to phony cardboard Fascist governments, and we control the votes of the United Nations. Along came Palestine, and we were in favor of partition. Everyone agreed, including the Russians. Then the Arabs kicked up a little bit, so Mr. Forrestal, a representative of the oil companies, said, "We cannot afford this. Our oil is in danger." So we called off partition. Then we wanted a trusteeship. We did not ask the United Nations to figure out a new plan; we just figured out a trusteeship. We wrote it up and handed it to them and said, "Debate this a reasonable length of time, and the answer is "Yes." So they did that. We told the Jews not to set up a State, that we would not approve of it. But they established it anyway, and there was a fait accompli. So Mr. Truman, without even telling our representatives at the United Nations, recognized Palestine in 10 or 15 minutes. Our delegate to the United Nations was left standing there when word came over that the United States had recognized Palestine. The other delegates asked him, "Has your Government recognized Israel?" He said, "I do not know what my Government is doing." He was right. The whole world laughed right in the faces of our representatives.

Never has the prestige of this country fallen so low as it is at this time. I can assure the Senate that with the new party, under the leadership of Henry Wallace, the people will know where we stand. There will be no shilly-shally and double talk, one thing today and another thing tomorrow. Mr. Wallace is a forthright man.

Mr. President, many people are opposed to the draft bill. I have seen many of them across this great Nation. I have here a clipping from the New York Times of March 19, 1948, which says:

Cardinal Dougherty calls peacetime UMT menace to health and morality of youth.

The article goes on to say:

Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, ranking prelate of the Catholic Church in this country, declared today he is unalterably opposed to peacetime universal military training.

The spiritual leader of a million Catholics in the Philadelphia Archdiocese stated the following reasons:

"First, it is against the traditions of this country.

"Second, where it is in existence is precisely where most wars have taken place."

Of course, Mr. President, that is a fact. All the countries of Europe have military training, and they were always getting into wars because they were always ready for war. Then it remained for us to go in and settle the proposition. We won, after all the countries with military training got the stuffing kicked out of them. We are now trying to follow their example, and it does not make sense.

The article continues:

Said training would remove young men, at a critical age, from their home surroundings and safeguards.

That is a true statement, Mr. President. The most terrible thing about it is that it will take young men out of school, and once they are out of school they seldom return. They will not return unless we provide many inducements, similar to those in the GI bill of rights.

The article continues:

It would throw them, with all their inexperience and without adequate safeguard, into frightful temptations calculated to undermine their morality and physical health.

Of course that has been proven, also, Mr. President. I have a very good friend in Idaho who had a boy who joined the Army. The boy was a little wild, to be sure, and when he got away from home and was over in Germany it was not long before he was shipped back in a box, feet first. He had drunk some wood alcohol, and that was his finish. His father had managed to keep the boy under control as long as he was home, but when he got away from home he did not last long.

I read further:

Experience shows that even military officers are frequently corrupt and a bad example to those under them.

This is Cardinal Dougherty speaking, I hasten to say, lest some Senator jumps up and calls me a Communist.

Here is what the Cardinal says:

Venereal disease would rise in a frightful degree and break down the health of future fathers of families.

No one can deny that. Past experience has proved it to be so.

The expense of universal military training would involve annually millions, if not billions of dollars to be paid by the taxpayers.

There seems to be no need in this country of universal military training, which is boosted most by soldiers, particularly Army officers, who covet promotion and higher salaries.

Of course that is true, Mr. President. Army officers want to remain officers. They want to be promoted. All we have to do in order to appreciate their position is to try to put ourselves into their position. Suppose we had spend our lives becoming Army officers, and all of a sudden peace should break out. That is the way it is being referred to in the papers now, Mr. President. They say there is danger that peace might break out. But suppose peace broke out and the Russians and this country agreed that there would be no more war. Would not those Army and Navy officers be in terrible shape? They would be wore off than I would be if I were out of politics. They do not know another thing in the world except being generals. No wonder they want to remain generals.

Cardinal Dougherty goes on to say:

Finally, the chances are that hereafter battles will be fought in the air, rather than on foot; and in that case large armies will not be needed.

As I say, this article was written in March 1948, so it may be that Cardinal Dougherty had not heard yet that we have hundreds of atomic bombs, and that the war would not be fought in the air, if all we had to do was to set off our bombs and wait for everyone to die.

Cardinal Dougherty also observed that "certain groups are opposed in conscience to war and consequently to preparations for war"; and this is not only true of Quakers but also of many mothers of other religious beliefs.

Of course they are opposed to it, Mr. President, if we can just get word to the American people, if we can tell them how utterly stupid this whole business of preparing great armies, costing millions of dollars for tanks and arms of one kind and another, when we have the bombs just to end it all, how silly it is. I am afraid there are going to be a lot of folks who vote for this draft who will not be back here next fall, and then we will vote to repeal it.

Mr. President, I have said that I think it is possible for us to get along with Russia. Recently, when we had our peace scare, when the Russians took us at our word, when Gen. Bedell Smith, our Ambassador to Moscow, delivered that note, the Russians took us at our word and said they wanted to discuss this matter to talk about peace. We assured them we did not mean it, that we were just kidding, just being polite. At that time there were several accounts in the press, none of them played up, they were played down, in fact, over on the second or third page, telling about what happened in Russia when it looked as if we might have some peace talks.

Here is an article to which I wish to call attention though it does not deal with this particular matter. I had these articles printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that is why I am quoting from the RECORD. This is a dispatch from Moscow by Eddy Gilmore, Associated Press correspondent. He is a very reliable correspondent. He had been in this country some time, and he had just gone back to Moscow. This is what he had to say on returning to Moscow:

Returning to the Soviet Union from the United States one is struck by the absence of

war talk among the Russian people. One simply doesn't hear any.

He does not say that there is very little war talk; he says one is struck by the absence of war talk in Russia. "One simply does not hear any." That is pretty strong language, a pretty broad statement. How different that is from what we hear in this country. The papers day in and day out are hammering away at us that we may have war most any day. Prominent men make inflammatory statements, average citizens take it up, of course, as they are wont to do when their leaders make such statements. The average citizens say, "We had better fight those Russians." Get in a taxicab or a barber chair and you can hear statements like that all too often.

Mr. Gilmore proceeded to say:

In Berlin the United States press department told me I'd better take a Russian-speaking Amercian officer from the liaison section with me to the Soviet airdrome to catch the plane.

"We'll give you a military escort, too," they said.

You see, all they can think of is military, military. He continues:

Showing up at 2 a. m. I was met by a liaison officer who said if it was all the same to me he wouldn't go along into the Soviet sector.

I told him I spoke Russian and it wasn't necessary.

With a German chauffeur, four suitcases, a typewriter, and a small dog I had purchased for my little daughter, I set out. Halfway to the Russian zone we were overtaken by American military police.

"We will escort you," said one of the men.

"Why?" I asked.

"Well, you never can tell," said the man.

About 100 yards from the Soviet zone the military police car halted.

"This is as far we go," said the man next to the driver. "We'll wait here. If your driver doesn't come back, we'll know you and he have had it."

This was not cheerful talk for so early in the morning.

I am still quoting Eddy Gilmore.

About 200 yards down the road in the Soviet zone was a road block. A young Russian soldier stepped out and held up his hand.

"Where to?" he asked.

I told him.

"Got any documents?"

I told him, "No—just an American passport with a Soviet visa." He examined them by the headlights.

"What about documents for the jeep and driver?" he asked.

"Don't have any. Yesterday was Sunday."

"Oh, well," said the guard, "I guess everything is all right."

This certainly was not very ominous.

At the airport gate it was the same story. Again I got through with no trouble.

Mr. President, I am constrained to stop here and comment. He got into Russia with little or no trouble, yet we know that statements have been made recently that we are appropriating "Fund X," unspecified millions of dollars, for fifth-column activities in Russia and in nations friendly to her. Yet they let Mr. Gilmore right through.

Mr. President, if the Russians stated publicly that they were going to do such a thing as that we would be scared to death. We would not let Eddy Gilmore back into this country even after he had been to Russia. But they let him in with no great trouble. He continued:

"Here's your ticket," said the official. "We are not charging you for the dog. He can ride free."

There were 11 Soviet officers behind me. One suggested I should accompany him to have some tea.

After tea we discovered there was some vodka.

"To the friendship of our countries," said a young major returning to Moscow from an assignment in Berlin.

"To peace between our countries always," I proposed. All 11 officers drank the toast at once.

Here is the final paragraph in this article from Moscow by Eddy Gilmore:

Despite the Berlin tension in the American headlines and war talk, I heard not one word of that in Moscow. I'll wait 24 hours, I said to myself, and talk to more Russians. This I've done. Not one has mentioned war or the possibility of it.

Yet, Mr. President, we are being fed war propaganda. The situation is so serious, to hear people tell it, that we have to draft our boys and provide billions for armaments. This is the greatest crime that was ever perpetrated upon humanity, the misleading of the American people into the idea that they have to fight Russia. There are millions of them coming to accept that idea. When they become indoctrinated enough, they cannot be stopped.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said recently, the American people cannot continue indefinitely hating someone without doing something about it. When we are told we are in grave, imminent danger of attack from Russia, the people cannot continue in that strained way forever. They will insist on doing something about it sometime.

I have here another article which bears the date line Moscow on the day the exchange of notes took place, when it looked like there was some hope that we might have peace. The article was published, I believe, in the Washington Star of May 11. The date line is Moscow, and this is what it says:

Russians crowded five and six deep in front of newspaper bulletin boards today to read a Russian-American exchange of notes which they hoped might lead to better relations.

Did anyone see anything like that in America? I did not. Did anyone see people crowding 5 or 6 feet deep in front of a bulletin board to read the good news that maybe there was a chance that they were going to have peace? Well, they did in Russia. They must really want peace over there. I continue reading:

Laboring men in overalls, shawled mothers with babies in their arms, white collar workers and Army officers stood patiently awaiting their turn to read the three full columns of a Tass Agency dispatch on the exchange. As they read they nudged each other and made such comment as "Good eh! Good."

For the first time in months many of them beamed at those among them who obviously were foreigners.

That is something people understand.

An elderly subway construction engineer said "Molotov will get together with you folks yet. You just see."

Well, unfortunately Mr. Molotov has not gotten together with us yet, so that Russian who wanted peace—he did at least, whether Molotov does or not—his hopes are not going to be realized, Mr. President.

No, I believe it is possible to get along with Russia. If you do not think so you might just as well go out and start digging your own grave with an automatic device to dump the dirt in upon you after you get in, because that will be our fate if we continue with this "get tough" foreign policy. If war comes we will all be killed at once, and there will be no one to bury us.

Mr. President, I should like to know why all the rush to jam this legislation through when nothing has been done about housing, nothing has been done about civil rights. There are many, many things which should have been done which have been left undone. Nothing has been done about a minimum wage. We are spending billions of dollars for useless armament.

Out in the Northwest they tightened up on everything else, spending less money for all good things. Out in the Northwest big floods have practically washed our country away. I have been agitating for a Columbia Valley Authority since 1938. Do Senators know what they called me because I wanted a Columbia Valley Authority like the TVA, to develop our Northwest, to prevent the possibility of these floods which have just cost us millions and millions, and many lives? Do Senators know what they called me because I wanted a Columbia Valley Authority? They called me a Communist. I was called a Communist before I began to run with Wallace. Since I have run with him is not the first time I have been called a Communist. I have been called a Communist for years, and it used to worry me a great deal, because I was not a Communist, and had not even read any Communist literature. Of course, after I had been called a Communist for a while my curiosity was aroused for that reason, and I started to study up on the subject, to see what it was all about.

The people called me a Communist in 1938. At that time I ran for Congress, and I was called a Communist because I wanted to develop our resources. I denied the charge. In every speech I made I said I was not a Communist. I denied the charge indignantly and righteously. I was defeated. I came fourth in a field of nine candidates in the primary.

In 1940 I was nominated to be United States Senator, and people began calling me a Communist again. They had not paid much attention to me until I received the nomination, because no one thought I would receive it. After I received it, however, they began calling me a Communist again. All the political experts told me I must jump on that charge, I must deny it. I did jump on it, and I was defeated again by 14,000 in the general election.

In 1942 I was again nominated to be United States Senator, and people again began calling me a Communist, and the political advisers said: "Don't let them get away with that. That is murder."

So I again denied the charge that I was a Communist. In every speech I made I told the people I was not a Communist, but again I was defeated.

In 1944 I again ran and was nominated to be United States Senator. Again people had not expected me to receive the nomination, but after I received it they began calling me a Communist again, and the political smart boys said: "Do not let them get away with that. Jump on that charge. If you do not, it will ruin you." I said: "The 'H' with them. I am not going to pay any attention to them. I am just going to tell the people what I am. If they want to think I am a Communist, it is just too bad." I did not even mention the charge. People just yelled "Communist" at me at the top of their voices, but by golly I was elected, Mr. President.

So we are not going to worry about this Communist smear in the new party. That is all those who are against us have to say about us. We have all the truth on our side.

We say it is idiotic to appropriate millions of dollars for useless armament when we can destroy the world with the atom bomb we have. It is even foolish to continue making more bombs, Mr. President, because if we explode the bombs we have, we will all be dead. So why make any more. Why not quit making more of them now that we have the ultimate, the acme, here in this country. We can rub out Europe with the bombs.

Then there is the Marshall plan; yes; the Marshall plan. That is the biggest fake that was ever perpetrated on the American people. I have before me a clipping from the New York Times, and the headline of the article is: "Europe feels pangs of overproducing."

In other words, they have surpluses over there, so in order to help them out we start dumping our own on them. That is a fine idea—appropriate $6,000,000,000 to dump some surpluses on them when they have overproduction of their own. Of course they are hard up. The people do not have any money. So we will send them free stuff. That will be better. Over there goods are manufactured, but the people do not have any money with which to buy what is manufactured, so the result is they must shut down their plants. We have gone crazy. If the Marshall plan is the best plan we can figure out the capitalists might just as well move out and private enterprise will be on the way out. If we cannot figure some way under private enterprise and capitalism, whatever you want to call it, so that it can distribute the good things we can produce, what good is it to continue to produce?

I think we can figure out these things. We can figure out a way to keep a large part of our private economy. We may have to socialize the monopolies. They are bigger than the Government. They run the Government. We may have to socialize them. We may have to socialize the rails, communications, and steel. Look at steel, Mr. President. We have had a steel shortage for years, and not a thing has been done about it. Everything is dependent upon steel, yet it is kept scarce. Steel should be socialized. It is a monopoly. It is a basic industry. Too many genuine little enterprise undertakings depend upon steel for us to permit steel to be monopolized and kept scarce. The people should own it.

I mentioned rails. Coal is a joke. It is basic. We must have coal. Whenever there is a strike, what happens? The Government takes over—a fake—and runs up a flag, but the same boys continue to draw the profits. The same boys operate the industry. A couple of colonels move in and take a bottle of Old Taylor with them, and that is the extent of the occupation. Let us be honest about these things. We need some socialization in this country if we are to keep any private enterprise at all. But if we do not, if we let scarcities persist, there will be no private enterprise. Right now little-business men are in terrible shape. Anyone who has a sheet-metal-working shop is in tough luck. He cannot get sheet metal, and he must close up. Does anyone suppose that that makes him love private enterprise, when he is put out of business? No, sir.

We are in favor of real private enterprise, for a modest-sized establishment, especially when a man owns his own business and actively manages it. We could arrive at some just yardstick to determine when an industry should be publicly owned. We have that task to do, or we shall have another depression, starvation in the midst of abundance, and communism. That is what Henry Wallace and I want to head off. Those who claim to be the best friends of private enterprise, those who call Henry Wallace and GLEN TAYLOR Communists, are the worst enemies of private enterprise, and actually, in practice, the very best friends of communism.

It is said that the Communists are going to support Wallace and TAYLOR. The pink ones, the ones who are about the color of this pad on my desk, may do so. Incidentally, that pad is a Senate pad. I did not order it especially. It was placed on my desk. I think that ought to be investigated. It is very pink. The pink Communists, the ones who really believe in democratic processes, may vote for Wallace and TAYLOR, and probably will. But the real red Communists, the ones who want revolution, will not do so. I have stated this on the floor of the Senate previously, but it will bear repeating, because perhaps some others will read it in the RECORD: The real red Communist will vote for the most reactionary candidate he can find. Of course he would probably be a Republican. So the real Communists will be voting Republican.

I told this story on the floor of the Senate about a year ago, but it will bear repeating: Before I came to the United States Senate I worked in a war plant. That was the last job I had before I came here. I worked as a sheet-metal mechanic in a war plant. I worked at a bench. I was not a foreman. I was merely a mechanic. There was a fellow working with me who was a welder. He was a nice fellow. He had a little country place, with a small acreage. His wife lived there, and he would go back home over the week end. He would tell me about the little acreage he had, with walnut trees, orange trees, and one thing and another on it. We argued politics. He hated Roosevelt. That was in 1943, before Roosevelt was elected for the fourth term. He would cuss Roosevelt. I would say, "Denny, how can you talk that way? Roosevelt is the best friend the workingman in America ever had. He saved us at a time when we were on the verge of chaos."

He would reply, "No; that Roosevelt—blah, blah, blah—the blankety-blank so-and-so." As I say, the Presidential election was coming up. This welder who worked with me said: "I hope that TAFT is nominated on the Republican ticket. That is the man I am for." I would say, "Denny, how can you be for a man like TAFT? You know his record. He is a conservative and a reactionary."

Since then, of course, the Senator from Ohio has been called a Communist, but that was because he wanted to build houses for the people. However, I could not convince my coworker. He was for TAFT; and if he could not have TAFT he wanted BRICKER. We would argue frequently. I would say, "You cannot mean that. You work for wages. Those fellows are not your friends."

Finally, after we had argued for several weeks, one day he laid down his welding torch and spit out a chunk of tobacco. He was a big red-faced Irishman, a very fine appearing man. He looked at me, grinned, and said, "Do you know why I am for TAFT and why I hate Roosevelt?" I replied, "No; I have not been able to figure it out. It really has me worried." He said, "Well, sir, I am a Communist. We were just ready for a revolution, and that so-and-so Roosevelt came along and spoiled it all. He patched things up and ruined the revolution. If we can just elect that fellow BRICKER we will have a revolution inside of 2 years."

So that is where the Communist vote will really go—to the most reactionary candidate the Communists can find. Indeed, if I were a Communist I would follow that line of reasoning. It makes sense. If you want a revolution, that is the way to get it. Do not vote for Wallace and Taylor, because we will do as Roosevelt did. We will patch up the machine and make it work—perhaps we can make it work even better than Roosevelt did.

Mr. President, this bill should be subjected to the most searching examination of any bill that has ever passed a peacetime Congress. It should be considered by the country, by the people throughout the country, who have not had time to express themselves in connection with the sudden move to substitute the peacetime draft for the earlier proposal of universal military training. That is the principal reason why I am opposed to the passage of the bill at this time. I think it should be fought out in the campaign. Let those who run for office say, "I am for the peacetime draft," or "I am opposed to the peacetime draft," and let the people decide on that basis.

Hardly any Member of this body was elected on the platform of voting for a peacetime draft. We had just got out of

the war when this Congress was elected. We had no thought of drafting men again. But things have moved fast since Mr. Roosevelt left us, and here we are again. So I believe that this bill should go over so as to let the people determine whether or not they want to elect a Congress pledged to vote for the draft. In that were done, I should not object. I do not object to what the people want, if I am sure they are getting what they want. That is all right; but from what I have seen in traveling around the country, I have not found very much sentiment in favor of a peacetime draft. One can always find young men who will say, "If they need me, I am ready to go." But the issue to be fought out here is, "Do we need them?" I would be ready to go if I thought I were needed. If we were in danger, or were attacked, I would be perfectly happy to go to war—I would not be happy; I would be perfectly willing to go. Let us put it that way. I would be glad of the opportunity to serve my country. Naturally, I would not be happy to walk off and leave my family. But the question is, "Is it necessary?" I come back to the argument which I mentioned before, that with the bombs we presently have we can kill everybody. What sense does it make after that to have any more preparations for war?

Another issue which should be fought out before the people is the question of equality in the armed services. As it is now, Negroes are segregated in the armed services. They are told that they are going out to fight for freedom; yet there is no freedom, no equality. They are made mess boys, cooks, stewards, and waiters, and placed in the most dangerous positions. On board ship they are down below, in the kitchen or somewhere else, and when the ship is torpedoed they have no chance to get out.

I think this whole matter should be gone into very thoroughly. The President's commission to study the proposition recommended that segregation in the armed forces should be abolished, and that everyone should be treated equally. But that makes no difference at all to the committee; they report a bill which contains nothing at all to stop segregation. The able and courageous Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] fought valiantly here for equal-rights amendments and antidiscrimination amendments to the draft bill. After the various amendments have been made, and particularly after the proposed amendments to ban discrimination have been rejected by both Houses, I thing this question of segregation should be gone over again at this time.

I wish to speak of three main points in considering the draft legislation.

The first is that the proposed draft legislation presented to the Senate, by failing to provide against segregation and discrimination, does violence to the principles of Americanism and even to the principles on which such legislation must be based.

The second point is the objection to the draft as a peacetime instrument of policy in the United States.

The third point I should like to discuss is based on the simple facts of our international position, which in my estimation render a draft law unnecessary, and in fact make it necessary for us in the interest of peace to refuse to enact such a law.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has resolutely opposed all the amendments, offered on this floor by the Senator from North Dakota—amendments which I have supported—to end discrimination and segregation in the armed forces. The chairman of the committee has even gone so far as to oppose his own majority leader on the proposed amendment to bar the payment of poll taxes by inductees. From reading the RECORD of the debate and the vote on that issue, I would gather that there was some kind of gentleman's agreement among the leaders of both parties not to press for any amendments which would protect the civil rights of Negro inductees. One might also gather the impression, from the fact that the Senate approved only one of the amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota, that the Members of this distinguished body could squeeze out approval of a ban on the payment of poll taxes, but could not find the necessary degree of approval to eliminate the terror of lynching or the vast, subtle terror of discrimination against the members of the armed forces who happen to be of another color. I do not know how to argue any better the merits of those antidiscrimination amendments, which have been turned down by the Senate; but in turning down those amendments, the Senate and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee have done violence to any system of draft or of military training which has ever been urged in recent times. It is the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Members who participated in the gentleman's agreement to vote down the antidiscrimination amendments, who are introducing new and extraneous matter into the subject of military training—not the few Senators who support antidiscrimination as a part of the system of military training.

I see that the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has been appointed to ride herd on me while I occupy the floor here. He is a very likable gentleman, and his wife is a very lovely lady. My wife is very fond of her.

By way of diversion, let me recall that recently when I spoke, the junior Senator from California rose to his feet and very heatedly denounced me as a tool of Stalin, or something to that effect. I should like to read what I said after he got through denouncing me.

Since that time, of course, we have been on excellent terms. I may say for the benefit of anyone who is listeninng that that is one of the good things about the United States Senate: A Senator may call another Senator a tool of Stalin, or almost anything else—although that is the worst thing that a person can be called nowadays—but later both Senators will meet in the cloakroom and will not even mention the incident, and will go on as if it never occurred. Of course, that is a good thing.

The strange thing about all this, Mr. President, is that although I have made several speeches here, and although on many occasions Senators have risen to denounce what I have said, they have never denounced anything specifically. They have said that my speech sounded as if Stalin wrote it, or something of that sort; but they never say that what I said is not a fact, or that they would like to argue with me about some report on Russia, or they do not say that what I said must be a lie. They never say anything of that sort. They simply say that I sound like a Bolshevik—they say that in general terms. Sometimes after I have finished speaking, Senators will enter the Chamber and will denounce me, even though they did not hear what I said. Sometimes they say that although they did not hear what I said, it must have been bad.

When the Senator from California denounced me, I said:

> I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, what could be more polite than to thank someone for denouncing you?

Then I said:

> I may say that his remarks will probably rate a great deal more attention than anything I have had to say here today.

In other words, I said that his denunciation of me for denouncing our foreign policy would get more attention than all the facts I had cited and all the statements I had made about what a rotten foreign policy we have had and about how the American people are being duped and deceived.

It has previously been pointed out on this floor that under the European recovery program, $10,000,000 of the taxpayers' money is to go to the newspapers for their work in selling the Marshall plan to the people of America, so it is no wonder that the newspapers favor the Marshall plan, and it is no wonder that they are against me when I oppose the Marshall plan; and, of course, it is no wonder, under those circumstances, that the newspapers give the Senator from California a "break" in the press when he denounces me.

I had some of my office force look through the newspaper accounts to see what the press had to say about my speech that day. The Senator from California took about 2 minutes to denounce me, whereas I talked for quite a while and presented a great many facts and figures and charges.

Let me read excerpts from some of the newspaper accounts.

Here is an article which appeared in the New York Times:

> KNOWLAND BLASTS TAYLOR IN SENATE—TAYLOR ASSAILED FOR TRUMAN BLAST
>
> Senator KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, denounced TAYLOR—

And so forth. Here is another:

> KNOWLAND TURNS WRATHFUL BLAST AT TAYLOR JIBES
>
> Senator KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, today—

And so forth. It would be nice to be on the other side, Mr. President, where you can just get up and denounce a guy for 1 minute, and you get all the head-

lines. In the position I occupy, of trying to tell the people the truth, you can talk until you are black in the face—I would not want that to happen and be discriminated against [laughter] but you can talk until you are blue in the face, let us say—we will compromise on blue—and you do not get a word—just the folks who denounce you get all the publicity. They get into the papers all they had to say, but you do not get any.

Republican hits blast at Truman—Senator KNOWLAND sees TAYLOR'S attack aid to Kremlin.

I wonder what this one is. Oh, this one gets off the subject a little bit. I will save these and quote from them a little bit later, here. I have been looking for these; I lost them; they got mixed up with KNOWLAND. I will put those aside. But I have a great many more here, showing how the press treats a thing like this. Somebody will probably get up and denounce me when I am through today, and they will steal all the thunder. Here we are, getting back, now:

KNOWLAND DENOUNCES TAYLOR FOR SLURRING TRUMAN, FORRESTAL

Senator KNOWLAND, Republican, California, today wrathfully denounced—

Another headline:

TAYLOR assailed by Senators for aid to Kremlin—Denounced by KNOWLAND and McMAHON for attack on Truman and Forrestal.

McMAHON got in on that one a little bit. That is the Herald Tribune. Here is one from the Des Moines Register:

GLEN TAYLOR calls names, receives a stiff rebuke.

Well, thank the Lord, I got my name in the paper that time.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND replies—

And so forth. I got my name in the other one. This, from the Oregonian:

Senator castigates TAYLOR for criticism of Truman.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, California, Wednesday wrathfully denounced Senator GLEN TAYLOR • • •

This, from the San Francisco Examiner:

Senator KNOWLAND raps TAYLOR—Speech assailing Truman branded Kremlin aid.

The Philadelphia Inquirer:

Blast at Truman stirs Senator row.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND wrathfully denounced TAYLOR for slurring Truman, Forrestal.

I do not know what paper that is, it is a Washington Associated Press dispatch.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

KNOWLAND backs Truman against Taylor attack.

Is it not funny, Mr. President? Just the other day, because I took Mr. Truman to task for his poor handling of our foreign policy and for his militaristic collaboration with Republicans and the pouring of our money down rat holes, giving it away all over the world, Senators got up and denounced me. "He is our President, right or wrong. We are standing foursquare behind our President." But then Mr. Truman goes out West, and they give him some spurs, and he says, "Let me at Congress." And then Congress calls him all sorts of names. The same boys called me names the other day because I did not like what Harry was doing, and now they are trying to see who can outdo each other, and see who can call Truman the worst names. They even called him a gamin. I do not know what that means, but it must be awful.

The St. Louis Democrat:

KNOWLAND blasts TAYLOR for aid to Kremlin.

Well, I guess I am giving aid to the Kremlin. I do not want us all to get killed, Mr. President, and that is a kind of favor, to help everybody live. Of course, I cannot help them without helping us. That is the bad part of it, the way a lot of people look at it we are all going to live together, and we are all going to die together, so when I speak for peace, it is for everybody.

The Los Angeles Examiner:

TAYLOR scored by KNOWLAND—Attack on Truman stirs California Senator.

My, how the attacks will fly on Truman pretty soon, when they really get into the campaign.

Here were some clippings I saved a while back. This was when a New York school wanted to bring its pupils down here on a vacation, and they could not come because they had some Negro pupils—honor students—who had won a trip. They could not come to Washington because there was no place for them to eat down here, and they could not find any place to sleep in the Nation's Capital. They would be discriminated against. So our little children got their first lesson in discrimination when they planned to make a trip to the capital of the greatest democracy on earth.

The New York Herald Tribune writes about it, saying it is a national disgrace—which it is. I am teaching my children that there is no difference between people; some just happen to be born with one color of skin, some with another, and that they are not to treat people differently on that account. The sad part of it is that here in Washington the schools are segregated and there is nothing I can do about it. It is being driven home to my children that there is some reason—something the matter—because the colored children go to one school and they go to another. In Idaho we do not have that problem; all children go to the same schools. I am opposed to it, and just as soon as I can get around to it I am going to introduce legislation to see if something cannot be done to end discrimination at least in the Nation's Capital. But perhaps I had better read the article before I read the editorial. It says:

Washington race segregation cancels New York schoolboys' trip.

Hotels bar 4 Negroes who are among 51 honored for safety patrols.

All will see the Yankee game instead of visiting the Nation's Capital.

A Washington sightseeing tour by 51 outstanding New York schoolboys, including 4 Negroes, was called off yesterday by Dr. William Jansen, superintendent of schools, because of segregation practices in the Nation's Capital. Dr. Jansen decided to keep the children home on learning that it would be impossible in some instances for schoolmates to dine together in Washington.

Can you imagine that, Mr. President? Here these school children came down to the Nation's Capital, or had planned to, and then for them to go to eat, and have somebody say, "No, you stay back, you stay out, you cannot come in. You have got to go some place else to eat," would be a fine thing.

He said, in the statement canceling the trip:

The youngsters will go to the ball game instead, after receiving medals today as previously planned from Mayor William O'Dwyer. The boys, 8 to 14 years old, picked as high-caliber school safety patrolmen for public and Catholic parochial schools, were going to Washington for the week end as guests of the Automobile Club of New York, an affiliate of the American Automobile Association. To honor them and 15,000 other patrolmen, Mayor O'Dwyer proclaimed today School Safety Patrol Day. The automobile club tried for the last 2 weeks to obtain a hotel reservation, but without success, according to William J. Gottlieb, president. He said he called repeatedly and was told that it is not the custom to put up Negro and white guests together, so the club's board of directors voted Wednesday to propose a local program. Dr. Jansen, who consulted about it, agreed and issued the statement. Naturally, a representative—

I do not know whether I have the rest of this particular clipping or not, but anyhow he said that they naturally could not come to Washington. Here it is:

A special citation was to have been given by Truman today.

They were going to see the President and have a big day, but they had to call it all off and stay in New York.

I want to say this for New York, whatever else anybody else may say about it. As a child, I know, out West I thought of New York as just the hellhole of iniquity. I thought if you went there you just had to keep your hand on your hip pocket to keep from getting your wallet picked out. That was where all the city slickers were. But those people in New York City certainly have a greater appreciation of what it means to live in America than people any place else in our country, for the simple reason that so many of them have come from foreign countries where our freedoms are unknown, so they are very tolerant up there. They do not have segregation, discrimination, and one thing and another.

The New York Herald Tribune had an editorial regarding this regrettable incident. It said:

Another shameful reminder arises of the custom of segregation in the Capital of the United States. Fifty-one New York school boys from 8 to 14 years old were going to Washington to see the sights. Picked out as honor members of school safety patrols, they were the guests of the Automobile Club of New York. This was a tribute to merit.

The article goes on to say that one can imagine their joy and elation, their excited anticipation of Washington.

But what happened, Mr. President? Forty-seven of the schoolboys were completely acceptable in the National Capital, but four of them were not allowed to stay at the same hotel as their classmates,

or eat with their friends, attend theaters, or go other places together.

The article goes on to say:

They are Negroes. In Washington the color of a boy's skin sets him vastly apart. Segregation is the rule in our Capital. The whole trip had to be called off. We think it is about time that Washington, our National Capital, lifted itself above the regional as a national district, as a world capital. It belongs to all the people. Segregation is not an all-American custom. Discrimination does not belong in the District of Columbia. The humiliation of these poor New York school boys was a national disgrace.

Yes, Mr. President, a Negro cannot go into the Senate restaurant and eat, here in the Capital of what we are happy to call the greatest democracy on earth. We forget that a great majority of the people on this earth have colored skins, and that when we discriminate we make more enemies in 5 minutes than all the Marshall plans—of course, the Marshall plan is making enemies, too, but even if it is as good as it is said to be, we, when we discriminate, make more enemies in 5 minutes than the Marshall plan could make, if it were good, in a hundred years. As soon as I can find the time I shall do something about discrimination in the Nation's Capital. I do not want my children to be brought up to feel that they are better than someone else because their skins are a different color. I do not believe that in the Capitol Building itself there should be discrimination. If I cannot end it in any other way, I will hire a Negro to work in my office and will take him to the restaurant to eat. If he is not permitted to eat in the restaurant, we will set up a card table out in the hall and dine there every day, just to call attention to the rottenness that goes on in the Capital of the United States. It is time something should be done about it. We shall not accomplish anything by adopting planks in party platforms.

Mr. President, speaking of the Republicans coming back here, they may come back if I can talk long enough to stop this draft bill. They will have a nice, shiny, new platform, inflated with a lot of things that have no business being there. They will make promises to the Negro people. What will they do if they come back and go into session? They will have to do something about their platform. They cannot say to the Negroes, "We are going to end discrimination if you vote for us," because the Negroes will say, "Listen, brother, you went back; why didn't you do something about it then?" They will come back from Philadelphia with a new platform in their pockets.

The new party has done something. Henry Wallace has gone down South, where there were never mixed meetings before, and has held mixed meetings. The police came and tried to make the people segregate, and they just said, "Make us." They did not make them. I did not come off quite as well as did Henry. I got put in jail. But I am going back where I came from, and we will hold meetings, and the police will either put us in jail, or we will continue to hold meetings. That is the only way we can do anything about these things. It did not even soak in on me, Mr. President, for a time. To be sure, the Negroes in Idaho all live in one community. There are not very many. There are approximately 500. Four hundred of them are in Pocatello, the city in which I live. I never thought to look into the matter to see whether the Negroes had to live in one community, or whether it was their choice, because it was a small problem in Idaho. The significance of the question is not realized until we see many Negroes and what goes on in America in connection with them. I am glad I found out how poorly treated they are. They constitute a great segment of our population. The new party will do something about it before the election, by calling attention to the situation, apprising Americans of what goes on.

The best argument against segregation, for anyone who has not given it serious thought, is to put yourself in the other fellow's place. There is a play on Broadway concerning an old southern planter, in fact, a southern Senator. By some freak of magic the southern Senator is turned black, and he finds out what it is like to have a black skin. He changes his mind about a great many things, in short order. All we have to do is to put ourselves in the other fellow's place and imagine how we would like it if we went along the street and could not get anything to eat because our skin was not the right color. I think that is all we have to do in order to realize that it is not right. Any right-thinking person, who claims to be a Christian, certainly, or who claims to be just a decent person, cannot favor such things going on in this country. They must be changed. Both the old parties have promised changes for many years. They write the same things in their platforms every time. I do not think the southern Democrats had anything to be worried about when Mr. Truman issued his statements on civil rights. I think it was only a little campaign propaganda. But the boys have got so used to jumping on anything like that, they could not resist the temptation. They started jumping on the statement, and the little boys back home saw what was going on, and they started jumping, too, and the situation got out of control. It got beyond them, and they found themselves in a very embarrassing position. They went out and do not know how to get back in. But they will be back in the Democratic Party, Mr. President, because they knew all along that no one meant it; they were only talking for the consumption of the Negro people. The new party means what it says, and it will do something about the matter. The Negroes believe us, and we shall get their votes. In fact, we shall get the votes of many people who are disgusted with many things.

Both of the old parties must shoulder responsibility for the Taft-Hartley law. There were about as many Democrats as Republicans who voted for that vicious bill. I said at the time that it would be used to break the unions, and they are being broken at this time. Both the old parties have to take responsibility for all that has been done, which is not much. Much that they have done has been bad. They must also take the responsibility for a great many things that have not been done in this Congress.

Just the last couple of days they have had two or three votes of that nature. The American people were greatly surprised in 1932 at the strength of Roosevelt. They are going to be more surprised at the strength of Henry Wallace in 1948.

Mr. President, a while ago I started reading some material I had prepared on this question of civil rights, and I shall continue with it. I got sidetracked.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, would have us believe the opposite. But let us examine the facts. They argue that the Committee on Armed Services rejected proposals for ending discrimination and segregation in the armed forces and having done so, the Senate must abide by that rejection. I do not question the wisdom of the members of the committee—but I must state flatly that their judgment is completely wrong.

The draft legislation arose first from the attempt to impose universal military training for the youth of the country. Since this proved to be highly unpopular, the Congress moved to combine a degree of universal military training with a new proposal for a draft. The basic document on which the whole program rests is a report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training. Let us go to that document and see what it has to say on the subject of discrimination in the armed forces.

The President's Commission states in its report that the fundamental principles of a program of military training are:

First, that is must be universal in its application.

Second, it must provide equality of privilege and opportunity.

Third, it must be a responsibility of the American people as a whole, rather than the exclusive or even principal responsibility of the military authorities.

I ask that Senators examine these fundamental principles, as set forth by the distinguished civilians, headed by President Compton of the Massashusetts Institute of Technology, who made this report. Every single one of these principles—the report calls them "fundamental" principles, and I stress the word "fundamental"—fairly cries out for the end of discrimination and segregation in the armed services.

Discrimination and segregation violates every one of these fundamental principles. The Commission says that a program of military training must be universal in its application to all persons of a given age or status, and the obligations which it imposes on each must be substantially equal. The Commission says that it is of the essence of democracy that the obligations of citizenship should not be exclusively those of persons who choose to consider them, but they must be shared commonly by all without favor or discrimination.

I am quoting from the report of the Commission. That is what they had to say about a draft law. Those who draft-

ed the law have not gotten one of the good recommendations of this Commission. All they did was say "The Commission recommended a draft," so they drew a law. But they did not put anything of the myriad restrictions, guaranties of freedoms, anything the Commission recommended at all. So when I speak, I am speaking not only against the silly idea of drafting our boys in peacetime when we are all going to die anyhow—it does not make any difference whether one has on a uniform or not—I am also speaking to prevent further insults, further hurt being done to certain of our American citizens whose skins are off-color. I at least will not inflict upon them the compulsion of serving in the armed establishment where they have to submit to flagrant discrimination, where they are made flunkies and bus boys. We will at least leave them out in the open, where they do not have to go and be discriminated against if they want to keep away from it.

How does the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee propose to square a ban on discrimination in the armed forces with that essential principle of democracy? How can the obligation to serve be equal if some men are to be set aside and given a moral quarantine? How can the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps and the Air Force justify its numerous clauses against Negroes, its attempts to keep Negro enlistments within a definite low number—sometimes to zero in number in some branches—and expect there to be equality in obligation?

I charge that it is not we who demand an end to discrimination who are raising extraneous issues but the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle who are parties to the gentleman's agreement who are raising extraneous issues by fighting against the ban on discrimination and segregation.

I come now to the second principle advocated by the President's Commission as "fundamental" to any program of military training. That principle is that a program of training must provide equality of privilege and opportunity for all those upon whom this obligation rests. The first principle was equality of obligation. The second principle is equality of opportunity and privilege. Let me quote directly from the report of the Commission:

> Neither in the training itself, nor in the organization of any phase of this program, should there be discrimination for or against any person or group because of his race, class, national origin, or religion.

How quick they are to quote this committee when they see we need a draft, and how conveniently they have forgotten all the other recommendations which would have made this some semblance at least of an American proposal.

Segregation or special privilege in any form should have no place in the program.

Those, Mr. President, are the words of the President's committee to investigate the necessity of a draft. They are not my words.

> To permit them—

That is, segregation and special privilege—

> To permit them would nullify the important living lesson in citizenship which such training can give.

Imagine, Mr. President, what will happen to boys from out in my part of the country, Idaho, where we do not have segregation, where we have very few Negroes in fact, but where boys are not brought up to believe that someone else is inferior to them, or to believe like Hitler taught his boys that they belong to a superior race. The boys from my part of the country do not have any of that feeling. Then they are drafted into the Army and there it is drilled into them—"These Negroes are not as good as you are. They will wait table on you, shine your boots, carry out your slop cans," and one thing and another. "You are something special, son. You are a little better than they are." The ypung boys in the Army will get that idea, and it is awfully hard to get it out of them. It is sort of pleasant, if they do not think too deeply on the subject, to enjoy this feeling of superiority to someone else. It is terrible to think that such boys are going to be drafted into the Army and inculcated with such beliefs. They have got to stay where they are put in the Army. If they do not like what is told them, that others are inferior to them, that this boy whose skin is black must do menial service, that the white boy must let the colored boy wait on him while he sits down to eat, there is nothing they can do about it.

I return to the report:

> Nothing could be more tragic for the future attitude of our people, Mr. President, and for the unity of our Nation than a program in which our Federal Government forced our young manhood to live for a period of time in an atmosphere which emphasized or bred class or racial differences.

There it is, Mr. President. The same committee that recommended the draft also recommends these other things. But now, Mr. President, we have a draft, and we have none of these other things in the bill, none. The Commission has placed its finger on the heart of the program before us. It explicitly condemns segregation and discrimination. It goes further than mere condemnation, however. It insists that an integral part of the program of military training must be nonsegregation and nondiscrimination.

I deeply regret, Mr. President, that we must continue to use so many negative words to express such a positive concept. But I do not have the time now to fence about words. The important thing is that the Commission which made a complete survey of the problem tell us that no program could be worth while unless equality of privilege and opportunity matches equality of obligation.

Here, Mr. President, we ask—we insist, we do not ask, that the boys serve. We tell them they must serve, and then we segregate them, and discriminate against some of them, give them the menial jobs, the bad jobs, the tough jobs. We place a mark upon them even if they have been raised in a colored community and have been kept away from actual evidences of segregation. Now we force them to subject themselves to that kind of treatment when we have the opportunity in this draft law to start breaking down these prejudices. Superstitions is what they are, Mr. President.

The Senate Armed Services Committee denies this proposition absolutely and unequivocally. They tell us in effect, Mr. President, that a ban on segregation and on discrimination is superfluous, is a luxury, something added, something new. But if we are to take the Commission's report at face value, the very opposite is true. The committee which removes the ban on segregation and discrimination is removing the heart of the program. It is destroying one of the essentials of the program as propaganda by various groups to gain the adherence of the American people.

Whom are we to believe, Mr. President, the members of the Armed Services Committee who insist on segregation and discrimination, or the members of the President's Commission who tell us that segregation must go in any democratic army? It is a fundamental test of our democracy. It is not a question of believing one set of authorities over another. It is a question which we must answer as Democrats, with a small "d", I hasten to add, and if we answer that question in the light of our history as a Democratic Party there can be but one answer for the Members of all parties—no army that serves a democracy can be anything but a fully democratic army.

Perhaps it is not the intention of the Senate to establish an army for a democracy and built on democratic lines to serve democratic purposes. In fact, Mr. President, I have come to have serious doubts about the intentions of some people in this country toward our democracy, when I see them even considering a bill like the Mundt bill; when I see them start us down the road of an armament economy like Hitler did; when I see them carelessly throwing charges against Russia, propaganda, day in and day out, as Hitler did; when I see the Congress overwhelmingly pass the Taft-Hartley law over a veto even; when I see a loyalty order, under which people can be dismissed from Government service without even charges being filed against them, just some vague statement made that for unknown reasons which cannot be revealed their services are terminated.

When I see all these things certainly I begin to wonder a little bit about democracy in this country, whether some people really believe in it or not. Anyone who criticizes the bipartisan foreign policy is branded as a Red, as a stooge of Stalin, and one who makes such a brash charge can secure all the headlines, while the charges made and documented against our foreign policy receive no attention whatever.

I do not know what is going to be done. Something has to be done about the press of this country, Mr. President. We now insist that the radio give both sides of every argument. We have got to have a law of some kind to see that the press does the same thing, because there is no other way to get the truth to the people.

They are getting bilked and hoaxed, and a great disservice is done to them by the Marshall plan, under which billions of dollars are given away supposedly for buying good will, when really, Mr. President, what we are doing is buying ill will.

Actually the American taxpayers are paying for the enmity of all the rest of the world, enmity which they are buying with this Marshall plan money because, as I read the other day from the New York Times, the statement was made flatly that Europe feels pangs of overproducing. The article went on to say that they are destroying food in Holland, that in Italy they are destroying fruit—Italy with the lowest standard of living in Europe.

Factories are being closed down or slowed down over Europe. Even in Germany goods are piling up in warehouses. Yet after knowing those facts, the Senate goes ahead and appropriates $6,000,000,000, raising the House $1,000,000,000. The Members of the House are getting kind of scared.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am afraid I cannot yield without prejudicing my rights to the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, under the rules of the Senate, I think there is no question but that the Senator can yield for a question, but I am going to ask that the rules be strictly enforced and that there be question and answer, and not a speech.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the unwarranted statement made by the Senator from California, I decline even to ask a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am very sorry. I should like to yield to the Senator from North Dakota. I think he is the most courageous Senator on the floor when it comes to speaking his mind and saying what he thinks, regardless of the "red smear" which is going on. He says what he thinks at any time he feels like it. The Senator from North Dakota is a great man.

The only way to judge greatness, I have found in the Senate, is to judge a man by how much guts he has, not how much knowledge he has, because there are many smart men here who do not have the courage to vote their convictions. They know that they are voting wrong. I have seen them do it. A man like that, no matter how much brains he has, is not a great man. I say that a man is great who votes his convictions, regardless of what the consequences may be to himself. By that standard the Senator from North Dakota is the greatest man in the United States Senate at the present time. Of course, we never include ourselves when we are speaking of these things.

The Senate Armed Services Committee—we might as well go ahead with the Marshall plan, so long as we were talking about that. The Marshall plan is certainly a fake and a "phony," but can anyone get the press to print it when he says things like that?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is busy.

Mr. LANGER. A short time ago the Senator mentioned factories being torn down. I ask the distinguished Senator from Idaho whether that includes fertilizer factories?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not know about them being torn down to so great an extent. They are simply closing them and not operating them, because they have overproduction, which, of course, is underconsumption. But they are probably tearing down fertilizer factories. I do not know what they are doing. If the Senator can think of anything that is crazy, and asks me, I will say that they are probably doing it, because the Marshall plan is the ultimate of nonsensical asininity.

We are appropriating billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to ship goods to Europe when the United States News and World Report, a conservative publication edited by David Lawrence, tells us that there is overproduction in Europe, and that goods are spoiling in warehouses. Yet we appropriate billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to send more goods to Europe. If they have not sense enough to distribute what they have, I do not believe that we should send them any more. If they have so much that they are closing their factories and not distributing their products because the people do not have the money, is that any reason why we should be suckers and send them the money with which to buy their own goods, so that they will not starve to death? That is the height of something or other. But it is going on, Mr. President.

I am beginning to think that the reason for the Marshall plan is this: I have repeatedly charged that our cartelists, our big monopolist, and the militarists are in cahoots to take up where Hitler left off. They feel that they can do what he failed to do, namely, conquer the world and exploit it.

The Marshall plan is part of their scheme to try to get control of the economy of the world without fighting, if they can. The plan has two objects. One is to remove potential surpluses from the American market. We were just on the verge of having plenty of everything in this country at reasonable prices. They had to figure out something to stop that, so the Marshall plan was devised. The taxpayers are buying goods and paying for them, and we are shipping them to Europe. In that way it is not easy for our people to buy, and that keeps prices up. The people pay for the samples sent abroad, and prices are kept up at home, so that we must pay $3,000 for a $1,500 automobile that we cannot get. That is some scheme, is it not, Mr. President? We tax the American people to ship goods to Europe, which makes them scarce at home, so that the people must pay two prices for what they can buy at home.

The American worker has already paid for the Frigidaire which is not in his house, because it or some other product made of the same material has been shipped to Europe as a sample of what our cartelists have to ship. We are sending free samples to Europe, where surpluses already exist. Of course, European industrialists cannot compete with our free goods, so they are going to have a hard time getting money. That allows our boys to get the markets, because the factories over there are closed. We give the Europeans free samples to show them what we have to sell, and the European industrialists cannot get their factories started.

If that makes friends, I do not know much about human nature. But that is the way the Marshall plan is working. It is helping reaction in every corner of the globe. In any place where we cannot find any scoundrels in business, we set them up in business so that we can help them. We are losing friends all over the world.

At the same time we are heading straight toward war, with our anti-Russian propaganda. That must be kept going, because the minute that stops, the whole plan collapses; the armament program collapses; the Marshall plan collapses; the people will not appropriate the money for all this tomfoolery, and the whole scheme collapses. It all depends on anti-Russian propaganda. But the newspapers are doing a good job. We just got through giving them $10,000,000 for it. I suppose another appropriation will come along pretty soon, because newspaper publishers are not suckers. They will not keep it up forever. They have learned that they can get paid for it. They will start easing off one of these days and we shall have to appropriate more money for them. That may operate to end the racket, because the people will become angry and will not appropriate the money, and the newspapers will not print the propaganda unless they get paid for it, so it may be a good thing that that is happening.

We had to have the Marshall plan because we were faced with abundance here at home. That would not solve the problem, so we had to have an armament program, to take workers out of useful production and put them in useless production. We tax the people to pay for armaments. That makes profits for the boys. It keeps everything scarce, so that the people can be charged two prices for automobiles, washing machines, and other things that are manufactured for them.

The Marshall plan is the most colossal hoax ever perpetrated on a people. The only reason it is possible is that no longer is there a free press in America such as we once had, in which editors could sit down and write their honest-to-God opinions. There are so few editors nowadays who can write what they think that it is pitiful. A publisher is a big-business man, and he tells the editor what to write. Let us not kid ourselves. The policy extends even to small newspapers in Idaho. I used to say that there were 11 daily newspapers in Idaho, and that they were all against me but one,

which was neutral. As I say, I used to say that. I cannot say it any more. Since I joined Henry, they are all against me.

The last time I was in Idaho I went to see the editor of the once neutral newspaper. He had always been pretty friendly.

He said, "GLEN, I was with you on the Greek proposition, when it was proposed to appropriate money for the Greeks. I was with you because I thought it should have been handled through the United Nations. But I wrote a couple of editorials about it."

Mind you, Mr. President, this was in a town of 10,000 people. This editor said, "I wrote a couple of editorials about it, and three of my best advertisers came in and told me that I had better cut it out." They saw what the Marshall plan would do for them. It would keep things scarce, and keep the boom booming. They told this editor that he had better cut it out; and he said to me, "I cut it out."

I did not blame him. But we must stand up somewhere and fight. I know many persons who feel that they ought to be in this fight with me—particularly on this vital issue, although I did not have that in mind when I spoke. What I had in mind was that they feel that they should be with Henry Wallace and GLEN TAYLOR in this fight, and they are not there because of economic considerations. They sneak around and hand us $50 for the campaign, and say, "We are with you, boys, keep up the good work. But if I come out openly for you, our business will suffer."

We need them worse than we need the $50. We need a few people with intestinal fortitude and leadership to stand up and be counted. There are many of them, but they are afraid to be counted. That is understandable, because all over the country people are losing their jobs because they come out openly for Henry Wallace. College professors, ministers of the Gospel—it is getting so that we can hardly get a preacher to pray for us at all, anymore, at our Wallace-Taylor meetings, because they lose their jobs. That has happened time and again.

In one town those who were planning the meeting went through the entire telephone book trying to find a preacher to pray for us when the meeting was opened. The only one they could find who would pray for us was a Russian Orthodox minister. All the rest of the ministers were afraid to pray for us. But that Russian Orthodox minister was not afraid of being smeared as a "Red." He was willing to pray for us; but we did not have guts enough to let him do it, so we had to go without being prayed for.

Mr. President, very often we make arrangements with ministers to open our meeting with prayer; but they they call up, shortly before the meeting, and say, "I am sorry, very sorry; I am mortified and humiliated; I am tremendously embarrassed; but I cannot come to open your meeting. I hope you will understand." Of course we understand, because the situation is that their influential parishioners put the heat on them and tell them they had better not come to pray for our group or else they will lose their jobs. Mr. President, that is some Christianity, is it not? Ministers are not allowed to come to open our meetings with prayer and to pray for our poor benighted souls. One would imagine that if we are as bad as we are said to be, all the ministers would be encouraged to come and pray for our souls, but that is not the case.

Even the labor leaders are against us. Never was a group of people so sold out as is the group of laboring people in this country, Mr. President. The labor leaders are afraid of the Red smear. They want to protect their $25,000-a-year jobs. The bug has got them. So we have the sorry spectacle of the labor leaders being afraid to support a party that they know is their party. The workers are flocking to our party, but the leaders are like a lot of hens that have hatched out ducklings and do not know what to do about it. Mr. President, there will be more new labor leaders hatched out in the next year or two than there have been in many, many years.

But, Mr. President, the rank and file of labor are with us, and many of the labor leadership are openly flouting the mandates of the hierarchy, and are attending our meetings and are joining us.

Many others are joining us, too. As I have said before, doctors, dentists, ministers, businessmen, and many others are openly advocating our party and are making statements in favor of us, even though they know that by doing so they may lose their jobs. It is easy to see why so many people are now joining us and are openly declaring themselves in favor of our new party, because anyone who thinks at all and realizes the danger the United States is in with this armament economy, and this drive toward war, and this foreign policy that has lost us all our friends, and the Marshall plan that is supposed to get us new friends, and the bipartisan coalition that is bankrupting our Nation by profligately throwing away our substance all over the world—when people see those things, they are very eager to join our new party. In fact, many people are so disgusted with just one of those things, that that is enough for them. But anyone who gets to the bottom of it all and sees how messy the whole business is, will, very naturally, if he has any fortitude, come out in favor of Henry Wallace, because the new party is the only one that is opposed to those things. The other parties just try to outdo each other in hollering, "Me, too!" when they say they are opposed to Russia; and they draw up fancy platforms about helping the Negro and everyone else, but they do not do anything about helping any of them.

Mr. President, South America has even gone by the board; we have even lost our friends in South America. Mr. Roosevelt had what he called the good neighbor policy down there; he made many friends there, and the South Americans were feeling very kindly toward us. But now we have lost them all. Sumner Welles says so. Every expert says so. What a fiasco the Bogota Conference was. We told the South Americans that we were going to appropriate half a billion dollars to loan to them, and so we expected them to get up and cheer. But they just sat there. It made Marshall awfully mad because they did not get up and cheer when he told them that we were going to loan them some money. But they are just too smart for us. They see us giving away billions of dollars in Europe, and they wonder why we should not give them a few dollars also.

Then we tried to get the South American countries to pass laws and even to change their constitutions so as to protect our investors, so that our businessmen could invest their money there and be sure they would get it back again. The Mexican representative rather told us off. He said they were happy to have us invest our money in Mexico if we wanted to do so, but he said they did not need any laws to protect our investors. He said that what they needed were laws to protect their people from our investors. Mr. President, when I read that statement in the newspapers I was delighted. I like anyone who stands up on his hind legs and says what he thinks. I sent that man a telegram—or perhaps it was a cablegram; I am not sure which it was—and in it I said, "Congratulations, sir. I admire anyone who stands up for his own rights. I want you to know that not all Americans are imperialists, and I want you to know also that there are millions of Americans who still believe in the good-neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt."

In reply, he sent me a very long telegram. I have been so busy recently that I have not had time to get it translated, so as to find out what he had to say. If my secretary is around here, I will tell him to get that telegram and have it translated, so that I can read it and see what he had to say. But it must have been good; he would not have made it so long if he had been saying anything bad.

But that is the situation. We are losing our friends right and left—even such friends as Canada—because of our arrogant, imperialistic policies of exploitation. All over the world that is going on—the use of the Marshall plan as a guarantee of profits for our monopolists and cartelists abroad. The foreign currencies are no good, so our monopolists and cartelists go abroad and use promises of business to come to inveigle those foreign businessmen into giving our fellows an interest in their businesses—a controlling interest, many times; and then we do business in foreign currencies. But when it comes time to cash in, in dollars, that cannot be done, because the foreign countries have no dollars. So our taxpayers cough up through the Marshall plan to pay the representatives of our monopolists and cartelists in good, old, hard American dollars, or at least in greenbacks. You see, I come from the West, and in the West we see lots of silver dollars. It seems strange, after being here in the East, to return to the West and see a complete change from greenbacks to hard dollars.

Mr. President, if we hired people to think of Rube Goldberg devices by which we could lose friends and deinfluence people, we could not do a better job than

we are doing with this Marshall plan, and our get-tough foreign policy, and our backing of Fascists and reactionaries all over the world, and our scuttling of the United Nations. We were the first ones to really deal a serious blow to the United Nations. I pointed out earlier in my talk how the Russians went into Iran, as part of the war strategy, and how they overstayed their welcome. The matter was brought to the attention of the United Nations and the Russians went home. They did not even wait for a verbal blast by the United Nations; they went home because they did not want to be condemned by this great new Organization set up to keep peace in the world; so they went home. That was really the first problem the United Nations had to deal with. One time at bat, and they scored a hit. It was not long after that until the Englishmen and Frenchmen were in Syria and Lebanon. They held those countries as protectorates from World War I. They were supposed to go home and give those people their freedom, but they, too, overstayed their welcome, and do not forget that. We can always remember the bad things the Russians do, but the Englishmen and Frenchmen stayed in Lebanon and Syria, when they were supposed to get out. That was brought to the attention of the United Nations, and England and France almost fell over each other to see who could get out of the Near East first, from Syria or Lebanon. They did not want to be the first ones slapped down by the United Nations. People still respected the United Nations then, because it was new and its potentialities were unknown. So that was the second and third time at bat for the United Nations, second and third hits. That is pretty good—three times at bat, and three hits.

Then along came the Greek proposition. The country was in chaos in a struggle between left wing elements and monarchial adherence. In between was a big group, by far the biggest group of Greeks who were democrats, moderates, believing in some socialism probably, but they wanted a democratic form of government. They did not want communism, and they did not want a king. But, instead of asking the United Nations to go in and seal the border and hold free elections, we said, "We will handle this; just get out of the way, United Nations. This is Uncle Sam who is going to take over now." The Englishmen bowed out of Greece. They could not afford to stay there. They knew they would make "suckers" out of us and that we would take on those countries. So we went on into Greece. I opposed it at the time. I said the United Nations should handle the matter. We were told "The United Nations cannot handle this. The United Nations is an infant in swaddling clothes." I remember hearing that statement on the floor. Of course an infant only grows by being fed and by being allowed to exercise. So I said, "The United Nations could handle it." Many arguments were raised against it; it was said the United Nations did not have any money. Well, I said, "We are going to spend the money anyway, so why not give it to the United Nations and let them spend it? They are in Greece, and if it turns out well, it will help the United Nations; if it turns out bad, we will not be to blame."

I may say, Mr. President, that there was a high official of the United Nations in Washington at that time. I cannot name him because the poor sucker would probably lose his job. We run the United Nations, as I have said. He would probably get fired if I stated in the Senate that he was here. But he is a big shot in the United Nations, suffice it to say. We heard he was down here, so I called him and asked him if another Senator and myself, or two other Senators and myself, could see him and talk to him about this Greek proposition. He said, yes, we could see him, but to come into the place one at a time and by separate doors. He did not want anybody to know we had been there seeing him. He was afraid. So we went there and sneaked into the place to see him, like Bolsheviks with a bomb in each hip pocket. We asked him about the Greek problem, "Can you handle it?" He said, "We have got to handle it. If we do not, if they take it away from us, it will practically be a death blow to the United Nations." So we asked him questions. We said, "They are saying you have not got any soldiers up there." He said, "That is right, but where there is a will there is a way." He said, "We can get enough soldiers to seal that border, picking up a few here and there from the small nations, if need be. We would not have to arm them, we would not have to clothe them; all we would have to do would be to feed them and just put an arm band on them saying, 'United Nations,' and nobody would shoot one of them any more than anybody would think of shooting a Canadian mounted policeman or a Texas ranger." They just do not do that, because they know what would happen to them, and that is the way it would have been with the United Nations. That is the way he explained it. I said, "I will go back and tell those fellows up there that you can handle it." He said, "No, you cannot quote me. If they ever found out I had seen you, I would lose my job." So we had to come back here and listen to these folks saying, "Well, they have not got any money, have not got any soldiers, the United Nations is weak and impotent," and all this and the other.

So the Greek proposition was put through, appropriating some $500,000,000. I think it was supposed to be $200,000,000 for food and other products useful to the people and $100,000,000 for guns. At the time, we said it would turn out to be more guns than butter, and sure enough they hardly got them working when they started changing the ratio from day to day, taking a little of the butter money and putting it over into the gun department. It finally wound up about four bits for bread and $3.50 for guns. That is about the way it wound up. Anyway, we spent $300,000,000 in Greece, and when the thing came up to be done over here, a while back, and we were asked to give them another $175,000,000, I thought, that will take a week of debate anyhow, because it took about 10 days last year, on the first installment. On the floor, here, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the famous bipartisan architect of chaos, here, was asked on the floor of the Senate how many guerrillas there were when we appropriated $300,000,000, and said "13,000." He was asked "How many guerrillas are there now, a year later, after we have spent $300,000,000?" He said, "26,000." We spent $300,000,000, and there are twice as many guerrillas now as there were when we started. I thought it would take a week to debate this thing anyhow, so I went to New York.

I will tell you, Mr. President, where I went and why I went. I went to New York to address a meeting welcoming the Russian Ambassador to this country. Nobody else of any consequence at all in the United States would appear on the platform with him. They were afraid they would be smeared red, so I decided I would go up and welcome the Ambassador. I am talking for peace and I wanted to get along with Russia. I figured the least I could do was let him know that at least there was one American above the rank of a garbage collector who would speak to him. So I went up and spoke on the same platform with him. Incidentally I figured out an idea to sort of help relations a little bit. To help out the program, I had made arrangements for a little girl at the Russian Embassy to record a Russian song in Russian, and my son 12 years old recorded Home on the Range, and then we gave the little girl that record and she gave us the Russian record. My boy learned the Russian song and the little Russian girl learned Home on the Range. Each one sang the other country's song at the dinner. They made a big hit. But I guess those kids will be put in concentration camps as soon as things are fixed the way some people want them.

I thought it would take a week, at least, to debate the new contribution to Greece and Turkey. I went to New York to make a speech, and the measure was brought up and passed in 3 hours, without even a roll-call vote. We gave away $300,000,000. There were 26,000 guerillas compared to 13,000 the year before. That did not affect the situation at all. I never saw so much confidence in spending money as that which I have seen exhibited in this Congress in the past few months. The only rule we have here is to bring prosperity to all the world. We like to give folks things which, in many cases, they do not need and do not want.

We went ahead in Greece. It was the most serious blow that had been suffered. That was the beginning of the decline of the United Nations. It went from bad to worse. The Greek episode is the most despicable chapter in American history. We can hardly pick up a newspaper without seeing in it every day that hundreds of Greeks have been lined up and shot. It got so bad that even the British protested—those old experts at shooting people. Of course it was not because we were shooting people, but that we were shooting too many. They did not like our bad technique. They figured out how

it was possible to shoot fewer people and get better results. We should let them handle that shooting business for us in Greece. All the liberal-minded Greeks are being killed. The leader over there has become so bold that the other day he had one of our newspaper men shot. I hold no brief for the press, but I like the newspapermen themselves, and do not want them to get shot. God knows they suffer enough for writing the stuff they have to write, without being shot. But they are being shot in Greece for writing things that they do not want them to write. That is worse than Hearst treats them.

In Greece a newspaperman by the name of George Polk was recently murdered. He was no Communist, Mr. President. In fact, I think he was sort of a conservative man. He wanted to tell the truth. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President. The press tells the truth some of the time; the only difficulty is that it has so much junk mixed with it that it is like trying to eat mush and milk and keep them separated. It is difficult to find out what is the truth. Polk wanted to get the truth, so he made arrangements to go up and see for himself. He soon began receiving threatening telephone calls from the police, calling him a Communist, and saying that he was going to be shot if he did not watch out. He disregarded the threats. He was a good newspaperman, in every sense of the word; he would go any place he thought he should go. He was the sort of fellow who, if he thought he ought to be for Wallace, would be for him, regardless of the consequences. He never came back, Mr. President. His body was found floating in the harbor at Saloniki. The police conducted an investigation. They immediately announced that the Communists had killed him, in spite of the fact that Polk had written letters to Drew Pearson, and there were many reasons to believe that he had been killed by the Fascists or the Nazis. His wife is not permitted to leave Greece. Other persons are being held there because they may know too much.

Mr. President, if it had been the Communists who had killed him they would have been only too glad to have the whole thing spread out for the world to see. But because of the scoundrels we are dealing with over there, in this black chapter of American history, the whole thing is hushed up. They can even get away with the murder of an American newsman who has tried to tell the full truth. The truth is, Mr. President, that there are many people, not only in Greece, but in other places, who do not want the American people to know the truth. I do not know what will happen. I guess George Polk will go down as a sort of George Hill of the newspaper game. That will be about the end of the matter. Poor George, I knew him well!

Mr. President, I have an article here regarding the murder of George Polk, and I ask that it be printed as part of my remarks at this place in the RECORD. Let the folks read about it and see what a rotten deal poor George got.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Frontpage magazine for June 1948]

THE MURDER OF GUILDSMAN GEORGE POLK

On May 16, 1948, the body of George Polk was washed ashore at Salonika, Greece. Polk, a member of the Newspaper Guild of New York and Middle East correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System, had been shot in the back of the head and his hands and feet were bound with twine. He had been reported variously as missing for a week, as in the water for a week. He was in Salonika attempting to arrange a meeting with Markos Vafiades (General Markos), leader of the Greek guerrillas.

The Greek police immediately began questioning suspected Communists. An unnamed Government official said "we are 1,000 percent sure that Communists killed Polk." Public Prosecutor Christos Moustakis, in the words of the Associated Press, said "police excluded the possibility Mr. Polk had been slain by right-wing extremists." Not a single rightist was interrogated.

. An open and shut case, evidently. Perhaps. But against whom?

On May 20, 1947, Seymour Freidin of the New York Herald Tribune, who had been outspokenly critical of the Greek Government, was suddenly and without explanation refused permission to board a Greek airliner at Athens for Crete. Freidin reported from Athens the next day that "pro-government elements of the press and political quarters charged, without attribution, that this correspondent was a Communist." Commented Freiden: "This type of intimidation has been employed by government quarters in the past, in the hope of whittling correspondents critical of the government down to size."

One week later Robert Vermillion of the United Press was attacked as an "American journalist of the Communist creed" by the Greek War Minister George Stratos, after Vermillion described a visit to the Greek guerrillas.

On March 5, 1948, Homer Bigart of the Herald Tribune was denounced by the Royalist newspaper Ethnikos Kiryx as an "instrument of Moscow." The paper demanded censorship of all foreign correspondents. Bigart had criticized the wholesale executions by the government of former resistance fighters.

William L. Shirer, noted radio commentator, summarized the situation in a newspaper article on February 22, 1948: "Our correspondents in Greece work under great difficulties. * * * The Greek Government obstructs their work in dozens of ingenious ways. It stoops to having agents spread malicious slander about correspondents whose stories displease it.

"I am surprised that the President and the Congress are not more concerned about * * * tactics which the Greek Government has used in an attempt to prevent American newspapers and radio from publishing and broadcasting the truth."

Radio, Shirer noted, was a specific target of the Greek attempts at suppression. On December 21, 1947, the Athens Government announced that thereafter all radio scripts of the American correspondents would have to be submitted and approved before they could go on the air.

Just where did George Polk fit into this chronicle of struggle between the Greek Government and American newspapermen who found it less than perfect? In December 1947 Polk wrote a comprehensive article for Harper's magazine, summarizing his impressions of Greece. He described Napoleon Zervas, the former Minister of Public Order and a power in the royalist-dominated government, as a "professional gambler and unscrupulous politician" whose activities, "public and private, are even more sinister than when he participated in four prewar Greek political revolutions." Polk cited a secret American official document as noting the "dictatorial and Fascist tendencies" exhibited by Zervas in his "ruthless campaign against the opponents of the Government, no matter what their political convictions."

Polk dealt mercilessly and in detail with the fantastic abuses of the Greek economic system, which mainly favors special individuals.

On December 22, 1947, Polk wrote a letter of protest to the Herald Tribune against a series of articles on Greece by Maxwell Anderson in that paper. Anderson had reported that he heard virtually no charges of outright injustice against the Greek Government. Responded Polk: "Greeks continually complain of outright injustice on the part of their extremely corrupt and inefficient Government; of outright injustice in the distribution of food, the imposition of taxes, the levying of their soldier sons into military service, arrest of persons without constitutional processes of law, the failure to release from concentration camps may persons now held."

So much for Polk on the Greek Government. How did the Government feel about him?

The Harper's article drew a protest to CBS from Greek officials in the United States. A month later, when Polk in a broadcast referred to some Greek cabinet ministers as "semifascists," the Greek Minister of Information in the United States, Nicholas Lely, demanded radio time to answer him. Lely's statement and a rebuttal by Polk were carried by CBS.

At that time—September 1947—Polk was "resented in high places in the Athens government," according to an article by Marquis W. Childs in the New York Post of May 19, 1948. Wrote Childs: "Polk told me of the effort to smear him as a Red or pink. He realized he had made enemies because of his criticisms of the failures and stupidities of the Athens government."

On February 3, according to CBS commentator Edward R. Murrow, Polk "in a private letter said there were a number of vague hints that somebody is likely to get hurt." More recently, Polk wrote Drew Pearson that he was having great difficulties with the Greek government who did not want him to interview the guerrillas. And less than 3 weeks before his death, Polk told Constantine Argyris of the Christian Science Monitor that he had received telephone calls denouncing him as a Communist and declaring: "We are going to kill you."

It may be pure coincidence—but Polk was slated to return to the United States very soon. His visit would have coincided with that of Dwight Griswold, chief of the United States mission in Greece, who left Athens May 16 to report to Washington on the further needs of the Greek Government. Comments Marquis Childs: "Rumors persist of a new build-up to be launched from Athens and Washington—a build-up of the need for United States troops in Greece. What Polk might have said and written when he returned to the United States could have interfered with that build-up." Or, as Murrow put it, "George Polk probably knew more about Greece than any other American reporter there. He was coming home. He was murdered. It may be that he knew too much."

Obviously, the Right had reason to fear Polk. But does it seems logical that the Greek Communists, whose newspapers are suppressed and whose radio cannot reach overseas, would assassinate a man who was trying to report their story?

Indispensable to this account is the role played by official representatives of the United States in Greece. On May 2, 1948, Mr. Griswold joined the Rightist press of Greece in attempting to discredit Homer

Bigart. He wrote a lengthy letter to the Herald Tribune, challenging Bigart point after point. This evoked a response by Constantine Poulos, veteran Middle East correspondent of the Overseas News Agency, who termed Griswold's letter "an obvious attempt to shake the confidence of the newspaper and its readers in the correspondent." In conclusion, Poulos wrote: "We may be sure that Mr. Griswold's letter, already published in the Athens press, will serve to encourage the extremists."

All this leads to two unmistakable conclusions:

(1) A full investigation of the murder of George Polk by a qualified team sent out from the United States, is necessary, and at once. It is utterly unrealistic to expect that the police of Salonika will do an honest and thorough job. The entire Greek police force is notoriously loaded with former members of the Nazi-organized Security Battalions. It is fantastically Rightist in membership, and is led by Royalists; it can hardly be expected to bring in findings damaging to the Right. The Greek Prime Minister, Sophoulis, has offered the assurance that every effort will be made to solve the case—"if it was not an accident." An accidental bullet hole in the base of the skull!

The investigation cannot be carried out by American representatives on the spot, because they have demonstrated their incapacity for forthright action and their essential lack of sympathy with the correspondents.

An American citizen, and a representative of our free press, has been murdered. It is the responsibility of our Government to uncover the entire story. Every aspect of the matter must be explored, including Polk's recently completed manuscript of a book on the Middle East and any light that might be contributed by Mr. Griswold on his return.

(2) There must in future be full guarantees of protection for United States correspondents overseas, in line with the United States backed resolutions at the UN's "Freedom of the Press" conference in Geneva. The Greek government must be made to cease encouraging its Royalist press to incite acts of violence. Correspondents must be permitted to go where the story is, without hindrance or censorship and with adequate protection.

The United States is quick to defend the interests of its businessmen abroad. Are its newsmen, the eyes and ears of the country, less important? They are the real American ambassadors; they report direct to the people. The murder of George Polk is in every sense a gesture of contempt for the American people; it must not pass unnoticed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the situation is becoming pretty bad when we are losing all our friends all over the world. The Russians fear and distrust us. When it is considered who is running the country, it is enough to drive them frantic with fear. It is a well-known fact that between World Wars I and II our boys learned the cartel business from Hitler's boys, and helped to finance Hitler in his rise to power, with the understanding that he would fight Russia. One of the men who was helping to finance Hitler in order for him to fight Russia is now our Secretary of National Defense, former president of Dillon, Read, a Wall Street financial house which helped to finance Hitler. Our Under Secretary of the Army is Mr. Draper, a former vice president of the same firm. He was very active in making arrangements between our monopolists and Hitler's monopolists. We were going to decartelize Germany. Mr. Roosevelt established a program and people were appointed to carry it out. They went over after Mr. Roosevelt died, but most of them came home and said they could not do much decartelizing. All the men with any pride and sincerity of purpose came home. One of them is a member of our new party. He lives in Maryland. He said he wanted a little honest government, so he joined the new party.

The decartelizing of Germany has been called off. Mr. Draper recently went to Germany to get the matter straightened out. There is a man by the name of Hawkins in charge of the decartelization in Germany. He is Mr. Draper's son-in-law. Mr. Draper set up the cartels in the first place, and now his son-in-law will decartelize them. So the matter is in good hands.

The Russians see what type of people have control of our country, a stranglehold on it—Admiral Lahey, Fascist sympathizer, the President's right hand officer in the White House; Mr. Dulles, and all these people who are running this bipartisan foreign policy. As I say, they have all tried to outdo each other by seeing who could say the most vitriolic things about Russia. All we ever heard about it is the Red fifth column in this country, how they have tried to subvert our Government. Perhaps they have, I would not argue the point, but I cannot remember one prominent American who has ever been subverted by the Reds, any Cabinet member, general, anybody of any particular consequence at all. But the western capitalists, the big money boys of the West, financed the fifth column activity in Russia between the wars so successfully that we all remember that along about 1937 the Russians had to take most of their generals and cabinet members out and shoot them. They had been subverted with promises of bribes and promises of power to come when the Communist government was overthrown. If they had been that successful in this country we would have some reason to be excited and worried. But they have not been.

What do we find? In this country there is a great witch hunt, and the newspapers are whooping it up day in and day out, all our prominent citizens making statements about Russia, that we have to have bombs to bomb Russia. And what do we find about Russia? If we can believe Eddy Gilmore of the Associated Press, there is no war propaganda in Russia, none, none at all. If we can believe the other article I read, the people over there want peace, they are willing to stand many feet deep in front of a bulletin to read about peace, or any possibility about peace.

Mr. President, if it is being a tool of Joe Stalin, as the able Senator from California accused me of being a while back, because one gets up and tells these truths, even if they never go any further than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or the gallery, or the Senate, if it is being a Red if you let the American people know they are being lied to deliberately, deceived, duped—if it is being a tool of Stalin, all right, I am willing to accept the charge.

Mr. President, I have here an editorial from the New York Post. The headline on it is, "November Casualty." It is a tribute really to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. It mentions the fact that he brought into question the sincerity of his party in their extravagant promises to the colored people and the meagerness of their delivery on those promises. It says:

The Republican Party doesn't keep its promises.

Of course, if they had just put the Republican and the Democratic parties in, they would have had something. The Republicans do not, nor do the Democrats. That is why I am a new-party man right now.

"The Republican Party doesn't keep its promises," Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, charged angrily on the Senate floor when his colleagues killed one after another of his civil rights amendments to the draft bill.

No, they have no qualms at all, Mr. President. It is miraculous. They will sit right here and vote down these civil-rights amendments one right after another, and then they will just hurry up to Philadelphia, as soon as I get through talking, and write some more platforms, some more planks, telling the Negroes what they are going to do for them. Then, if they have to come back here next week, if I hold them up, they will come back and make some more promises.

Back in 1944, when there was another election to be won, the GOP platform promised legislation to end discrimination in the armed forces.

Of course they did. So did the Democrats, for that matter. Let us be honest about it.

But events have shifted and swept yesteryear's pledges away. The Republicans now know that they need produce only token legislation to outdo the Democratic record. Accordingly, they have come across with one small amendment which bars levying a poll tax on soldiers.

Mr. President, the irony of that amendment, the one which provides that they cannot levy a poll tax on soldiers, is that there are only two States which have a poll tax on soldiers, if I am not mistaken. They have all gotten so gentlemanly that they do not have a poll tax on the soldiers. But this amendment in itself does not allow the boys to vote unless the State sets up the machinery for them to vote. So the whole amendment is just a fake and a farce, just a scheme to try to fool somebody, that is all.

The article further says, speaking of the Republicans:

Apparently they plan to point to this pitiful gesture as proof positive that they are the friends of the American Negro.

We're not convinced. And we'll bet that the voters aren't, either.

They are not, Mr. President, nor are they convinced that the Democrats mean it. They do not believe Mr. Truman means it when he talks about civil rights. The New York Post editorial proceeds:

It is a matter of record that the Republicans approved drastic gags to limit debate

which might allow antisegregation and antidiscrimination measures to get a foothold on the Senate floor. When cloture wouldn't work, the GOP went even further by sanctioning three motions to shelve "the pending question" which stopped discussion instantly.

The excuse offered for these steamroller tactics was simple: The southern Democrats threatened to filibuster if any serious attempt was made to attach a Negro bill of rights to the draft legislation. The Bourbons, if they ever got started, could drone on uninterruptedly until the scheduled June 19 adjournment.

Is it not so, Mr. President? My goodness, how excited they get when the scutherners are going to filibuster on anti-lynch or anti-poll-tax bills. They get worried about it. So they ditch the whole business and say, "We will have no part of those southerners, they are tough customers."

You did not know my father came from the South, did you, Mr. President?

Anyhow, they steer clear of southerners. I do not believe they are any more afraid of them than they are of me, but the bill they do not like is a bill to benefit common people, an antidiscrimination bill, to give everybody equality, something good. They are not anxious to pass that kind of stuff. They seize any excuse they can find to dodge it—and the excuse is that the southerners will filibuster, and that is a good excuse, and they dodge it. But GLEN TAYLOR, Henry Wallace's Vice Presidential candidate, does not want the boys of America drafted. He wants a good thing, he wants the country to stay free, not be militarized. So that is out. They cannot do that at all. They are not afraid of him. They will break his filibuster, you bet your life. They will not compromise with him at all. So they will just sit it out. But they will not have any trouble with the southerners. They will not bring up anything they do not like. I have a good notion to help the southerners the next time they have a filibuster.

Let us get back to the New York Post editorial:

Ostensibly in the interests of coaxing some necessary and long-neglected legislation out of the Senate, the party leaders apparently decided not to provoke the lily-white statesmen into their act.

But it's interesting that when Senator TAFT, with an eye to future campaign oratory, decided that the Republicans had better adopt at least one civil-rights measure, he was able to squeak the anti-poll-tax amendment through the Senate.

Mr. President, it is disgraceful that the anti-poll-tax amendment should be the one picked out of all seven amendments the Senator from North Dakota offered. They picked that one amendment, the anti-poll-tax amendment, which does not affect the soldiers of any but two States, and in those two States the provision will have no good effect unless the States enact enabling legislation of some kind. So what was done about the poll tax does not mean a thing. Mr. TAFT can go out and talk now about how they outlawed the poll tax; that the soldiers can no longer be charged a poll tax, and a lot of Republican spokesmen will forget that it was only the soldiers who were covered by that legislation; that they just outlawed the poll tax respecting the soldiers. Yes, they will go out and talk about it, and then the southerners can go down South and talk about how they stopped anything in the equal-rights program going through the Senate. They can say, "True, they got a little antipoll tax through which does not affect anybody, but we sure held them up."

So it was a happy thing for everyone concerned, the Republicans are happy, and my lovable southern colleagues are happy.

Let us see what the New York Post further had to say:

Rather makes you wonder if the Senate couldn't have been induced to approve most of Langer's measures—

Sure, Mr. President, I wonder if they could not have been induced to approve most of them—

if only the GOP had made a determined effort to live up to its 1944 campaign promise.

Yes, Mr. President, it is going to be awfully tough on them to come back here after the convention. I just cannot see them doing it. If they do they are going to have to deliver. They will go to Philadelphia and write some new, fancy promises, and they will have to deliver on them; so if I should have to talk here for 2 or 3 days it would be awfully embarrassing to them. I do not think I will make it, but I might.

The Post continued:

We'll never know. And neither will the boys who may be forced to serve in the Jim Crow outfits of our mighty democracy's defense army.

The Republican's tactics may have been tawdry. Yet the turncoat antics of so-called "liberal" Democrats, who have no known allegiance to the for-whites-only rule south of the Mason-Dixon line, deserve equal censure.

With the exceptions of Senator HARLEY KILGORE (Democrat, West Virginia), and Henry Wallace's running mate, GLEN TAYLOR (Democrat, Idaho)—

I apologize, Mr. President, I had not read the editorial before—honestly I had not. I did not know that my name was in it. Someone handed it to me and I placed it on the desk. I hate to brag on myself, but I appreciate this recognition, however, by the New York Post. We will read that over again:

With the exceptions of Senator HARLEY KILGORE (Democrat of West Virginia), and Henry Wallace's running mate, GLEN TAYLOR (Democrat of Idaho), the Democrats voted solidly with the Republicans to discrard LANGER'S proposal that the draft bill contain a ban on race discrimination.

There is the record, Mr. President. There is the answer. There is the reason why the Negro people are not going to be fooled by the promises of tweedledum and tweedledummer any more.

The editorial continues:

And Senator SCOTT LUCAS, Democratic whip even had the effrontery to denounce TAFT'S belated move to write the anti-poll-tax ban into the bill. LUCAS baldly stated that TAFT had upset a previous agreement—a "gentleman's agreement."

A gentleman's agreement, Mr. President.

LUCAS badly stated that TAFT had upset a previous agreement—a gentleman's agreement, we suppose you'd call it—to table all civil rights amendments. Thirty Democrats voted against the anti-poll-tax measure.

The Democrats may have been dutifully following the lead of their party standard bearer, Harry Truman.

I think they were, Mr. President. That is what I said a while ago. I think the southerners just got way off base when they got all excited about Harry's message. He just did not mean a thing by it, and I think there was nobody more surprised than Harry when the southern boys started jumping down his throat, and they got him on a spot where he could not back down and they could not back down. Of course, now they are all coming back and sneaking in the back door of the tepee, sort of. I am afraid that is the fact.

The Senator from North—or South—you are South, are you not? You are from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Is the Senator from Idaho yielding to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. I was just addressing the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. He was remonstrating in an undertone that they were not going back into the tent, but if anybody wants to bet me, I will bet that the southerners will be back in there with Harry before this thing is over.

I read further from the New York Post:

The Democrats may have been dutifully following the lead of their party standard bearer, Harry Truman. The President is apparently so anxious to gain his party's nomination that he is refusing to antagonize the Southern delegates by ordering the end of racial discrimination in Government agencies and in the armed services.

What about that, Mr. President? Mr. Truman a while back told them to cut out segregation in the armed services. He told them to do so a couple of times. No one did a thing about it. I wonder whatever became of that order.

The Post continues:

Once the President implied that he would. But that was before leading Democrats talked seriously about replacing him with another candidate, one more acceptable to all wings of the party.

Civil rights is becoming a casualty of our November elections. We would hint to the Democrats, Senators, and Harry Truman alike, that there may be another casualty close to home, unless they challenge the Republicans' meager performance and come through with a record which will convince the voters that Democrats don't consider some citizens "second class."

Well, there is no challenge from the Democrats or the Republicans on civil rights.

The only assurance respecting things that really matter to the American people—the question of actually keeping alive, Mr. President, the question of civil rights, of equal rights, of nondiscrimination, the only chance that labor has to survive which is as an organized entity, the only chance the old people have of getting a square deal, the only chance the soldiers have of getting homes—witness what is going on in the Senate today,

the scuttling of the housing program—the only chance the United Nations has to survive, the only chance Israel has of getting a square deal, the only assurance that the monopolists and the cartelists will get what is coming to them—the only guaranty or assurance of any of these things is a victory for the new party in November and the election of Henry Wallace as President of the United States.

Mr. President, we all remember that awhile ago when Mr. Truman—it was not Mr. Truman, either; it was Gen. Bedell Smith, our Ambassador to Moscow—they are all generals. Look them up. We find generals from Patagonia to Korea, all the way across the world. Our Ambassadors everywhere are generals. At any rate, Mr. Bedell Smith delivered a note to Molotov telling him how tough we were, how powerful we were, but that if they wanted to talk things over the door was always open. Mr. Molotov said, "All right; let us talk."

Our diplomats and statesmen hastened to explain that the last sentence in the note, to the effect that the door was always open, was simply diplomatic finery. It did not mean any more than the President's message on civil rights. We had not meant a thing by it. The door was not really open. We were still tough, and might become tougher, and did not even want to talk about it.

How did the newspapers over the world report the occurrence? People all over the world were very much thrilled and happy that we were offering a chance to make peace in the world, but we told them, "No; we do not even want to talk about it. The door is not open at all." I believe that the handling of our foreign policy—and, remember, it is a bipartisan foreign policy—is the most disgraceful chapter in all American history. Never has there been such stupidity in such high places.

This is what the New York Herald Tribune of May 14 had to say:

French people still hope for cold-war truce. Mix-up on United States-Soviet talks causes disappointment. London press pessimistic.

(By Walter Kerr)

PARIS, May 13.—The excitement caused by the Moscow radio's report of possible negotiations between the United States and Soviet Union died down in Paris today, leaving most Frenchmen disappointed, but still hopeful that something may come of it.

Mr. President, we threw cold water on the hopes and aspirations of the whole world.

This is the way the Washington News reported it. The headline says, "Truman chills Reds' reception of peace offer."

The second heading over the article is:

Truman ignores peace bid.

How the President of the United States has the nerve to tell the people that if they will only reelect him he will keep the peace by becoming tougher with everyone, I do not see. I have never heard of keeping the peace by becoming tough with anyone. A man must be pleasant with his neighbors if he wants them to be pleasant with him. He cannot swagger around like a big bully and expect his neighbors to love him.

Returning to the article about the French people—

No one any longer anticipates bilateral talks in the immediate future, but most newspaper commentators still call for some sort of an arrangement that could bring an end to the cold war.

The French people are not happy about the cold war. They do not feel so cock-sure about it. They do not have atom bombs. They are right in the middle, so to speak. They have no ocean to protect them. They are not so happy about our cold war.

While the excitement was on it was hot, and it is now known that French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault reacted sharply and angrily before a full explanation was laid before him. Private citizens tired of the cold war feel a little let down by the turn of events.

I suppose they were. I know that I was. I thought to myself, "At last those fellows are getting a little sense. They are realizing that war means the end of all of us, so they are going to be a little more moderate. They are going to see if we cannot come to an understanding." My hopes rose, and then they were dashed, just as were the hopes of the good people of Europe.

The heading on the next article is "Pessimism in London."

LONDON, May 13.—Confusion and pessimism marked comment today on the 3 days of exchanges between Moscow and Washington.

The London Times said the hope of a Soviet-American conference for the discussion of differences has been dashed. It blamed both the United States and Russia for what it called a bewildering episode. Russia, it said, had a right to believe that Ambassador Walter Bedell Smith meant something more than a conventional expression when he told Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov that the door was always open to discussion. But instead of rushing to the radio with an announcement that she had accepted a bid to negotiate, Russia should have inquired quietly just what the Americans had in mind, said the Times.

That was the reaction abroad when we withdrew our offer to talk things over. Everyone was disappointed, and I am sorry to say that the Russians came off better than we did in the explanations, charges, and countercharges which ensued.

It seems that Mr. Truman has little regard for Gallup polls, when he refuses to talk with the Russians. The Gallup poll of May 1 says:

Majority in favor of world peace parley.

Do you think it would be a good idea or a poor idea for President Truman to call an international meeting with Stalin and heads of other nations to work out more effective plans for peace? A good idea, 63 percent; poor idea, 28 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

That is the result of the Gallup poll.

Let us see what the reaction was to our action when we recognized Israel on such short notice. The press had this to say:

United States action shocks delegates to UN. Many are resentful because of unexpected shift from backing of trusteeship.

As I have said, we had given them this trusteeship. We told them to talk it over awhile, and then come back with the right answer, "Yes." But then we kicked the pegs out from under them by recognizing Palestine. They did not like it.

I have before me an article by George Barrett; I believe the article appeared in the Washington Post. It says:

UNITED STATES ACTION SHOCKS DELEGATES TO UN—MANY ARE RESENTFUL BECAUSE OF UNEXPECTED SHIFT FROM BACKING OF TRUSTEESHIP

(By George Barrett)

Anger, incredulity and shock, mixed finally with relief, made the General Assembly session at Flushing Meadow last night the most stirring United Nations meeting to date as a result of the United States recognition of the new state of Israel.

Delegates, officials and the small crowd of visitors were dumbfounded by reports of the Washington announcement and few believed it at first.

Press bulletins flashed the news to the corridors and the story raced through the Assembly hall shortly after 6 p. m. while the delegates were still voting on the Jerusalem trusteeship resolution. The first reaction was that someone was making a terrible joke, and some diplomats broke into skeptical laughs.

However, even before Dr. Philip C. Jessup of the United States was able to make the news official in a statement, the delegates were slowly beginning to believe it. Dr. Guillermo Belt, of Cuba, referring to an earlier indication that the Soviet Union would recognize the new Jewish state, commented sarcastically that apparently Russia knew more about what was going on in Washington than the United States delegation did.

MANY DELEGATES RESENTFUL

There was considerable resentment among many of the delegations over the way the United States had pushed so vigorously for a trusteeship agreement in United Nations debates while apparently intending all the time to approve partition by recognizing the new state of Israel.

This feeling soon began to give way in some delegations to one of relief that the United States had at last come out firmly after what many of them believed was a long display of indecision.

Most of the remarks heard around the corridors were too caustic to be attributed to the authors.

Imagine that, Mr. President. The representatives of the United Nations made such remarks that they could not even be printed in the newspapers—such remarks about our foreign policy, about our vacillation, our wiggling and waggling, back and forth.

I read further from the article:

One delegate asked another for the United States position on Palestine and was told by another diplomat that he did not know because he had not seen an announcement for 20 minutes.

Imagine that—making fun of us to that extent, saying that they did not know what our foreign policy was, because they had not seen a dispatch for 20 minutes.

I read further:

During the Assembly debate Prince Faisal al-Saud, of Saudi Arabia, the chief Arab delegate, sat alone in a corner of the public lounge, with his aides reporting to him from time to time. He refused to comment on the United States recognition move, but he turned to an aide and exclaimed: "So what!"

Sir Carl Berendsen, of New Zealand, remarked tartly that he was "Just dizzy; that's all; just dizzy."

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, head of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, was surprised and delighted by developments.

"This is marvelous," he said of United States recognition. "This is what we've been praying for."

Of course, there were many Jewish people who were delighted at that particular moment, but they should have waited until several days later, for things have not been so good for the Jews over there since then, and goodness knows what will happen to the Jews before these matters are straightened out.

I read further:

It had been a long day of confusion for most of the delegates, who began their Political and Security Committee session at Lake Success, then hurried to the 5 p. m. plenary meeting of the Assembly.

Mr. President, let me refer now to an article which I quoted a while ago. The article is entitled "Britain Intercedes for Doomed Greeks." Mr. President, it caps the climax when the British have to ask us please not to shoot so many poor Greeks. Of course, I always save newspaper articles such as these, because some of these things sound so fantastic that people will not believe them unless you are able to show them the newspaper accounts. For instance, no one ordinarily would believe that the British are trying to keep us from shooting so many poor Greeks. Many people do not read the newspapers very carefully; so many people will say, "Oh, the British are so bloodthirsty that they would not intercede to help the Greeks." So we have to show such people articles such as this one in order to let them know what really is happening.

Mr. President, the Turks did not help us during the war, but we have given them great quantities of guns. My earliest recollection of the Turks is that when I was a kid, I was told about the Turks' massacring the Armenians, and I thought the Turks must be terrible people. But we have gotten too bloodthirty for the Turks, Mr. President. I never thought I would live to see the day when that would happen; but we have sent the Turks so many guns, that the other day they sent us a note in which they said, "Please, if you do not mind, we have gotten enough guns, and now we would like something to eat."

Mr. President, I read now an article by William Philip Simms, entitled "Palestine Pendulum"— a very appropriate name for what is going on with respect to our policy in regard to Palestine.

Mr. Simms says:

The United States is doing so many flip-flops on Palestine and in the foreign field generally that both Embassy Row and Capitol Hill are dizzy and bewildered.

Mr. President, this bipartisan foreign policy of ours is a strange, strange thing; and it is a wonder that both the Republican and Democratic Parties have adhered to it for so long. Either the Democrats or the Republicans could have gotten out from under this foreign policy of ours long ago, and could have left the other side with the darnedest hot potato that anyone ever saw. But they are loyal, Mr. President; I will say that. They refuse to get out from under.

The article further says:

White House, State Department, our Foreign Relations committees of Congress, delegation at the United Nations and envoys abroad each seems to be functioning separately without often knowing what the others are doing.

Of course, Mr. President, he gives them credit for seeming to be functioning and operating. Of course, that implies that something is going on, that someone has some idea of what is going on. Personally, I think it is just a madhouse. I read further:

President Truman's recognition of Israel, the new Jewish state in Palestine, for instance, seems to have caught the State Department, our delegates at Lake Success and the world in general wholly by surprise.

Shortly before the White House acted, State Secretary George Marshall was quoted as having advised both Arab and Jewish leaders in Palestine to avoid hasty action when the British mandate expired at midnight on May 15. Specifically he warned them against any "political change"—that is, against proclaiming sovereign states.

Midnight in the Holy Land is 6 p. m. Washington time. Israel was proclaimed independent at 6:01 p. m. Friday, our time. At 6:11 p. m., President Truman approved recognition and it was made public a few minutes after.

It was 10 minutes later.

I read further:

At the State Department reporters began to ask questions. The answer was invariably: "No comment." The lid had been clamped on—it is said, by Secretary Marshall.

That is a pretty good scheme: If you cannot think of anything to say, and are at an utter loss, just keep your mouth shut, I guess.

I read further:

At Lake Success it was even more embarrassing. Report of the White House action circulated around the General Assembly table from mouth to mouth. Presently Francis B. Sayre (deputy in the absence of his chief, Warren R. Austin) was asked for a fill-in. Blushingly he had to admit that all he knew was what he had seen on the ticker.

American policy on Palestine has been swinging like a pendulum for a long time. Everyone has complained about it—British, Arabs, Jews, the UN, and others alike.

In 1946—to go back no further than that—an Anglo-American committee presented the Morrison plan for partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab provinces within the British mandate. Jews, Arabs, and the United States turned it down.

In 1947, a special UN committee proposed partition into independent states. This had such strong backing from the American delegation that some characterized it as a scandal. Washington was charged with using pressure to put partition across.

Then, last March, the United States took the opposite stand. It announced against partition. The move came as a bombshell. In fact UN members called it just that. Zionists seemed stunned. Some wept. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, former head of the World Zionist organization and now first President of Israel, denounced the trusteeship plan which the United States now favored as an impossible solution.

State Secretary Marshall is believed to have engineered the switch. Fear of what might happen to world peace if independent Jews and Arabs started war before the UN had either the strength or the organization to handle it is thought to have influenced him. At any rate, he openly expressed his approval of the shift, describing it as only an "interim measure" to be taken "without prejudice" to any eventual political settlement.

So great was the opposition in this country, and in the UN, however, that of late the United States has stressed it less and less, putting major emphasis on a truce between Arabs and Jews until some all-round settlement satisfactory to all could be devised.

Which is where matters stood last Friday at 6 p. m. Then, at 6:01 came another Palestine bombshell. Coming on top of the Smith-Molotov incident of only a week ago, British, French, and other friends of the United States are more than taken aback. As one foreigner at Lake Success expressed it:

"If this sort of thing keeps up, we may be pardoned if we begin to wonder soon who makes American foreign policy and who can really speak for it."

That is what Mr. William Philip Simms thinks of our foreign policy. It is really something, Mr. President.

The Washington News wrote an editorial about Mr. Truman's handling of our foreign policy. I think it is legitimate to discuss all these things in order that all may understand why they should not vote for a draft now at this time. It is necessary for them to understand all the other silly things that have gone on before they will believe how silly the present bipartisan coalition that is ruining this country can really be. So these things are all pertinent to building up the testimony on tall fronts. Under the heading, "Irresponsible," the editorial says:

President Truman's handling of American recognition of the new state of Israel was irresponsible. Regardless of the merits of the policy, the method was inexcusable.

The President made a momentous decision affecting the security of the United States, the fate of the United Nations, and the peace of the world, without sufficient consultation with the State Department, the defense establishment, and our allies.

What moved the President we do not know. Whether he was thinking of Jewish votes in the November election, as his critics charge, or whether he was trying to beat Russia to a decision which she has not yet taken, or whatever his motives, he made his sudden move in the most costly manner.

He left the State Department demoralized, the Defense Department unprepared, our UN delegation helpless, and our foreign allies feeling they had been double-crossed.

Less than 24 hours before proclamation of the state of Israel, which was followed in 21 minutes by Truman recognition, the Israelite foreign minister-designate announced that Secretary Marshall had warned the Jews against such a step. The White House now claims that Secretary Marshall and Undersecretary Lovett were notified of the Truman change in policy in advance—how long in advance is not said. Other State Department officials and our UN delegation, representing American policy on Palestine, knew nothing of it.

Our delegate in the Palestine session of the UN had to confess he had no information. He had to telephone Washington to find out, and then belatedly confirm the fact to the UN to the accompaniment of general ridicule.

The London and Paris governments, with which President Truman was supposed to be working for a peaceful Palestine settlemen within the UN, were not informed; nor were our ambassadors abroad who were negotiating.

Foreign governments are saying that the United States cannot be trusted and that American diplomats cannot be believed when they represent American policy.

When the President kicks in the teeth America's allies, not to mention his own official representatives—

I think he ought to, Mr. President. I think he is very smart, kicking all these folk in the teeth. They seem to like it. The Republicans come right back for another helping of bipartisan baloney. Let him kick them around. It says:

When the President kicks in the teeth America's allies, not to mention his own official representatives, he is injuring our closest foreign relations at a time of world peril. If it were necessary to turn the entire Moslem world against us and jeopardize our defenses in the Middle East and north Africa, it certainly was not necessary to insult the British and French Governments—the two largest Christian powers in the Moslem world, upon whose friendship we are now even more dependent.

We are not here discussing the merits of recognition of Israel. But in any case no major American foreign policy, much less a reversal, should ever be decided suddenly and without careful preparation at home and abroad. By violating that rule of government and of common sense, President Truman has brought ridicule and reproach upon America.

If the President had taken his position openly and stood for it consistently, he would have won respect at least. As it is, he has earned distrust for his country.

I have here an article by Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. President. I am sorry to say that it is hard to keep up with Mrs. Roosevelt lately. We cannot tell on which side of an issue she will be. One day she will condemn Russia and the next day she will condemn us, over the same issue, practically. But, nevertheless, she does have a good argument on this particular issue of the note which Mr. Bedell Smith delivered to Mr. Molotov. She says, "Why should we have to deny we want peace?" That is the heading which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Monday, May 17. The article is dated New York, Sunday. She says:

I am not quite sure I feel very happy over the barrage we have felt it necessary to put out to deny Soviet accusations that we were making a move for peace.

That is the way I felt about it, Mr. President. Why should we feel compelled to deny that we were even open to talk the matter over at all?

Mrs. Roosevelt goes on to say:

I thought whatever was said, we were the ones who felt the need for further conversations. As a matter of fact, most of us knew the U. S. S. R. couldn't make any one, except their own people, believe that. Perhaps their own people needed a little encouragement.

Nevertheless, why should we feel it necessary to deny so vehemently that we intended to make a move for peace when heaven knows everything that we do in these days is directed toward that end? We do not want the Russians to think that we are afraid of them and are coming hat in hand to beg for more conversations.

But I can't see why we have to deny that we try to bring about better understanding between us.

In fact, Mr. President, very few people approved of our stand when the Russians said they wanted to talk peace. If I recall correctly, I believe Walter Lippmann and nearly all the other experts on foreign affairs said we made a terrible mistake in stating to all the world that we did not even want to talk about peace, and that it was only an accident. I think Sumner Welles commented on how terribly incompetently the whole matter had been handled.

Mr. President, I was mentioning awhile ago our foreign policy based on the United Nations and wanting to work through the United Nations. The New York Times of May 6, 1948, quotes Sir John Boyd Orr, noted Britisher, as saying:

Full stomachs are the answer to communism, but the United States won't or can't understand this. The United States talks about Russian misuses of the veto, but the United States itself has vetoed, and therefore destroyed, a world plan to feed the world without a blueprint, and we were ready to go ahead. Then America said, "No."

Yes, Mr. President, some people are forever berating Russia and never saying anything about what we do. It is just too ridiculous. None of us is perfect. If we would just realize that we should give the Russians credit for the decent things they do, if they were only publicized widely, the situation would be much improved. We have been told that there is no war propaganda in Russia. That was the statement of Eddy Gilmore. If we would let the people know such things, and then go to the Russians in good faith and tell them we will be glad to go home and stay there, if they will do the same, and that we would be glad to get rid of our weapons if they will do the same, we could do all of those things with no appeasement.

I was recently in Detroit. It was on the day after the exchange of notes, and there was an editorial in the Detroit Free Press, which is quite a famous newspaper. The heading of the editorial is as follows:

Shall we drift into war because we lack leadership?

Of course, Mr. President, we have the leadership of a bipartisan coalition, presumably the best brains of both old parties. But if they have not made a mess of things I never saw one. If we had leadership we might do something sensible. In November, of course, the American people will choose Henry Wallace as their leader, and then we will get on the right track, establish peace in the world, and work out a sensible program at home, using a few of the billions of dollars we have appropriated for guns to make this a better country in which to live.

But to get back to the editorial in the Detroit Free Press, there is a picture of Mr. Stalin seated at a table. Across from him is Uncle Sam, with his silk hat on the table, but there is no head protruding from the figure of Uncle Sam. On his brief case are the words, "Blundering United States diplomacy. No head."

That is correct. The bipartisan policy has no head. If we elect Henry Wallace we might make the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] our Secretary of State.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question, but not for the acceptance of the proposal.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator in favor of the pay raise?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I might take the job.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, there is a caption under the cartoon in which Uncle Joe is pictured as trying to talk to a headless Uncle Sam regarding our foreign policy. The caption is:

Even Joe must be slightly confused.

I guess he is. The article says:

This newspaper confesses complete bafflement over American policies in relation to foreign affairs.

Who does not, Mr. President? Who is not completely baffled? The article goes on to say:

Stark tragedy faces a might nation that is without guidance.

Too true. It goes on to say that our leaders are dealing with the destinies of the human race, and we must needs stand by helplessly in a terrior of contradiction.

That is correct, Mr. President. We are likely to get into war by using this technique of scaring people and trying to get an armament economy fastened on the Nation, trying to get the Marshall plan to dump our surpluses abroad. We are liable to be scared right into war, and that means the end of life on this planet, of course.

Mr. President, I want to make it plain that this is a quotation because somebody is likely to jump up and call me unpatriotic, a stooge of Stalin, or something, so I want to make it plain that this is quoted. It says:

General George C. Marshall is a valiant old soldier whose years have been spent in selfless service to his country but he is not trained in the arts of diplomacy.

I have said that before, and folks thought I was almost a traitor even to question General Marshall's fitness to be Secretary of State. It continues:

To add to the fused confusions, he is not master of the State Department, but must wait on the opportunistic vagaries of President Truman, who is thinking of precinct votes instead of the single universal issue that confronts all mankind.

And so we have before us this utterly mad contention:

If we make a gesture of peace toward Russia it will be taken as a sign of weakness, so we must not do that.

On the other hand, if Russia makes such a gesture, then we must reject it because the rulers of Russia are not to be trusted under any circumstances.

That is what we have been told, Mr. President. The Detroit Free Press points out how ridiculous it is, how it can only end in disaster, because there is no way out. It continues:

This makes war inevitable because it makes it impossible for the two mightiest powers on earth ever to get together.

We here present the three major problems this Nation has before it with the Soviet Government's position a major factor in each issue.

1. There is the movement to bring about a meeting of minds between Moscow and Washington.

2. There is the Palestine question with Russia and the United States alone going along parallel lines.

3. There is the ending of the efforts in the United Nations to bring about understanding on the regulations of atomic energy. And with that failure the sudden announcement by Washington of far mightier weapons of war in connection with the atom.

Mr. President, we have much better weapons now.

The subhead is "Russia and the Wallace letters." The article states:

Henry Wallace is, to our way of thinking, an utterly naive man in whom erratic emotions have entirely supplanted balance.

I read that because I want to go on and read the rest. They say he is "nuts" and then they agree with him.

His foreign policy, as outlined at his recent appearance in Olympia, is unrealistic as the play fantasies of a little child.

Nevertheless, we do not believe that Henry Wallace's habit of living in a dream world constitutes reason for rejecting the response which his letter to Joseph Stalin has produced.

You see, they say Henry is crazy, and then they say, "Well, by golly, his letter to Stalin got an answer, and we think we ought to do something about it." They will forgive you for saying Henry is crazy, because if you mention Henry nowadays and do not say he is crazy at the same time, the Un-American Activities Committee puts you on its list, and the free press does not want to get on the list, so they say Henry is "nuts." Then they say he is all right. The article continues:

True, the exchange can be attributed to political maneuvering in a campaign year. Wallace wrote his letter as a private citizen—but a private citizen endeavoring to get himself elected President.

I just do not believe that. I believe Henry Wallace is absolutely sincere. If he thought it would best serve the interests of this country for him to get out of this race, anything he thought would be for the best, he would do it; but he thinks, and I think, and millions of other people think, that the only way for our country to get out of this morass of confusion and false policy is to elect Henry Wallace President of the United States. He would be perfectly willing to give it up if he thought it would be the best thing.

I read further from the article:

Stalin's amicable reply could be a shrewd Kremlin maneuver on behalf of the Wallace candidacy. By making it appear that the Wallace letter laid a cornerstone for international accord, canny old Joe Stalin doubtless can help Wallace's nonvestigial political chances.

And the Kremlin certainly would be extremely elated to have Henry Wallace in the White House. Any enemy of the United States would.

Of course, that statement, Mr. President, is absolutely unwarranted, that any enemy of the United States would want Henry Wallace in the White House. But, as I say, they have to say these bad things about him because they are saying that perhaps he is not crazy after all. I read further:

All these things are realized, but we can't go on forever looking for a hidden-ball trick and turning down all overtures. At some point we must sit down with the Russians and discuss formulas for living and letting live.

In other words, they say that Henry is right, after they have called him all the names they can think of.

The only alternative is eventual war. We can't exist forever in a diplomatic stalemate—the fancy camouflaging name for which is "cold war."

What we fear is that the point is rapidly passing where any chance remains for sitting down across the table from the Russians and making an honest effort to wipe out the oppressive, constant threat of a shooting war.

That is right, Mr. President; the Detroit Free Press is absolutely right in that. The time is passing, the time will eventually come when there will be no turning back. We will have gotten so tough that we will just have to go on being tough. Our people will be sold on the idea that anybody who speaks kindly of the Russians or to the Russians is a traitor, and there will be no hope then of ever getting along with the Russians.

The article continues:

Worse, as we drift on and the administration fumbles and postures, we are losing both world confidence and world respect.

Events are making us and not the Russians the obdurate ones; the ones who shout "No" to every proposal. No propaganda skill is necessary to make our antics appear to dash all hope that peace can be realized.

This is a very severe indictment of this bipartisan foreign policy that is being so blithely accepted and promulgated and continued by the press of both the old parties. It says:

All you have to do is to tell the unornamented story. Over the rest of the world it can't help but make us look like the badies and the Russians the goodies—to borrow film studio terminology.

Though it was kept from Americans many months—

Mind you, Mr. President—

Though it was kept from Americans many months—

The Americans do not get the truth any more unless it suits somebody's purpose to let them find it out; just like they are not finding out the truth about this newsman who was murdered over in Greece. They have hushed it all up because they are afraid that we will find out the truth, and get mad at the Greek Fascists we are supporting and might not give them any more money. So they hush the whole matter up.

Though it was kept from Americans many months, as far as back as last January the Russians made diplomatic approaches. Contact was arranged through Robert Murphy, our political adviser to Gen. Lucius Clay in Germany.

Statements were made that these overtures had been made. Our State Department denied it flatly. Later it comes out that it did happen. They just lie to us. The people in charge of our country, the bipartisan coalition, have no responsibility to the democratic traditions of this country at all, Mr. President. They keep information from us and let us have it to suit their purposes.

The editorial continues:

They (the Russians) sought a meeting between Premier Stalin and President Truman and were willing to stage it on neutral ground—in Stockholm. It was even hinted that such a conference might cancel what Russia considered the necessity for steps it has since taken in Czechoslovakia and Finland.

There you are, Mr. President. In other words the Russians told us, "We want to talk things over; we would like to arrive at a peaceful settlement with you; but if you will not talk to us we are going to have to take certain measures in Czechoslovakia and Finland." And we said, "Well, we are not going to talk. We do not care what you do." So Russia did what she did, and then we are flabbergasted and profess great surprise and shock at what happened.

What the Detroit Free Press is saying—not what I am saying, Mr. President—is that we sold out Czechoslovakia and Finland. If we had been willing to sit down and discuss these differences, and call off the cold war, there might have been a chance of stopping what happened there.

The editorial continues:

Secretary Marshall rejected the whole proposition, and it is even rumored that Murphy found himself in bad for having made even preliminary moves toward the accord.

Is not that a sad commentary on the state of affairs in the handling of American foreign policy? If some well-meaning fellow even sounds out somebody on the possibilities of peace he is ostracized and made a villain, and probably will lose his job. We do not even want to talk peace to anybody. We are just tough. We have got the atom bomb with which we can kill everybody in the world. We have got all the oil, and are doing fine.

The editorial continues:

Then only last week, it was revealed that our Moscow diplomat, Ambassador Walter Bedell Smith, had delivered to the Kremlin a note which outlined our position, and in so many words told the Russians that we stood ready to meet with them at any time.

Like Murphy, Smith found his action promptly disowned and discredited. When the Russians accepted it in what ought to have been accepted as good faith, official Washington promptly steamed itself up over what it said was a breach of protocol.

They said it was not cricket for the Russians to publish Bedell Smith's note. I guess they forgot that just a little while ago we printed a lot of secret papers, and it was said that it was the first time in all history that one nation had printed secret documents about another nation that was supposed to be friendly to it at the time. But we printed them and broke all precedents. Yet we got all excited because the Russians would print a note we sent them telling them that we would be glad to talk peace. I do not see what is secret about that.

Russia has published the contents of Smith's note and the Kremlin answer.

That is all it was.

In the midst of this artificially induced heat, State Department spokesmen spouted balderdash about the Russians having misunderstood what we meant. They couldn't have. Here are Ambassador Smith's words:

"As far as the United States is concerned, the door is always open for full discussions and the composing of all differences."

Mr. President, I think this discussion of foreign affairs, our refusal to discuss peace terms with the Russians to end the cold war, are very pertinent to this question of the draft. If we could make peace with the Russians there certainly would be no need for this idiotic draft. There is no need for it any more, because we have enough atom bombs to kill everybody in the world, so I do not see that it makes any difference whether we draft them first or kill them first.

The editorial continues:

If Stalin wasn't thoroughly confused and suspicious after that incident, he was a minority of one.

That is right. The whole world wondered what in the world was going on here.

All the rest of the world assuredly was (confused).

Now, taking the Wallace letter as his springboard, he has made another overture. And it ill behooves the Government of this country to remain aloof because it is easy to cite possible ulterior motives.

That is right. Simply because Henry Wallace thought it up they figure it cannot be any good. When they think that, they ought to think about hybrid corn, Mr. President. Wallace thought that up, and it is pretty fair.

It can't help but be known to readers of this page that we have no friendship for Henry Wallace—

No; after reading the first of the article we gather that—

that as a public figure we regard him as being of such light weight that he wouldn't register on an apothecary's scale.

That is pretty light. I read an article recently by, I believe, Mr. Reston, of the New York Times, published in the Times magazine pointing out some fallacies of our foreign policies, and even Mr. Reston, who is a conservative through and through, felt impelled, after he had gotten a few paragraphs into his article, to devote a paragraph to denying that he was a Communist, saying that he was not a Communist.

And so it is. If you are going to write anything about Henry Wallace and suggest that he has any good sense at all, then you have got to write two paragraphs for every one in praise of him, saying that he is idiotic completely, but something happened here, and Wallace had a fool idea which worked out pretty good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. I am just trying to find my place. All right; here we go. The editorial says:

But in the matter of our relationships with Russia and the prospect of bettering them. Henry Wallace is, after all, a private citizen. And if any private citizen in this Nation—no matter what his own standing or competence—wrote a letter that brought a diplomatically favorable response from the Kremlin that would urge that the opportunity this afforded be seized upon.

Naturally, it is necessary to go into any negotiations with our eyes open.

The whole purpose of any diplomatic parleying is to obtain your own ends. And only the hopelessly innocent will suppose that the opposition isn't equally selfish.

The process is not one of attaining clean, complete victory for either side, but somehow to adjust the claims and aspirations so that there will be no need to set armies marching. Compromise has to be accepted.

Nor is honest compromise anything like appeasement. It is a measure to avoid war by creating a reasonably equitable even if not perfect condition. Yet the administration and our diplomacy persists in only one task—that of ferreting out darksome explanations for why the Russians should want to make a try for mutual understanding.

Never give them credit for one honest motive—one sincere wish to bring about peace in the world. Just keep plugging on the old propaganda that the Russians are no good at all. If Eddy Gilmore writes an article saying that there is no war propaganda in Russia, put it over on the third page somewhere.

Better men would make the try and desist only after they discovered the trick—if there was one to be discovered.

That makes sense. That is exactly the program Henry Wallace has in mind—to try sincerely, all out—to reach an agreement with the Russians. After that there is plenty of time to fight. We have not tried.

They would be willing to subscribe to the belief of Benjamin Franklin that "there never was a good war or a bad peace."

For, by their every act and word, the mouthpieces for the White House—

I interpolate to say the bipartisan mouthpieces in our foreign policy—

make it apparent that they believe the only solution of our relations with Russia is to maintain two armed camps.

We cannot do that forever, worse luck.

Not only is life in an armed camp uncomfortable. The perpetuation of two of them makes war inevitable. When nations have differences to settle and one of them refuses to talk it over—to show even the beginning of good will and high purpose—the ultimate means of settlement can't be anything else but battle.

Our Washington leadership prefers to invite that rather than concede that Henry Wallace has been the instrument for giving us still another opening to make peace with the Soviet.

They finally got around to saying it. After condemning Henry to keep themselves in the clear, so that they would not lose all their advertisers, they become pro-Wallace. After taking him over the coals, they finally say:

Our Washington leadership prefers to invite that rather than concede that Henry Wallace has been the instrument for giving us still another opening to make peace with the Soviets.

If the men in the Kremlin are feeling dizzy, we don't blame them. More, we thing they probably share their dizziness with most of America.

Henry Wallace surely is not the only one who is dizzy, if he is, trying to keep up with our foreign policy.

RUSSIA AND THE PALESTINE ISSUE

The world may share a sense of bafflement when it contemplates the United States and Russia, acting through the United Nations, as the apostles of peace in an effort to force a truce upon Israel and the Arabs.

It is not so unusual, perhaps, that power powers should be seeking a peaceful settlement, as it is a strange contradiction that they should select the UN as the vehicle.

The United States made the first move, asking the Security Council to intervene to the extent of demanding that both the Jews and Arabs cease firing within 36 hours and rest on their arms in the positions each now holds.

Out of the big five members of the Security Council, only Russia gave immediate approval and support to the American proposals.

We have, as a result, the picture of the two greatest and most powerful nations on the earth which have long made the UN the battleground for their own cold war, joining hands and standing alone in favor of a principle which none of the other member nations have so far accepted.

That, however, is not the only contradiction in the situation.

Last Friday, President Truman rushed his announcement of this Nation's recognition of the new state of Israel.

It was done without reference to the United Nations to which the whole problem of Palestine had been previously referred.

On each point which this country had placed before the UN, beginning with the question of partition, President Truman has reversed himself by resorting to ex parte measures, completely bypassing UN.

And now, after following the same course, and after Israel's independence has become a recognized fact, the administration in Washington seeks peace in Palestine through an appeal to the Security Council.

Considering our wavering, our emotionalism, and our side glances toward political expediency, it is not to be wondered at that the other member nations treat our new proposals cooly and wrap themselves protectively in a wait-and-see attitude. It must be as puzzling to them as to see Russia and this country, allied within the Security Council, working together for peace.

With dissension between Russia and the United States within the UN having all but wrecked that organization; with a clique of vocal Members of the United States Senate demanding in effect that Russia be expelled from the UN, it is proper to ask what machinery we now have to enforce our demands for an armistice in Palestine.

Mr. President, recently there has been a rash of resolutions introduced in the Senate, presumably to strengthen the United Nations. I started it in 1945, shortly after the atomic bombs had fallen, on October 24, 1945. I decided that the United Nations, in view of the atom bomb, was inadequate, so I introduced a resolution calling upon the Senate to go on record as asking the President to call a meeting of the United Nations with the object of changing the United Nations into a federated world government, a real republic patterned after what ours used to be like. I say "used to be like" advisedly, Mr. President.

I went around trying to persuade Senators to act with me as sponsors of the resolution. They would read it and say, "That is a good idea. It is the only solution. We must have something strong." I would say, "Do you want to sponsor the resolution with me?" They would say, "No. It is a good idea for you, but not for me."

I am afraid that one thing most Senators fear more than anything else is being called an idealist—getting out on a limb a little ahead of the parade. Most of them are like a gentleman in the French Revolution. He saw the mob going down the street. He looked out

the window and said, "There goes the mob. I am their leader. I must follow them."

I do not feel that way. I drafted the resolution. I could not get any Senators to sponsor it with me, so I introduced it on October 24, 1945.

Last year I decided to introduce another resolution, not quite as broad, merely strengthening the United Nations to make it possible for them to enact, interpret, and enforce world law. I took that around and showed it to some people—not to Senators. They said, "Wait; we want to get you some cosponsors on this resolution."

So I waited from about March to July, and kept on asking what was going on, all the time. Finally, after an endless amount of work, they got several Senators to act as cosponsors of the resolution. Of course, they simply took my resolution and presented it as their own—these outsiders—and got other Senators to act as cosponsors. Those who presented it to the other Senators were afraid that if they presented it with my name on it, that would ruin its chances, because, after all, ain't I a friend of Joe's? Then after they got those Senators to endorse it, they let me put my name on the bottom of it.

Then they decided they would go see Secretary of State Marshall about it. After seeing him, they came back with it; but by that time the insides had been cut out of the resolution, and there was nothing left of it but the beginning and the end, and it meant nothing at all by that time. However, they introduced it.

So I went ahead and introduced a good resolution, and I got some sponsors for it in short order.

Now they have introduced another group, this year; but this year these resolutions are not designed to strengthen the United Nations. They are not designed to keep peace in the world. These new resolutions are part of the bipartisan scheme just to kick Russia clear out of the family of nations, out of the United Nations, out of everything. The resolution that was passed here the other day was a sorry thing. We argued first that it was simply arming us to fight Russia, but we were assured that was not the case at all, but that it was a good resolution.

How did the press play it up the other day? They knew the truth; you cannot fool them. They said, "Senate Authorizes Arms for Europe." They knew what it was.

Mr. President, there are many people who pay lip service to the United Nations, but do not really care anything about the United Nations. They are in favor of destroying it, because the cartelists and the monopolists and our home-grown Junkers, the militarists, see the profits to be made by prolonging this cold war and making it possible to ship goods all over the world—free samples by which our industrialists will get markets. It is simply terrible the way the United Nations has been kicked around, until now it is almost dead.

In fact, today it is not possible to obtain the appropriation of money for the building of the headquarters of the United Nations. I almost wish the money for the headquarters would not be appropriated; I wish the headquarters would be taken to Switzerland or some other country. I think the United Nations would have a better chance there than in the United States, with all the saboteurs that we have in this country, who try to undermine the United Nations. I think the United Nations would be better off in some other country, where war is more real to the people, and where they have a genuine desire to have peace. I was greatly put out about the failure to appropriate money for the United Nations headquarters until I began to think that the United Nations might have a better chance to succeed if it were located in some other country where not so many lobbyists would be around.

But to go back to the editorial in the Detroit Free Press, it says:

> Do the other nations expect that America and Russia—the new-found friends on the Israel issue—will send forces into Palestine to police that unhappy land and to enforce peace?

Of course, our boys will not permit the Russians to send any forces into Palestine. Our boys will not permit the Russians to do anything. They make the Russians stay out. They treat the Russians like Negroes are treated in this country; they discriminate against them. The editorial also says:

> Let the matter be proposed and see how long Russia and the United States continue to hold hands.

It was proposed, and the whole thing was blown up, of course. We would not have anything more to do with partition when the Russians agreed to it; that made it bad right away. The editorial further says:

> Will moral suasion alone be resorted to? What foundations have Russia and this country laid which would make a moral appeal reasonable?
>
> The United Nations up to now has been largely ineffective because of the failure of Russia and the United States to compose their own differences.

Mr. President, I should like to say here that all the differences between us and Russia on the United Nations and all the failures of the United Nations have not been because of the use of the veto by Russia. Great Britain and ourselves have made the Russians veto one issue after another. We did it deliberately; we tried to think of things that we knew the Russians would have to veto. Mr. President, that is not my statement; it is the statement of Sumner Welles, the foremost writer on foreign affairs in this country, and certainly no howling liberal.

He said the other day that the failure of the Security Council was not due to any Soviet veto, but was due entirely to the cynical approach to the matter by Great Britain and, more particularly, he said, by the United States.

Mr. President, I like to quote such statements, because then if someone calls me a tool of Stalin—just because I tell the truth—I can give the source.

The editorial further says:

> Under the circumstances can it be hoped that they—

Meaning Russia and the United States—

> can now work together to solve the problems of the rest of the world?

Here is another part of this editorial:

> RUSSIA AND THE ATOMIC BOMB
>
> In embracing the Wallace proposals as a means of achieving accord between this Nation and Russia, Marshall Stalin declared that one of the objectives would be a general reduction of armaments and outlawing the atomic bomb.
>
> And simultaneously with his statement comes the announcement that the United Nations' Atomic Energy Commission, which has been seeking a mutually acceptable basis for atomic control, has given up the job as hopeless, and closed up shop.
>
> And if that is not enough for one day, the White House announces a whole new arsenal of atomic tricks, with more powerful weapons developed by this country in its tests at Eniwetok.
>
> It boils down to this: For months the UN has been seeking some means to control atomic energy on an international level so that it could not be used for purposes of warfare.
>
> The Commission began its work in the first place on the assumption that the United States, the only power to possess the atom secret, was willing to put it away for keeps if other countries—particularly Russia—would not stock pile atomic weapons when it had developed the formula for making them.
>
> A provision, laid down by this country, required all atomic development facilities, our own included, to be open to international inspection.
>
> Thus the United States made a gesture of its good intentions.
>
> They were rejected by Russia, and now, as the UN Atomic Energy Commission goes out of business, Stalin talks of his desire for disarmament and outlawing the bomb.
>
> Is this just a bid for empty talk which will lead us nowhere but into another impasse?
>
> Is it a device by which Russia seeks to step outside of the UN to obtain a concession which she was unable to get through that organization?
>
> The United States made what all the world outside of Russia could have interpreted as a sincere desire to cooperate and to eliminate from the minds of all men the fear of the most deadly, the most destructive and diabolical instrument ever devised.
>
> And then, as a token of how much we meant it, the administration declares that we have gone beyond anything that was demonstrated at Nagasaki and Hiroshima. We have refined the atomic weapon, presumably to the point where the original bomb is now almost obsolete, and President Truman declares a new program of development in the light of achievements at Eniwetok.
>
> We have questioned the sincerity of the Russians. Who is to blame if our own professions of good will and good intent also are brought under suspicion?
>
> And, finally, just to make the puzzle a little harder, it can be pointed out that the collapse of the Atomic Energy Commission occurred within the framework of that same United Nations in which Russia and the United States are now joined in a policy designed to end the war in Palestine.
>
> Peace, we have both decreed, must descend on Israel and the Arabs.
>
> But we can no longer talk within the UN-AEC about peace between ourselves.
>
> The atom race just goes on.

Yes, Mr. President, the atom race just goes on, to extinction. As I said earlier, we have within our power enough bombs

to destroy life on this planet, to make all the world uninhabitable.

Here is a very pertinent article by Scott Nearing. Scott Nearing is one of America's really great men. He has devoted himself unselfishly to a study of our economic and political problems. The article reads:

AS OTHERS SEE US

The people who are saying hard things about Soviet foreign policy would gain a better understanding of the situation if they would put the shoe on the other foot.

If the Soviet Union:

1. Possessed the secret of the atomic bomb and
2. Were doing its best to keep it from us, meanwhile
3. Building up a stock pile of the bombs.
4. Maintaining an army larger than ever before in its history and
5. A navy larger than all the other navies of the world combined,
6. Proposing to introduce universal military training in time of so-called peace,
7. Allowing her army and navy officers to talk openly of attacking us before we should have time to recover from our war effort and perhaps learn to make our own atomic bombs,
8. Carrying on a press and radio campaign to foment suspicion and hostility toward us,
9. Seizing and holding military bases along both our frontiers (Iceland, Greenland, the islands of the Pacific),
10. Sending naval expeditions into northern waters for special training in Arctic warfare,
11. Maintaining its most powerful naval unit near our shores (eastern Mediterranean), and armed forces along our frontier (Germany, Italy, Trieste, Greece, China, Korea, Japan),
12. Welding South and Central America into a military bloc and standardizing Latin American, British, and Russian war equipment; and if
13. The Greek Catholic Church were offering to lead a holy war against us; and if
14. Marshal Stalin arranged and officially sponsored a public ceremony at which a former British prime minister, who had twice tried to overthrow our Government and our economic system, was highly honored and, in his address, urged an alliance between our two most powerful rivals—

What would we think of Generalissimo Truman and Foreign Commissar Marshall if they did not work night and day to see that the United States had friendly governments in every capital from Canada to Argentina and if they did not move heaven and earth to discover the secret of the atomic bomb?

Let us try to see ourselves as others see us.

Surely, Mr. President, that is a very good admonition at this time in history when relations are so strained.

Mr. President, due to the fact that there is no order in the Chamber and no attempt made to keep order, I shall talk to myself from here on out. [Laughter.]

Here, Mr. President, is a feature written by Arthur Gaeth, a well-known radio commentator. He is one of the very few liberal radio commentators left, for the simple reason that most of them have been kicked off the air. Mr. Gaeth is still there, because he works for the United Electrical Workers. They have a radio program on which he broadcasts. That is why he is still on the air. That is why he can be liberal and is liberal. "Let the People Speak" is the title of his radio program, and this particular one is entitled "War Hysteria and Propaganda," broadcast No. 57, May 17, 1948. He said:

ARTHUR GAETH. Hello friends, in Moscow. Premier Stalin answered the open letter Henry Wallace read at a Madison Square Garden rally late Friday. Said Stalin: "The letter was one of the most important political documents of recent times." The main thing is that Mr. Wallace in his letter makes an open and honest attempt to get a concrete program for peaceful settlement. Stalin said Russia is ready to negotiate the settlement of differences between the two countries if the United States is willing. For a week now that Ambassador Smith-Molotov exchange of ideas has been in the frying plan. Only today Walter Lippmann wrote critically that the State Department ought to think out carefully how it intends to conduct its diplomacy before it tries to engage in it. A few days ago in the New York Times, James Reston's article maintained that the existing stalemates between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could not be broken merely by demanding that the Russians break them. Secretary Marshall's insistence that the UN, so often bypassed, do it also came in for comment.

The United Nations probably never could have come into being had not Harry Hopkins gone personally to Moscow to secure agreement on two issues plaguing the big powers. Max Lerner wants to know what we are trying to avert—war or peace.

There is the United Press article in many of your newspapers tonight, "United States seeks a balance of power before entering Red talks." It states the United States wants to restore the balance of power in Europe and, therefore, slammed the door when Molotov put his foot into it. The article concludes that while the people of the world are tired of constant war talk and want and believe the Russians and Americans can get together, our State Department is not willing to negotiate at present because it thinks the Russians have the advantage.

It's war hysteria produced by propaganda which is plaguing the people of the world, and particularly us here in America. We are preparing to invest up to $15,000,000,000 a year for quite some time—but what about peace endeavors?

Back in the 1930's, when the great prophet and world historian, H. G. Wells, was still alive, he described the pattern which was leading to World War II. Big business and finance in Great Britain and the United States, said Wells, were afraid of socialization of their own industries. They were even frightened by change, so they embarked on a propaganda program against it. They decided to rebuild Germany to the tune of billions. They recognized Hitler, closed their eyes to his actions, figured he was their stooge; but, gangster that he was, he shook down the bosses, hoping to take over. And he almost did. If Wells were alive today he would probably embellish on the old pattern, redrawing the position of Russia and pushing Great Britain out, with the United States of America going it alone—but for Germany there would be the same role. And there would be power politics, a great hysteria and propaganda game going on, financiers and militarists playing their roles. For world war III is in the making unless many people soon get a lot of sense.

Here in New York, Prof. Clyde R. Miller, of Teachers College, has long been a student of propaganda. He has just written a new pamphlet for the commission of propaganda analysis of the Methodist Federation for Social Action. It is all about propaganda. I transcribed an interview with Professor Miller. When I asked him how less than three short years after the most destructive war known to humanity we have gotten ourselves into the mental state for another war, he replied:

Professor MILLER. Mr. Gaeth, a country doesn't get itself into that state; the people in the country are gotten into that state by certain propagandists who operate through government, press, radio, church, schools, labor unions, patriotic groups, other groups, channels through which propaganda flows.

Mr. GAETH. Now, are we really in great danger or are we the subjects of extensive propaganda at the present time? What are the techniques being used on us?

Professor MILLER. Well, Mr. Gaeth, I think we are in great danger and chiefly because we are the unconscious subjects of propaganda which we don't even know is propaganda.

Mr. GAETH. Well now, what are these propagandists actually aiming at; what are they trying to do to us?

Professor MILLER. I don't know. I have several theories or ideas. There may be three or four aims involved. One of them may be the actual aim of preparation for war against Russia with the continuous day-after-day drumming up of a war hysteria against Russia. Number two—that may not be the real aim, that may be only the apparent aim—the real aim may be to give Congress and the people the reason for supporting compulsory military training and the renewal of the draft so that we will have millions of young men being trained in the Army and the other armed forces. And the purpose for that may be the fear of a coming depression, Mr. Gaeth. And you recall the last depression hundreds of thousands of young fellows wandered about the country and there was a good bit of confusion and chaos. This time it may well be that these young fellows are disciplined by the Army and to be called back into the Army to preserve law and order amongst themselves and amongst others. Then there is the third reason and that may be that this war hysteria is being whipped up simply to make it possible for a Democratic candidate or one of the Republican candidates to ride into office on the basis of its being almost treasonable not to vote for a man who wants the fullest preparation for a war in a time of apparent great danger.

Mr. GAETH. Now, when I stated that it would seem that the basis for going to war was much more a propaganda one than an actual one, that we really didn't have all the reasons for going to war held out for us, Professor Miller replied:

Professor MILLER. Well, I can't help but agree with you on that, Mr. Gaeth.

Mr. GAETH. Now, Professor Miller, what are the dangers of such name calling as the Russians and we Americans are engaging in?

Professor MILLER. Well, the danger of such name calling is very simple. The use of violent words directed by one person against another frequently can cause violent action. Now, if that is true of a few individuals hurling bad names at one another, it can also be true of the peoples of two nations or the propagandists of two nations whipping up hysteria amongst their peoples, breaking out in violence, in war.

Mr. GAETH. In other words, if we are driving for peace we don't use war technique and war propagandists to produce a peaceful state of affairs?

Professor MILLER. Right—if we are driving for peace we would use the methods of the peace maker and not the war maker if we really are sincere in the drive for peace.

Mr. GAETH. But then I wanted to know how we can sift the chaff from the wheat, what test could be applied to propaganda to determine whether we were being misled, and Professor Miller answered:

Professor MILLER. Well, first we ought to know what propaganda is. And I have tried to set that forth in a little booklet I did for a Methodist group, the Methodist Federation for Social Action, recently. And what is propaganda—it is nothing more or less than an attempt to persuade someone to do some-

thing. And it can be good or bad, depending on what you think is good or bad. I think the United States Constitution is good, and the Declaration of Independence is good, and the great ethics in all religions is good, and I think that good health is good, and propaganda that would persuade people to live up to those ethics and obligations and to have good health, I would say, would be good propaganda.

Secondly, we ought to know how propaganda works. It works both at the brain level and what you might call the spinal cord level. At the brain level, if I am a propagandist and I am trying to persuade you to do something, I attempt, if I am an honest and rational person, to martial relevant facts and opinions; and if you are a rational person you attempt to weigh those and come to a conclusion that is based upon those relevant facts and opinions. That is all open and above board and you are conscious of the process and so am I. Now, at the spinal cord level, we react to certain words and phrases such as "Communist" in America or "Capitalist" in Russia as bad words, and we are conditioned automatically to reject and condemn any person or program thus labeled.

Mr. GAETH. Now, when I asked if we Americans had a basis or a set of standards for judging good or bad propaganda, Professor Miller replied:

Professor MILLER. I think we in America are very fortunate, because we have in this country three things—first, we have the various religious groups, and their ethics make a common denominator of righteousness; secondly, we have the Declaration of Independence which is a wonderful ethical statement; and thirdly, we have our United States Constitution which implements that Declaration of Independence with concrete rights and obligations. Now, you wouldn't want any better standard for measuring propaganda than the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution. And, incidentally, you wouldn't want any better standard of government than those.

Mr. GAETH. A song may help us see the Red scare in a new light; the lyrics are by my friend E. Y. Harburg whose Broadway musical Finian's Rainbow has played to packed houses for more than 500 performances. This music is the old folk tune Molly Malone. Now here is comely Betty Sanders with her guitar presenting E. Y. Harburg's The Red Herring:

Miss SANDERS (singing The Red Herring):

"I'll sing you a ditty about Munich's fair city
Where a poor paperhanger hung out long ago,
Till he got an idea, a bright panacea,
Selling herring, red herring, alive, alive-o.

"With Goebbels and Goering he sold that red herring
To Quisling, Laval, and the boys in the know.
Europe fell like a sparrow beneath that wheelbarrow
Filled with herring, red herring, alive, alive-o.

"Now this red herring master soon met with disaster,
His wits were a-blitzed and his Fritz was laid low,
But his red-herring notion leaped over the ocean
And landed in Wall Street, alive, alive-o.

"Now Wall Street is bloomin', they sold it to Truman,
A nice little crisis for raisin' the dough,
The dough that will cure up the ills of all Europe,
Red herring, red herring, alive, alive-o.

"Now taxpaying millions are shelling out billions
For herring that Goering had sold long ago,
But American fellers have developed their smellers
And they'll bury that herring, alive, alive-o."

Mr. GAETH. Thank you, Betty Sanders, nicely done. And when war hysteria and propaganda aims to raise our temperatures we'll think of "the Red herring."

Next week I will deal with a crisis from within—three members of the Yale faculty will discuss the Mundt bill.

And now good night until next week at this same time.

In his broadcast Mr. Gaeth asked: "What are we trying to avert, war or peace?" I think that is a very pertinent question, Mr. President. What are we trying to avert in this country, war or peace? It looks as though we got more excited when it seemed we were going to have peace with the Russians than we do when it appears we are going to have war.

I might have sung that little ditty, Mr. President, but I expect it would have been absolutely against the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, that is a pretty good example of what is going on in America. They just scare the people silly with this red herring, telling them that the Communists are going to get them, so they can pass most any sort of legislation. Honestly, the poor folks remind me of the sheep of Australia. There is some kind of a bird there that lights on the backs of the sheep and picks out their kidneys and they die. They are so dumb they do not know what is going on. The poor people of America have no way of knowing what is going on. The newspapers and magazines and radio are just full of propaganda against Russia, and all for this armaments program, saddling an army on the people, just like the one Hitler had, just exactly, all these programs for them to give up the right of free speech and assembly, telling them that if they do not, the Communists are going to get them. The poor folks are just beside themselves, do not know what to do, so they just continue to work on them.

Mr. President, I was following a prepared statement awhile ago when I got sidetracked. I do not believe I had finished it. I have the statement right here now. I was telling about the President's Commission to look into the necessity for the draft. They turned in their report, and the only thing the Senate Armed Services Committee accepted was the draft, and that was the small part of the report. They said we needed a draft, but they told of all the other things we needed to go with it—assurances that there would be no discrimination, and things of that sort. But we have none of those things as it is now before the Senate.

They have asked me to permit them to appoint conferees, but one of my colleagues gave me a note a moment ago which said, "The conferees are ready to report." They do not care about whether they are appointed or not; they have gone ahead and held their conference, and, as I said earlier in the day, whenever they get the floor they will pull a request to appoint conferees out of one pocket and the conference report out of the other pocket. I will take awhile longer on the strength of that.

The ablest propagandists for military training, of course, have been, not the military themselves, but the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training.

Mr. President, as long as there is order in the Chamber I shall try to talk so people can hear me. When there is not order, I shall talk to the reporter.

I hasten to add that I have not seen any of these distinguished gentlemen who wrote the report in the forefront of those demanding that their principles, on which I have just touched, be retained intact in the military version of the draft we have before us. It does seem that, inasmuch as they wrote this report, they would be speaking up in behalf of their findings, and insisting that something be done about it, not just letting it go by the board by default, as they have been doing. These were able, representative American citizens who prepared this report of the President on the draft. But they are distinguished propagandists for all that, and they put out a fine report, very well set up, placed on sale throughout the country in a cheap edition for everyone to read. They have lent their names to an endeavor and enterprise of great seriousness.

This distinguished commission tells us that military training programs would have a great number of benefits. In their summary they list 12 such benefits. I assume these benefits accrue even more to the draft which would lengthen the time of service of our young men. After all, if the benefit of 6 months' or a year's training are so great, the benefits of 2 years' training should be either four or twice as great, perhaps even greater for the smaller number involved.

Let us consider these benefits in the light of the committee's insistence that segregation and discrimination must be a permanent part of the system. The first benefit offered by the Commission is that training would shorten the time in which our effective fighting force could be mobilized in case of war.

But segregation and discrimination, by barring the full use of one-tenth of our eligible people, acts in a contrary direction. Instead of shortening the time for mobilization, segregation and discrimination act to lengthen the time, because it introduces the factor of selecting men not on the basis of their ability to fight but on the color of their skin or perhaps the language they have used at home or even their religion.

The second alleged benefit is that it would give our young men the essentials of military training that would be the basic prerequisites for technical, specialized, or unit training in an emergency; and training saves lives. That is a curious argument about the need for a specialized army which I shall not discuss here. But it is important to note that this means training is supposed to fit men to move into higher and more specialized training, which all competent military authorities agree is necessary for modern warfare.

But the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and Air Force insist that this does not apply to all men, but only to some men. If there are Negroes, for example,

who are highly qualified for such specialized training, the military tell us and this bill writes into law, that they shall not be permitted to move freely across the barrier of segregation and discrimination into positions of training where they are of most use. Yes, indeed, as the Commission says, "training saves lives"—but only training of part of our manpower, not the training of the full complement of the manhood of America.

The third alleged benefit of training, according to the Commission, is that it would make possible an effective National Guard and Organized Army, Navy, Air, and Marine Reserves capable of rapid absorption into the professional Military Establishment in time of war. But again, if we apply the test which the military demands that we apply by their dictatorial ukase on segregation and discrimination, the effectiveness of the National Guard and the Reserves is reduced by so much as the armed forces practice segregation and discrimination. Again, the alleged benefit is destroyed or nullified by discrimination and segregation. As we have seen from the exchange of correspondence between the Secretary of the Army and the Governor of New Jersey, the Army intends to abide by the pattern of segregation in the National Guard, despite the President's order to abolish segregation and discrimination. This means the Army will see to it that the effectiveness of the National Guard will be reduced, if the Army can help it, by all those practices of segregation which bar the complete and wholehearted use of all men in the interests of a feudal obsession with caste.

The fourth alleged benefit from military training is that it would improve the efficiency, quality, and alertness of the Regular forces in peacetime. But if the committee, at the insistence of the military mind, inserts the qualification of segregation and discrimination, instead of improving efficiency it will be lowering the efficiency of the Regular forces. Instead of improving the quality and alertness of the Regular forces, it will cause their deterioration. What other result can there be from a system which creates false tensions between different groups of men, which seeks to keep men in the servitude of a lower caste, which places a premium on men acting in accordance with a feudal code? Alertness, efficiency, and improved quality of workmanship, whether in peacetime pursuits or in the armed forces, comes with freedom. Is that not our boast to the world—that we can outproduce the world because our people enjoy the blessings of freedom? But segregation and discrimination, upheld at the insistence of the military men, limits and curtails that freedom and by so much reduces the capacity of all men to function at their best.

The fifth alleged benefit, according to the Commission, is that it would help produce qualified Reserve officers in numbers that would assist in meeting the officer requirements of the Regular services and the civilian components and to staff the forces needed after M-day in any future crisis. I am quoting the Commission's report exactly. We all know that this is nonsense when it is applied in actuality to Negroes. We all know that Negroes are systematically kept from officer positions, by the order of the highest men in the armed forces. Let me quote some figures on the Army's policy toward admitting Negroes to the position of officers.

In 1940, when the Selective Service Act was passed, there were 4,451 Negroes in the Army but only 5 commissioned officers and 11 warrant officers. According to a War Department release of November 1, 1947, out of a total Negro Army strength of 58,437, there is a total of 937 Negro officers, and only 111 of that number are commissioned in the Regular Army. There are nine senior ROTC units. As late as 1940 not a single one of the more than 500 Negro Reserve officers had been called up for duty.

The Army places effective barriers in the way of Negroes becoming and remaining officers. Now the Navy is probably worse. The Marine Corps does not have any Negro officers. What is the effect of this practice on the alleged benefits which the Commission finds? Where is the alleged benefit of additional trained Reserves if the military mind refuses to train these men as officers and refuses to use them once they are forced to train them?

We have a good, objective story about the practical effect of this barrier of segregation and discrimination. The Gillem report of the Army, issued by the War Department on April 27, 1946, on utilization of Negro manpower in the postwar Army policy, has made a study of Negro performance in wartime. There were many fantastic and garbled and defamatory stories about the part played by Negroes during the war.

The Gillem Board investigated some of these instances. I do not know the facts myself, and I am a little suspicious about the findings of a board heavily weighted by the narrow military mind in a field which requires the utmost care and special training in social and sychological problems, a field that the Army does not particularly train for. But in any event, the Gillem Board has this to say in its summary:

> From the evidence presented by the most experienced commanders, the Board cannot fail to conclude that the results obtained by all units are in direct proportion to the leadership demonstrated. The failures of Negro units have in almost every case been attributed to the lack of leadership qualities of junior officers and noncommissioned officers. Leadership, therefore, must be stressed and the development of all attributes which contribute to this must be the prime objective of those responsible for the training of the postwar Army.

This is one of those fine after-the-fact recommendations, a fine statement of principle and objective. But the very military men who make this kind of recommendation—and the recommendation boils down simply to giving Negroes full access without discrimination or segregation to training for officerhood—are the same men who insist on preventing that full access to training from becoming a reality. They throw out the window their own experience.

I submit, Mr. President, that the record of the military mind in this instance is such as to confirm us in asserting civilian authority and independent judgment over their actions. I further submit, Mr. President, that the Armed Services Committee has failed the Senate in submitting to the dictates of the military prejudice when they removed the ban on segregation and discrimination from this bill. The Armed Services Committee might well post in its committee room the famous remark attributed to Clemenceau, the Tiger of France, that the business of war was too important to be left to the military. Certainly the record of the military in this field is so bad that one cannot trust their judgment. They have done everything to violate the principles which make for a good and efficient army, and they will continue to do so.

I do not think I need to burden the Senate with more than a brief consideration of the other alleged benefits supposedly coming from military training, according to the Commission. Senators can, if they will, read them. I merely ask that in reading these alleged benefits each Senator ask himself whether the ban on segregation and discrimination will increase those benefits or lessen them. I am confident that any candid examination will reveal that segregation and discrimination nullify all of those alleged benefits.

The Commission finds a benefit from military training in inculcating spiritual and moral ideals in support of American democracy. These would be nullified by segregation which inculcates the ideals of Hitler's master race, not democracy.

The Commission says it would establish a pool of young, physically fit, and trained Reserves for future mobilization, and provide a large trained group in every community to deal with civil defense. But this is utterly refuted by segregation—for segregation makes for two pools, not a large pool, and diminishes the strength of our people instead of increasing it. And segregation means that civil defense, too, I presume, would have to proceed by setting up one alarm system for whites and another for Negroes, with separate bombproof shelters for both groups, and all the other double bookkeeping that goes on in a discriminated and segregated army ordering a civilian economy.

But the real jokers are the benefits alleged by the Commission of helping to channel qualified young men into programs of scientific and vocational training in fields important to national defense. In peacetime the Navy excluded Negroes from naval service except as messmen. I can see young college-trained Negroes—where they have been fortunate enough to get the peacetime training—being channeled into the important field of serving on tables in the Navy and thus contributing best to our national defense. I can see the embryo Negro scientists who are made to serve in sanitary companies enjoying the feeling that their talents were being used to best advantage. As the representative of the National Association for Colored People said to the Senate committee:

> So long as Congress leaves the military with unfettered discretion to discriminate as it may please in training and service, the

types and extent of discrimination will depend as a practical matter upon the will of the officers who are administering or supervising particular programs. This Congress should not permit it.

Negroes with talent and ability are specifically excluded by the brass hats of whatever echelon from many important functions where their abilities are much needed. They are excluded entirely from becoming pilots in the Air Transport Command even today. When the Army badly needed 10,000 meteorologists and weather observers, the Army nonetheless specifically excluded all qualified Negroes from this much-needed service. Even when the need is overwhelming, it is apparently never overwhelming enough for the brass hats to overcome their encrusted prejudices. The Army's excuse was that it already had seven Negroes in this field and that number was enough.

I submit, Mr. President, that this record convicts the military not only of undemocratic tendencies, but perhaps even more fatally, of incompetence. We cannot afford to trust men with such mentalities, men who will place their prejudices ahead of the democratic ideal, men who will set their own ideas against the orders of their Commander in Chief in this field, men who would rather perpetuate their ancient abuses than to run the most efficient Military Establishment they can.

I submit, Mr. President, that this bill, by cutting out the ban on segregation and discrimination, by cutting its cloth to the fit of the military mind, stands convicted on this one point alone and does not deserve the support of any Member of the Senate concerned with the strengthening and preservation of our democracy.

On April 3 America's illustrious historian, Dr. Charles A. Beard, sent a solemn warning to the Senate Armed Services Committee, which begins on page 1053 of the report of the hearings. I wish that all America might heed his warning at this late hour. Dr. Beard calls this step the most momentous step in the history of the Republic. I quote from the statement of Dr. Beard.

The statement of Dr. Charles A. Beard was read by Dr. Charles C. Tansill, of Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. Mr. President, bear in mind that Dr. Beard is one of the foremost historians in the United States, if not our foremost historian. He should know something about what he is talking about. He has spent a lifetime studying these things.

Here is what Dr. Beard had to say about this question of a peacetime draft, speaking through Dr. Tansill. Dr. Tansill said:

Dr. TANSILL. I have been asked by Prof. Charles A. Beard to read his statement this morning. This is his statement:

"I regret that the state of my health at the age of 73 prevents me from appearing before this committee in person to protest against efforts, amid war alarms, to fasten on our country military conscription as a fixed national policy."

Those are the words of our foremost historian, Mr. President. He probably can see that there will not be much more history to write if he does not get on the job here pretty quick.

He goes on to say:

Universal military training, so-called, represents an attempt to implant in the United States a well-known curse of the Old World. I have studied it on the ground there and in the melancholy history of the nations brought to ruin or servitude under its degrading influence, gross and subtle.

This system of conscription would violate every liberty to which our Nation has been dedicated since the foundation of the Republic.

Mr. President, it is said that those who study history generally are able to look into the future fairly well. Dr. Beard has spent his life at studying history, I suppose, and he says we do not want military training.

I read further:

It would destroy the freedom which our ancestors, having fled from the despotism of Europe, established for themselves and their posterity on American soil.

Mr. President, that is what I am fighting for tonight: to maintain the liberties for which the founding fathers fought. What I am fighting against here, tonight, is the European ideology, the idea that you can draft men and make them fight, and that they will fight with their hearts in what they are doing.

I read further:

It would create a monstrous military bureaucracy drawn from the upper and middle classes.

That is true, Mr. President. The Army is starting to do that now; it is getting very snooty about who will be accepted as volunteers into the Army. Those who volunteer have to pass tests almost as difficult as the tests that are given to the young men who wish to go to West Point. The Army now wants none but the very best. Of course, in order to pass those tests, a young man must have been well educated, and of course the ones who are the best educated come from the upper brackets. So that makes the Army an elite profession, as it was in Germany under the Junkers, with all their polished boots and fancy uniforms. Probably that is the next thing we shall have over here. Dr. Beard further says:

It would enslave the sons of the plain people—farmers, industrial workers, and all other laborers who toil with their hands for a living.

Charles Beard knows what he is talking about; he is one of our foremost historians. He has studied all the European systems which included conscription, and he knows what conscription does to people. He is trying to warn us.

Mr. President, I warrant that there are not a dozen Senators who have read this statement of Dr. Beard's, aside from those who were at the committee hearings. Yet we presume to act, even without preparation, with no understanding of what we are doing to our American way of life, to our traditional freedoms.

Dr. Beard further says:

It will exalt the military above the civil, and thus would work for the overthrow of the first principles upon which the Constitution of the United States is based.

Of course the military is exalted above the civil now, Mr. President. The military have taken over. They really are running our country. We still have some forms left; we still can talk here in the Senate all we please, but the military go ahead and do as they please. We in Congress appropriate $100,000,000 for Turkey; but, lo and behold, the military spend a billion dollars in Turkey. They have things figured out so well, now, that they simply use the surplus. When we in Congress appropriate only $100,000,000, the military buy a billion dollars' worth of material and declare it surplus, and then sell it for $100,000,000.

So they can do anything they please, anywhere in the world. Mr. President, the military has become very, very powerful.

Dr. Beard further says:

In its insinuating and insidious course, it would serve the cause of those leaders in military and civil life who exalt the Executive above the legislative and are now claiming that the President has a right to make war at his own discretion, without any declaration of hostilities by the Congress—under the new dogma that the best defense is secret offense.

Mr. President, everything Dr. Beard says is true. Today the military are attempting to enslave us on the pretext that we are too dumb to know what is going on. Even the Senate does not know what is going on. There are just a few persons who know what is going on in the United States in the way of national defense activities.

Dr. Beard further says:

This ominous tendency of our days I describe at length in my book on President Roosevelt and the coming of the war, 1941. Owing to my inability to give a review of it in person, I respectfully direct attention to the last chapter (pp. 582 ff.) and I have requested my good friend, Dr. Charles C. Tansill, professor at Georgetown University, to present these supplementary views to the committee.

The people of the United States are now called upon by high civil and military authorities in Washington to take the most momentous step in the history of the Republic.

Mr. President, that statement comes from Dr. Charles Beard, our most eminent historian. He says this is the most momentous step in the history of the Republic. Yet there were those, today, who criticized me because I chose to talk at this time. Some said that I was abusing the democratic privilege. Mr. President, it is they who are selling us down the river. Our democracy soon will be gone. I am the one who is defending our democratic privileges, in a last-ditch fight against those who would have us go the way of Europe, of fascism or nazism.

Dr. Beard then says:

They are called upon to make conscription of young men, or, to use more pleasant words, universal military service, a permanent policy in peacetime as well as wartime.

As I have said, Mr. President, once these things are fastened upon us, whether it be the armament economy into which we are moving or whether it be peacetime conscription, once they are fastened upon us, we shall not be able to get rid of them. There are too many

vested interests tied up and associated with these things, and then our freedoms will be gone forever. Dr. Beard then says:

The subject has been argued, for and against, in thousands of pages, but the arguments thus far presented miss the main point in the dispute. Nor is there any evidence in the brief for the affirmative filed by President Truman's Commission on Universal Service that the authors of that document made any serious study of this point or were indeed competent to discuss it out of comprehensive knowledge.

It is this neglected main point that makes the step, if taken, the most momentous step in the history of the Republic—a radical departure from all peacetime life and experience in the United States since 1776.

It is a sad commentary, Mr. President, that in spite of the testimony of this great historian, this man who has no ax to grind, no motive except to warn his fellow Americans, there is but one voice raised in the United States Senate against the enslavement of the American people, against the abandonment of all the free institutions we have known down through the years, the things for which our fathers and our grandfathers have fought. He says:

The universal liability of all able-bodied men to defend their country was recognized by the founders of the Republic and still stands as an acceptable principle. This is, then, not the main point in the controversy.

The country is to be defended to the last ditch against foreign enemies. That, too, is an accepted principle—by all save extreme pacifists. Whether a huge conscript army would be the most effective instrument of defense in an age of atom bombs and guided projectiles is debatable. In fact, grave doubts as to its effectiveness in our age are warranted by the knowledge that military men are prone to prepare for the next war mainly in terms of experience in the last war. But in the argument over conscription this is not the main point.

The main point in the argument before the country is: The menacing impacts of universal military service on every branch of civil life, on all civil liberties, on all the virtues that make America precious to the people, on every aspect of American civilization.

It will be said this is a vague statement that cannot be proved; and besides, we are assured to the contrary by President Truman, high military men, and the President's Commission on Military Service.

With all due respect for such eminent personages, there is higher authority to give us instruction on consequences of universal military service and the huge military establishment which inevitably accompanies it. This authority is the long experience of the nations which have made universal service an instrument of permanent policy.

It will be replied by the exponents of the new course, the American people are different from all other peoples and so they will preserve their civil liberties intact and all other values of American life under a regime of universal military service.

With respect to those who reject experience with universal military service and proceed on the pleasing theory that Americans are a chosen people immune to its dangerous consequences, there is an authority on the other side of the argument more worthy of consideration.

It is the authority of the framers of the Constitution, to whom we are indebted for our form of Government, which survived the storms of 160 years. The one thing on which they all agreed was that historical experience with military establishments, ancient and modern, had demonstrated their peril to civilian life, economy, and liberty.

One of the framers of the Constitution, preeminent for knowledge of human experience with military establishments, James Madison, summed up their convictions, as a warning to their fellow citizens and to posterity, in the words:

"The veteran legions of Rome were an overmatch for the undisciplined valor of other nations and rendered her mistress of the world. Not less true is it that the liberties of Rome proved the final victim to her military triumphs; and that the liberties of Europe, as far as they ever existed, have, with a few exceptions, been the price of her military establishments. A standing force therefore is dangerous, at the same time that it may be a necessary provision. On the smallest scale, it has its inconveniences. On an extensive scale, its consequences may be fatal. On any scale, it is an object of laudable circumspection and precaution. A wise nation will combine all these considerations; and, whilst it does not rashly preclude itself from any resource which may become essential to its safety, it will exert all its prudence in diminishing both the necessity and danger of resorting to one which may be inauspicious to its liberties." (The Federalist, No. 41.)

Mr. President, that is a pretty stringent warning. I know that there are Senators here who knew they should not vote for this bill. They voted for it because of the Red smear, just afraid that if they did not, somebody would say they were traitors, selling out their country. Well, that might be right, Mr. President, but we are selling out our country by voting for a measure like this. We shall lose to native Fascists all the freedoms that they warn us we are going to lose to foreign Communists.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] broke in at this point in the testimony and had something to say to Mr. Beard. We shall skip that, and go on with Mr. Beard's testimony:

There, in James Madison's admonition, is an imperative warning against the menace of military establishments, against their everlasting danger to civil liberty. Since Madison's time the experience of many great nations with universal conscription and huge military establishments has furnished additional evidence to confirm the instruction provided by the framers of the Constitution. Surely, in the first principles of the Constitution and in the experience of all countries which have had or now have universal conscription, we have better guidance than in all the rhetoric employed by contemporaries who know little or nothing about universal service as historical experience or at first hand.

To indicate what will be found when Europe's experience with universal military service is examined, I give the following brief description of a common soldier's career under the regime as operated in Germany before World War I—before Hitler's "refinements" had been invented. This description is drawn from specific sources of information for the authenticity of which I can vouch.

1. The influence of the army on this common soldier's life began as soon as he entered the first grade of the elementary school. In a short time a wooden stick was placed in his hand, and along with his classmates he was taught the goosestep. The teacher, a former soldier himself, took advantage of every occasion to praise the military virtues, and the textbooks used for instruction confirmed the praise. Not a breath of criticism or objection was ever allowed in the classroom or on the playground. Boys who gave any hints of opposition were warned and marked.

Mr. President, that is just as it is in the Senate. Anyone who opposes the militarization of the country is a marked man; he is branded as a Communist. So some of us are afraid to speak up. It is too bad.

The one thing constantly hammered into the head of every boy was his duty to render his obligatory military service, without raising any questions whatever, and to render it in the spirit of abject obedience to military authorities.

Mr. President, that is a disgusting situation. I have three sons. If this country were in danger I would expect them, when they are of age, to defend it, but, by the heavens, I hate the prospect of their being bossed around in peacetime in a military conscripted peacetime army.

As the time approached for the induction of this German boy into the military training service, he was not free to leave the country. The only way he could have escaped it was to run away secretly by hook or crook, or to secure a forged passport by bribing the proper officials. As he was a poor boy, whose parents had no money or special privileges, he had to stay in his country and take what came. In other words, the boy in a working class or farming family could seldom, if ever, escape the clutches of the military authorities by fleeing to some foreign land.

That is not a pretty picture of future America which Mr. Beard is painting for us.

As soon as this boy was inducted into training service, he was given a small record book in which were entered certain facts about his early life, and then from time to time other facts about his conduct in the service. This book he had to keep always at hand and show it on demand when questioned by his superiors.

Our own War Department is already moving in the direction of requiring just such a record. In its form on officer qualifications (AGO No. 0857) a complete personal history is compiled for each officer and I am certain records of the same nature will be maintained for all enlisted men. In time this will develop into the same detailed inquisition into the private life of every citizen as it did in Germany.

While in training service this boy was subjected in all matters to strict military law, which provided forms of punishment for breaches of duty. In addition, there were innumerable ways in which any officer, high or low, could punish him for trivial or other acts not mentioned in the military law and make life miserable for him during the entire period of his original training service, and later while he was in the various stages of Reserve service and called up at specific times for supplementary training.

During the period of his original training service, the soldier's life and activities were regimented down to the last detail. All newspapers, magazines, books pamphlets, and other reading matter available to the privates were censored by officers. The mere possession of any printed matter not officially approved was dangerous and might send the soldier to the guardhouse for days, to live on bread and water. Every package of food, cigarettes, or other objects sent to the boy by his parents or friends had to be opened in the presence of an officer and if it happened to be wrapped in a piece of a newspaper banned by the military, the private was penalized for the very act of receiving it.

Imagine, Mr. President. That is what the Senate is trying to vote on America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer has endeavored to keep the Chamber in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, it is of very little consequence to me. I shall be happy to try to speak out and be heard if order is maintained. If it is not, I shall not exert myself.

I continue quoting from Mr. Beard:

Even when on furlough during the original training period, the soldier was ever under the watchful eye of the military. On his arrival home, he had to report his whereabouts immediately to the head of his military district so that he could be reached at any moment. Before leaving home on his return to service he had to report again to the head of his district and give him the details of the return journey to the barracks.

After this German private had finished his original training period, his record book was duly signed and he was allowed to go home. When he sought employment, his prospective employer might ask for his record book. This act on the part of the employer was not required by law, but he was "on the safe side" in inquiring into the applicant's military record. At all events an "unsatisfactory" military record could make it difficult for a man to secure employment after he had completed the first stage of his military training.

If we say all these military controls over our people will not happen here, let me answer that such authority over private lives of our people is already proposed by an official report and endorsed by the military.

I quote paragraph 7 on page 35 in the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training as follows:

"Universal training would involve the maintenance of an appropriate selective-service system adaptable to rapid conversion to wartime needs. It would make possible also a continuous inventory of military skills, aptitudes, and leadership qualities, which could be used advantageously in making military assignments in wartime. This inventory would be especially helpful if a check were maintained on the whereabouts, subsequent training, skills, occupation, and dependency status of those who complete their basic training. A selective-service machinery, actively functioning in peacetime, would be a decided military asset in wartime."

Completion of the original training service did not free the young man from military control. His after life, until he reached the age of 45, was divided into two periods. For the first period, he was in the reserve, or reserves, and for the second, in the Landwehr, or militia. During each of these periods he had to report at stated times for supplementary military training.

A particularly obnoxious feature of the German military reserve system was the Kontrollversammlung, or muster of reserves. This control meeting was an assembly at which the men of a country or smaller unit who were in the reserve or Landwehr had to appear for inspection and instruction by a military officer. On the day of this meeting all of these men were under military law and jurisdiction and any one of them who committed a misdemeanor during the day could be severely punished under military law.

If to this description of a young man's career under the system of universal service in Germany were added a description of the way in which the military system affected the daily affairs of all German people—family life, education, employment, amusements, intellectual pursuits, and civil liberties—it would be seen immediately that the whole of German society was subdued to its weight. To imagine that the American people would escape the major effects of this militarism, if universal military service were permanently established in the United States, is to indulge in daydreaming and self-deception.

If the President and the military leaders force conscription upon the American people, they will find that instead of gaining in national security, they will have destroyed the real essence of American strength—the spirit of a free people which has twice brought us victories over conscripted armies.

It is almost unbelievable, Mr. President, that the Senate has failed to heed this warning of Mr. Charles Beard, this famous historian. He continued:

Hence, before the Congress of the United States subjects the country to "universal service" under military administration, it should establish a commission on experiences with universal conscription, for the purpose of inquiring into what it has meant in other countries and will mean here, in all probability, if adopted. Such a commission should include only men and women who can read the necessary foreign languages and have an extensive knowledge of military history. Such a commission should hear not only military officers, educators, pacifists, and people of that kind always eager to testify. It should also hear what men and women who have had experiences with universal military service have to say about its impacts on individual family, and social life in general. There has been enough "big talk" about the subject. The time has come to get down to the brass tacks. For Congress to act without having command of this knowledge is to betray its trust, despite all the clamor and all the Gallup polls.

But if Congress is unwilling to create such a commission of its own and have an inquiry made by persons competent to make it, then there is one thing that the Members of Congress are themselves especially fitted to consider before peacetime conscription in any form is permanently placed on the backs of the American people. Members of Congress represent the States and communities of the Union and are intimately acquainted with their constituencies. By numerous addresses recently made in the two Chambers, Republicans and Democrats alike have made it evident that they are alarmed by the highly centralized power already assumed by the National Government over the States and communities.

Even those Members of Congress who are not experts in military affairs know very well that a special centralization of power over life and property must come if a huge body of young men is conscripted and placed under the control of professional military officers. Members of Congress know that power once brought into being grows on the meat fed to it, is never satisfied with what it gets but demands more and more, resents restraints imposed on it, and ever strives to become sovereign in its own right. If Members of Congress rightly fear civil centralization and the growth of an independent civil bureaucracy, they have far more reason for fearing military centralization and a military bureaucracy, based on the control of the Nation's youth—physical, moral, and intellectual control—by professional military officers whose tenure is permanent and survives all passing Senators, Representatives, and Presidents.

Mr. President, how we can bow our necks and go ahead with this thing after testimony like that was given before the committee, after it appeared in the volume of testimony for all to read, how we can still go ahead and blithely bring an end to the era of freedom that has been America, is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will recall that earlier in the evening I propounded a query as to whether or not the distinguished Senator might let us vote on the motion, and he would then have another opportunity, of course, to continue his speech on the conference report when it came in. Does the Senator feel that he would be receptive to the propounding of that question again?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should be happy to quit if I thought the conference report would not be brought in until morning, but if they have it in their hip pocket, I am going on and talk.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, I cannot advise the Senator about what will happen with the conference report. What I am suggesting to him once again is that no matter when it comes back, he might continue his speech without prejudice to his right to make any argument he might wish to make. I am not in any way trying to cut the Senator off. If the Senator desires to continue, it is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I will talk a while longer.

(Applause in the galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the occupants of the galleries that demonstrations of any character are not permitted. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, after the hearings of the Senate Armed Services Committee were closed abruptly, with many other organizations waiting to give testimony against the peacetime draft, the House Armed Services Committee held hearings which brought out much evidence that is recent and pertinent to the question before the Senate.

On Tuesday, April 20, Dr. Alonzo Myers, who is chairman of the department of higher education of the National Education Association gave very damaging testimony which all should hear. Dr. Myers testimony is at hand and I wish to read from it to let the Nation know that the proposed draft bill is unnecessary.

The testimony begins on page 6464 of the House Armed Services Committee hearing, and Dr. Myers testified:

My name is Alonzo F. Myers; I am chairman of the department of higher education of the National Education Association. I am, however, testifying today in behalf of the national council against conscription, of which I am a national cochairman.

When selective service was proposed by the President last month it was with such fanfare and atmosphere of crisis that there were many Americans who thought war was imminent. Since then we have been assured by Secretary of the Army Royall that war is not imminent and by Secretary Forrestal that we are in a tension—not a crisis.

We have had no evidence that Russia is planning by military invasion of other nations to precipitate a war with the United States. Although she had vastly superior numbers on hand and within calling distance, Russia permitted a token force of

American soldiers to bar her from the Berlin railroad station. Moreover, recent political developments seem to indicate that Russia is not thinking in terms of immediate war. The new treaty between Russia and Finland wherein the Soviet accepted the more moderate treaty draft of the Finns rather than risk a possible conflict is a straw in the wind. And the comparatively quiet Italian elections seem to indicate that western Europe will have a chance without war to wage the economic and political struggle against communism.

In support of this reasoning we can turn to the statement of General Clay: "The present conflict in Germany 'is a political one and not a military one.'" (New York Times, March 26, 1948.)

We can also turn to General Bradley's testimony, March 25, before the Senate Armed Services Committee. He pointed out that if selective service should pass and the size of the Army should be increased, the Army would not increase American strength in Europe but would actually withdraw 3,000 men.

Since any attack upon the United States must come either through the air or via the sea, we believe that the Air Force and the Navy, whose task is to intercept any aerial or naval attack, must be the first lines of defense as well as the major vehicles of offense in the early stages of a war. The fact that the Secretary of Air and the Secretary of Navy told this committee that they did not need selective service in order to get recruits for the Air Force and the Navy, seems to us to destroy completely any case for a peacetime draft. We want, therefore, to examine very closely the Army's request for an increase in strength as well as their request for a draft.

We do not believe that the Army is justified in asking an increase beyond its authorized strength.

1. In support of this we want to quote from the recently concluded Senate hearings. Lt. Gen. W. S. Paul, in a statement on April 2, said that "the Army holds to the view that the proposed present increase in strength is not a mobilization for war, but merely an increase in the strength of the active force in order to permit the Army to carry out its global commitments." But when you examine the proposed deployment of Army forces, according to General Bradley, only 13,000 additional combat troops and 1,000 service troops would be sent overseas if the Army increased its strength by 240,000 men and got a peacetime draft. This is only a token increase overseas and does not in our opinion justify a draft. The bulk of the increase, or 226,000 men, would remain in the United States to swell Army ranks here.

2. We have not been impressed with the argument that the Army must maintain a balance with the Air Force in peacetime. Both Secretary Royall and General Bradley, for example, told the Senate committee that if the Air Force were increased to 70 groups, the Army must provide only an additional 15,000 service troops to support the Air Force.

The proposed Ground Forces increase, even if adopted, would not provide enough additional combat troops for Air Force support to permit a balanced operation against Russian troops in Europe and Asia in the early stages of a war. The Air Force can swing into immediate action in the event of war, whereas ground troops would have to be augmented by millions beyond the proposed increase if the Army were to attempt to meet the onslaught of Russian ground forces in Europe or Asia. No matter how well balanced with the Air Force the Army is, we do not see how the Army can, in the early stages of a war prior to all-out mobilization of manpower and of industry, to which they must look for a steady and adequate flow of supplies, actually maintain or take bases anywhere in the Russian orbit.

While we do not want to overemphasize this, we do believe there is some truth to the newspaper accounts which have implied that prestige and jealousy among the various branches of the armed forces may account somewhat for the desire of the Army not to be out of balance with the Air Force. The New York Times of April 14 described the situation as follows:

"The unification of the country's armed services, achieved after many years, had not lessened a whit the rivalry between them. * * * The necessity of maintaining absolute balance between the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, urged by Secretary Forrestal, was overemphasized for the sake of keeping peace among the three services."

An earlier report of the New York Times appearing in the March 16 issue described decisions made at the Key West meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as follows:

"On the other hand, the discussion apparently revealed that many of the service traditions and preconceived notions of warfare * * * still were important factors in trying to reach agreed decisions."

Business Week for April 10 said of the Key West conference:

"The conference was highly publicized, but you must read between the lines to find out what really was decided. Instead of an integrated defense program that would subordinate land and sea power to the requirements of the air age, the Joint Chiefs of Staff came up with this deal: If a dollar is spent to enlarge our air power, the Army and Navy must each get a dollar, too."

They are getting them, Mr. President. Senators have never seen appropriation bills which have come to the Senate for the Army or the Navy or the Air Force trimmed; they always have been "upped" substantial percentages. They are really getting the dollars.

As a further indication of the problem, Hanson Baldwin on April 15 wrote:

"The Air Force believes that Russia can be defeated, if war should come, with atomic and other bombs by planes operating from bases secure by distance. Many of its leaders believe no attempt should be made to establish bases which might be overrun by Russian ground forces but that bombing should be conducted from bases 2,000 to 2,500 miles away.

"The ground forces and the Navy do not believe that atomic bombing alone would defeat Russia, even if atomic bombs were used in a war—which is by no means certain. They hold that intermediate or close-up bases would be necessary, in any case, for effective bombardment and that these must be seized and defended and supplied by sea-ground power.

"This—in oversimplified fashion—is the basic cleavage between the services. The consequential cleavage—quite probably a subconscious one—is as follows: General Bradley emphasized today Russia's ground strength. His estimate of 170 Russian divisions * * * is not accepted by some of the other services without qualifications. They hold that most of these divisions are organized in cadre form only and that Russia probably has only 40 to 60—perhaps a few more—full-strength divisions.

"On the other hand, the Air Force's estimates of Russian air power are extreme. * * * Estimates of Russian military strength by the services thus differ widely, with each service subconsciously tending to emphasize the arm with which it is particularly concerned. Nor has Central Intelligence Agency, supposedly the coordinating agency of all intelligence services and now smarting under the shame of Bogota, been able to reconcile these differences."

3. General Bradley told this committee that selective service must stay in operation until universal military training is passed. He said: "If our Reserve units were filled up with men with proper training, we believe we could reduce the size of our Regular Army. And it might get it down to a point where it could be maintained by voluntary enlistment." This is, of all arguments, the least convincing because the Army has over a million volunteer Reserves whom it has deliberately neglected. The April 10 Collier's contained an article by a Reserve officer, Does the Army Want the Reserves? It stated:

"1. As of September 30, 1947, only 18?,998 of the 509,255 Reserve officers had been assigned to units, and even this figure was misleadingly high. Of the 189,998 total, over 80,000 were, according to General Evans, assigned to pools, not to real, functioning military units.

"2. The 631,039 ex-GI's who signed up with the Reserves have been even more neglected. Merely 71,668 of them have been given assignments, and again, a large proportion of these went to pools.

"3. Not one Reserve unit has been given adequate equipment, although millions of rifles, artillery pieces, and other material are lying idle or being shipped overseas."

Mr. President, the boys who run the Army are actually, I believe, the biggest finaglers anywhere. We talk about the old Army game. They really play it. They insist on new equipment every day of the week. They will not even use the old equipment. They are sending it to Turkey or somewhere else, and letting the Reserves in this country train with broomsticks or sit around twiddling their fingers.

"4. Just 6,418 Reserve officers and 1,199 enlisted reservists received any sort of field training from the Ground and Service Forces during the first quarter of the 1948 fiscal year, the last period for which figures are available."

I presume the generals, captains, majors, and colonels were too busy entertaining the boys who were going to vote for them. They did not have any time to train any Reserves.

"5. To date, the Army has not formulated any real long-range program for Reserve training. The Army Ground Forces have not even issued a directive on training policies. At the most recent muster, only 28,000 reservists were enrolled in the Army's correspondence courses."

Since General Bradley stated that "if our Reserve units were filled up with men with proper training we believe we could reduce the size of our Regular Army," we believe Congress should forthwith make use of the Reserves and reduce the size of the Army. The Army failure to use Volunteer Reserves ought not to justify the constant pressure the Army is putting on the citizens of the country and on Congress for a compulsory system.

While we are discussing the Reserves, Mr. Chairman, it would be well for the committee to recall the testimony given last July by General Collins, Deputy Chief of Staff. He said, "Our analysis in the War Department indicates we would have the need of a force of about 1,750,000 men available as an M-day force in the event we ever have to fight a major war again." He used this as an argument for UMT. May I point out that if the Army were to train its Volunteer Reserves it would have, together with the National Guard and its Regular force, more than the 1,750,000 men required for M-day. This seems to us to be an argument against authorizing an increase in the Ground Forces and an argument against a peacetime draft.

Mr. President, I depart from my reading of the testimony to say that the Army has shown conclusively, to anyone who wishes to look into the question, that it does not want volunteers. What it wants is this iniquitous peacetime draft, so that the military can get their hooks into us and keep us forevermore. Then they will really have things their way.

4. A fourth reason against giving the Army an increase at this time is the fact that the Army is using uniformed personnel to do civilian jobs. The March 25 Chicago Tribune states:

"More than 50,000 Army, Navy, and Air Force men in uniform are sitting behind desks performing clerical and administrative tasks which could be done at less cost by civilian clerks, a Government personnel expert asserted today. These thousands of desk jobs handled by GI red-tape artists could be done more efficiently and economically by girl clerks or other well-trained civilians whose pay is far less than the cost of maintaining a soldier or a sailor."

The Washington Post of March 19, 1948 says

"Military people were brought in and told to do the civilian jobs * * * Thousands of jobs such as hospital attendants, firefighters, guards, skilled trades, and even typists and file clerks were filled by military men. It certainly isn't economy as it will cost more in the long run to have a military person in a civilian job." The Post goes on to say that Congress is responsible for the cut in civilian personnel.

While we are speaking of military personnel who are filling unnecessary civilian posts, we might as well speak of military personnel being siphoned off from essential work to man the Fort Knox showcase to which thousands of civilians are being brought annually to be propagandized for UMT. These, plus other uniformed men who occupy public relations and propaganda jobs to sell UMT, could be put on genuine military duty if the Army desperately needs men.

Our next point, Mr. Chairman, deals with the question of Army personnel and recruiting. The people of this country have been led by Army spokesmen to believe that the Army is over a hundred thousand men below its authorized strength. This is only a partial truth. The authorized strength of 670,000 is a ceiling set by Congress beyond which the Army should not go. The actual strength each year is recommended by the President in his budget message and finally set by Congress through the appropriation voted. The Army has been granted enough money to support 560,000 men, which means that the Army is under the recommended strength by about 18,000, and not by about a hundred thousand. And what is more important, during the early part of this fiscal year the Army did maintain a strength of 560,000 or better.

The President in his budget message this year asked for money for 560,000 ground troops for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948. Even if he had asked for the full 670,000 permitted by Congress, we believe it would be possible to get these men by the volunteer method, as we hope to show in a moment.

The first suggestion for improvement of Army recruiting has to do with the problem of reenlistment. General Bradley told the Senate committee that the Army expects this year to lose 240,000 men whose terms expire. If this is correct, it means that almost half of the Army's present strength have decided not to reenlist. We believe much of this is due to dissatisfaction with the Army as a result of conditions which could be corrected. The Army has failed to meet the demands of veterans for a drastic revision of its court-martial system. Many enlisted men have found from bitter experience that justice means one thing for officers and another thing for enlisted men. Likewise, the Army has failed to implement the recommendations of the Doolittle Board. Many men object to the officer caste system. A former editor of Stars and Stripes, in an article in Life magazine, wrote:

"The lord-and-master overtones of the present officer-and-enlisted man relationship are at best an archaic hold-over from several hundred years back. The good officer does not need it to enforce discipline and will almost invariably mellow the distinctions. In too many cases these zealously guarded distinctions protect the inefficient and inferior officer more than they contribute to Army discipline." He went on to speak of the off-limits and out-of-bounds signs for enlisted men which caused deep resentment.

If the Army were to meet these important demands of veterans there would undoubtedly be more men who would want to reenlist. We have two other suggestions at this point. Why doesn't the Army accept short-term reenlistments for a year, as they did in 1945 and 1946? And why doesn't the Army follow General Paul's suggestion about housing? He was quoted in the October 11, 1947, New York Times as having said that he believed the manpower picture would improve materially if more decent housing could be assured in the Army. If the Army had put into housing the millions of dollars spent on propaganda for UMT, including the expensive Fort Knox experimental unit, they would have done something concrete to solve their manpower problem.

With respect to new enlistments, everything we said about improving the Army would help. In addition, we want to call attention to the statements of the Army recruiting chief that the Army has been turning down "about 50 percent of those who apply for enlistment," because the Army has raised its requirements from a 70- to an 80-grade in the Army general classification test (New York Times, September 10, 1947).

Army spokesmen in the Senate hearings maintained that they did not want to lower the grade from an 80 to 70 because every man should be a specialist in some function. However, an official Army pamphlet entitled "The Fort Knox Experiment," which was reprinted in the Senate hearings, refers to "the 70 minimum which is usual for Army enlistment." And General Eisenhower on April 2 told the Senate committee: "My memory is sometimes tricky, but I thought I had directed before I left the Chief of Staff, to drop for the Ground Forces at least, the figure is back to 70, and I thought there is where it was so we could fill up certain places where we could do this."

Out of about 60 jobs in the Army, we are informed that at least 15 can be performed by men in the 70- to 80-grade group. These include such jobs as longshoreman, amphibious truck driver, amphibious tractor driver, duty soldier I, duty soldier II, duty soldier III, cook, section hand.

General Paul is quoted in the Senate hearings as saying about the Army general classification test that, "The standard score is not an IQ and does not involve the notion of mental age." The Army's tables submitted to the Senate committee compare the years of education with the scores made on the Army general classification test. They reveal that only 9 persons with more than 16 years of education and only 105 persons with more than 12 years of education, and 1,593 with more than 10 years of education have failed to get an 80 AGCT grade, whereas only 148 persons with less than a fourth-grade education were able to get more than an 80 score. The problem seems to be one of education and not necessarily a matter of intelligence. The question should be asked: "Since the Army conducted literacy training and other education during the war and would do so if universal military training passes, why doesn't it do so now and accept men with lower educational standards?"

Another disturbing thing about Army testimony is the Army's insistence on getting the best young men of the Nation to go into the Army. A nation cannot remain strong if the Army takes the best and disregards the needs of the civilian population. For example, as Hanson Baldwin points out, the Army has about 1 doctor for every 88 men and 1 dentist for every 451, and the Air Force 1 doctor for every 190 and 1 dentist for every 832. Yet the country as a whole has a ratio of only 1 doctor to every 768 persons and 1 dentist to every 1,900. We believe Representative A. L. MILLER was right when on April 8 he said: "Why should not the military be required to take its share of the average men and women."

That is a fact, Mr. President. If the military get so snooty that they take just the cream of the crop, who will pay to keep the military going? Who will run industry for us if we put the elite in uniform, just to suck off the wealth? We had better think about that.

I read further:

In the hearings before this committee General Bradley stated that the Army didn't want men between a 70- and 80-grade because there are more guardhouse people and troublemakers among them. In our judgment this is in no sense a justifiable statement, even if true. Before accepting it we urge this committee to find out exactly what proportion of men in the 70 to 80 group were committed to the guardhouse and why. The Army has so many minor regulations that it would take a good memory to obey all of them. However, I do not believe that people of less education are more criminal or immoral in their actions. The fact that a man cannot answer certain mathematical questions or explain the meaning of certain words, as the AGCT requires, in no sense should involve a prejudgment as to criminal tendencies.

We also believe that the Army's attention should be called to their claims that military training improves citizenship and reduces crime. If they can make these claims, as propaganda to get the public to accept UMT, then they ought to make good on these claims in the Regular Army. If the Army doesn't want these boys because they violate rules or laws, why does it claim that only 6 months of military training under UMT will give these same boys such good discipline and citizenship training that the crime rate would be reduced?

Still another way that the Army could get more men is to eliminate the quota restrictions on qualified Negroes and Puerto Ricans. It is quite as unjust to keep qualified Negroes from joining the Army as it would be to impose quotas on any other section of the population.

The Army could permit enlistments for an 18-month term and conceivably for a 1-year term. While a 1-year term would not be so profitable to the Army as a longer term, there is no reason why the Army could not combine a short-term enlistment with a 3-year enlistment in the National Guard or the Reserves. Every argument the Army has used in behalf of UMT could be used to justify such a program. If the Army won't accept this suggestion because too much time would be required to train these short-term recruits or because they won't be specialists, then the Army must recognize the validity of a considerable number of arguments against universal military training.

Having made these suggestions, Mr. Chairman, may I add that the Army's volunteer recruiting has improved considerably. Since no publicity so far as I have been able to discover, has been given to these figures, possibly because it would not help the draft

clause, it is well to note that the Army recruited in January 18,203 men, in February 16,653, and in March 21,960, or a total of 56,813 in the first quarter. The first week of April they got 4,485, which probably means at a monthly rate of 16,000 to 18,000. Since most of these recruits are for terms of 3 years or more, it is obvious that the voluntary system could easily support an army of about 670,000 men, especially if some of the recruiting suggestions we made should be adopted.

I am greatly concerned about the way in which the Army is trying to foster a program of peacetime conscription in America. General Bradley's plea for UMT last week is a good example of emotionalism. He said:

"The youth of America have a stake in this. Most of them are not going into the Regular services but if war should come most of them will have to go to war. Giving up a training program means they go to war the next time unprepared, mentally, physically, and with no training. Picture your own son or somebody else's, 18 or 19 years old, enlisted in a National Guard unit and moved off in a week or two to Alaska or Greenland or some other spot. Picture him going into combat. The alternative is not 70 groups or UMT. The 70 groups are not going to give that boy the lead time he needs in training."

My goodness. That is touching, Mr. President, all that essay on our poor boys, the sad fate they are going to meet if they are not properly trained. I do not think it will make much difference to them whether they were trained or not when they get shot, or more especially, when the atom bombs are dropped. They do not have to drop them. They just set them off some place. They could kill everybody in the world. The boys are not going to worry much about whether they were trained or not. They know how to die.

The general did not reveal that most of the youths who go to war would not be combat troops, that out of 14,000,000 in the armed forces during this past war only 1,500,000 were combat troops. He implied that National Guard units might be moved to a combat zone in a week's time, yet didn't reveal the Army's low opinion of the guard, which kept most of them out of combat zones until 1943, though they were mobilized in 1940 and 1941. Nor did he reveal that the failure of the guard and the Reserves to have adequate training is the Army's fault for not making weapons and training personnel available to them.

It is increasingly clear that the Army wants a permanent compulsory training and service system in America, regardless of whether we are at peace or war. So far as I have been able to discover, the Army has not suggested a time limit on selective service. At one point in the Senate hearings "possibly the decade" was mentioned as the length of the draft. At another point Mr. Forrestal implied that we would change the proposed program when she (Russia) withdraws to her own borders and is content with a national rather than an international effort to govern. Mr. Forrestal also told the Senate committee that when "the long-term program [universal military training] is adequately functioning, we should be able in a more peaceful world to curtail or eliminate the short-term program [selective service]." Secretary Royall made it equally clear in his Army Day speech when he said, "I see no safe way of ending selective service until we build up a trained Reserve by universal military training."

Oh, Mr. President, these boys are certainly determined to saddle militarism upon America, and I am equally determined that they shall not do it.

In other words, indefinite peacetime conscription is desired, whether it is called selective service or universal military training.

It would be far better for this country to remember what it is that has made America strong, lest we automatically accept the path which Germany and Japan and other nations have trod. The Wall Street Journal of April 7 stated the case well:

"The question we as a people have to decide is not whether the United States should be strong. In this parlous world we must. The question for decision is how we may best be strong. President Truman and his military advisers think the way to military strength is through a huge standing army and an armament industry geared now for war. They think the way to be strong is to go now on a war footing, to draft both men and resources now for some coming battle. That is ever the answer of military men. * * * Since battles are fought with men and guns, getting a lot of them seems the obvious way of preparing for war. But troops and guns, and even skill at tactics, do not guarantee victory. They are a necessary adjunct to military victory; they win battles. But they can also lose wars if in acquiring them a nation pays too high a price.

"The priceless ingredient in our society is the discovery that the freeman is a greater asset to his community than the slave. From that has come a productivity unequaled in history and it is that productivity, the efficient use of resources, that has made us strong. Now what the administration proposes is this."

When they speak of the administration, they should make it the bipartisan coalition, because they are all for it.

"That we drain off more than a million and a half of our industrial capacity into making goods that add nothing to our future productive power; and that we bind our energies with continued oppressive taxation and with regulations and controls by an omnipotent government. This is to make us strong.

"Possibly we could stand this for a while, as a healthy man can for a long time fight a sapping disease. A champ starting from perfect physical pitch can abuse his body for a long time and still be better than the next man. But in the end if we abuse our heritage it will make us weaker, as it did Germany and Japan, as it will Russia, too, if she stays on a permanent war basis. A nation, like the strongest man, needs a rest to recuperate its strength.

"We need to be prepared. We need a well-knit, skilled armed force to offer initial protection from sudden aggression and to form the nucleus of a mightier force if war should come. But we should beware lest too great a faith in arms exhaust the inner strength that is now, and always has been, our real source of power."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, our own people, as well as other people, will not believe that permanent or even temporary draft legislation is a peace measure. The history of conscription both here and abroad is such that it has never prevented war. And for this country to establish it now means placing even more power in the hands of the National Security Council whose secret discussions cannot be challenged until it is too late. It means strengthening the hand of those military strategists whom the Chicago Tribune of March 8 describes as "fostering a military doctrine that the President should lead the Nation into war against a potential enemy to keep it from striking the first blow without waiting for congressional declaration of war."

We believe rather that America should adopt a course which would unmistakably lead to peace. The Detroit News of April 9 editorially recommended such a course. Writing before the Italian election the editor described the foolishness of our present policy as follows:

"The Italians above all want peace, and the Communist Party has been wooing the voters in the terms of that yearning. The commie line has explained our interest in the election as concerned with making Italy an American stooge for purposes of a planned war against Russia. The Defense Department seems to have done its untimely best to lend an air of truth to that version of American intentions. It should be added that the News repeatedly has (advocated) * * * an American challenge to Russia to outlaw war, effectively and finally, by agreeing to a universal, supervised disarmament. The problem is to prove American devotion to peace in a manner so convincing that not even the most suspicious and ill-informed European could doubt it. The disarmament proposal would do just that."

Mr. President, here is some more of Mr. Alonzo Myers' testimony. He said:

I am a professor at New York University, being chairman of the department of higher education of the National Education Association.

I do not want to be quoting Mr. Baldwin all the time. I have quoted from him several times tonight, but he happens to be one of those professional writers on military matters who has watched this military game a long time, much longer, and with better preparation, than many of us. Mr. Baldwin has written an article in the New York Times for Sunday, May 9, 1948, on the Army's study about Hitler and the power of his army in 1939. He comments on a recent army study called foreign logistical organizations and methods, and compares it with some of the fine statements made by Churchill in his memoirs. The report deals with German production of aircraft before and during the war. It is clear from this report and Mr. Churchill's memoirs how much the military men of both this country and England overestimated German war production before and even during the war. This is Mr. Baldwin's comment:

In other words, Germany's great advantage in the immediate prewar and early war years was not in production output, and our estimates of Germany's production figures, including official intelligence estimates and some made from these figures by this writer, were greatly exaggerated.

I should like to read further from Mr. Baldwin's article on this subject, Mr. President. He has this to say:

German industry and German aircraft production facilities—contrary to official and popular impression—were not by any means fully mobilized for war when Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, according to a comprehensive official study and report prepared for the Secretary of the Army.

The report, a staff study made under the direction of Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, was published for limited circulation last October, and is entitled "Foreign Logistical Organizations and Methods." Its facts, compiled carefully from German records, modify, supplement, and at times take sharp issue with some of Winston Churchill's contentions, as expressed in the British war leader's historical memoirs now appearing in the New York Times.

The report reveals, for instance, that in 1938 Germany produced only 3,350 combat aircraft, or 5,235 aircraft of all types, includ-

ing trainers and noncombat types. In 1939, when Britain was producing 8,000 military aircraft of all types, combat and noncombat, Germany produced only 4,733 combat planes, or 8,295 of all airplane types, including civil aircraft. In the same year the United States turned out 2,141 military aircraft and 5,856 of all types, military, and civil.

Not until 1944, when the United States produced more than 96,000 planes, did German industry reach production peaks. In that year, despite prior and continuing intensive bombings, the Reich manufactured almost 40,000 planes of all types, nearly five times its 1939 production.

OTHER PRODUCTION SMALL

The same trend, of small production at the start of war but of immensely increased production during the war, particularly after the German invasion of Russia and the induction of Dr. Albert Speer as German economic dictator, is applicable, the report notes, to tanks, trucks, and other military matériel. Germany was not prepared in 1939—contrary to democratic assumption—for a long war or for total war; her economic and industrial effort was by no means fully harnessed; her factories were not producing war matériel at anything like top capacity.

These conclusions are at sharp variance with some of Mr Churchill's statements.

Speaking of the years 1934–35 and his struggle to awaken Britain to the need of rearmament, Mr. Churchill wrote that "a disaster of the first magnitude had fallen upon us. Hitler had already obtained parity with Great Britain. Henceforward he had merely to drive his factories and training schools at full speed, not only to keep his lead in the air but steadily to improve it * * * quantity was henceforth beyond us."

Later, in discussing the Munich settlement, Mr. Churchill writes:

"It is probable that in this last year before the outbreak, Germany manufactured at least double, and possibly treble, the munitions of Britain and France put together, and also that her great plants for tank production reached full capacity. They were therefore getting weapons at a far higher rate than we."

But the staff survey shows that in 1934, when Mr. Churchill first commenced to express his concern, Germany produced only 840 combat aircraft, 1,968 of all types, and that up until 1940, at least, Germany's production did not markedly outstrip Britain's. The difference was, however, that Germany's production was specifically applied to military aircraft and especially to fighters and bombers; Britain was producing fewer than 100 fighters a month in September 1939 and only a handful of heavy bombers. Much of her production was of training or commercial types, whereas German production had built up to 500 combat planes a month.

The same lack of German preparedness for total war or for a long war is revealed throughout the Army Department report.

In the last 4 months of 1939, after war had started, Germany produced 247 tanks and self-propelled guns, the British 314 tanks. But in 1943, after blitzkrieg had become attrition war, the German tank production mounted to 12,063, compared with the British home production of 7,476; and in 1944, despite bombing, German tanks and armored vehicle production was 27,340.

In 1939 Germany built 101,745 trucks and her truck production decreased slightly to 92,959 in 1943. But Britain built 112,500 heavy-wheeled vehicles in 1940.

In other words, Germany's great advantage in the immediate prewar and early war years was not in production output, and our estimates of Germany's production figures, including official intelligence estimates and some made from those figures by this writer, were greatly exaggerated.

As the Army study notes, "the full extent of military armament (by Germany) by 1939 has often been exaggerated."

"The total production of all tanks up to September 1939 had provided the German Army with about 3,000 tanks, of which only 300 were medium tanks," the report continues. "When Germany attacked Poland, the army had three Panzer divisions with only 600 tanks in reserve. * * * In the German ordnance industry no new gun plants were constructed before 1939. * * * The Army had sufficient ammunition in 1939 to last 6 weeks; the Air Force had bombs enough for 3 months' operations at the rate of expenditure experienced in Poland. * * * When the Polish invasion began, Germany had 1,000 frontline (serviceable) bombers and 1,050 fighter planes. (These latter figures agree fairly closely with Mr. Churchill's estimates.) Up to the outbreak of war, the German submarine industry had delivered just 53 submarines to the German Navy.

AMMUNITION RESERVE SMALL

The actual armament performance achieved by September 1939 is not too impressive. Germany was able to put more than 100 divisions into the field in the Polish campaign, but only 3 were armored and none were completely motorized. She had almost no reserve stocks of ammunition and equipment. * * * But the equipment which was available was utilized to the full in the kind of campaign which Hitler himself conceived as the only type which the German Army would have to wage—short decisive action against one military opponent at a time. * * * But Hitler was not economically prepared for the new kind of war he now had to fight (the war of attrition which replaced the war of blitzkreig after the Germans failed to capture Moscow in 1941). Hastily he took steps to enlarge the industrial base of his military might. But it was too late."

This revealing study—while it stands in sharp comparison to some of Mr. Churchill's estimates and to other estimates—does not invalidate the Churchillian contention that Britain should have started to prepare long before she did, and that Munich cost the Allies Czech divisions, strategical position, and other assets more important than the time gained.

But it also shows that military strength is considerably more than production figures; in fact, Germany won her initial great victories with a production output smaller than the combined production output of her opponents. Organization for war, concepts of war, sound strategy and tactics, good training and administration are all important ingredients of military strength and Germany had developed these. Germany was, on the whole, quite well prepared in 1939 for blitzkrieg war against individual opponents, but certainly not for total war against a great coalition, which is the kind of war she got.

Incidentally we might say, Mr. President, that in spite of all Hitler's preparation, in spite of all he could do, along came America, which had never had conscription, and laid him in the shade.

Mr. President, I do not think it is fully realized how much of our policy is determined by the military, instead of by civilian authorities. From the start to the finish, we are furnished with military opinions, not political opinions, and not opinions that reflect a well-rounded view of the whole situation.

Take for example, the matter of Germany and Japan, to which I have referred. Here the military are in complete command. So we depend entirely on the military and the men they appoint for all information and advice on how to handle those countries. We also depend on them for the policy. Just how trustworthy this is may be gathered from a little quotation from a civilian military expert, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the respected military expert of the New York Times. Writing on June 8, 1948, in the New York Times, Mr. Baldwin speaks of the relaxation of tension in Washington from the February and March crisis atmosphere, and then goes on to say:

In some measure that crisis was made in Washington, but it stemmed in part from some very alarmist cables from Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States military governor in Germany, who, in common with others, expected the Russians to march in weeks or months. There was little tangible foundation for any such belief then, and there is even less now, although some officers still talk vaguely of trouble after the harvest is in and of mysterious troop movements.

What shall we think of men who keep sending us in alarmist information from day to day that causes crises to arise back home? How can we trust them with more important information and policy?

I have not begun to speak in any detail about the big Army apparatus of propaganda and publicity to get the draft adopted. When a civilian organization wants to get a bill passed in Congress, its members come meekly into the Senate and House committees and are always afraid they are going to be thrown out by the nape of their necks. But when the Army comes into a Senate committee, they send in their best generals with all their brass glittering, and their stars shining and decorations gleaming—who can stand up against them?

But what about the nature of their arguments? That is a lot more important than the dress they wear or the influence they may have. I should like to quote this little piece from Hanson Baldwin about Mr. Forrestal's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Mr. Baldwin points out that the Defense Secretary failed to put into adequate perspective the exact state of the American Military Establishment today and he kept for a secret session of the committee some facts of major importance to the public opinion on this subject.

Mr. Baldwin's article further points out that the continued stress on American "weakness" is for domestic consumption, to influence the Congress and the public and to stampede them into accepting what the military think is necessary for the country.

I should like to quote a few little excerpts:

IT'S NO TIME FOR SECRECY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Secretary of Defense James Forrestal's presentation last week of the service expansion program was on the whole a reasonable and persuasive argument for greater military strength.

But the testimony before the Senate Armed Forces Committee suffered from one instance of sensationalism, one of exaggeration, and a recurrence of the old service differences. The Defense Secretary failed, moreover, to put into adequate perspective the exact state of the American military

establishment today, and he deferred to executive session some facts of major importance to the formulation of a sound public opinion about our military program.

MISLEADING THE PUBLIC

For the last 18 months—and increasingly in the last 6 months—Congress and the public have been told repeatedly by our military leaders of our "weaknesses," Secretary of State George C. Marshall stressed this "weakness" more emphatically than any other Government spokesman when he recently described the United States Army as a "hollow shell," an amazing statement by a Secretary of State in a time of crisis when the foreign policies he is espousing require the backing of military force.

Such statements obviously are intended for domestic consumption. There are some real weaknesses in our Military Establishment—notably the Army's shortage in manpower and in a strategic reserve, and our very small plane production—but the Army, Navy, and Air Force have elements of great strength and are by no means a "hollow shell."

The stressing of our weaknesses was aimed at Congress and the American people, both usually in a complacent and wishful-thinking mood until the moment of danger. But such exaggeration usually backfires. This has.

On the one hand the obvious retort of the citizen in this country is an inquiry into the intellectual capacity and administrative efficiency of our military leadership if $10,000,000,000 and $11,000,000,000 defense budgets can buy us only a "hollow shell." The other and far more important effect is abroad. The continued harping upon our military weaknesses has played directly into the hands of the Communists.

Communism is waging a campaign of fear in Europe; it is encouraging the flight of capital from Europe by a subtle spreading of rumors, fostering of unrest and the dissemination of reports that Russian troops will be in western Europe within the next few months. Communism stresses Russian strength, emphasizes Amearican weaknesses. Secretary Marshall's "hollow shell" statements and similar exaggerations are grist to the Communist mill.

Mr. Forrestal did something but not enough to correct this distortion last week; he could have emphasized more than he did our military strengths.

POSSIBILITY OF WAR

There was another omission in his presentation. In the last 3 months the opinion of our leaders appears to have shifted radically. At the beginning of the year Washington seemed more or less unanimous that war in the near future was unlikely.

The President's speech advocating resumption of the draft and UMT shows a sudden reversal of this opinion. Washington now appears to feel that war in the near future is a distinct possibility and that Russia may use military force to gain her ends. The reasons for this shift in opinion have not been made clear.

Have there been Russian or Yugoslav troop movements? Is Russia mobilizing? Mr. Forrestal hinted at possible answers when he asked the committee to hear in executive session the strengths and deployments of the armed forces of other countries.

Yet if a whole shift in Government opinion, a major development of policy and the biggest peacetime military expansion program in our history are to be based, even in part, on such strengths and deployments, surely the American people are entitled to the evidence. The situation is far too serious for secrecy or for anything less than direct candor.

Nor did Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan help the cause with his abrupt and sensational announcement that submarines not belonging to any nation west of the iron curtain have been sighted off our shores.

That just turned out to be a blank, outright falsehood. The submarines off our shores, of course, were way up off the Aleutians. They happened to be our shores, but they are as close to Russia as they are to us. It turned out to be a distortion of the truth to scare the American people.

AIR FORCE RESENTMENT

The Secretary did not elaborate. But anonymous naval officers amplified the report. "Off our shores," it appears, was in at least one instance in mid-Pacific.

I am quoting Hanson Baldwin. He is no wild-eyed alarmist.

This is pretty flimsy evidence upon which to build a defense program.

Secretary of the Air Force W. Stuart Symington added to the excitement and confusion by disagreeing with a previous statement of his colleagues that the Eurasian "heartland" could not be reached from North America by any existing bombers. It soon developed, however, that Mr. Symington meant that our B–29's "could bomb any part of Russia and return to American bases" only by refueling in the air, presumably from B–36 tanker planes. What Mr. Symington did not explain, however, was that neither the technique nor the logistics of large-scale midair refueling operations have been solved, and that the refueling planes must also have a base of operations.

And behind his statement, it quickly developed, was Air Force resentment that it was not to get a larger share of the expanded budget presented by Mr. Forrestal.

All of which "is a hell of a way to run a railroad."

That is an old joke which I heard years ago. I have forgotten what it was about, but I remember the gag line which Mr. Baldwin uses.

Mr. President, on April 21, General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, testified before the House Armed Services Committee. In order to show what they learned over on the other side, I wish to read a few brief selections from that testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. ELSTON. If the President decided before that the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1940 should not operate, how can the services give us any assurance now that the President will not take a similar provision with respect to this act?

Mr. BROOKS. That is the point exactly.

Mr. SHORT. You know the road that is paved with good intentions and where it leads.

What has the Department done and is doing now to help the Reserves?

General EVANS. Very little.

Mr. SHORT. In furnishing you equipment?

General EVANS. Nothing.

Mr. SHORT. Nothing. That is what I thought. Nothing.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to ask you this: What is the status of the Reserve at the present time?

General EVANS. I am speaking now of the Reserve of the Army and Air, Mr. Brooks. Three years have gone by. There is not an adequate troop basis which gives a man a wartime assignment. There are not adequate units. People are not assigned to units. The enlisted men—some six-hundred-odd thousand—that were taken, veterans all of World War II—have not been contacted. They have not been put in units. Their enlistments run out this year. We will lose nearly all of them. So you can rather quickly see that it is a rather pitiful state that the Reserves are in.

Mr. SHORT. General, the only time they call you is when they are in war and they need you to win it.

General EVANS. Unfortunately.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. General Evans, we want to find a legal way to have them carry it out, when we write it in the law.

General EVANS. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Instead of relying on promises of the military.

General EVANS. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Up to now they have not done very much for you, as Mr. SHORT pointed out.

* * * * *

General EVANS. There are two things. It is true we have 600,000 on paper; but they have not been contacted. They have not been put into units. They have not been given any training. Their enlistment is going to run out, and because of lack of interest they are not going to reenlist. So, you are going to lose them.

Mr. BATES. Probably because they have not been given anything to do.

General EVANS. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Have those bills that the House passed cleared the Senate yet?

General EVANS. No; not the retirement bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They are still pending; are they not?

General EVANS. The retirement bill is still pending in the Senate. It comes up before the Senate committee sometime next week, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Until you get organized units and equipment, those kinds of bills are worthless because they have nothing to apply them to.

General EVANS. That is right, Mr. JOHNSON. I am not talking about incentive. I am not talking about procurement. All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we now have.

Mr. BATES. You want to do the same with the Army that we are now doing with the Naval Reserve?

General EVANS. Exactly.

Mr. BATES. Give them something to do. Build the unit. Train them and equip them.

General EVANS. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS. You say the Army Reserve program has broken down?

General EVANS. Completely.

* * * * *

Mr. SHORT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It has been testified that the Air Force had all the men that they need, or can get them. We know there is a long list trying to get in who cannot get in. The Navy can get theirs through voluntary recruitment.

Now, we propose to spend millions of dollars in registering millions of men to get 240,000 for the Ground Forces.

My contention, General, is that if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and our Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, determined effort to build them up, we would not have this legislation here.

General EVANS. I agree with you thoroughly.

Mr. SHORT. There would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else.

General EVANS. I agree with you thoroughly.

Mr. SHORT. Good. I am glad to get it in the record.

Mr. KILDAY. Not UMT, General?

General EVANS. Yes; I would almost go that far, Mr. KILDAY.

Mr. KILDAY. You would go that far?

General EVANS. Yes.

There it is. This general admits that the Army has not tried to get men. He says that it could if it wanted to; but it did not. It wanted universal military training or the draft, so the Congress has voted the draft.

Mr. President, on April 23, the Reverend E. Paul Weaver, of Huntington County, Ind., appeared before the House Armed Services Committee and gave a remarkable statement of reasons why America should not adopt a peacetime draft. Rev. Dr. Weaver's testimony begins on page 6584 of the House Committee hearings. I think that the Senate should consider this testimony, especially since the Senate Armed Services Committee refused to let Dr. R. L. Holland present an oral testimony in behalf of the Indiana Committee for the Prevention of Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime. The roster of that committee is found in the Senate armed services hearings, together with the splendid statement of that committee, which was signed by 150 outstanding leaders of the State of Indiana. I wish to read from Rev. Dr. Weaver's testimony. Parts of this testimony were carried in most of the papers of the country. I quote:

Mr. Chairman, I am E. Paul Weaver, of Huntington County, Ind. I am a rural pastor. I am not here today, however, to represent any church group or its position in regards to selective service. I am here as the authorized representative of the Indiana Committee for the Prevention of Compulsory Military Training in Peacetime. The complete statement which every member of our organization has signed and the list of 150 principal members of our committee is found on pages 834 to 838 of the Senate hearings, which with your kind permission I should like to have entered into the record at this point.

Briefly I might state that our Indiana committee is composed of the State-wide leaders of the following organizations: The Indiana Farm Bureau, the Indiana Grange, the State WCTU, the Indiana Congress of Parent-Teachers Associations, the Indiana Council of Churches, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Disciples Church, and others; four leading Jewish rabbis of the State, the presidents of 11 colleges of the State of Indiana, and many other prominent citizens of the State and officers of other organizations. In addition to the 150 names found in the report of the Senate hearings, we have local chapters in many of our counties.

Since military spokesmen have made clear the interrelationship of selective service and universal military training when they spoke of being willing to give up selective service if universal military training were passed, we believe that both forms of a peacetime draft ought to be rejected.

First, I should like to demonstrate that evidence before the country and the committee at this time does not conclusively prove that it is now necessary to depart from our historic American policy of a voluntary peacetime Military Establishment.

1. The Air Force does not need selective service: Secretary of Air Symington told this committee on April 13: "We do not feel that selective service is necessary in order to get the people * * * for the Air Force." General Spaatz added: "I have no doubt in my mind but what the Air Force will get sufficient recruits to maintain the Air Force proper on a voluntary-enlistment basis."

2. The Navy doesn't need selective service: Secretary of Navy Sullivan told this committee on April 13: "We believe that the way our enlistments have been running we probably will be able to do it (without selective service) * * *." Admiral Denfeld, in reply to a question on whether the Navy could get its strength without a draft, said: "I think you can get it if the present situation continues."

3. As we consider the Army's case for selective service, we must bear in mind the fact that Secretary Royall testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 25 that "war is not imminent." To that we must add the fact that the Italian elections turned out rather worse for the Communists than most Americans anticipated.

Italy went anti-Communist without the help of selective service, even though Mr. Truman certainly implied in his message to Congress that only a peacetime draft would back up our foreign policy.

Now that the elections in Italy are over and no crisis requiring drastic military action is on the horizons, there should be less reason for enlarging the Army. If the United States is not planning to launch an aggressive war there doesn't seem to be any reason to put men in the Army beyond the number needed for our present commitments. The Army spokesmen in the Senate hearings indicated that if the Army were increased by 240,000 men only 14,000 additional troops would be sent overseas. This doesn't seem to justify a draft.

Furthermore the Army is rejecting enlistments because it has raised its standards of admission.

The Army has tried to justify its rejecting men whose grades in the Army general classification tests are between 70 and 80 on two grounds. First, that the ability of men to learn is registered by the test and also that men who get less than an 80 score are unable to learn well enough to be in the Army.

Actually, of course the Army knows that men who make less than an 80 score do learn well enough to be in the Army. General Paul, for example, in a statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee admitted that the Army now has men of prior service with good records whose score is between 70 and 80. An Army officer who signs his name Maj. K. S. V. wrote a letter to the Infantry Journal which appears in the March 1948 issue. In it he gives 12 reasons why the Army is not getting enough recruits. The one the major emphasized was the intelligence requirements. He claimed that many good noncommissioned officers in the Army would not now be able to get in if they had to pass the present standards. He recommended lowering the score and stated that all of the old-timers he had consulted before submitting his letter to the editor agreed that it was most urgent to lower the present intelligence requirements. General Paul's statistics submitted to the Senate Armed Services Committee also reveal that 1,593 persons with more than 10 years of education failed to get an 80 score. Yet the fact that these men were able to advance through 10 grades of school is an indication that they have ability to learn.

During the war and until early 1947 the Army accepted men with a 70 grade. General Dahlquist testified before the House Armed Services Committee the military has not to any perceptible percentage changed in any way since World War II with respect to mechanization, electronics, etc. The general added "we are getting more gadgets, but gadgets do not necessarily take higher intelligence. The greatest intelligence needed by any soldier is needed by the man who alone with the rifle is a complete army." Now, General Dahlquist really meant this, he was talking about ordinary horse sense or judgment which is quite different from the book-learning skills or other skills. Furthermore, riflemen were needed a lot more in past wars than they will be in future ones as war becomes more mechanized. If an 80 score was not required for riflemen in past wars it ought not to be required now. And if mechanization does not necessarily take higher intelligence what is the justification of raising the standard for men who serve in a mechanized army.

The second argument Army spokesmen have used to justify rejecting men with a 70 to 80 score is the one used by General Dahlquist that they will have greater numbers in our guardhouse and greater numbers in developmental battalion.

Statistically, it is true that more men with lower grades end up in the guardhouse than do men with higher grades. This, however, is not because men with lower grades are more immoral or because they have criminal tendencies. It is because the brighter criminals, the men who are a little more clever, cover up a bit more and don't get caught so often.

I was impressed with the statement before this committee made by the prominent educator D. Alonzo Myers. He asked this committee to find out exactly what proportion of men in the 70 to 80 group were committed to the guardhouse and why. He pointed out that the Army has so many minor regulations that it would take a good memory to obey all of them.

General Hershey told this committee that about 12,000 paid personnel and close to 175,000 unpaid draft-board personnel would be required to operate selective service. Now General Hershey didn't reveal whether 175,000 experienced draft-board personnel who served for 5 years during the war are going to work without pay during peacetime when there is obviously no emergency. Evidently General Hershey doesn't expect that they will, for the Chicago Tribune of April 8 reports that he has asked National Guard headquarters in each State to assign men for training in draft procedures. Not only will General Hershey have to find thousands of new men and persuade them to work without pay, but he is apparently already planning to insure military control over selective service through the National Guard whose appropriations for example are recommended by the Army.

General Hershey tried to justify using over 150,000 men to draft 240,000 men by saying that the draft would encourage 600,000 others to enlist. This is pure double talk. The Navy and Air Force say they can rely on volunteers. The Army needs only 240,000 additional men and is recruiting now at the rate of about 225,000 men a year without the heat of a draft. (See recruiting figures in Myers testimony.) General Hershey cannot take credit for encouraging 600,000 to enlist. He would be nearer the truth if he would say that he is hoping to use almost 200,000 men to draft about 200,000 men.

It seems clear to many of us that the Army is not utilizing the Enlisted Reserves in a manner that will prepare them for an emergency. General Evans of the Reserve Officers Association testified before this committee yesterday. "It is true that we have 600,000 men on paper, but they have not been contacted and they have not been given any training." He added, "All I've been urging for 3 years is to have somebody do something for the Reserves."

In the April 10, 1948, Colliers, Donald Robinson has discussed this problem under the subject Does the Army Want the Reserves?

PROPOSALS FOR POSITIVE ACTION

1. Urge Congress to pass at once the Landis resolution which was originally proposed by Speaker MARTIN which resolves "That before the United States adopts compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States delegate to the United Nations organization, Warren R. Austin be, and hereby are, urged to work unceasingly

for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations."

2. Inasmuch as the Air Force and Navy can get their recruits by American voluntary methods, I suggest that Congress appoint a committee to investigate and find out:

(1) Why the Army is not able to get sufficient men by voluntary enlistments.

(2) Why the rate of reenlistment for the Army has sunk so low.

(3) Whether the Army is using its existing manpower and reserves. If not, why not?

3. Let Congress tell those concerned to cease propagandizing our Nation for universal military training and selective service, and to make our American democracy work.

Mr. President, Reverend Weaver, whom I have just been quoting, also gave a speech at Elkhart, Ind., on May 20 over radio station WTRC. It has much good information in it and reveals some of the errors of the current arguments in favor of the peacetime draft. From Reverend Weaver's radio talk at Elkhart I quote the following:

There is one thing that all of us have in common. All of us love America. My ancestors came to these shores just about 200 years ago, because America appeared to them as a land of freedom and great promise. I was reared in these great traditions. I believe in the American way of life. All of us love America. If we did not love this country we should not be so deeply concerned that it should not go down the path that would lead to its self-destruction.

Recently I have returned from our Nation's Capitol where for 2 weeks I studied carefully the testimony being presented to the House Armed Services Committee. I have seen the clever trick that is being played in an attempt to get Congress to provide for permanent compulsory military training. When it became evident that Congress would not pass UMT temporary selective service was demanded in the President's address on March 17. On the 18th of March when Secretary of Defense Forrestal testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee he appeared to be so surprised by the request of the President that he had no plan to offer the committee (p. 43, SASC hearings). However, by April 12 when Secretary Forrestal testified before the House Armed Services Committee the following conversation occurred:

"Mr. HÉBERT. I understood you to say that selective service is merely a temporary measure?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir.

"Mr. HÉBERT. Which will be on the books so long as you do not have UMT; is that correct?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. Yes, sir; that is right.

"Mr. HÉBERT. Then it will be as temporary as some of those buildings on Constitution Avenue which were erected during World War I and which are still there—if we do not have universal military training?

"Secretary FORRESTAL. That is my opinion." (House Armed Services Committee hearing, p. 6114.)

Let no one be confused. The program calls for permanent peacetime conscription and regimentation. Its advocates want all they can get. They will start with a little if they cannot get all at the first attempt. After studying the situation carefully I am convinced that the program calls for more than permanent peacetime conscription for military service. It follows its logical course to conscription of labor and regimentation of capital and industry, in fact regimentation of all life. If we should follow such a course in an attempt to defeat a totalitarian dictatorship abroad we should inevitably find ourselves the victims of just such a system here in the America that we love.

I live in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana. We in the Fifth District are happy to have as our Representative the Honorable FOREST HARNESS, who loves our American way of doing things. I have found Mr. HARNESS to be a statesman of unusual courage. If our American way of life is preserved by this Congress, all America will be in debt to Mr. HARNESS and his investigations of the agencies of the Federal Government which have been using our money to control the thought of this Republic. His investigations of the War Department's "illegal and improper" propaganda activities for UMT helped to turn the tide from the way of regimentation.

If we felt that peacetime conscription were really necessary to our security, I know that Congress would pass a law to that effect without hesitation. I talked with dozens of Congressmen. I know that they feel that they are not getting the truth from the administration. I predict confidently now, contrary to the predictions of so many, that neither UMT nor the proposed Truman draft will pass in this session.

Well, it looks to me as though the Reverend Weaver got some bum steers when he made that prediction that they would not pass in this session—probably a case of wishful thinking.

Just yesterday I received my copy of the minority report of the House Armed Services Committee and signed by Congressmen SHORT, BISHOP, HEFFERNAN, PHILBIN, and HAVENNER. It is a masterful summary of the case against the Truman draft.

It is not only the Truman draft; it is a bipartisan draft. They are all for it.

The responsible officers of the Air Force testified that they felt that even for a 70-group program the Air Force does not need selective service. Likewise on the same day, April 13, the men responsible for our Navy testified that they felt that the Navy can get its men without selective service.

On March 31, 1947, the Army grades were raised to 80. At the present time the Army is turning down almost 50 percent of the men applying for service, although they must admit that men with grades under 80 did spendid jobs during the war. In fact men with grades of 59 were used. The Army claims that men with grades under 80 make up an unusual percentage of the men in the guardhouse.

Dr. Alonzo Myers, an infantry captain of World War I, told the House Armed Services Committee that "The Army has so many minor regulations that it would take a good memory to obey all of them." (House Armed Services Committee hearings, p. 6472.)

It was pointed out in the minority report of the House Armed Services Committee that "the Army has deliberately refrained from making all-out efforts to utilize voluntary recruitment methods. Just as little interest has been shown in supporting the Reserve Establishments as long as the Army feels that universal conscription is obtainable, so the Army has been unwilling to pursue energetically the problem of making Army service more desirable to the average potential soldier.

I think, Mr. President, if we once and for all told them they were not going to get a draft, they would get busy, hustle around, and recruit the men.

Many believe that if the Army would reform its system according to the suggestions of the Doolittle report, Army life would be more attractive to the average young man. The minority report also stresses the observation that—

"To date the record of the Army in refusing to build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard borders on a national scandal. The testimony before our committee established clearly that the Army has followed a policy of deliberately ignoring the Reserves as a means of exerting pressure to get universal military training."

The argument that hooks more people in favor of peacetime conscription and UMT than any other is the story that has been fed very cleverly to our Gold Star Mothers. It has also been fed to the patriotic organizations as gospel truth. I should like to have the people examine this clever fiction very carefully.

The proponents of a regimented society argue that if we had UMT and/or peacetime conscription those Gold Stars would not be there. They say that the reason that we lost so many boys is that we did not have UMT. "If only we had had UMT," the conscriptionists sigh. What is the truth?

The relative casualty lists disprove this fiction. Here are the casualty lists of soldiers killed in World War II according to General Marshall's estimates:

Countries with peacetime conscription: USSR lost 7,500,000 (1 for every 22 inhabitants); Germany lost 2,850,000 (1 for every 25 inhabitants); Japan lost 1,506,000 (1 for every 46).

The Nation without UMT and/or peacetime conscription: The United States of America lost 295,904 (1 for every 500 inhabitants). (These figures do not include civilian deaths by bombings.)

Of course we would come out better than anyone else in that respect.

Mr. President, I might say to the folks who expect to attend the Philadelphia convention that they had better be putting on their thinking caps, because we are just going good here. I am beginning to realize that Saturday night is not so far away. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] may rally around after a bit, and we can run this right through, without a stop, until midnight Saturday, without any strain whatsoever. So the boys may as well go home and get busy and figure out what they are going to do.

I resume reading:

During the war the Army insisted upon a teen-age draft together with an unfulfilled promise to parents that boys would be given adequate training.

In October 1942, Congress was asked to lower the draft age to 18. The United States News of March 9, 1945, stated "The Senate wrote in a provision that youths of 18 and 19 could not be sent into combat without receiving a year's training. That provision was killed by House and Senate conferees after they were assured that draftees would be given all the training necessary to make good fighting men. Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, appealed to Congress to "trust our judgment and our insistence that we fight only with properly trained units, to see that each soldier has adequate training before he enters combat."

The New York Times reported on December 9, 1944, "Because of a large increase in the percentage of youth that are being drafted, the Army has changed its policy and is now sending 18-year-old soldiers overseas as infantry and as armored force replacements, Robert P. Patterson * * * disclosed today." The United States News of March 9, 1945, also indicated that Secretary Patterson had said in general that all men would get about 8 months' training be-

fore going into combat. The News added, "Even then the names of 18-year-olds were showing up in casualty lists. Boys who had been graduated from high school in June were being reported killed and wounded in December."

Mr. President, these military boys do not think much of their plighted word. They are a kind of cold-blooded, hard-hearted lot.

I hope that every Gold Star Mother realizes that the Army had inducted approximately 8,000,000 men. According to General Marshall's last biennial report only 1,500,000 of these were combat troops. We know that there were millions of men in the Army over 20. If the Army had kept faith with the parents would they have sent the 18-year-olds into combat?

Of course they did not keep faith, Mr. President. Young boys were killed and wounded a few months after they were inducted into the Army. At this moment there is a fine establishment in Tennessee or Kentucky where there is a show place, to indicate what they would do with the UMT. If they once get the law passed and get the boys into the service they will not treat them that way any more.

I hope that the decision to send our 18-year-olds into combat while the Army had millions of more mature men was not made by men who have been endeavoring to sell UMT to America for almost 30 years.

The Reverend Weaver is speaking wishfully again, Mr. President.

The Army has tried to create the impression that if the United States had had UMT, the casualties could have been prevented. This is attempted in both the War Department pamphlet of January 1947 and the UMT bill H. R. 4278. Most of us who think soberly will realize that these 18-year-old boys who were sent into combat had just finished high school. They would not have had UMT even if UMT had been the practice of America.

It does not seem to be honest to blame the casualties of the last war upon the absence of peacetime conscription. The Nation's leading military analyst, Hanson Baldwin, in the January 5, 1945, New York Times, discussed this question. He assigned the blame for the casualties of the Battle of the Bulge at least partly to inferior equipment. He attributed this situation to the "conservatism and traditionalism in the Army mind, complicated organization in the War Department," etc.

The Gold Star Mothers who have seen through this clever ruse at transferring the blame for the loss of their sons, are among the most ardent opponents of UMT and the peacetime draft. At the Indiana State pastors' conference in January 1948, a lady collecting all the material about peacetime conscription available, looked up with tears in her eyes as her Gold Star was noticed.

She remarked, "Yes; I have another son who is only 15." She does not want to turn that boy over to the same group that took away his older brother. It would be most ironical if, after the older brother has offered his life to defeat the regimented militarism of Japan, we left MacArthur behind there to root out that militarism and peacetime conscription and set up a democracy, while we in America proceeded to set up a system of militarism complete with universal military training and peacetime conscription.

Millions of people who deeply love the American way of life are opposed to universal military training and/or the proposed Truman draft because they have read the following statement:

"It is clear to anyone who even stops to think that in case of a coming war the entire Nation would have to take up arms; that therefore millions would be driven toward the enemy with bad, insufficient, or half-finished training. One must nevertheless not forget that the shortage of trained soldiers could easily lead, at the beginning of a war, to losing that war.

"The Army educates them only to be reliable, decent members of the community, men who in the hour of need and danger will feel themselves united in loyalty with the Nation, and should fate confront them with the sternest ordeal, will defend the freedom of their people with bravery and honor."

That statement was made not by a loyal American but by Adolph Hitler in Mein Kampf when he was trying to sell his Nazi youth movement to the German people.

It sounds just like what is being done to us now, and it is exactly the same thing, indeed. Those who are party to this effort are just as remiss in their duty to the American people as those who saddled militarism on the Germans were to their people.

The Reverend Mr. Weaver proceeds:

When I testified before the House Armed Services Committee on April 23, I was asked, "What do you suggest we should do to stop Russia?"

To that question I replied, "I think we must not follow the method of Russia; but we must approach Russia with some positive action. We cannot defeat communism, which is an idea, with guns. We must learn that. You cannot stop an idea with a gun. You drive it in further. But you can stop an idea with a more powerful idea, and the more powerful idea is the Christian ideal of democracy. Jesus Christ taught respect for the human personality, and our Government today has lost it. It is time that we find it again. If we have the ideal of a Christian democracy which our ancestors had, we will defeat communism not only in America, but we will stop it in Russia. The "iron curtain" is not so high but what Russia will hear of the democracy which is working in America. But if we fail to make it work here, they will have a good, fertile bed for their ideals here in America."

I still agree with that statement. We must make our democracy work. We must reaffirm our faith in the American way of life. We must say "No" to every effort at unncessary regimentation. UMT and the "Truman draft" are only a beginning. When my hostess requests, "Will you keep your fork, please," I know there is something more coming. In the case of UMT and the Truman draft there is also something more coming. I would warn us solemnly, "It will not be pie and cake." God helping us we can yet resist these steps toward regimentation and these efforts at Federal thought-control.

That is the end of the radio address delivered by Rev. Mr. Weaver.

The Senate and the country might also be interested in the methods of propaganda used by the military to get over their ideas on the draft and UMT. I quote from the report of the Publicity and Propaganda Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives made on July 24, 1947, almost a year ago.

The committee concludes in its report that the War Department is using Government funds in an improper manner for propaganda activities supporting compulsory military training.

I was interested in noting that one of the people—the paid propagandists of the Army—used was a woman who went around to various women's group and also contacted the former Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts. Mr. Roberts is known as head of an organization lobbying for UMT. I find it interesting that Mr. Justice Roberts lobbies on the one hand for universal military training and the draft, and on the other for some form of world government. I had not thought we should work for government that will be imposed by arming the world.

Here are the quotations from the committee of which I spoke a moment ago:

This report summarizes our hearings on this phase of the inquiry, to date, and presents the conclusions arrived at, following careful evaluation of the testimony and documentary evidence presented by, and relating to, the War Department.

The use of Federal funds for the purpose of influencing legislation before Congress is unlawful under section 201, title 18, of the United States Code. We have, therefore, brought these matters to the attention of the Department of Justice, with a request that the Attorney General, at once, initiate proceedings to stop this unauthorized and illegal expenditure of public moneys. A copy of the chairman's letter to the Attorney General is made a part of this interim report.

This, our second report, deals exclusively with the activities calculated to build up a federally stimulated public demand upon Congress for enactment of legislation for universal military training. The activities (which we shall hereinafter more fully set forth) have been those of civilian employees of the War Department, as well as the personnel of the United States Army.

* * * * *

Another of the War Department's civilian consultants was Mrs. Arthur Woods. Mrs. Woods, a former lieutenant colonel in the WAC, also traveled throughout the country at Government expense, speaking on behalf of universal military training. She was particularly interested in influencing women and parents of the country on the virtues of compulsory military training. The purposes of the activities of Mrs. Woods can, perhaps, best be shown in a letter written by her to Miss Linnea Woolf, 164 East Thirty-third Street, New York 16, N. Y.

The letter of this lady appears in the report. However, I shall not take the trouble to read it.

Now, Mr. President, I think I shall turn over the chore to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], whom I eulogized earlier in the evening, and for whom I have a great admiration and high regard. Later I shall resume. I am entitled to another speech on this same matter. At this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Eastland
Baldwin	Cain	Ecton
Ball	Chavez	Ellender
Barkley	Connally	Feazel
Brewster	Cooper	Ferguson
Bricker	Cordon	Flanders
Bridges	Donnell	Fulbright
Brooks	Downey	Green
Butler	Dworshak	Gurney

Hatch	McGrath	Smith
Hawkes	McKellar	Sparkman
Hayden	McMahon	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Stewart
Hill	Malone	Taft
Hoey	Martin	Taylor
Holland	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Ives	Millikin	Thye
Jenner	Morse	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Myers	Umstead
Kem	O'Conor	Vandenberg
Kilgore	O'Daniel	Watkins
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Langer	Pepper	Wiley
Lucas	Revercomb	Williams
McCarthy	Robertson, Va.	Young
McClellan	Russell	
McFarland	Saltonstall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes";

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations; and

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor; and

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5716) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5734) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6657. An act to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

H. R. 6800. An act to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6958. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.

The message notified the Senate that Mr. BROOKS had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, vice Mr. DURHAM, excused.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. TOBEY, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2894) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

GEN. MATT WHITAKER RANSOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR UMSTEAD

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Gen. Matt Whitaker Ransom, delivered by him at Jackson, N. C., on August 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSIAH W. BAILEY

[Mr. UMSTEAD, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a tribute prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of Josiah W. Bailey, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WALLACE WHITE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the approach of Congress' recess brings to mind the fact that many of the distinguished men who grace this Chamber will shortly bid adieu to the United States Senate, in which they have rendered such noble and faithful service. At this time, I should like to briefly pay tribute to a man who is a friend of all of us, a guide, an inspiration, a devoted public servant of his native State and his Nation, a man who has served in this body since 1931 with success and distinction.

I am referring, of course, to the senior Senator from Maine, the Honorable WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

If you look in the Congressional Directory and read the long series of achievements of WALLACE WHITE in the House of Representatives, where he was first elected to the Sixty-fifth Congress and where he served until the Seventy-first Congress, in the Senate, in many international conferences and in numerous other capacities, the layman can only get a limited picture of what WALLACE WHITE means to us and has meant to us during all these years. You would have to know him personally, as we have known him, to realize the strength that he possesses that is, nevertheless, gentle, the humor with which he is so richly endowed, but which is always in such good nature, the leadership which he has constantly exercised, both as minority and majority leader of the Senate, but about which he has always been so modest.

It is difficult for any man to try to sum up in a few moments the devoted work of a lifetime by a dear friend. We can recite the facts, but it is hard to convey all of the sacrifices, all of the patience, all of the endless devotion which went into each of the activities of our dear friend.

We can recall that WALLACE WHITE served as an employee of the Senate for some years prior to his service in the Congress. For example, he served as assistant clerk to the Committee on Commerce for a couple of years when the chairman of that committee was the Honorable William P. Fry. He also served as Secretary to Senator Fry for

several years when the latter was President pro tempore of the Senate. WALLACE WHITE continued in that capacity until November 1903.

On April 2, 1917, 4 days before America's declaration of war in the first world conflict, WALLACE WHITE was sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives. In the House, he served as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, of the Committee on Woman's Suffrage, of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

In September 1930, following his unbroken service in the House of Representatives, he was elected United States Senator, in which post he has been successively reelected. In this Chamber, he has served with distinction on the Civil Service, Claims, Commerce, Education and Labor, Post Office and Post Roads, and other committees. In May of 1935, he was appointed to the Committee on Foreign Relations and he has served on numerous other Senate groups.

With the advent of the GOP's control of the Congress, Senator WHITE, who had served as acting Republican floor leader following the death of Senator McNary, was elected majority leader of the Senate.

We in the Senate know how popular WALLACE WHITE has been with all his colleagues and with all those who have come in contact with him.

Without fanfare, without histrionics, he has performed his duties selflessly and faithfully.

In whatever capacity he has served, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee and ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, or as floor leader, he has gained the respect and admiration of his associates on both sides of the aisle.

To say that WALLACE WHITE's departure from the Senate will leave a gap that will be hard, if not impossible, to fill, is an understatement. To say, however, that we will look to him for continued public service and continued guidance is merely to state the obvious.

WALLACE WHITE has deserved the rest and relaxation which are so much his due but which have been denied him during all these strenuous years in public service. We know, however, that he will continue to be a source of inspiration and direction to all his fellow citizens of Maine and to all of his associates here in the Senate.

As he has paid tribute to other great men who have graced this Chamber, so now we pay deserved tribute to him and wish him good luck and Godspeed on all his future ventures.

PROMOTION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE IN PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House; agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, quite a number of the Members of the Senate, members of the Appropriations Committee, have been working on appropriation bills all evening. They must return to committee rooms to deal with more appropriation bills. House conferees are waiting in the conference rooms. I am very hopeful that all Members of the Senate will agree to the appointment of conferees on Senate bill 2655. I especially ask my colleague from my neighboring State of North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to allow the appointment of conferees.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I will wait until I secure the floor in my own right.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 5888, to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my understanding is that it requires unanimous consent temporarily to displace the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the motion of the Senator from South Dakota be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed with the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Change the figure "400,000,000" to read "$450,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Page 2, line 4, of the amendments of the Senate, strike out the words "one fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two fiscal years"; page 2, line 12, of the amendments of the Senate, after the word "year", insert the following ", including any funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Page 2, strike out all of subsection (a) under 2 (a); and on page 3, line 8, strike out "(b)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered nine, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Page 4, line 8, of the amendments of the Senate, change the figure "$20,000,000" to read "$17,500,000"; Page 5, line 19, change the colon to a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph through line 9, on page 6; and the Senate agree to the same.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN S. COOPER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
E. G. ROHRBOUGH,
J. GLENN BEALL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

STREAM POLLUTION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REVERCOMB. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the conference report on Senate bill 418, which is a bill dealing with the removal of pollution from streams and with the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO SURVIVING CHILDREN OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on Senate bill 2825, a bill to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: That paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided in part I, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"Widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $100 (with $15 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $60 (or both), $35 each."

"SEC. 2. Subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Any veteran or the dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in part I of this regulation, if the disability or death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while engaged in extra-hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) while the United States is engaged in war.'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided for in part II, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at 80 per centum of the rates specified for such dependents in paragraph IV, part I hereof, as now or hereafter amended.'

"SEC. 4. The increases provided by this Act shall be effective from the first day of the second month following the passage of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes"; and the House agree to the same.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report is agreed to.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 2821, to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendent, as follows: "That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $21;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $35;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $45.50;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $56;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $14;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $24.50;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $35;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $17.50 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 2. That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $16.80;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $28;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $36.40;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $44.80;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $11.20;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $19.60;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $28;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $14 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 3. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this Act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

"SEC. 4. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this Act.

"SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report is agreed to.

STREAM POLLUTION

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I again ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the

immediate consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 418, which is a bill dealing with the removal of pollution from streams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] if there is any objection at this time to permitting a vote on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to appoint conferees on the military bill? I appeal to him to let us vote. When the business of the Senate continues, and the report is made, my distinguished colleague will have ample opportunity to debate the issue as to whether or not he wishes to approve the conference report.

I know that the Senator can do as he chooses, but it would expedite the work of the Senate if the motion could be voted upon. He could make his speech on the adoption of the conference report, which would be almost the immediate order of business.

I appeal to the Senator to permit us to expedite the work of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have another matter which I deem of such great importance that I decline to accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska at the present time, because I wish Senators to hear what I am about to say. I want all to hear who can possibly remain.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota wishes to make a speech. He has a perfect right to make the speech. I will assure the Senator that there will not be a recess, but that we shall proceed with the business of the Senate, and that before this session is concluded tonight the conference report will be submitted, on which the speech is to be made. It would greatly expedite the work of the Senate if that could be done. I appeal to the Senator to let us vote on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota. Then the Senator from North Dakota will have ample opportunity to make the speech which he is about to make. We will guarantee that the session will continue if he will do that for us.

Mr. LANGER. I assure my distinguished friend that I deeply regret that I cannot do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if a continuation of the present condition, which has existed on the floor of the Senate for the past several hours, is not almost certain to result in the death of many important measures which we would like to consider at this session, including that of increasing the pay of postal employees, and the bill with relation to the classified employees in the Federal service?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senate adjourns, as has been scheduled, it is almost a certainty that some of the legislation which the Senate would and should consider will be jeopardized if we cannot expedite the business of the Senate. Just which measures might suffer, I could not say. I will say, however, that if we could expedite the work of the Senate tonight, I am confident that the pay bills could be passed. I see no objection to them. I think they could be ironed out satisfactorily.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator believe that this situation is helping the chances of those bills?

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry to say that it is not. On the other hand, I want the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to know that he has a perfect right to make a speech on any subject he wishes. I shall not ask him again at this time to permit us to vote on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make only one statement.

The other day when the postal bill was called up, I suggested that I thought that because of the increased cost of living an increase in pay should be granted to postal employees. My statement was misunderstood by some. I wish to say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Nebraska that I believe other Government employees should likewise have an increase in pay.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I express to the distinguished Senator my approval of the statement he has made. We are all interested in the pay bill. It was our intention to make it the next order of business on the Legislative Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to ask the distinguished acting majority leader if he had considered the possibility of asking that some of these other important measures might be brought up.

I think the pending question is on the motion to agree to a conference on the draft bill and to appoint conferees.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. In the last few minutes I have seen other conference reports brought up, and the able Senator did not seem to object to their consideration.

Now we have pending some very vital legislation, and I am sure there would be no objection to bringing it up. For instance, there is the housing legislation, the legislation pertaining to pay raises for postal and governmental employees generally, and perhaps other measures.

I wonder whether the acting majority leader has given consideration to the possibility of asking the Senator from North Dakota to defer his remarks until those matters are disposed of.

I am sure the Senator from North Dakota would not object to the disposition of the measure for pay increases for postal employees, as well as other measures of similar character.

I wonder whether we can gain some time by disposing of some of these other vital matters, and asking the Senator from North Dakota to defer his remarks until they are disposed of, and then return to the draft measure.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, wil the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I might suggest that the unfinished business presently before the Senate is the bill for the extension of the terms of members of the Atomic Energy Commission; and I shall yield for privileged matters only because I have no other choice. But the moment the privileged matters are disposed of, I shall resist any effort to superimpose any other proposed legislation of similar standing or to bring it before the Senate in place of the bill for the extension of the terms of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I see no reason why the acting majority leader, in his discretion, could not include that in the request he might make, and I am sure the Senator from North Dakota would not object to it. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota expects to address himself to the draft measure. I assume that the Senator from North Dakota is not objecting to the consideration of any other subjects.

Mr. LANGER. I am not.

Mr. PEPPER. So it is up to the acting majority leader to determine whether he wishes these other matters to be proceeded with in the Senate or to have them kept behind the Draft Act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to make my own position on this matter clear.

I have not objected to the consideration of the miscellaneous matters which have come up that are not in any degree of a controversial nature.

But I wish to call attention again, although I am sure the Senate is already well advised as to this, that we have before us one of the most important bills which this Congress has had to consider, a bill which vitally affects the national defense of the Nation. For 8 hours a filibuster has been conducted against it in an effort to prevent the Senate of the United States from performing its constitutional duty.

I believe there is nothing more important than to proceed to a determination of the question whether the Senate of the United States can function or whether the Senate of the United States cannot function.

For that reason, I shall object to the consideration of any other business until that matter has been disposed of.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am in the same category with the able Senator from California in the belief that the rules of the Senate should be modified so that a majority of the Senate may determine what business shall be pending before the Senate and when the Senate shall vote upon any particular matter.

Senators will recall my introduction of resolutions to that effect and my appearance before Senate committees dealing with that subject. But the Senate has not chosen to adopt our viewpoint on that matter, and that is not the rule of the Senate at the present time.

The present rules of the Senate allow unlimited debate, except if cloture is invoked, and allow any Senator to speak twice in any single legislative day upon any pending question. That includes the right of the Senator from North Dakota to speak as long as he cares to speak.

Mr. President, that being the situation at the present time, the acting majority leader will, unhappily, no doubt, have to make the decision as to whether he is to allow the desire of the Senator from North Dakota to speak—which is perfectly within the rights of the Senator from North Dakota, under the rules of the Senate which the Senate has declined to change—and to obstruct all other desirable legislation, or whether the Senator might be requested to defer his remarks—and he has indicated that he is willing to do so—and have the Senate take up these other matters, so that they could be considered.

So, if the pending discussion of the Senator from North Dakota obstructs the other matters, I am not at all sure that the Senator from North Dakota will be the only one responsible.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is there a conference report ready to be laid down?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Nebraska will release the floor, the Chair will call attention to a bill received from the House of Representatives, the title of which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6465) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no further use in asking anyone to yield. The answer to the Senator from Florida has already been made. The Senator from California feels that this draft measure is the most important legislation before the Senate, and that it should be determined, and it will have to be determined under the rules we now have.

I should like very much to expedite the consideration of all legislation. Here we are in the closing hours of this session of the Congress. We could accomplish a program and end the session of Congress without any difficulty if we could just obtain full cooperation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky as soon as I finish making the statement.

If we could get a vote on the motion to appoint conferees on the draft bill, we could proceed, and the Senator from North Dakota could make his speech on any business which comes up. I want to have the Senate proceed just as harmoniously as it is humanly possible to do, and I make an appeal that we may have a vote on the present motion to have a conference on the draft bill, and then proceed with the other work of the Senate. The Senator from North Dakota could still make his remarks; he could oppose the draft bill when it comes back before the Senate in the form of the conference report. Certainly my suggestion is a fair one. Certainly what I suggest is the only thing to do under the present rules.

In a moment I shall yield to the minority leader; and while he is speaking, I am going to ask my distinguished colleague from North Dakota to consider my suggestion very seriously, and to realize that I hope with all the hope within my power that he will permit us to proceed with this important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska object to the consideration of the matter which has just been referred to?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not object, but I understand that the Senator from California will object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished acting majority leader in asking the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to permit the draft bill motion to be acted upon. It really would seem to discredit the Senate of the United States, in the last hours of what we hoped would be this session, to have to witness the utter futility of this body in the matter of legislation. Although I have cooperated with the other side as fully as I could to bring about the completion of the program and to adjourn today, I wish to say that so far as I am concerned, I myself will not vote either to adjourn or recess the Senate in the midst of this atmosphere of futility and impotence. I will vote to stay here all day today and all tonight and all day tomorrow and all tomorrow night and all every other day and all every other night, to end this futility.

(Manifestations of applause in the galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise those in the galleries that it will be necessary to have the galleries cleared if there are other demonstrations, for the rules of the Senate do not permit demonstrations by the occupants of the galleries.

The Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to state that if any Senators feel that they can force the Congress to adjourn because of the pendency of any measure or any number of measures, they are reckoning without their host.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield as soon as I finish making my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. PEPPER. Does it require the consent of the Senator from Nebraska in order to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, until I finish this observation, I do not intend to yield to anyone for any purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield, and he has perfect right to decline.

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield until I finish this observation. I shall be fair. I shall let any Senator talk who wants to, when the time comes for him to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Florida as soon as the Senator from Nebraska finishes.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall gladly yield until the Senator gets through with his observation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine. I thank the Senator.

We have about four important pieces of legislation that can be passed here I think without any difficulty. I agree with the Senator from California, however, that the most important issue before the Senate is the pending motion to send the draft bill to conference. Until that can be settled we shall all have to take the position of the distinguished minority leader and remain here until it is settled. I can see no other way out of it.

I appeal to the logic, I appeal to the reason of Senators, that inasmuch as the conference report will come back here, speeches can be made on it, and I will guaranty so far as the motion is concerned, there will be no motion to recess or adjourn made until the conference report is made to the Senate of the United States. I can see no reason at all why we cannot vote on the appointment of conferees. A Senator may talk about rules, he may talk about anything he pleases. Until we are in a frame of mind that we can have that kind of cooperation, Senators will not get any place in a program, unless we can do that very thing. That is all there is to it.

I should like to finish this session—it means something to me—in a spirit of harmony. This country is faced with some of the greatest issues it has ever faced in its history, and for the Senate to continue in a cooperative and harmonious way means a lot not only to the legislation that is passed but to our domestic and foreign relations.

I hope the distinguished Senator from North Dakota will yield on this one thing, that we may vote upon the appointment of conferees; then, when the conference report comes back, he can make his

speech on it. When we get that out of the way, we shall proceed to the orderly work of the Senate. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I propound the parliamentary inquiry, in view of the objection which was indicated by the able Senator from California, which was evidently regarded by the distinguished acting majority leader as preventing him from bringing up any other measure except the draft. I propound the parliamentary inquiry whether or not it requires unanimous consent to make a motion to displace the pending motion and consider something else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; of course it does not.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course not. It does not require unanimous consent. Then the acting majority leader by a majority vote of the Senate and upon his motion could displace the pending question and bring up any other measure he may care to bring up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe, however, in that connection that that would only make confusion worse confounded.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would that be possible? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Nebraska has no more to say, before the Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota, the Chair will state the question before the Senate, so there will be no doubt about it on this new day which has dawned since the quorum call was made, or just before it. The motion was made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] that the Senate disagree to the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the House, and the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed as follows: The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. LUCAS. Question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate has just been stated.

(Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!")

(At 1:45 a. m., June 19, the Senate was still in session. The proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948:

George V. Allen, of North Carolina.
Milton S. Eisenhower, of Kansas.
Luther H. Evans, of Texas.
Waldo G. Leland, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948:

Frank Capra, of California.
William H. Hastie, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Kathleen N. Lardie, of Michigan.
W. Albert Noyes, Jr., of New York.
George F. Zook, of Virginia.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Erank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1948. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MINT

Gilroy Roberts, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be engraver in the United States Mint at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma. Mr. Summers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.

Timothy T. Cronin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin. Mr. Cronin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine. Mr. Curran is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 29, 1948.

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina, vice Norris M. Thomas, term expired.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Oliver W. Gaines, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the rank of captain in the Navy.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Clinton C. Cook, Buckner, Ark., in place of C. C. Stokes, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Clive B. Hubbell, Challenge, Calif., in place of H. P. Mulock, resigned.

Catherine C. Schultz, Colfax, Calif., in place of A. D. Scanlon, retired.

Sidney A. Coleman, Kentfield, Calif., in place of N. A. Coleman, retired.

John E. Mixer, Midway City, Calif., in place of W. L. Watts, resigned.

COLORADO

William D. Pinkerton, Fort Collins, Colo., in place of Roy Maxwell, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Kenneth V. Mason, Albion, Ill., in place of J. R. Wick, transferred.

G. Stewart Allen, Crete, Ill., in place of D. W. Helme, deceased.

Evans R. Pratt, Morrison, Ill., in place of J. W. Wilson, resigned.

Frank C. Niemeyer, Stockton, Ill., in place of J. D. Cotter, resigned.

Wilbur K. Reader, Thomson, Ill., in place of M. J. Sheridan, resigned.

IOWA

Edward P. Domayer, Dyersville, Iowa, in place of L. C. Smith, retired.

John R. Bahne, Eldora, Iowa, in place of J. J. Fowler, deceased.

Mattison L. Swaney, Garner, Iowa, in place of C. O. Roe, resigned.

Robert M. Klingman, Wadena, Iowa, in place of C. S. Flower, resigned.

KANSAS

Frank L. Robinson, Eskridge, Kans., in place of J. O. Warren, transferred.

Gordon N. Carlisle, Lecti, Kans., in place of G. V. Downs, transferred.

John F. Buche, Mulberry, Kans., in place of Albert Cameron, deceased.

LOUISIANA

K. C. Peterson, Zwolle, La., in place of E. C. Leone, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Thomas P. Hallinan, Chicopee Falls, Mass., in place of A. E. Roberts, retired.

MICHIGAN

Samuel Somora, Sr., Baroda, Mich., in place of M. D. Hartman, resigned.

Horace J. Lickly, Dexter, Mich., in place of L. W. Rector, transferred.

Bruce A. Lee, Millington, Mich., in place of R. P. Lee, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Raymond B. Sullivan, International Falls, Minn., in place of W. V. Kane, resigned.

Robert P. Fritzke, Saint Clair, Minn., in place of M. E. Rohrer, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Temple G. Broadus, Purvis, Miss., in place of A. M. Avery, transferred.

MISSOURI

Ida M. Brunnert, Argyle, Mo., in place of F. P. Wulff, deceased.

Walter H. Bruens, Hermann, Mo., in place of George Petrus, resigned.

Tom J. Molloy, Joplin, Mo., in place of L. L. Travis, retired.

Sylvester Welch, Parnell, Mo., in place of E. J. Echterling, resigned.

NEVADA

Josephine Roberts, McGill, Nev., in place of E. S. Christensen, resigned.

Ray E. Hepworth, Wells, Nev., in place of E. C. Smith, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Carl J. Dagostine, Socorro, N. Mex., in place of L. M. Fay, resigned.

NEW YORK

Robert Q. Sullivan, Gainesville, N. Y., in place of J. J. Hickey, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Belle Q. Cable, Fontana Dam, N. C., in place of M. T. Calahan, resigned.

Frederick A. Bruton, Mount Gilead, N. C., in place of J. H. Ledbetter, deceased.

A. Garland Pierce, Southern Pines, N. C., in place of P. F. Buchan, deceased.

Gilbert A. Holt, Troy, N. C., in place of G. W. Stuart, resigned.

Maurice E. Walsh, North Wilkesboro, N. C., in place of J. C. Reins, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Roy R. Just, New Salem, N. Dak., in place of Carl Jahnke, retired.

OHIO

Robert W. Garrison, Frankfort, Ohio, in place of D. F. Briggs, Jr., transferred.

John B. Fanto, Lowellville, Ohio, in place of L. B. Milligan, deceased.

William J. Gallehue, North Hampton, Ohio, in place of M. K. Lehman, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Claude L. Hostetter, Clinton, Okla., in place of I. J. Loewen, deceased.

Clarence W. Phillips, Coyle, Okla., in place of G. E. Wandell, retired.

Alfred V. Koehler, Manchester, Okla., in place of B. E. Stone, resigned.

Robert Anderson, Sperry, Okla., in place of R. T. Holbert, deceased.

Oscar Renz, Weatherford, Okla., in place of J. M. Crabtree, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Grant M. Barrall, Wapwallopen, Pa., in place of C. D. Everard, transferred.

SAMOA

William F. Robison, Pago Pago, Samoa, in place of D. J. McMullin, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George A. Curry, Elk Point, S. Dak., in place of T. H. Ryan, retired.

TEXAS

Lance A. Leggitt, Lakeview, Tex., in place of J. D. Durham, transferred.

Jesse B. Strickland, Novice, Tex., in place of M. R. Howard, resigned.

Irvin L. Hergert, Perryton, Tex., in place of M. R. Coffee, resigned.

John O. Bier, Plainview, Tex., in place of J. C. Terry, retired.

VIRGINIA

James L. Hale, Chilhowie, Va., in place of E. B. Sanders, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Rival S. Moore, Long Beach, Wash., in place of C. D. Mitchell, transferred.

WEST VIRGINIA

Henry E. Chapman, New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of J. O. Eakin, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Ruby C. Bahr, Fairchild, Wis., in place of R. R. Hoffman, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 17, 1948)

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord and our God, again we wait in the shadow of Thy holy presence, in which all alarms have been hushed. We entreat Thee to teach us the best way to see, the best way to reason, and the best way to act in serving society and the State.

Give to the Congress a great measure of moral courage as it meets all pressing needs; grant that its achievements may bear the mark of a patriotic and convincing faith and that its decisions may become prophecies of a better tomorrow. In our Master's name and for His sake. Amen.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. REED, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) entitled "Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CORBETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two essays.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Red River of the North project and include letters, reports of hearings, communications, and newspaper articles.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast by Jack Bell entitled "Communism."

Mr. LOVE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Wheeling Intelligencer of June 17.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a quotation from the State Department and statements appearing in the Washington Star, and in the other an analysis of the Marshall plan in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in two to include an editorial and in the third an address by the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one concerning the Palestine question, and in the other to include a letter he is sending to some of his constituents.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in each to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed yesterday by the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the services of the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the committee.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by him to a constituent.

Mr. PETERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and statement.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several clippings from various periodicals.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include an editorial from the Montana Standard of Butte, Mont.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a newspaper article.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some telegrams.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the thirtieth observance of Lithuania's independence day. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was granted permission to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from President Truman, the speech of Dr. Frank Kingdon, sundry newspaper articles and pieces of correspondence, and the speech of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], in connection with a testimonial dinner recently given the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] in New York City. I understand that only a portion of this material was included in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that I again be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD as indicated, and that anything inserted in the RECORD in the previous extension be included in this insertion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, our friends and colleagues from Florida, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] will leave Congress at this session. They have both made very capable, conscientious legislators and Representatives. It has been my pleasure to serve with both of them during the entire length of their service. They have both fully cooperated with the Florida delegation in matters relating to the entire State and the national welfare. They have both been on the alert to represent the best interests of their respective districts. Great districts with diversified interests, they have been well represented in a critical period requiring hard work.

The Florida delegation, while small in number, has worked together as a team. These two, our friends and colleagues, have been an important part of that team, Representative HENDRICKS having served on the Post Office and Post Roads and on the Appropriations Committees, and Representative PRICE on the Post Office and Post Roads, Naval Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees.

Personally, and as chairman of the delegation from Florida, I rise to express my warm personal friendship and deep appreciation to them for their fine public service. We will miss them and we wish for them success and happiness in their future undertakings.

If I may depart for a moment from the use of formal language, I will say "Good luck, Little JOE. Good luck, EMORY. You both have made a good record. You will be missed."

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a prize-winning essay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the prize-winning essay in the contest conducted by Drew Pearson on Democracy was written by Rev. Alfred J. Fisk, of San Francisco. It is as follows:

Democracy, like good music, does not need argument; it needs rendition. The best way to make democracy live, is to live it.

People are too much concerned about democratic rights; too little about democratic responsibilities. But the rights imply duties, and become empty unless practiced. Democracy is not a fact; it is a task. To make it live, we must:

1. Vote in every election—using our best intelligence, studying propositions and candidates.

2. Exercise our right of petition, letting our legislators and officers of government know our convictions.

3. Promote community meetings for democratic discussion of civic and world problems.

4. Work through "Good Government" leagues—exercising eternal vigilance that political performance match profession.

5. Do an honest day's work. Parasites or shirkers fail in their responsibility to a democratic society.

6. Treat every man in personal relationships as an equal—without prejudice and without exploitation.

7. Finally, democracy—like peace—is indivisible. The world cannot long continue half democratic and half totalitarian. To make democracy live here at home, our Nation and we as individuals must use our influence that it live throughout the world.

Democracy begins with the individual; it ends with the world. Each of us, you and I, your next-door neighbor and mine, must practice democracy. We must build little islands of functioning democratic life. The islands will grow and touch other islands, merging into greater units, becoming continents, becoming finally the world. If you and I, the last and least citizen, live democracy day in and day out, democracy will live.

HOUSING

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, all signs now point to this—the housing bill as proposed by the Republican leadership will contain no provision for slum clearance, no public housing, no veterans housing, no farm housing. The public interest is plainly ignored.

The legislative machinery is well lubricated to push through a bill minus these provisions. Has the leadership completely overlooked the disastrous effects of present housing conditions on our people? Thousands of families are forced to live in disease-ridden slums; other thousands compelled to crowd into one, two, or three rooms, with attendant unsanitary conditions. Children must spend much of the time out of doors for there is no room at home, thus fostering juvenile delinquency. Thousands of houses, even in our modern cities, have no inside toilets, running water, or electric lights. How now will this situation be relieved? Not by the Republican controlled Congress, I assure you.

Social justice will be attained some days for these people. The Nation will not and cannot permit such uncivilized conditions to exist. How about the health rate and death rate under such conditions? Do not the leaders recognize that our manpower strength is dependent upon healthful living conditions? Perhaps if all of our people could live under proper conditions of health and sanitation there would be no need to worry about communism. Much of our social unrest can be traced directly to slums, filthy and poorly constructed homes, and unsanitary conditions in and surrounding those homes. How long will it be until some united and earnest effort is made to eliminate all of such conditions? That is the question to be answered by the Republican leadership of the House. The people will answer it for them if no answer is forthcoming.

DEFENSE OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the primary importance of Alaska in the plan of national defense is not properly appreciated even today. We are in effect making the same mistake we did in the years preceding the assault by Japan. Perhaps we are compounding that mistake. Then the United States did nothing at all to prepare this highly strategic area against aggression from Asia. Now we are doing just enough to make Alaska a more tempting prize than ever. Since the close of World War II we have done far too little. We can only hope that we will not be too late in taking those prudent steps which sound common sense advises must be taken without delay.

A defenseless Alaska imperils the entire United States. If our air bases in the Territory were seized by an enemy power every major city in the United States would be open to attack. The industrial East could be bombed at will, as could Detroit and Chicago and the great cities of the Pacific Northwest.

In some ways it might have been better that we did nothing in Alaska than

to do the little we have accomplished in the last 3 years. Alaska now stands as tempting bait. Properly fortified, it could be an almost impregnable bulwark against attack from Asia and could provide the spring board from which a major offensive action could be launched.

There is imperative need not only for carrying out without further delay the program outlined by the Department of National Defense, but for enlarging that program. For months on end last winter construction work at the vital Alaska defense centers was halted because of lack of funds. Buildings needed now and which could have been completed and in use now are only skeletons because workmen had to be laid off when Army funds ran out. We cannot afford to gamble in that fashion.

Neither can we afford to concentrate all our efforts upon installations at Fairbanks and Anchorage. The Air Force has in Arctic Alaska only one field. It is located at Nome. Once seized by an enemy power it could be used as the base from which to launch crippling attacks upon our installations at Anchorage and Fairbanks. There is almost literally nothing to keep an enemy from across Bering Strait from entering Alaska in any numbers he chooses.

NEED FOR ARCTIC BASES

It ought to be a matter of high national policy to ring the Arctic with suitable defenses. In any event this would be desirable and even necessary. It becomes all the more so because of the possibility of the existence in the Arctic of an oil field of considerable dimensions. It is a matter of public record that the Navy is exploring the vast Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. Although no official announcement to that effect has been made, there is high hope that underneath the Arctic tundra, heretofore held valueless, may be discovered one of the great oil pools of the world. If oil is found there Alaska will be more than ever a prize. Now, aside from the small force based at Nome, there is no protection at all along the entire Arctic coast.

Construction there will take time; it will proceed under difficulties. We should not overestimate those difficulties. We should not rule out the Arctic as a land so hostile and forbidding in climate and terrain that men and machinery cannot operate there. It can be done. It has been done. On the Soviet side of Bering Strait great advances have been made in many fields. It would be foolhardy for us to fail to note this fact. It would be foolhardy for us to make assumptions which might prove false under the stress of war. Nations have perished because of their failure to be hardheaded and realistic. We must not commit any such mistake.

SIBERIAN DEVELOPMENT

I have said that the Soviet Government has not been remiss in proceeding actively with the development of Soviet Siberia. What has been accomplished there is simply astounding. In these latter days, of course, we do not know everything that is being done but the record is clear that a great industrial empire is rising across Bering Strait and that huge cities and great farming areas are growing up. This is in startling and sad contrast to our continuing neglect of Alaska.

Alaska is a rich land. I need not elaborate on that here. It has magnificent resources of ocean and land sufficient to support a great and prosperous population, yet its area of over 586,000 square miles contains fewer than 100,000 people. What is the situation in Siberia? There were to be found 14,000,000 persons in 1944 and it is estimated the population has increased by several million since then. In 1944 along the trans-Siberian railway there were seven cities with a population of more than 100,000 persons. It is obvious that in event of war producing urban and rural populations would be of major value militarily. In Alaska we have done far too little—in fact, we have done practically nothing—to implement the national defense by attracting a civilian population to Alaska. The need for such action has been repeatedly emphasized by President Truman and by spokesmen for the armed services. The President was aware of the national interest when in his special message to Congress last month he urged adoption of an integrated program to provide for far wider utilization of Alaska resources by a far greater number of people.

The map shows why the United States cannot contemplate the loss of Alaska without contemplating at the same time the possibility—even the probability—that disastrous blows would be struck at the heart of this Nation.

PROXIMITY TO UNITED STATES

From Fairbanks, Alaska, it is 4,100 miles to Moscow. But it is only 2,790 miles from Fairbanks to Chicago, 3,270 to Washington, and 3,255 to New York. The distance from Fairbanks to Seattle is only 1,525 miles. Thus, it follows that while United States aircraft would in event of war be too far removed for direct strikes at the principal cities of Europe, the Alaska bases, once captured by an enemy power, could be turned against us with devastating effect. Bombers are now in use which can fly 8,000 miles with a load of 5 tons of bombs. Thus, no important city in the United States is removed from bombing range of Alaska. The urgency of the situation grows even more apparent when it is realized that until about 2 months ago there were no combat troops in Alaska at all. Now, some combat troops—numbering about 10,000—have been sent to Alaska for training purposes. This is a step forward, but does not meet the needs of the situation. Combat troops should be stationed permanently in Alaska in numbers sufficient to insure, insofar as such insurance can be provided, that the Alaska bases could be held even under a lightning attack. On February 1 of this year we had only 7,500 Army forces and 8,700 officers and men of the Air Force stationed in Alaska. These included Army elements stationed in the Aleutian Islands—and, as a matter of fact, those spread throughout the length and breadth of Alaska. Army troops are the service type and are largely for the support of the Air Force.

Construction is tremendously expensive in Alaska. The cost of erecting buildings has been a matter of proper concern to the appropriate committees of this Congress. Perhaps some savings could be effected. It has been suggested that gains might be registered if construction were by means of competitive bidding instead of by cost-plus contracts. However that may be, it can be fairly stated that no matter what the present-day costs are the money must be spent. It must be spent in greater volume than has been the case during the last 3 years. To do otherwise leaves Alaska defenseless and thus the Nation under constant threat. I suggest that if sufficient money is not immediately available and if time does not permit it is better to have temporary housing so combat troops can be stationed in Alaska in suitable numbers than to leave Alaska unarmed. First things must come first.

GENERAL TWINING CONCERNED

In a recent magazine article, Lt. Gen. N. F. Twining, commander in chief of the United States Army in Alaska, called attention to the needs and problems of Alaska when he wrote:

> Alaska and the Aleutians must be retained as the forward bastion of our defense. Bases for long-range heavy-bomber units must be developed, inasmuch as Alaska is primarily a theater for long-range, heavy-bomber operations. These bases must be adequately staffed, even though there is a current overall shortage of personnel that seriously affects all planning for the peacetime Air Force.
>
> No effort to conquer the problems presented by Alaska can be too great. The late Gen. Billy Mitchell said, "Whoever holds Alaska will hold the world." To fail to develop this potential would leave a critical gap in our national defense. Alaska retains a defense value that is both psychological and real. Alaska has been United States territory for 80 years. Americans anywhere would be as quick to resent an aggressive attack on Alaska as they were on Pearl Harbor, or as they would be on any part of the continental United States. Such an attack on Alaska would be certain cause for war.
>
> The average concept of Alaska and the Arctic is continuous cold, icebergs, glaciers, Eskimos, and generally uncomfortable living conditions. The people of the United States should be informed of the fact that this is not an accurate picture. While it is true that winter months are in some areas severe and really Arctic, it is also true that occasionally temperatures and conditions exist which are experienced as far south as the middle United States.
>
> Students of geopolitics have long been familiar with the teachings of Sir Halford Mackinder, who reasoned that whichever nation dominates a certain land mass (which he called the heartland) lying partly in Europe and partly in Asia, would be able eventually to control the whole world. More recent geopolitical theory speaks of two heartlands—the one designated by Mackinder, and another in North America. The shortest distance between the two "heartlands" of the world is across the Arctic regions. Our Arctic frontier has become, therefore, our primary defense consideration. Alaska, the northernmost portion of our Nation, thus assumes a place of primary importance in the strategy of national security.

Referring to some needs of the moment, General Twining wrote:

Logistical requirements in Alaska are many. Pipe lines are greatly needed. The existing railroad must be improved. New railways and highways are needed. Alaska has less than 3,000 miles of highways and roads in an area twice the size of Texas. These 3,000 miles would be called secondary roads in the continental United States. They could not sustain any major operation.

ALASKA UNPREPARED

My good friend Paul Herring, of Kodiak, Alaska, in a talk made before the Rotary Club of that community not long ago dealt in facts when he said:

With all the rough talk that we are making in the diplomatic world today are we prepared to back it up if war should be forced on us tomorrow? Of course, we are not in a position to answer this question for the rest of the world but our first and immediate concern is for Alaska, and our answer to the above question is a positive and emphatic "No; we are not prepared!" It is a fact that it would take no more than two or three thousand paratroopers properly equipped to descend upon and capture or destroy every military or naval establishment in Alaska today. This could be accomplished in 24 hours or less.

Paul Herring's statement was made before combat troops were sent to Alaska for training. Despite their presence, scattered as they are and numerically weak, it follows that no major thrust would be required by an enemy to take over Alaska.

William L. Baker, editor and publisher of the Ketchikan, Alaska, Chronicle, recently wrote five enlightening articles concerning the lack of preparation in Alaska in a military way:

Geography has placed Alaska in a position—

Wrote Mr. Baker—

to make it a probable battleground in any war between the two great remaining powers of the world.

There are no Maginot lines; no allies to hold the foe while we prepare.

A high officer in the Army Air Forces admitted to me recently that the construction program won't be completed at the present rate of progress for 8 to 10 years, and at that time it will be worthless. "How," he asked, "can we start building underground facilities when we don't get enough money to maintain a handful of air bases and to build houses for our personnel?"

The Bering Sea today is the hemisphere's frontier, and it boasts not a single first-class airfield along its thousand miles of coast line.

WE MUST ACT NOW

Maj. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, commander of the Air Forces in Alaska, in an address made before the Veterans of Foreign Wars encampment at Seward last month was quoted as having said:

The Army is not in Alaska to fan the flames of war, but Alaska is the strategic outpost, and the Army must guard against the area taking on a false sense of security.

Aside from the immediate strengthening of military forces General Atkinson called for improved railroads and highways, proper housing, adequate port, dock, and warehouse installations and modern airports.

All of us can hope and pray that existing tensions will be wiped away and that this troubled world may have a long period of peace. But since none of us can peer into the future clearly we cannot leave everything to hope. We must make prudent preparations for that which might occur. The desire of the American people for peace will never, we hope, again be accompanied by a lack of preparation for defense against an aggressive power. Since we must prepare and since man's inventive genius has narrowed time and space, we must make it sure and positive that our own land cannot be seized from us to provide the base for an attack on these States.

I recall that my distinguished predecessor as Delegate to Congress, Judge Anthony J. Dimond, called on the Nation in the early 1930's to fortify Alaska from the aggression he feared even then from the Japanese. He urged that a hundred million dollars be spent on naval fortifications in the Territory. His pleas went unheard. Not one penny was appropriated. Had that work been done then, it is highly unlikely the Japanese could ever have seized the outer Aleutians. They were dislodged at tremendous cost in money and American lives. Before the war, Delegate Dimond urged, too, that the Army garrison in Alaska, numbering then less than 300 officers and men, be expanded. But nothing was done. So when war did come, defenses which should have been built long before had to be constructed speedily at much greater cost and with much less efficiency than would have been the case otherwise. Had the Japanese desired to, they could have captured Alaska just as easily as it can be taken now.

We cannot afford to make the same mistake twice. We must realize and we must never forget that Alaska is the first and most important line in this Nation's defense. With it, bases would be ours to insure victory. Without it, we could be defeated. We must act and act now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] may extend his remarks in the RECORD regardless of the limit of cost reviewing the work of the Committee on Ways and Means, which he feels will be useful to each Member of the House. The cost will be about $450.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in regard to the work of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that each member of the Committee on Ways and Means may extend his remarks with reference to the work of Mr. KNUTSON as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the several requests are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Housing, a Party Test."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one concerning rural electrification and the other to include a letter concerning national park concessions.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the need for a strong merchant marine.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a timely editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith certain editorial and newspaper articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I suggest this motto for self-styled liberals and progressives, "Never do yourself anything you can get the Government to do for you."

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY FUNCTIONS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6771),

making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGEL of Michigan, CASE of South Dakota, TIBBOTT, SCRIVNER, KERR, MAHON, and NORRELL.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 6401) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States and for other purposes, which was requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The Clerk will read.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the reading of the engrossed copy.

The bill was read the third time by title.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PHILBIN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 6401) to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 125, nays 283, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—125

Allen, Ill.	Bloom	Clevenger
Andersen, H. Carl	Bolton	Clippinger
Andresen, August H.	Bradley	Cole, Mo.
Arnold	Brehm	Crosser
Banta	Buffett	Crow
Barden	Busbey	Cunningham
Beall	Butler	Davis, Wis.
Bender	Carson	Dawson, Utah
Bishop	Celler	Delaney
Blatnik	Chenoweth	Dolliver
	Chiperfield	Donohue
	Church	Doughton
	Douglas	Klein
	Elliott	Knutson
	Ellis	Landis
	Elsaesser	Lemke
	Feighan	Lewis, Ohio
	Folger	Love
	Gallagher	McCowen
	Gillie	McCulloch
	Granger	McGarvey
	Grant, Ind.	McGregor
	Griffiths	Madden
	Gross	Maloney
	Gwynne, Iowa	Mansfield
	Hagen	Marcantonio
	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
	Havenner	Mason
	Heffernan	Miller, Conn.
	Hill	Miller, Nebr.
	Hoeven	Mitchell
	Hoffman	Morris
	Holifield	Murray, Wis.
	Horan	Nicholson
	Hull	Nodar
	Isacson	O'Hara
	Jenison	O'Konski
	Jenkins, Ohio	Pfeifer
	Johnson, Ill.	Philbin
	Johnson, Ind.	Powell
	Jones, Wash.	Rankin
	Keefe	Reed, Ill.
	Keogh	Reed, N. Y.
		Rees
		Rich
		Rockwell
		Rooney
		Sabath
		Sadowski
		Schwabe, Mo.
		Schwabe, Okla.
		Scoblick
		Scott, Hardie
		Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
		Shafer
		Short
		Simpson, Ill.
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Ohio
		Smith, Wis.
		Snyder
		Somers
		Stanley
		Stefan
		Stevenson
		Stratton
		Twyman
		Vail
		Vursell
		Weichel
		Welch
		Youngblood

NAYS—283

Abbitt	Dirksen	Jones, Ala.
Abernethy	Domengeaux	Jones, N. C.
Albert	Dondero	Jonkman
Allen, Calif.	Dorn	Judd
Allen, La.	Durham	Karsten, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Eaton	Kean
Andrews, Ala.	Eberharter	Kearney
Andrews, N. Y.	Ellsworth	Kearns
Angell	Elston	Keating
Arends	Engel, Mich.	Kee
Auchincloss	Engle, Calif.	Kefauver
Bakewell	Evins	Kelley
Barrett	Fallon	Kennedy
Bates, Ky.	Fellows	Kersten, Wis.
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Kilburn
Battle	Fernandez	Kilday
Beckworth	Fisher	King
Bell	Flanagan	Kirwan
Bennett, Mich.	Fletcher	Kunkel
Bennett, Mo.	Fogarty	Lanham
Blackney	Foote	Larcade
Bland	Forand	Latham
Boggs, Del.	Fuller	Lea
Boggs, La.	Fulton	LeCompte
Bonner	Gamble	LeFevre
Boykin	Garmatz	Lesinski
Bramblett	Gary	Lewis, Ky.
Brooks	Gathings	Lichtenwalter
Brophy	Gavin	Lodge
Brown, Ga.	Gearhart	Lucas
Bryson	Gillette	Lusk
Buchanan	Goff	Lyle
Buck	Goodwin	Lynch
Buckley	Gordon	McConnell
Bulwinkle	Gore	McCormack
Burke	Gorski	McDonough
Burleson	Gossett	McDowell
Byrne, N. Y.	Graham	McMahon
Byrnes, Wis.	Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.
Camp	Gregory	McMillen, Ill.
Canfield	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mack
Cannon	Hale	MacKinnon
Carroll	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Case, N. J.	Hall, Leonard W.	Manasco
Case, S. Dak.	Halleck	Mathews
Chadwick	Hand	Meade, Md.
Chapman	Hardy	Merrow
Chelf	Harless, Ariz.	Myer
Clark	Harris	Michener
Clason	Harrison	Miller, Calif.
Coffin	Hart	Miller, Md.
Cole, Kans.	Harvey	Mills
Cole, N. Y.	Hays	Monroney
Colmer	Hébert	Morgan
Combs	Hedrick	Morrison
Cooley	Herter	Morton
Cooper	Heselton	Muhlenberg
Corbett	Hess	Multer
Cotton	Hinshaw	Mundt
Coudert	Hobbs	Murdock
Courtney	Holmes	Murray, Tenn.
Cox	Hope	Nixon
Crawford	Huber	Norblad
Curtis	Jackson, Calif.	Norrell
Dague	Jackson, Wash.	Norton
Davis, Ga.	Jarman	O'Brien
Davis, Tenn.	Javits	Pace
Dawson, Ill.	Jenkins, Pa.	Passman
Deane	Jennings	Patman
Devitt	Johnson, Calif.	Patterson
D'Ewart		Peterson
Dingell		Phillips, Calif.
		Phillips, Tenn.
		Pickett
		Ploeser
		Plumley
		Poage
		Potter
		Potts
		Poulson
		Preston
		Price, Fla.
		Price, Ill.
		Priest
		Rains
		Ramey
		Rayburn
		Redden
		Reeves
		Richards
		Riehlman
		Riley
		Rivers
		Rizley
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rohrbough
		Ross
		Rumley
		Russell
		Sadlak
		St. George
		Sanborn
		Sarbacher
		Sasscer
		Scrivner
		Seely-Brown
		Sheppard
		Sikes
		Simpson, Pa.
		Smathers
		Smith, Maine
		Smith, Va.
		Spence
		Stockman
		Sundstrom
		Taber
		Talle
		Taylor
		Teague
		Thomas, Tex.
		Thompson
		Tibbott
		Tollefson
		Towe
		Trimble
		Van Zandt
		Vinson
		Vorys
		Wadsworth
		Walter
		Wheeler
		Whitten
		Whittington
		Wigglesworth
		Williams
		Wilson, Tex.
		Winstead
		Wolcott
		Wolverton
		Woodruff
		Worley

NOT VOTING—22

Brown, Ohio	Lane	Stigler
Cravens	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	Macy	West
Hendricks	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Jensen	O'Toole	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	Wood
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	
Kerr	Robertson	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. West.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Mead of Kentucky with Mr. Lane.

Mr. GILLIE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SHAFER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOEVEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MCGARVEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—years 282, nays 131, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—282

Abbitt	Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ga.
Abernethy	Battle	Bryson
Albert	Beall	Buchanan
Allen, Calif.	Beckworth	Buck
Allen, La.	Bell	Buckley
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Bulwinkle
Andrews, Ala.	Blackney	Burke
Andrews, N. Y.	Bland	Burleson
Angell	Boggs, Del.	Byrne, N. Y.
Arends	Boggs, La.	Byrnes, Wis.
Auchincloss	Bonner	Camp
Bakewell	Boykin	Canfield
Barrett	Bramblett	Carroll
Bates, Ky.	Brooks	Case, N. J.

Chadwick	Harvey	Nodar
Chapman	Hays	Norblad
Chelf	Hébert	Norrell
Clark	Hedrick	Norton
Clason	Hendricks	O'Brien
Cole, Kans.	Herter	Pace
Cole, N. Y.	Heselton	Passman
Colmer	Hess	Patman
Combs	Hinshaw	Patterson
Cooley	Hobbs	Peterson
Cooper	Holmes	Phillips, Calif.
Corbett	Hope	Pickett
Cotton	Huber	Ploeser
Coudert	Jackson, Calif.	Plumley
Courtney	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Cox	Jarman	Potter
Cravens	Jenkins, Pa.	Potts
Crawford	Jennings	Poulson
Crow	Johnson, Calif.	Preston
Cunningham	Jones, Ala.	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jones, N. C.	Price, Ill.
Dague	Jonkman	Priest
Davis, Ga.	Judd	Rains
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten, Mo.	Ramey
Dawson, Ill.	Kean	Rayburn
Deane	Kearney	Redden
Devitt	Kearns	Reeves
Dingell	Keating	Richards
Dirksen	Kee	Riehlman
Domengeaux	Kefauver	Riley
Dondero	Kelley	Rivers
Donohue	Kennedy	Rizley
Dorn	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.
Durham	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Kilday	Rohrbough
Eberharter	King	Ross
Elston	Kirwan	Russell
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Sadlak
Engle, Calif.	Lanham	St. George
Evins	Larcade	Sarbacher
Fallon	Latham	Sasscer
Fellows	Lea	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Fenton	LeCompte	Scrivner
Fernandez	LeFevre	Seely-Brown
Fisher	Lesinski	Sheppard
Flannagan	Lewis, Ky.	Sikes
Fletcher	Lichtenwalter	Simpson, Pa.
Fogarty	Lodge	Smathers
Foote	Lucas	Smith, Maine
Forand	Lusk	Smith, Va.
Fuller	Lyle	Spence
Fulton	Lynch	Stanley
Gamble	McConnell	Stockman
Garmatz	McCormack	Sundstrom
Gary	McDonough	Taber
Gathings	McDowell	Talle
Gavin	McMahon	Taylor
Gearhart	McMillan, S. C.	Teague
Gillette	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Goff	Mack	Thompson
Goodwin	MacKinnon	Tibbott
Gordon	Mahon	Tollefson
Gore	Manasco	Towe
Gorski	Mathews	Trimble
Gossett	Meade, Md.	Van Zandt
Graham	Merrow	Vinson
Grant, Ala.	Meyer	Vorys
Gregory	Michener	Wadsworth
Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.	Walter
Hale	Miller, Md.	Wheeler
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mills	Whitten
Hall, Leonard W.	Monroney	Whittington
Halleck	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Hand	Morrison	Williams
Hardy	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Harless, Ariz.	Muhlenberg	Winstead
Harris	Multer	Wolcott
Harrison	Mundt	Wolverton
Hart	Murdock	Woodruff
	Murray, Tenn.	Worley
	Nixon	

NAYS—131

Allen, Ill.	Case, S. Dak.	Folger
Andersen, H. Carl	Celler	Gallagher
Andresen, August H.	Chenoweth	Gillie
Arnold	Chiperfield	Granger
Banta	Church	Grant, Ind.
Barden	Clevenger	Griffiths
Bender	Clippinger	Gross
Bennett, Mo	Coffin	Gwynne, Iowa
Bishop	Cole, Mo.	Hagen
Blatnik	Crosser	Harness, Ind.
Bloom	Davis, Wis.	Havenner
Bolton	Dawson, Utah	Heffernan
Bradley	Delaney	Hill
Brehm	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Brophy	Dolliver	Hoffman
Buffett	Doughton	Holifield
Busbey	Douglas	Horan
Butler	Elliott	Hull
Cannon	Ellis	Isacson
Carson	Ellsworth	Javits
	Elsaesser	Jenison
	Feighan	Jenkins, Ohio
	Jensen	Mason
	Johnson, Ill.	Miller, Conn.
	Johnson, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.
	Jones, Wash.	Mitchell
	Keefe	Morris
	Keogh	Murray, Wis.
	Kerr	Nicholson
	Klein	O'Hara
	Knutson	O'Konski
	Landis	Pfeifer
	Lemke	Philbin
	Lewis, Ohio	Phillips, Tenn.
	Love	Powell
	McCowen	Rankin
	McCulloch	Reed, Ill.
	McGarvey	Reed, N. Y.
	McGregor	Rees
	Macy	Rich
	Madden	Rockwell
	Maloney	Rooney
	Mansfield	Sabath
	Marcantonio	Sadowski
	Martin, Iowa	Sanborn
		Schwabe, Mo.
		Schwabe, Okla.
		Scoblick
		Scott, Hardie
		Shafer
		Short
		Simpson, Ill.
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Ohio
		Smith, Wis.
		Snyder
		Somers
		Stefan
		Stevenson
		Stratton
		Twyman
		Vail
		Vursell
		Welchel
		Wood
		Youngblood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Welch

NOT VOTING—16

Brown, Ohio	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	O'Toole	West
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	Whitaker
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	Wilson, Ind.
Lane	Robertson	
Ludlow	Stigler	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Ludlow against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Stigler.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Whitaker.

Mr. CELLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DOMENGEAUX changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. POWELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 671, the Chair lays before the House the Senate bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the House bill H. R. 6401, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2655 and insert the provisions of H. R. 6401, as amended.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill S. 2655, with a House amendment, insist on the amendment of the House, and ask for a conference with the Senate, and that the Speaker appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, House Resolution 690, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendment to S. 2655, ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes, and that the Speaker immediately appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] desire to use any of his time?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If this resolution is agreed to, when the bill goes to conference will the conferees have a right to agree to the Senate bill, without coming back to the House for instructions?

The SPEAKER. The Chair, of course, cannot anticipate what action the conferees would take or what action the Senate might take.

Mr. RICH. Suppose the House conferees agree to everything that the Senate wants, without having the amendment containing the provisions of the House bill in the legislation, would they not be required to come back here?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman understands that whatever the conferees do, they must report back to the House for further action. Their recommendations must be supported by the House later.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. The last I could hear about the motion was: "And with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole." I understand several amendments were adopted in the Committee of the Whole. I wish to know if the Shafer amendment will be a part of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The so-called Shafer amendment is a part of the House amendment to the Senate bill; that is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time allotted to me except to point out that the House has voted by substantial majorities certain amendments. I think the Managers on the part of the House at the conference should feel duty bound to insist on the amendments the House voted into this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I merely wish to repeat what I said in general debate yesterday: I know I am going to be a lonely figure, I am going to be alone. My hands are tied, but I will fight over there. And then they will bring it back and throw it into your laps. I hope that you have enough conscience, and courage, and conviction to rise up and vote on that conference report when it is returned to you.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from New York wants to do so, he can offer a motion to instruct the conferees to stand by the House bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. As I remember it, an amendment was adopted by the committee in anticipation of the Shafer amendment. Will it likewise be in the bill?

The SPEAKER. All the amendments adopted in the House will go to the conference.

Mr. FOLGER. All right. They will have a scrap over there.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, is a motion to instruct conferees to stand by the House amendments in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that such a motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I ask for this time only to say that whenever the gentleman from Mississippi comes to the rescue and aid of the gentleman from New York, Mr. Marcantonio, the days of miracles are not over.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that the gentleman from New York is in need neither of being rescued nor of a miracle.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to say that if the gentleman wishes to do so, as soon as the previous question is ordered it is in order to offer a motion to instruct conferees. That is the rule of the House that has always been followed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Mississippi that there is no previous question to be ordered, that the House is now considering under a suspension of the rules House Resolution 690, which carries the following provision:

> That the House insist upon its amendments to the bill of the Senate, S. 2655, ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Speaker immediately appoint conferees.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It has always been the rule and it is the rule now.

The SPEAKER. But this is under a suspension of the rules and it would not be in order after the adoption of the pending resolution to offer such a motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Then it is changing the rules of the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the resolution passed?

The question was taken and, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ANDREWS of New York, SHORT, COLE of New York, BATES of Massachusetts, VINSON, BROOKS, and KILDAY.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the House bill was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE DAY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the gentleman from Indiana can tell us what the program is for the remainder of the day or at least some of it.

Mr. HALLECK. I can at least give enough to start us off, which will keep us busy for some time.

As I understand it, there are several conference reports ready for action and probably they should be disposed of first. Then it is proposed to call up some measures under suspensions and they will be called up approximately as follows:

First. A bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Second. The housing bill.

Third. Increase in postal pay and rates.

Fourth. Air parcel post.

Fifth. The so-called revolving fund matter which has to do with cotton and wool for export to Japan, which bill is from the Committee on the Armed Services.

There are five measures. Other measures may be called up under suspension during the day if we have time and if other matters do not intervene.

THE HONORABLE FRANCK R. HAVENNER, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to announce that a black blot upon the records of a former committee of the House of Representatives has been officially erased during the present session of Congress. On June 15 the Committee on Un-American Activities, by unanimous vote, ordered that testimony attacking the reputation of Representative FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of California, which was given at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, be expunged from the records of the committee.

Thus a regrettable chapter in the history of the so-called Dies committee has been obliterated by official action.

During the summer of 1940, while the Seventy-sixth Congress was in session and while Representative HAVENNER, a Member of that Congress, was at his post of duty here in the National Capital, he received information that an attempt would be made to give certain derogatory testimony concerning him before the Dies committee. Mr. HAVENNER informs me that he went to see the chairman of the committee, Representative Dies, of Texas, and inquired whether there was any truth in this report. Mr. Dies replied that he had heard nothing about it. Mr. HAVENNER then requested Chairman Dies to notify him if anyone attempted to give any testimony concerning him before the committee, in order that he might appear before the committee and exercise his right as a Member of Congress to testify in his own behalf. Dies assured him that this would be done.

After talking to the chairman, Mr. HAVENNER visited Representative Dempsey, of New Mexico, the ranking member of the Dies committee, and Representative Voorhis, of California, also a member of the committee, and made the same requests of them. Both also assured Representative HAVENNER that they would notify him immediately if they learned that any testimony concerning him was to be heard by the committee.

Now comes the most amazing feature of this regrettable episode in congressional history.

Not until more than 4 years had elapsed did Representative HAVENNER learn that, shortly after his conversation with Chairman Dies, a meeting of a subcommittee of the Dies committee, which was not public, was held in Beaumont, Tex. At that meeting, which was attended, as Mr. HAVENNER states, only by

one member of the committee, the secretary of the committee, Robert E. Stripling, and the then investigator for the committee, James H. Stedman, a witness named John L. Leech testified under oath that it was his understanding that Representative HAVENNER had been and was at that time a member of the Communist Party.

The first time that Congressman HAVENNER knew that this meeting had been held on July 16, 1940, and that damaging testimony concerning him had been taken under oath, was when political advertisements, containing excerpts from the testimony given by the witness Leech were printed in San Francisco newspapers in October 1944, during Mr. HAVENNER'S campaign for reelection to Congress.

Mr. HAVENNER never received any notification from Mr. Dies or from any other member or employee of the committee, or from anyone else, that this meeting was to be held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and he was never given any opportunity to appear before the committee to refute this damaging testimony.

The record of the subcommittee hearing, which was not a public meeting, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, was kept on the secret file of the committee for more than 4 years and was never officially released by the Dies committee for publication.

Just how the supporters of Mr. HAVENNER'S opponent in the 1944 campaign for Congress learned about the secret subcommittee meeting and obtained the record of its proceedings for publication has never been officially disclosed.

When Mr. HAVENNER was returned to Congress in January 1945, he took the floor of the House of Representatives and denounced the testimony of the witness Leech as perjury in its entirety. On that occasion every member of the old Dies committee who was present arose and stated that they had never heard of the secret subcommittee meeting held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and had never known anything about the testimony concerning Mr. HAVENNER until he made his speech on the floor of the House.

When Mr. HAVENNER had concluded his statement, many Members of the House of Representatives voluntarily arose and expressed their confidence in Mr. HAVENNER'S patriotism and integrity.

Not a single Member of the House attempted to condone this testimony given in an attempt to smear their fellow Member, and many Members denounced it as an outrageous proceeding.

I participated in the discussion on the floor of the House on that occasion, and, in the course of my remarks, I said:

> There should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.
>
> If that testimony was false it means that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear the gentleman for a particular purpose. It seems to me to be a matter of interest to each and every Member of the House and I think, speaking as an individual, if anything is done that the committee should go further and if they do find falsehoods, look into them. They will find falsehoods, for the gentleman has denied that the statements were true. They should investigate the conspiracy because it concerns every Member of this body.
>
> As far as the gentleman himself is concerned, I have served with him, and I believe I speak the sentiments of every Member of this body. The gentleman may differ with me on this or that question, or differ with some of us who serve with him, but because we differ on public questions does not mean that we are not good Americans; it means simply a difference in our individual conscience and our individual judgment as to the best interests of the country. We may disagree as to judgment, but every man here has a love of America and is actuated by the same high patriotic motives as the gentlemen from California, who enjoys the confidence of every Member on each side of the aisle, as far as I know, who serves with him. I rise particularly to make this contribution because the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] enjoys our respect and confidence and because we recognize that he is both honorable and trustworthy.

The conviction which I expressed in these remarks back in 1945 that this whole unsavory affair indicated that there had been a conspiracy to misuse the privileged authority of a congressional committee in order to defame a Member of Congress is strengthened by certain information which Representative HAVENNER has recently given me. He states that with the permission of Chairman THOMAS he talked with the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Stripling, who was present at the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee down in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940.

Mr. HAVENNER asked the clerk of the committee who had arranged to bring the witness, Leech, whose home was in Los Angeles, out to this secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., to give perjured testimony against a Member of Congress. The clerk, Mr. Stripling, replied that it was the duty of the investigator, James H. Stedman, to produce witnesses for the committee hearings. When Mr. HAVENNER asked to see Stedman, he was informed that the former investigator had not been employed by the committee for several years. Congressman HAVENNER inquired where Stedman was located, and was informed that after he left the committee he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., in Los Angeles, and was still in the employ of that company.

The President of the Honolulu Oil Co. is Mr. Albert C. Mattei, a gentleman who has been very active in Republican politics in northern California for many years. Congressman HAVENNER states that Mr. Mattei has been the chief financial and political supporter of every Republican candidate for Congress who has run against HAVENNER since our colleague was first elected to this House back in 1936. Mr. Mattei was the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER'S Republican opponent for Congress in 1940, when the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee was held down in Beaumont, Tex. Mr. Mattei was again the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER'S opponent for Congress in 1944, when the defamatory perjured testimony taken at the secret subcommittee down in Beaumont, Tex., first saw the light of day in a political advertisement designed to defeat Mr. HAVENNER as a candidate for Congress.

And now it develops that when former Investigator Stedman, who is reported by the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities to have produced the witness who gave the defamatory perjured testimony against Congressman HAVENNER at the secret subcommittee meeting down in Beaumont, Tex., severed his connection with that committee, he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., of which Mr. Mattei is the president.

I leave this astounding sequence of facts to the judgment of Congress and the American people.

Congressman HAVENNER is one of the ablest Members of the Congress, sincere, courageous, a fighter for the people, and loyal to the best interests of the people, he is a credit to the people of his district. Congressman HAVENNER is a great American.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, JOHNSON of Illinois, MURRAY of Wisconsin, FLANNAGAN, COOLEY, and PACE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include recommendations.

Mr. RUSSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Felix Morley appearing in Human Events. This article proves again how far we have gone toward the totalitarian concept of government in our State Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. RUSSELL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Missouri Bismarck Gazette.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address by Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Bridgeport Brass Co.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter. In one of these instances it may exceed the limit under the rules, and due to the press of business in the Government Printing Office they have been unable to furnish me an estimate. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reqest of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions adopted by Henry H. Houston II Post, No. 3.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas (at the request of Mr. PLUMLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning I voted for the bill to provide for a temporary draft but I did so with considerable skepticism and reluctance. The wisdom of peacetime conscription in a free country is always open to serious challenge. It is a dangerous power to extend in time of peace except upon the most stringent and limited terms. In my judgment, its necessity can only be justified on the need for sufficient military manpower to adequately defend our country against attack from any potential aggressor. I base my support of this measure on the fact that the President, as Commander in Chief, and our military experts have advised us that our manpower in the armed forces is inadequate for this purpose and that it cannot be obtained by voluntary procedures.

The evidence is abundant that our Military Establishment has not given the voluntary system of induction a fair trial. But it is not difficult to understand that a voluntary system can never be successful when the men in charge of such a program condemn it in advance and doom it to failure. As long as military men have that attitude, there is little or no chance for a voluntary program to succeed.

It should be definitely understood that this legislation is temporary and limited in duration to the period needed to fill our basic minimum manpower requirements. Such a system has no place in a free government in peacetime except upon that limited basis. So I have supported this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because it is temporary in nature and because I think that we must be adequately prepared to defend ourselves against outside aggression and thus be able to insure the preservation of our country and the safety of our people. But I definitely want to be on record as opposing the use of peacetime conscription as a means of implementing our foreign policy. If I thought we were putting additional men in uniform for the purpose of sending them to the far-flung corners of the earth, to settle other peoples' problems or fight other nations' wars, then I would be irrevocably opposed to it. The average American has no objection to being called at any time to assist in the defense of his country. The real fear of our potential soldiers is the constant uncertainty of whether their services will be used in the defense of this country or whether they will be sent to some distant land to become involved in the settlement of disputes which have nothing to do with our national security or defense. No one can blame an American soldier for wanting some assurance that he will not again be sent to foreign battlefields. If Congress does not give him that assurance, to whom can he look for it? Those who have conducted our foreign policy since the beginning of the last war have made one tragic blunder after another. This policy has been costly in dollars. Let us pray that it will never again be costly in American lives.

Mr. Speaker, this country cannot afford another global war. The last one cost over $360,000,000,000 and left us with a national debt of over two hundred and fifty billion. Another such war would not only impoverish and bankrupt this Nation, it would completely destroy our freedom and the system of government which protects it. It would annihilate the only republic on the face of the earth where human rights and dignity come ahead of the state. We can never again afford to risk this priceless heritage by engaging in another global war.

No single nation can shoulder the social, economic, and military problems of the rest of the world and expect to survive. The United States cannot do it and survive. Yet, step by step we are trying to assume that responsibility. Day by day in ever increasing numbers other nations are saddling us with their social, economic, and military burdens. If we do not soon discontinue this kind of program we will eventually find ourselves in the same desperate situation as those we are seeking to save.

Our foreign policy and our military power should be dedicated wholly and solely to the preservation of our own national security and welfare. If we use the military and economic prestige of the United States for these purposes we will be in a better position to help maintain world peace, without endangering the solvency or stability of our own Government—and without engaging in other people's wars.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, in time of great national peril we must depend chiefly on able and loyal military and naval leaders for our security. It is more important today than ever before that the United States be assured that its future requirements for well-qualified and highly trained officers shall be adequately met.

Not long ago my attention was called to an editorial entitled "A Challenge to Service Schools," which summarized the criticisms directed at the United States Military and Naval Academies because of their short enrollments and unfilled vacancies. Under existing procedure, in a large measure the fact that there are unfilled vacancies in classes at the Academies may very well be the responsibility of Congress itself.

I sent the editorial in question to the Secretary of the Army with a request for his comments. His letter constituted so excellent a statement of the position of the Department and the Academy authorities that under the leave which has been granted I include its text together with a further exchange of letters between us. They are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., November 10, 1947.

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REEVES: In further reply to your letter of October 6, 1947, I would like to outline the principal reasons, as they appear to

the Department of the Army, for the present understrength at West Point.

Your letter refers to the article in the Atlantic Monthly, written by Ralph Lee Smith, a former midshipman at the Naval Academy. I know that you did not expect me to comment directly on this article, but I do wish to comment briefly on references to it in the editorial in the Kansas City Star, since it might be inferred that the complaints of this former midshipman about instruction and traditions might apply to the military academy.

The Army has maintained vigilant interest in the instruction at West Point, and has not relied solely on its own judgment thereof. In 1945 the Secretary of War appointed a board to criticize the proposed curriculum and the transition from the 3-year to a 4-year course. The board was composed of Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. James P. Baxter III, president of Williams College, and several distinguished general officers of the Army, including Lt. Gen. Troy H. Middleton, comptroller of Louisiana State University. In their report, the consultants commented most favorably upon the methods of instruction, the progressiveness of the teaching staff, and the modern equipment in the academic department. The program of physical education and intramural athletics drew their praise. The general conclusion was that the academic program at the academy was thoroughly sound and provided the balanced and liberal education in the arts and sciences directed in the Department of the Army's statement of the academy's mission. The curriculum has been broadened to cover recent developments in nuclear physics and electronics, and the course in leadership increased to 4 years. Additional professors have been authorized by Congress, and appointed. The ratio of instructors to students has been maintained at a level permitting individual instruction. Daily recitations by each cadet reveal either proficiency or deficiency in each phase of instruction, thus eliminating mediocre efforts in midterm and cramming for final examinations. Weekly standings posted on bulletin board and monthly reports to parents keep both informed of the cadet's progress.

Tradition has ever been part of military service, and properly so. That it is an important factor in the life of the West Point cadet is undeniable. The honor code, developed and adhered to by generations of cadets, is the outstanding tradition at the Military Academy, and, with others, has served to inculcate in these young men the acceptance of "duty, honor, country" as a personal code. This spiritual indoctrination is no less important than the technical, cultural, and physical development of cadets. Civilian schools have their traditions and customs; and if those at the Military Academy demand more of the student in fortitude, self-control, and determination, it only reflects the striving for an ideal of character, courage, self-denial, forthrightness, and physical stamina that is expected of the Regular Army officer. These traditions place all cadets on a common footing, regardless of personal fortune or social background. They serve to identify weaklings and reveal to themselves and to the authorities those who are unable to conform to group living under strenuous circumstances, or who are temperamentally incapable of submission to authority.

The reasons, in the opinion of the Department of the Army, for the decrease in the number of applicants for admission to the Military Academy and the consequent understrength in the Corps of Cadets, are set forth below under six main headings.

1. American economic conditions: Inflated earnings increase the attraction of civilian pursuits, while rising living costs decrease interest in an education that involves an obligation to serve many years at relatively low fixed incomes. Because of high earnings throughout the war years, many parents who would otherwise be eager to obtain West Point appointments for their sons, with education at Government expense, have accumulated sufficient money to pay for a civilian education.

2. The apathy of the public toward military service: The apathy of the public toward military service that became apparent as soon as actual combat was over has adversely affected the number of applicants for West Point, just as it has affected the success of the recruiting program. It is reflected in a slight increase in resignations from the Military Academy as well as in a decrease in the number of applications for admission. I understand the understrength at the Military Academy has a parallel at the Naval Academy, and that the reasons therefor are believed to be similar to those affecting the Military Academy. History has repeated itself, inasmuch as the Military Academy and Naval Academy had similar experiences following World War I. A large proportion of the young men within the age limits for admission to West Point have already had Army service, and their attitude toward a military career has been shaped by their war experiences.

3. GI bill of rights: Many men within the age limits for admission to the Military Academy are entitled, by reason of military service, to the education benefits of the GI bill of rights. They have unlimited choice of subjects and wide selectivity of schools, without obligation for military service after graduation. This applies particularly to students who had completed one or more years at a civilian college or university prior to entering military service and for which they would not receive credit upon admission to the Military Academy. The advancement of science makes specialized study more essential to the successful engineer, nuclear physicist, doctor, and other professional men, and in the public mind renders a military education less attractive than formerly. While the curriculum at West Point has been broadened to include new developments in science, this fact is not completely known to the general public. Students with serious scientific ambitions do not see sufficient opportunity for West Point graduates to pursue specialized scientific studies at advanced technological schools.

4. Opportunities for obtaining Regular Army commission by other methods: Legislation recently passed by Congress increased the commissioned officer strength of the Regular Army to 50,000. It has been necessary, within a short period of time, to devise procurement methods to fill this increase. Many men who would be qualified and normally interested in attending the Military Academy have had an opportunity to obtain a Regular Army commission through these methods. While no figures are available as to the actual number of possible candidates for the Military Academy who were eliminated by the above cause, there is every reason to believe that the number was substantial. It is not unnatural that these men interested in a military career as commissioned officers should choose these other methods, which permit them to receive their Regular Army commission quickly and often in a higher rank than the second lieutenant's commission they would receive after four strenuous years at the Military Academy.

5. Increase in foreign service assignments: The duties imposed upon the Army by postwar conditions require much greater amounts of foreign service, often in very undesirable areas throughout the world. This is very distasteful to many men, in considering their future. Prior to the war, the years spent by an officer on foreign service covered a relatively short period of his career and usually were spent in areas which permitted him comfortable living and climatic conditions.

6. Hold-over of appointments of 1947 until 1948: Every year some Members of Congress notify The Adjutant General of their intention to carry their vacancies over to the following year, which is done either to reserve appointments for certain individuals or for lack of suitable applicants. There was a marked increase in hold-overs from 1947 to 1948, as compared with previous years, but no break-down as to the reasons therefor is available. The Congressmen do not always specify the reason, but where reasons are given, they generally indicate a decrease in applications or lowering of qualifications of applicants, thus reflecting the factors mentioned in previous paragraphs.

It is believed that the shortage that existed in the class entering the Military Academy in 1947 was brought more plainly to public attention because of the contrast of the present shortage to the abundance of applications for attendance at the Military Academy during the war years. During that period, there was never a dearth of candidates, available vacancies being applied for by many more times the number of men than could possibly be admitted. As a result, the Department of the Army was flooded with applications and the competition was keen. During the war years, the operation of the Selective Service System served to swell the number of applicants for the Military Academy. Under a ruling made by Selective Service in 1942, candidates holding appointments to the Military Academy were not liable for induction during the pendency of such appointments. New appointments for unsuccessful candidates could be obtained for each succeeding year that the applicant was within the age limit for admission. Many faced with the necessity of military service, sought appointments in a sincere desire to qualify for commissioned service. However, hundreds of others are believed to have taken advantage of this opportunity for deferment as a means of avoiding or postponing induction and possible exposure to hazardous duty. This painful fact was brought clearly to light when the suspension of the draft brought with it a complete reversal of the motivating interest in obtaining appointments. This was also reflected in the number of resignations from the Academy, and in declinations of appointments.

It is desired to present certain information relative to resignations at the Military Academy. In the years from 1921 to 1945, inclusive, resignations from the Military Academy were a minor factor in the number of vacancies, averaging only 29 a year. Immediately following both world wars, however, resignations jumped to a high figure, contributing in large measure to the total number of vacancies. Following are figures for the 2 years following each war:

1919: One hundred and forty resignations, or 10.5 percent of the authorized strength of 1,334.

1920: One hundred and two resignations, or 7.6 percent of the authorized strength of 1,334.

1946: One hundred and eighty-two resignations, or 7.3 percent of the authorized strength of 2,496.

1947: One hundred and fifty-two resignations, or 6.1 percent of the authorized strength of 2,496.

In 1921 and 1922 resignations dropped to a very low figure, possibly as a result of the depressed economy of that period. It is believed that resignations from the Academy in 1948 and 1949 will decline from the 1946–47 figures, but in view of existing economic and political conditions, an accurate forecast is impossible.

In reply to your quest'on about legislation authorizing the filling of vacancies, section 2 of the act of Congress approved June 3, 1942, authorizes the filling of vacancies occasioned by the nonuse of appointments, whether through failure to pass entrance

examination or otherwise. Section 2 provides:

"When on the date of admission of a new class the total number of cadets is below the number authorized, the Secretary of War may bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing qualified alternates and candidates recommended by the academic board, two-thirds thereof from qualified alternates and one-third thereof from qualified candidates (competitors): *Provided*, That any appointment made under this section shall be an additional appointment and shall not constitute an appointment otherwise authorized by law."

The only candidates who are eligible for consideration are those who have been found mentally and physically qualified in connection with an appointment held for admission on the first week day of July of the year concerned. No application is necessary for consideration by the academic board since all candidates who are fully qualified but who are not entitled to admission under the terms of their appointments are rated relatively according to general merit. The academic board, in determining the general merit, studies the records of these candidates and makes its selection based upon consideration of the academic grades and other pertinent factors which affect the qualifications of the various candidates to become officers of the Army. In spite of the provisions of section 2, it was impossible to fill all vacancies in 1947. It was found on July 1, 1947, after all other admissions were authorized, that the corps of cadets was operating at a strength of 2,227, or 269 less than its authorized strength. However, since there were only 14 qualified competitors left on the lists of competitive candidates, only that number of competitors and only 28 alternates (thereby maintaining the one-third, two-thirds ratio) could be admitted under the provisions of the law cited. Therefore, 227 vacancies remained unfilled (269 less 42). Action was recently taken by the Department of the Army to authorize the nomination of four candidates instead of three for each vacancy for enlisted men of the Regular Army and National Guard. Similar action had already been taken for all other sources of admission under which the number of nominations for each vacancy were limited. This will increase the number of qualified competitors, thus making the provisions of section 2 more effective in filling any vacancies which may exist in an entering class in the future.

Your interest in the United States Military Academy is greatly appreciated. If there is any further information you desire, I shall be happy to obtain it for you.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

NOVEMBER 22, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under date of November 11 my secretary acknowledged receipt of your excellent letter of November 10, written in reply to my inquiry of October 6, 1947, concerning the reported understrength at the Military Academy at West Point.

You have answered my question completely. Much of the information and many of the comments which you included are particularly illuminating and would be of considerable interest to other Members of the House and to the public as well. For that reason I would like to include the text of your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I shall not do so unless it is agreeable to you. Do you have any objection to its publication?

* * * * *

During almost 4 years of service in the Army in World War II my observation and association with officers of the Regular Establishment gave me a high regard for the Academy and its traditions, and in my present position I feel keenly the responsibility to strengthen and encourage public interest and confidence in its work.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1947.

Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REEVES: Thank you for your letter of November 22, 1947, expressing your high regard for the United States Military Academy and its traditions, with which I most heartily agree.

I would be very glad to have the letter to which you refer published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I would also appreciate the publication of your letter of November 22, 1947.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have voted to recommit the draft bill to committee because this is the only means by which I can at this time express my disapproval of those amendments which have so weakened the effectiveness of the bill. I would prefer to give the committee another chance at a better bill. I recognize that this is not going to be done.

We are going to have to take the bill as it is. I will vote for it as the best we can get.

It is my judgment that the passage of an effective Selective Service Act is of more importance as a demonstration of the national determination to defend our way of life than any measure we have so far considered.

In the present state of the world we will be ill advised to adopt any measure which falls short of adequacy, and do anything which may be less than enough to accomplish our purpose, whether it be the enactment of measures of domestic import, of foreign aid, or of national defense.

Last night I looked across the Mall at the floodlights playing on the figure of Armed Freedom atop the Capitol Dome. The artist had given arms to Freedom, well knowing that unarmed she could not long be free. There seemed to be light enough on Armed Freedom but less was shed over either House. Perhaps there is a moral in this somewhere.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short letter from the American Tariff League.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1948, I inserted in the RECORD an article from the May issue of ATL Topics, the magazine published by the American Tariff League. Portions of this article were read to the House to point out that the Gearhart antireciprocal trade extension bill passed by the House earlier in that week bore a striking resemblance to certain recommendations made by the Tariff League in the secret, star-chamber sessions of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tariff and Reciprocal Trade.

The article stated:

This temporary program parallels, in some instances the proposals for a long-range program, providing for flexible rate-setting by a new governmental commission, with opportunity for review by Congress, but not requiring congressional action, offered by ATL President H. Wickliffe Rose at the recent House Ways and Means Subcommittee hearings, and contained in the new ATL Declaration of Principles and Program for World Trade.

From this statement, as well as from comparing the unmistakable effect of the House bill in killing the Reciprocal Trade Act with the long-standing high-tariff hostility to the Reciprocal Trade program of the American Tariff League, it seemed a warrantable conclusion that the Tariff League should be claiming the credit which I inferred from the ATL article. Moreover, Mr. H. Wickliffe Rose, president of the American Tariff League, appeared to assume some responsibilities of authorship when he told the Senate Committee on Finance that "because H. R. 6556 incorporates some of the basic principles proposed in our declaration and because to that extent we believe it is in the right direction toward a sound, long-term program and policy, we approve the bill as a whole for an interim measure."

Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a letter dated June 11, 1948, from Mr. Richard H. Anthony, secretary of the American Tariff League, which states that the American Tariff League does not claim credit for H. R. 6556. In accordance with the request contained in the letter, under unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

THE AMERICAN TARIFF LEAGUE,
New York 18, N. Y., June 11, 1948.

Congressman HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN EBERHARTER: Our attention has been called to a statement made by you on May 28 in the House of Representatives and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, beginning on page 6884. The title which, I assume, is intended to summarize the views of the speaker, is "American Tariff League Claims Credit for the Gearhart Bill."

This league does not claim credit for H. R. 6556, the bill in question, and we do not think that the article in our May issue of ATL's Topics, from which you quoted, can be properly construed in that way. You apparently have so construed it, however, and so we must categorically deny that your conclusion is the correct one.

The only part taken by the league in regard to pending legislation was the appearance of the president of the league, Mr. H. Wickliffe Rose, at hearings held by the House Ways and Means Subcommittee and the Senate Finance Committee. At both appearances he offered the league's "Declaration of Principles and Program for World Trade," which is briefly summarized in the

ATL Topics article you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Copies of that declaration were left by Mr. Rose at the time of his appearance before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee for every member of the full committee. You should have received one as a matter of course, and, to be sure that you have one, an additional copy is enclosed. I hope that you will want to give it careful study. It envisions a long-term program, and does not refer to any bill in either House of Congress.

You will remember that H. R. 6556 was not before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee at the time of the hearings the first week in May. Hence, Mr. Rose could not have addressed any remarks to that particular bill. However, when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on June 3, the hearings were on the subject of H. R. 6556, and in reference to that bill, Mr. Rose, as part of his testimony, made the statement which appears on pages 296–297 of the printed hearings entitled "Extending Authority to Negotiate Trade Agreements," as follows:

"The proposals in this declaration are directed to a long-term program and policy on tariff, in the belief that its adoption will foster world trade, peace, and prosperity. We do not expect you to analyze it in detail today, and we know that there is not time to prepare legislation for its complete adoption in this session of Congress.

"Consequently, we agree that it is practical to pass an interim extension of the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year, as in H. R. 6556, in order to give Congress the opportunity to study and develop a long-term program and policy.

"Furthermore, because H. R. 6556 incorporates some of the basic principles proposed in our declaration and because to that extent we believe it is in the right direction toward a sound, long-term program and policy, we approve the bill as a whole for an interim measure. Under this or any other act of Congress, however, we see nothing to be gained by the United States through additional international tariff bargaining agreements."

Mr. Rose's statement on H. R. 6556 is the full extent to which any league action has been taken thereon. We believe that an opportunity should be afforded the league to deny that it claims credit for H. R. 6556. In the interest of fair play, would you be willing to insert this letter in the RECORD?

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ANTHONY,
Secretary.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members of the House in emphasizing his position on this legislation, has quoted the words of George Washington when he said, "One of the most effectual means of preserving peace is to be prepared for war."

I believe in full and complete preparedness. It is absolutely necessary in view of the position that we find ourselves in today that we have adequate defenses. Not only with respect to manpower, but just as important we must have adequate air power, atomic power, together with the latest and most modern equipment that can be produced. We are living in a blundering, bleeding world and we are disappointed to find this country and the world at large so far from reaching an understanding of peace among the peoples of the various nations.

It is fundamental that our armed forces should be improved and modernized so that our country may at all times be adequately defended from any type of attack. As I understand it, the question involved today is whether peacetime conscription is required for an adequate and modernized system of national defense.

Those in charge of this legislation have given us to understand quite definitely that the need for additional men in the armed forces is not immediate. The House Committee on Armed Services in charge of the bill approved an amendment to this legislation to extend the enforcement of the draft for a period of at least 90 days following the effective date of the act, so that the bill as presently submitted and approved could not become effective until November of this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the committee report and according to the facts submitted by the sponsors of this legislation, we have 1,211,818 men in our armed forces as of March 1, 1948. Four hundred and sixty-nine thousand four hundred and ninety-six are in the Army; 351,181 are in the Navy; 317,102 are in the Air Force; and 74,039 in the Marines. We now have the largest and strongest Navy in the world. In fact, our Navy is more than equal the strength of the combined navies of all the rest of the world. We are advised by those in charge of this legislation that the Navy has more enlistments than they need. In fact, our committee tells us that the Navy does not request or need peacetime conscription.

This Congress recently passed legislation to increase our Air Force to a 70-group corps. This is even larger than was requested by the Department of Defense. It is larger than was requested by the President. I was glad to support the authorization as well as the appropriation for the 70-group Air Force. In fact, I think the Air Force is the strong arm of our defense.

I want to pay tribute to the infantrymen who I think do not receive the credit to which they are entitled. It is not a glamorous job. We must not ignore the necessity of the men in the Infantry. It is a fact that the Infantry does not carry the appeal that we find in the Navy, the Marines, or the Air Force.

The first question involved I think is with respect to the immediate need of 300,000 additional men in order to bring the armed forces up to the strength that the Department of Defense has suggested. They tell us that the need is not immediate, but that in 3 or 4 months from now the authority of conscription may be required. I believe that only in case of a national emergency should we resort to a policy of registering two or three million men for conscription. Now, I call your attention to the fact that prior to World War II and during that period, a test of 59 points was the mimimum requirement. Since that time the requirement has been jumped to 80 points. I am told that if the requirement for induction were reduced to 70 points, and incidentally I have secured an amendment to the present bill to make such provision, there are a good many men who would join the armed forces if given an opportunity to do so. It has been pointed out the draftee, under this bill, will not have a choice of services. He will go where the Army assigns him.

Furthermore, the Army, instead of encouraging and building up the extension of the Reserve Corps for hundreds of thousands of men, have permitted it to dwindle and have disappointed and discouraged a good many men who would otherwise have joined the Reserve. It is unfortunate, too, that those in charge of the Regular Army of our country do not encourage the enlargement and the advancement of the National Guard, which after all was the backbone of the infantry organizations during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported every appropriation to increase our defenses all the way up and down the line and if this committee had made a real showing with respect to the need of the conscription of men for the armed forces, I should be glad to support this legislation. I regret that in view of the showing that has been made by those who propose this legislation, that I am unable to support it. And do not forget that if and when the need for conscription of men is shown, I will be one of the first to support it. Incidentally, I am inclined to agree with Members of this House who have spoken before me who believe that if the time comes for the need of the conscription of thousands and millions of men to defend our country against a foreign foe, we should at the same time conscript the wealth of our country as a part of that program. May it never be said again that our country produced millionaires who made profits from munitions of war, either directly or indirectly, while our young men were sacrificing their lives in the defense of their country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if what I hear regarding the so-called housing bill is true then I must vote against passage. I will not be guilty of the betrayal of the trusting millions among our people or perpetrating a hoax upon our deserving veterans who while promised solution of the housing shortage now face years of slum existence as a reward for their unfaltering patriotic service. I have been watching this bill and the arduous road over which it was compelled to travel. In the Committee on Banking and Currency the other day it seemed certain that the coalition of 11 Democratic and 3 Republican Members saved the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and restored the people's confidence in the integrity of the Congress. This morning however, I learn that the whipping received by the 3 Republican Members who joined in righteousness their Democratic colleagues has inclined them to

once again follow the wrong course toward ease and error. I shall not have the opportunity to discuss the iniquities of the Wolcott bill when presented to us later this afternoon. I shall not blame the Republican leadership for this because time grows short but I must place the blame upon the leadership of the party in control for encouraging—yes, for forcing the Republican members of the committee to reconsider their vote, reversing their position, and reporting the husk of what might have been a real housing bill. The Wolcott bill raises the cry of socializing housing, but nothing is said about the socializing support of Government given to builders in guaranteeing loans, in the taking over, specially, of Government-built housing at an accelerated depreciation in order to reduce taxes and thereby increase the financial return to the investor. I must oppose the bill if it does not contain the public-housing provision to which the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman WOLCOTT, is uncompromisingly opposed. To meet any standard slum clearance rural housing, too, must be included. All these features involve the family life of our country and upon this family life the Government is founded. Anything that imperils family life undermines and endangers our country.

The public-housing feature in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to which the real-estate lobby so strongly objected and which has been wiped out in the Wolcott proposal dooms to the slums the widow and the children who unfortunately having lost their husband and father cannot meet the rentals charged while the breadwinner lived. The subsidized rental property intended by the T-E-W bill was condemned and stricken from the Wolcott bill as socialistic. Seemingly there is no concern about the widow and orphaned children of a citizen, and he may have been a veteran, when they are forced to give up their old home for an alley slum all because of the death in the family. The Wolcott bill preserves the slum for the use of the unfortunate upon the pretense that it is socialistic to render aid to helpless future citizens. What little might be saved to the Treasury of the United States will be paid out a thousandfold due to delinquency in health and morals, which thrive in the slums and which will require the construction of asylums, hospitals, and prisons.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"; and

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the Act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. FULBRIGHT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) entitled "An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Company."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II;

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp. of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1779. An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa; Kansas City, Mo.; and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

PRINTING OF THE DEMOCRATIC WAY AND THE TOTALITARIAN WAY AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 678) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the volume entitled "The Democratic Way and the Totalitarian Way" prepared under the joint auspices of the United States Commissioner of Education and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress be printed as a House document.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after "printed", insert "with illustrations."

Line 5, after "document", insert a comma and the following: "and that three thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on House Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF GEN. JOSE GERVASIO ARTIGAS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the bill (S. 2591) to provide for acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States the bronze statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, as a gift from the people of Uruguay, and erect the same on a suitable site to be selected by the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in a public park or other federally owned property in the District of Columbia. Such statue shall not be erected until the plans and specifications for the pedestal and landscaping have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. The preparation of the plans and specifications for the pedestal and landscaping and the erection of the statue shall be under the supervision of the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including the design and construction of a suitable pedestal for such statue, the landscaping of the adjacent area, and the necessary plans therefor.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 686) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF STATISTICS OF HOUSING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 684) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed additional copies of part numbered 2 of the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing entitled "Statistics of Housing," for the use of the said joint committee, the cost of which shall not exceed $500.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 672) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $100,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 4, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$20,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES AS AN ADVOCATE OF OVERTHROW OF GOVERNMENT BY FORCE AND VIOLENCE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 199) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 11,000 additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence, of which 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the House document room.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 2, strike out "eleven thousand" and insert "six thousand."

Line 6, strike out "ten thousand" and insert "five thousand."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVELYN RICHARDSON

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 677 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Evelyn Richardson, widow of J. Frederick Richardson, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said J. Frederick Richardson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment on page 2 of the bill.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

LEONARD W. HALL,
ROBERT HALE,
WILLIAM J. MILLER,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER E. CAPEHART,
CLYDE M. REED,
E. H. MOORE,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made two amendments to the bill. One amendment inserted at the end of the bill a new section 3 amending section 303 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so that the penalty provided therein would apply only to violations which were willful or resulted from gross negligence. The other amendment modified the title of the bill because of the new provision added by the first amendment.

The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from both amendments.

LEONARD W. HALL,
ROBERT HALE,
WILLIAM J. MILLER,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a conference report on the so-called Miller bill?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. What was done in conference with the so-called Moore amendment?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. The Senate receded and concurred and the so-called Moore amendment was stricken out of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, S. 2341, to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 491), is amended by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed $150,000."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pnuematic-tube systems, and for other purposes, with amendments of the House thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. REES, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee.

AMENDING VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5508) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "legally."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2739) to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 5-cent air mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATING RETIREMENT SYSTEM OF OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2692) to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, which was approved by the committee on June 17, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence after the first proviso of the second paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 12, sec. 481), is amended by deleting the comma after the words "whose compensation" and striking out the words "including retirement annuities to be fixed by the Comptroller of the Currency" and deleting the comma following those words.

SEC. 2. (a) The United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain the amount of the gross assets in the retirement fund of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized and directed to cause to be transferred all such assets to the Secretary of the Treasury to be entered on the books of the Treasury Department to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund.

(b) In the case of each officer or employee who is a member of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the United States Civil Service Commission shall cause to be credited to his individual account in the civil service retirement and disability fund an amount equal to such employee's accumulated contributions and interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the time of

its termination: *Provided*, That in the event that such amount is in excess of the amount which would have been to his credit had he made the contributions required for allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, as amended, currently during the same period of time for which he has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, plus interest thereon, such excess amount shall be applied to any other deposits or redeposits required of such employee under sections 7, 9, and 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, covering periods of allowable service for which said employee did not have creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, or, if he has no such additional allowable service, the excess shall be repaid to such employee in cash: *Provided further*, That no part of said sum credited to such employee's individual account shall be applied to any period of allowable service prior to August 1, 1920, or to periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, for which periods no deposit shall be required, as provided by section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; nor shall deposits be required for any periods of time prior to June 1, 1936, for which such employee has creditable service under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, in excess of the amount of such employee's accumulated contributions plus interest standing to his credit on the books of the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency at the date of its termination.

SEC. 3. (a) In the case of an officer or employee who, prior to the effective date of this act, shall have been retired on annuity under the rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office, the annuity shall be paid out of the civil service retirement and disability fund and shall be increased effective on the first day of the third month following the month in which this act is enacted by 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser: *Provided*, That each such annuitant may, prior to the effective date herein prescribed, elect to retain his or her present annuity in lieu of the increased annuity provided by this subsection and name his wife or her husband to receive upon his or her death one-half of his or her present annuity but not to exceed $600 per annum during the remainder of the life of such surviving wife or husband and upon the death of such survivor no further annuity shall be due or payable: *Provided further*, That the amount payable in the event of the death of the annuitant either to his nominated beneficiary or estate, in the form of a lump-sum payment or survivor's annuity, shall not be less than the amounts which would have been payable under the applicable rules and regulations of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office.

(b) In the case of any officer or employee who was a member of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office and who, prior to the effective date of this act, terminated his employment with that office and elected to receive a deferred annuity at age 65, under the applicable rules and regulations of the retirement system of that office, such annuity shall be payable out of the civil service retirement and disability fund beginning at the age of 62 years. Otherwise his rights shall be determined and the annuity computed as though this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 4. In the case of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency who withdrew his accumulated contributions from the retirement fund of that office upon leaving its employ, said officer or employee or former officer or employee of such office shall be entitled to the same allowable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to which he would have been entitled if he had never been a member of the retirement system of the Comptroller's office, subject, however, to the payment of the deposits required under said act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins at least 30 days after the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6771

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6771.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. I there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 30, 34, 35, 42, 46, 54, 61, 62, 70, 78, 79, 80, 93, 96, 118, 135, 144, 147, 170, 172, 173, 185, 186, 202, 226, and 243.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 39, 44, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 67, 68, 69, 71, 87, 88, 89, 94, 95, 99, 104, 109, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 145, 148, 153, 158, 160, 162, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 174, 175, 176, 179, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 204, 205, 207, 208, 210, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 228, 229, and 230, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$1,115,842"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "not to exceed $50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$160,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$215,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "eight"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,888,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That not exceeding eight per centum of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That interest heretofore collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power in Grand Coulee Dam shall be covered into the reclamation fund forthwith: *Provided further*, That, awaiting legislation, said interest shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1949"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said

amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That none of the appropriations made in this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel assigned to regional offices of the Bureau of Land Management in excess of the average total number of all personnel assigned to such regional offices during the fiscal year 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Salaries and expenses, district offices: For expenses of district offices at Billings, Montana, and Portland, Oregon, only, including printing and binding, $200,000: *Provided*, That any unobligated balances of 1948 appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for payment to employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from service or furlough from active duty by reason of reduction in force under the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses, District Offices'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,334,115"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,242,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$755,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate nmbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,411,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$3,154,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$188,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$36,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$167,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "two hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "purchase of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-five for replacement only in fiscal year 1949, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "hire,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem (not exceeding $100,000)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not exceeding $48,000,000 of appropriations available for expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation during the fiscal year 1949 shall be used for administrative personal service and other personal services"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the total number of employees in the Bureau of Reclamation holding a permanent, temporary, or other appointment in grades CAF-9 and P-3, or above, shall not exceed three thousand five hundred at any one time during the fiscal year 1949"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", and in addition thereto the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,293,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,985"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,298,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,780,175"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,200,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,437"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$814,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$447,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$169,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$101,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$292,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$217,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,645,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$337,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$206,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$93,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,212"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 123: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$77,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$104,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,470,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$212,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $1,750,000; irrigation facilities, $30,876,900; irrigation distribution systems, $1,000,000; power facilities, surveys, $20,000, Shasta power plant, $1,000,000, Keswick Dam, $1,700,000, Keswick power plant, $1,000,000; switch yards, Shasta, Keswick and Tracy pulping plant, $3,250,000; transmission lines, Shasta to Delta (Tracy) via Oroville and Sacramento, $500,000, Shasta Dam to Shasta substation, $250,000; substation, Contra Costa, $12,000; in all, $41,358,900, no part of which shall be available for examination and surveys in connection with power facilities in any State other than the State of California: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance on June 30, 1948, of funds heretofore appropriated for this project shall be classified under and combined with these amounts and shall be expendable only for the specific purposes set forth in this paragraph, subject to determination by the Comptroller General;"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 131: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$42,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,611,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$146,357,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 136: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,786,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 137: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than three thousand seven hundred and sixty-six feet, unless and until new land in Broadwater County, Montana, equal in acreage to the irrigated land to be inundated in Canyon Ferry Reservoir above elevation of 3,766 feet is provided with facilities for irrigation; or for or in connection with the acquisition or installation of the power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out

by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"ALASKAN INVESTIGATIONS

"For engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water-power resources of Alaska, $150,000, which shall be available for, but not restricted to, services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rations and quarters for field parties while away from inhabited communities in which such facilities are available."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Not exceeding eight per centum of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 155: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$540,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 156: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$592,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 164: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$602,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 166: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,027,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "eighty, of which thirty shall be"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 180: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$765,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$665,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 184: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$790,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$137,951"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 200: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 201: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 203: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 203, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,312,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 213: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "not exceeding 35 per centum of the amount allocated to any State shall be available for the construction of buildings: *Provided further*, That the requirement of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, that not exceeding 20 per centum of the amount allocated to any State shall be available for the construction of improvements is hereby waived with respect to unobligated balances on June 30, 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 215: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,123,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 216: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "sixty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 217: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 217, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 218: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "hire (in Alaska),"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 219: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 219, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2.00"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 225: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 227: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 227, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 232: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 232, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 233: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 233, and

agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Board on Geographic Names, $150;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 234: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 235: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 236: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 237: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 237, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 238: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 239: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 239, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 240: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 240, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,375"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 241: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 241, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 242: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 242, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "unless a higher rate is otherwise authorized by law or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 84, 101, 125, 126, 150, 151, 152, 178, 189, 190, 199, 211, 212, 214, and 231.

BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, and 3, relating to the Office of the Secretary: Permits employment of such personnel outside the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,115,842, for such office, instead of $965,842, as proposed by the House, and $1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate; and permits the use of $50,000 for the Division of Power, instead of $75,000, as proposed by the Senate, and a prohibition against the use of any funds for such purpose, as proposed by the House.

No. 4, relating to the Office of the Solicitor: Appropriates $250,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $220,225, as proposed by the House.

No. 5, relating to salaries and expenses, Division of Territories and Island Possessions: Appropriates $160,000, instead of $146,800, as proposed by the House, and $185,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 6 and 7, relating to the Oil and Gas Division: Authorizes the purchase of four passenger vehicles, as proposed by the Senate, instead of two, as proposed by the House; and appropriates $325,000, for such division, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the House, and $350,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 8, relating to salaries and expenses, soil and moisture conservation operations: Appropriates $2,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,700,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 9 and 10, relating to contingent expenses, Department of the Interior: Appropriates $215,000, instead of $205,730, as proposed by the House, and $230,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 11 and 12, relating to expenses, power transmission facilities: Provides funds for expenses in connection with the supervision of contracts executed prior to June 30, 1948, as proposed by the Senate, instead of "1947", as proposed by the House; and provides for terminal leave payments to employees on furlough from active duty, as proposed by the Senate.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, relating to Bonneville Power Administration: Appropriates $21,125,700, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $20,920,760, as proposed by the House; provides that $3,231,800 shall be available for operation and maintenance and administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House; authorizes the purchase of eight motor vehicles, instead of five, as proposed by the House, and ten, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the Administrator to contract for "services", as proposed by the Senate; provides contract authorization in the sum of $11,888,500, instead of $10,269,290, as proposed by the House, and $12,046,500, as proposed by the Senate; restores the House provision relating to force account work amended to allow eight per centum of funds appropriated for construction for such work, in lieu of the Senate proposal; and restores the provision of the House relating to the disposition of interest collected by Bonneville Power Administration from sales of electric energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam on the unamortized balance of investment allocated to power, amended to make such provision effective during the fiscal year 1949.

The use of funds or of contract authorization for the Lebanon and Coos Bay substations mentioned on page 8 of the House Report and on pages 3 and 4 of the Senate Report has been disapproved by the conferees. The conferees approve the table of allocations as submitted by Bonneville Power Administration appearing at page 1540 of the Senate hearings with the following changes:

	Cash	Contract authorization
(1) Changes in amounts recommended for use on 230,000-volt facilities to maintain schedules coordinated with installation of new generating capacity (groups I, IA, and IB)	−$40,860	+$929,210
(2) Olympia-Shelton-Port Angeles line (item IA-3)		−25,000
(3) Olympia-Shelton line No. 2	−9,000	
(4) Beverly Park-Snohomish circuit No. 1	+170,000	
(5) Beverly Park-Snohomish circuit No. 2		+54,000
(6) Forest Grove-McMinnville-Salem line (item IB-9)	−70,000	+70,000
(7) Canby substation (I4-14)	−25,000	
(8) Spokane-Colville-Spirit line (item IIA-2)	−52,000	−50,000
(9) Cottage Grove-Drain facility (item IC-4)	−50,000	+50,000
(10) McKinley-Gold Beach interconnection	+50,000	+280,000
(11) Idaho Panhandle (Sand Point-Bonners Ferry)		+161,000
(12) Columbia-Ellensburg line (item IIC-2)		+150,000
Recommended adjustments in construction program	−26,860	+1,619,210
Recommended increase in operations and maintenance limitation	231,800	
Net changes from House bill	+204,940	+1,619,210

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28: Appropriates $1,000,000 for salaries and expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $900,000 as proposed by the House; and strikes out the word "only" following the words "District of Columbia" as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,562,565, as proposed by the House, for management, protection, and disposal of public lands; authorizes the purchase of 15 motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of 10 as proposed by the House; and provides that no part of the appropriations in the Act shall be used for salaries of personnel in regional offices in excess of the average total of such personnel during the fiscal year 1948, in lieu of the House provision eliminating such regional offices; appropriates $500,000 for revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $469,300 as proposed by the House; strikes out the provision of the House prohibiting the transfer of activities to the field, as proposed by the Senate; and inserts the provision of the Senate relating to the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, instead of the proposal of the House.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 29: Appropriates $200,000 for salaries and expenses, District Offices, in lieu of $600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum recommended provides $110,000 for a District office at Billings, Montana, and $90,000 for a similar office at Portland, Oregon, for special activities and functions applicable to those areas.

No. 30: Appropriates $2,400,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,200,000

as proposed by the Senate for salaries and expenses, reservation administration. The conferees approve the recommendations contained on page 15 of the House Committee report (No. 2038) with reference to maintenance of the agencies and subagencies in Oklahoma and the keeping of the enumerated records at such agencies and subagencies.

No. 31: Appropriates $125,000 for maintenance of law and order instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 32 and 33: Appropriates $4,118,962 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,518,762 as proposed by the House, for the Alaska Native Service and inserts the word "vessels" in such item as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriates $907,900 as proposed by the House, instead of $1,907,900 as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the contract authorization of not to exceed $3,350,000 proposed by the Senate amendment for construction and maintenance service, Navajo and Hopi Service. In connection with these decreases, the conferees wish to point out that the proposed increase was submitted in a supplemental estimate which went to the Senate and on which the House had no opportunity to hold hearings or give consideration. For this reason the conference committee decided that the request for additional funds and contract authorization should be deferred.

No. 36: Appropriates $4,334,115 for agency services of the Navajo and Hopi Service, instead of $3,748,615 as proposed by the House, and $4,584,115 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase of $585,500 in the House bill, $56,500 is provided for purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $29,000 for education, and $500,000 for welfare work. Conferees request that the Indian Bureau submit a report to the Congress early in the next regular session on conditions as to the general welfare of the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

No. 37: Corrects a total.

No. 38: Appropriates $755,000 for maintenance of buildings and utilities instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House and $810,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 39 and 40: Appropriates $10,100,000 for education of Indians, instead of $9,574,709 as proposed by the House, and $10,376,000, as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase in the House bill, $200,000 is provided for education of Navajo students, $125,000 is for State educational contracts and $15,000 for equipment at the Anadarko Arts and Craft Building, Oklahoma.

No. 41: Appropriates $900,000 for management, Indian Forest and Range Resources, instead of $711,687 as proposed by the House, and $950,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 42: Restores the House provision relating to a revolving fund for loans to Indians, in lieu of the Senate amendment.

Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47: Relating to construction, irrigation systems; appropriates $2,600,000 for Colorado River, Arizona, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $190,000 for payment to the San Carlos Irrigation and drainage district, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of March 7, 1947, and $60,000 for miscellaneous small projects instead of $25,000, as proposed by the House, and $90,000 as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House limiting personal services in the District of Columbia to not exceeding $12,500; and corrects the total of such items.

Nos. 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59: Relating to construction of building and utilities: Appropriates $622,500 for such work in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $222,500, as proposed by the House; appropriates $125,000 for buildings, and so forth, Celilo Falls, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $79,000 for sewage works, as proposed by the Senate, and $75,000 for water supply as proposed by the Senate, instead of $35,000 as proposed by the House, at the Cherokee, North Carolina reservation; appropriates $213,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $85,000, as proposed by the House, for construction of school buildings for the consolidated Chippewa Indians, Minnesota, as authorized by Public Law 231, Eightieth Congress; appropriates $35,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000 as proposed by the House, for a school building at Walker, Minnesota; appropriates $750,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, for a tubercular sanatorium at Galen, Montana; appropriates $80,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House, for a building for the Hunter School District, Sawyer County, Wisconsin; appropriates $250,000 for a school building for the school district of Roosevelt, Utah, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $200,000 for school building in Owyhee, Nevada, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $300,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $300,000 for miscellaneous repairs and improvements, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House, and $400,000 as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total appropriation for such items.

No. 60: Appropriates $2,500,000 for roads, Indian reservations, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,894,400, as proposed by the Senate; the conferees have approved work to be prosecuted on the Ethete Road, Wyoming, and have also approved the provision in the House report recommending $150,000 for road construction on the Sprague River Road on the Klamath Indian Reservation. In connection with the latter item, it is understood that the states will match these amounts equally, thus providing a total of $300,000 for this work.

Nos. 61 and 62, relating to the Klamath Agency, Oregon, tribal funds: The amendments restore the provisons and amounts in identical form as provided in the House bill.

Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68: Appropriates $138,875 for support of Menominee Agency and pay of tribal officers, instead of $162,250 as proposed by the House, and $215,500 as proposed by the Senate; and adjust the amounts available to provide $36,500 for relief of such Indians, $5,500 for compensation and expenses of attorney; limits to $10,000 the amount available for salaries and expenses of certain Menominee representatives, as proposed by the Senate; and provides for the appointment of a recreational director, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 69: Inserts the language of the Senate providing a total of $197,000 for support of the Osage Agency, in lieu of the language of the House providing a total of the same amount for such purpose.

No. 70: Appropriates $50,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $73,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of tribal council officers in a travel status.

No. 71: Appropriates $82,880 for compensation and expenses of attorneys, instead of $62,080, as proposed by the House. The proposed increase of $20,800, covering compensation under approved contracts, was submitted to the Senate after the bill had passed the House and into which the House conferees have not had an opportunity to examine.

Nos. 72, 73, 74, 76, and 76: Relating to industrial assistance, tribal funds: Appropriates $350,000, instead of $277,500 as proposed by the House, and $422,500, as proposed by the Senate, and adjusts such total amount to provide $167,500 for the Menominee Indians, Wisconsin, $20,000 for the Nez Perce Indians, Idaho, $50,000 for the Standing Rock Indians, North Dakota, and $75,000 for the Blackfeet Indians, Montana.

Nos. 77 and 78: Authorizes the purchase of 200 passenger motor vehicles, instead of 100 as proposed by the House, and 250 as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 79 and 80: Permits the use of funds for salaries and expenses, reservation administration, for the hire of aircraft, instead of limiting such use to maintenance and operation as proposed by the House.

Appropriations for Indians in Oklahoma: The conferees are in agreement with the provision and recommendations set forth on pages 17 and 18 of the House Report on the bill, House Report No. 2038, which breaks down the appropriations available to the State of Oklahoma into miscellaneous items covering schools, agencies, hospitals, and so forth. Where the conferees have increased amounts for activities above the amounts allowed in the House bill, it is the understanding of the conferees that such funds shall be distributed proportionately in order that Indians in Oklahoma will receive their equal share of the increases.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 81, 82, and 83, relating to administrative provisions: Authorizes the purchase of one hundred and twenty-five motor vehicles, instead of three hundred, as proposed by the Senate; provides for the hire of aircraft, and eliminates authority for acquisition of aircraft from other government agencies; and inserts a limitation of $100,000 to the Senate provision relating to the employment of consultants.

No. 84: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91, relating to salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,600,000, instead of $3,161,472, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the transfer of $7,800,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects, instead of $6,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $8,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House restricting the use of funds for salaries of personnel engaged in obtaining power contracts with customers already supplied, with the understanding, however, that the conferees are in general agreement with the objectives set forth in such amendment, and it is directed by the conferees that the Bureau curb activities of the nature which have given rise to the widespread opinion that its employees have been unduly aggressive in offering the extension of services which are often in direct or implied competition with existing private facilities. In connection with amendments 88 and 89, relating to the prohibition against the use of funds for certain employees without certain qualifications, the House has accepted the Senate amendments making the date effective "after January 31, 1949", and requiring that such employees have five years' engineering and administrative experience, instead of ten years' experience, as proposed by the House. In connection with amendment No. 90, the conferees have restored the provision of the House amended to fix such limitation of funds available at $48,000,000, instead of $45,341,615, as proposed by the House. In connection with amendment No. 91, the conferees have recommended restoration of the House provision amended to limit the number of such employees to 3,500, instead of 3,251, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 92, 93, 94, and 95, relating to general investigations: Appropriates $3,500,000, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to make such funds available until expended,

and inserts the word "construction", as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107, relating to construction, from the reclamation fund: Appropriates $1,000,000 for the Santa Barbara County project, California, Cachuma Unit, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision of the House authorizing a contract authorization, amended to allow $1,600,000, instead of $1,500,000, such funds being provided for construction of tunnel and conduit and acquisition of right-of-way; appropriates $1,525,000 for the Boise project, Idaho, Payette division, instead of $1,400,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,650,000, as proposed by the Senate; eliminates the provision of the House requiring completion of the Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho; increases the limitation on the amount available for surveys, Minidoka project, Idaho, to $147,500; reports the contract authorization for the Palisades project, Idaho, in technical disagreement; appropriates $1,293,000 for the Tucumcari project, New Mexico; appropriates $57,985 for the Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas; appropriates $1,980,000 for the Provo River project, Utah, as proposed by the House; appropriates $1,298,650 for the Yakima project, Washington, Roza division; appropriates $1,780,175 for the Riverton project, Wyoming; and corrects the total of such items.

Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, and 124, relating to operation and maintenance: Authorizes the use of $2,645,380 from power revenues for the Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California; appropriates $230,437 for operation of the Central Valley project, California, and $814,400 from power revenues; appropriates $220,000 for the Boise project, Idaho; authorizes the use of $447,500 from power revenues for the Minidoka project, Idaho; authorizes the use of $175,500 from power revenues in connection with the North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming; appropriates $101,250 for the Deschutes project, Oregon; appropriates $292,500 for the Owyhee project, Oregon; appropriates $217,000 for the Klamath project, Oregon-California; authorizes the use of $1,645,000 from power revenues for the Columbia Basin project, Washington, and strikes out the provision of the Senate authorizing the payment of tuition for children of employees; appropriates $337,500 for the Yakima project, Washington; authorizes the use of $206,250 from power revenues for the Kendrick project, Wyoming; appropriates $93,700 for the Riverton project, Wyoming, and authorizes the use of $57,212 from power revenues on such project; and appropriates $77,200 for the Shoshone project, Wyoming, and authorizes the use of $104,800 from power revenues on such project.

Nos. 125 and 126: Reported in disagreement.

Nos. 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134, relating to construction from the general fund: Appropriates $2,470,000 for the Gila project, instead of $2,240,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,700,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $22,125,000 for the Davis Dam project, Arizona, instead of $18,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $22,884,300, as proposed by the Senate; with the understanding that funds available for the construction of transmission lines shall be used only for backbone or main transmission lines now under construction or under contract; appropriates $212,000 for the Parker Dam power project, instead of $190,000, as proposed by the House, and $234,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $41,358,900 for the Central Valley project, California, instead of $40,000,400, as proposed by the House, and $42,467,400, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $42,500 for the Kern River project, California, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the House, and $45,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $20,225,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, instead of $19,750,000, as proposed by the House, and $20,700,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $14,611,650 for the Hungry Horse project, Montana, instead of $8,100,000, as proposed by the House, and $15,115,500, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total of such items.

No. 135: Appropriates $990,000 for the Fort Peck project, Montana, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,980,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 136, 137, and 138, relating to the Missouri River Basin: Appropriates $54,786,650 for this project, instead of $52,767,500, as proposed by the House, and $56,275,800, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House amended to provide that new land in Broadwater County, Mont., shall be provided equal to the acreage to be inundated in Canyon Ferry Reservoir; and restores the language of the House relating to construction of power facilities amended to cover the acquisition or installation of the power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana; and inserts the proposal of the Senate that no part of the appropriation may be used for surveys, etc., in connection with the Glendo project, Wyoming, to a greater capacity or other purposes than set forth in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, without specific authorization of Congress.

A break-down by projects of the amounts approved by the conferees is as follows:

Unit location	*Amount approved by conferees*
Phase A, units selected for construction:	
Angostura, S. Dak	$3,120,000
Bostwick, Nebr.-Kans	2,600,000
Boysen, Wyo	6,000,000
Belle Fourche, Wyo	550,000
Cannonball, N. Dak	580,000
Canyon Ferry, Mont	2,950,000
Cedar Bluff, Kans	1,750,000
Frenchman-Cambridge, Nebr	7,505,000
Glendo, Wyo	850,000
Grand River, S. Dak	1,560,000
Heart River (Heart-Butte and Dickinson Dams), N. Dak. (Including $1,893,850 for Heart-Butte Dam and $412,300 for Dickinson Dam)	2,306,150
Kortes, Wyo	4,085,000
Lower Marias, Mont	450,000
Missouri-Souris, Mont.-N. Dak	287,500
Moreau River, S. Dak	847,750
Narrows, Colo	1,650,000
Powder River, Wyo.-Mont	850,000
Region 6 headquarters, Montana	5,000
St. Francis, Colo.-Kans	1,700,000
Transmission lines (see table)	4,250,350
Yellowstone pumping, Montana-North Dakota	565,000
Operation and maintenance during construction	42,500
Subtotal, phase A	44,504,250
Phase B, units being prepared for construction:	
Bad River, S. Dak	$9,250
Bighorn pumping, Wyoming	20,000
Columbus, Nebr	175,000
Grand Island, Nebr	412,500
Hardin, Mont	500,000
Jefferson River, Mont	82,500
Lower Marias, Mont	300,000
Middle Loup, Nebr	255,000
Missouri-Souris, Mont.-N. Dak	700,000
Montana pumping, Montana	210,000
North Dakota pumping, North Dakota	42,500
Oahe-James River, S. Dak	360,000
Owl Creek, Wyo	200,000
Rapid Valley, S. Dak	47,250
Shoshone extensions, Wyoming	150,000
South Dakota pumping, South Dakota	26,000
Sun River, Mont	40,000
Tongue River, Wyo	65,100
White River, S. Dak	35,000
Wind River, Wyo	16,500
Subtotal, phase B	3,846,600
Phase C, continuing work on the general plan of development:	
Big Horn Basin, Wyo.-Mont	56,000
Cheyenne River, S. Dak	24,500
Clarks Fort, Wyo.-Mont	4,200
Garrison diversion, North Dakota	54,600
Helena Valley, Mont	21,000
Judith River, Mont	10,500
Kansas Basin, Colo.-Nebr.-Kans	280,000
Little Missouri, N. Dak	10,500
Lower Platte Basin, Nebr	490,000
Nilan, Mont	5,600
Niobrara Basin, Wyo.-Nebr	140,000
North Platte Basin, Colo.-Nebr.-Wyo	126,000
North Republican, Colo.-Nebr	3,800
South Platte Basin, Colo.-Wyo.-Nebr	210,000
Three Forks, Mont	299,600
Upper Marias, Mont	35,000
Wilson, Kans	70,000
General:	
Power studies, region VI	21,000
Reports staff, region VI	70,000
Subtotal, phase C	1,938,300
Phase D, cooperation with Corps of Engineers	77,500
Other Department of Interior agencies:	
Bureau of Land Management	390,000
Bureau of Mines	150,000
Fish and Wildlife Service	425,000
Geological Survey	3,305,000
National Park Service	185,000
Office of Indian Affairs	165,000
Subtotals, other agencies	4,620,000
Grand total, Missouri River program	54,786,650
Region VII:	
Transmission lines:	
Gering-Sidney	343,000
Sidney-Sterling	314,000
Sterling?North Platte	54,000
Gering-Hot Springs	175,400
Cheyenne-Sterling	139,850
Casper-Gering	451,100
Fort Randall-O'Neil	195,300
Glendo-Lusk	102,700

Unit location	Amount approved by conferees
Region VII—Continued	
Substations:	
Sterling	$52,700
Sidney	163,500
Ogallala	24,000
Pine Bluffs-Kimball	50,000
O'Neil	67,700
Guernsey	2,700
Caspar subadditions	180,000
Goring subadditions	245,450
Bridgeport	79,050
Lusk	42,000
Alliance, Chadron and Hot Springs	128,100
Total, region VII	2,810,550
Region VI, transmission lines and substations:	
Williston-Garrison	720,850
Williston substation	102,700
Beulah substation	102,700
Heart River-Heart Butte	277,050
Boysen lines	56,750
Canyon Ferry lines	2,700
REA and pumping	177,050
Total, region VI	1,439,800
Grand total, transmission lines and substations	4,250,350

Nos. 139, 140, and 141, relating to investigations, Colorado River development fund: Appropriates $900,000, as proposed by the Senate, and inserts the word "construction" in connection with estimates of costs of projects, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 142, relating to the Boulder Canyon project, operation and maintenance: Strikes out the proposal of the House in connection with payment of tuition of children of employees, and inserts the proposal of the Senate.

No. 143, relating to construction, Boulder Canyon project: Appropriates $1,700,000, instead of $1,600,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,728,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 144: Appropriates $4,000,000 for the All-American Canal, as proposed by the House, instead of $4,242,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 145: Strikes out the proposal of the House relating to a moratorium or stop order by the President in connection with the use of appropriations for flood control or reclamation.

No. 146: Restores the provision of the House relating to Alaskan investigations amended to include the words "as a basis for legislation".

No. 147: Restores the provision of the House relating to contract hold-backs.

No. 148: In eliminating this provision from the bill the conferees are in agreement that new legislation shall be passed at the earliest opportunity providing for the disposal of the interest collected on sums invested in power and municipal water features on reclamation projects, and with the understanding that interest heretofore or hereafter collected on such investment in power or municipal water features of any such reclamation project constructed or operated under the authority of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1949.

No. 149: Restores the provision of the House relating to force account work amended to limit such restriction to eight per centum and excepts certain projects or items not in excess of $200,000.

No. 150: Reported in disagreement.

No. 151: Reported in disagreement.

No. 152: Reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

No. 153 authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 166 passenger motor vehicles (of which 146 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate, instead of the purchase of 146 for replacement only as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 154 and 155 appropriates $4,350,000 for topographic surveys, instead of $3,563,498 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $540,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $505,000, as proposed by the House, and $573,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 156 and 157 appropriates $2,625,000 for geologic surveys, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $592,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $585,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 158, 159, and 160 appropriates $3,496,700 for gaging streams as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,034,800 as proposed by the House, of which $2,361,900 is to be available only for work in cooperation with States or municipalities as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House, and of which not to exceed $300,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $265,000 as proposed by the House and $350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 161 and 162 appropriates $300,000 for classification of lands, instead of $243,400 as proposed by the House and $325,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $65,725 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate instead of $56,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 163 and 164 appropriates $602,950 for printing and binding, instead of $477,950 as proposed by the House and $700,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $450,000 is for engraving and printing geologic and topographic maps instead of $325,000 as proposed by the House and $547,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 165 appropriates $690,000 for mineral leasing as proposed by the Senate, instead of $675,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 166 adjusts the total recommended for all items under salaries and expenses to $13,027,000, instead of $11,456,998 as proposed by the House and $13,924,050 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

Amendment No. 167 provides, as proposed by the Senate, that not to exceed $16,000 of the appropriation for control of fires in inactive coal deposits may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 168 provides that not to exceed $150,000 of the appropriation for coal-mine inspections and investigations may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate, instead of $145,000 for such purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 169 provides that not to exceed $25,000 of the appropriation for anthracite mining investigations may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 170 and 171 appropriates $9,750,000 for synthetic liquid fuels as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,250,000 as proposed by the House, of which not to exceed $100,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the House, instead of $140,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 172 and 173 appropriates $300,000 for coal investigations as proposed by the House, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $45,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the House, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 174 inserts, as proposed by the Senate, the word "construction" in the text of the language of the appropriation for mining experiment stations in order to clarify the purposes for which the appropriation may be used.

Amendment Nos. 175 and 176 correct errors in spelling.

Amendment No. 177 makes the appropriations for the Bureau available for the purchase of not to exceed 80 passenger motor vehicles (of which 30 are for replacement only), instead of the purchase of not to exceed 60 for replacement only as proposed by the House and the purchase of not to exceed 100 (of which 94 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 178 is reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Amendment Nos. 179 and 180 appropriates $765,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $737,818 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate, including $100,000 for printing and binding as proposed by the Senate instead of $87,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 181 appropriates $665,000 for regional offices, instead of $615,290 as proposed by the House and $715,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 182 appropriates $3,750,000 for administration and protection and so forth of national parks, instead of $3,658,163 as proposed by the House and $3,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 183 appropriates $1,625,000 for administration and protection of national monument, historical and military areas, instead of $1,556,464 as proposed by the House and $1,690,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed that not to exceed $20,000 of the total appropriation recommended may be used for administration of the Fort Sumter National Monument.

Amendment No. 184 appropriates $300,000 for recreational areas, instead of $273,495 as proposed by the House and $350,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed that not to exceed $20,000 (additional) of the total appropriation recommended is for Lake Texoma, Tex., and Okla.; for additional work at this area.

Amendment No. 185 appropriates $60,000 for the Travel Division as proposed by the House, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 186 appropriates $10,000 for administration and protection of recreational demonstration areas as proposed by the House, instead of $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 187 appropriates $790,000 for salaries and expenses, National Capitol parks, instead of $774,150 as proposed by the House and $815,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 188 appropriates $137,954 for investigations and studies of the recreational resources and the archeological remains in the river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin), instead of $122,954 as proposed by the House and $152,954 as proposed by the Senate. The total appropriation recommended includes funds for archeological work in the Fort Gibson Reservoir area, Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 189 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 190 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment Nos. 191, 192, and 193 appropriates $4,762,350, as proposed by the Senate, for construction and maintenance of roads and trails and construction and repair of buildings and utilities, instead of $5,162,350 for such purposes as proposed by the House; provides that $3,110,000 of such amount shall be allocated for roads and trails as proposed by the Senate, instead of

$3,210,000 as proposed by the House; and further provides that $1,652,350 of such amount shall be allocated for buildings and utilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,952,350 as proposed by the House. The amount recommended is $400,000 below the appropriation proposed by the House, of which $100,000 is applicable to roads and trails for Alaska and $300,000 is applicable to physical improvements for Alaska.

Amendment No. 194 makes appropriations of the National Park Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 40 passenger motor vehicles (of which 28 are for replacement only) as proposed by the Senate, instead of the purchase of not to exceed 30 for replacement only as proposed by the House.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Amendment No. 195 appropriates $270,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $247,470 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 196, 197, and 198 appropriate $1,879,525 for propagation of food fishes as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,800,525 as proposed by the House, including not to exceed $2,000 for purchase of certain specified land as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,500 as proposed by the House; also effects a minor change in language in conformity with the change in the total.

Amendment No. 199 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 200 appropriates $1,147,500 for investigations respecting food fishes, instead of $1,025,000 as proposed by the House and $1,224,500 as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended is $122,500 above the bill as passed by the House for the following purposes: (1) $15,000 for operation of fishery research vessel, Albatross III; (2) $50,000 for Alaska fishery research (exclusive of construction of laboratory); (3) $20,000 for investigation of damaged oyster beds in Mississippi and Louisiana; and (4) $37,500 for studies of soft-shelled and hard-shelled clams.

Amendment No. 201 appropriates $510,000 for commercial fisheries, instead of $495,000 as proposed by the House and $525,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 202 appropriates $1,000,000 for investigation, exploration, and development of Pacific fisheries as proposed by the House, instead of $1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 203 appropriates $60,000 for Alaska fur-seal investigations, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $69,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 204 corrects a typographical error.

Amendment No. 205 appropriates $225,000 for enforcement of the Alaska game law as proposed by the Senate, instead of $175,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 206, 207, 208, and 209 appropriates $1,312,500 for maintenance of mammal and bird reservations, instead of $1,210,000 as proposed by the House and $1,340,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which not exceeding $7,500 (instead of $5,000 proposed by the House and $10,000 proposed by the Senate) may be used for the repair, painting, and maintenance of dwellings and the buildings and facilities on the Chinsegut National Wildlife Reservation. The total amount recommended for this appropriation also includes $100,000 (instead of $125,000 proposed by the Senate) to repair flood damage in certain areas due to excessive run-off of water during the spring of 1948.

Amendment No. 210 appropriates $150,000 for river basin studies as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 211 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 212 (relating to a total) is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 213, relating to the special fund for Federal aid in wildlife restoration restores the provision in the House bill limiting expenditures for construction from State allocations for fiscal year 1949 to 35 per centum of any such allocation, amended to make the restriction applicable only to construction of "buildings", and waiving a similar restriction carried in the 1948 appropriation act with respect to unobligated balances on June 30, 1948, from State allotments for fiscal year 1948.

Amendment No. 214 (relating to a total) is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 215 authorizes the use of not to exceed $1,123,000 under the various appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service for departmental personal services, instead of $1,113,862 as proposed by the House and $1,130,112 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 216 makes funds available for the Fish and Wildlife Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 65 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, instead of 50 as proposed by the House and 86 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 217 and 218 makes funds available for the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service available for the purchase of not to exceed 3 aircraft, instead of 2 as proposed by the House and 5 as proposed by the Senate; and permits the hire of aircraft by the Service, as proposed by the Senate, amended to restrict such hiring to the Territory of Alaska.

Amendment No. 219 sets at $2.00 the maximum per man per day commutation of rations of vessel employees of the Service, instead of $1.50 as proposed by the House and $2.50 as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Amendment No. 220 appropriates $64,500 for salaries and expenses, offices of the Governor and the Secretary, Territory of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $62,785 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 221 appropriates $448,000 for care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in Alaska as proposed by the Senate, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 222 and 223 appropriates $10,442,400 for construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, trails, and so forth, Territory of Alaska, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $8,500,000 as proposed by the House; and authorizes contractual obligations in the amount of $13,904,000 for such purposes, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment Nos. 224, 225, 226, 227, and 228, relating to the Alaska Railroad: appropriates $17,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House; authorizes contractual obligations of $12,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,700,000 as proposed by the House; provides that not to exceed $12,000 of the appropriation shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $6,575 as proposed by the House and $15,000 as proposed by the Senate; retains the limitation of $8,500 as proposed by the House (the Senate had proposed $9,000) on the annual salary to be paid out of this appropriation to anyone other than the general manager of the Railroad and one assistant general manager; and provides that not to exceed $22,500 of the Alaska Railroad funds shall be available for printing and binding, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 229 appropriates $25,900 for salaries and expenses, offices of the Governor and the Secretary, Territory of Hawaii, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 230 appropriates $213,000 for salaries and expenses, Government of the Virgin Islands, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $205,050 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 231 is reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment Nos. 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, and 240 amend section 4 of the general provisions by providing that appropriations in the bill for the several bureaus and offices shall be available for expenses of attendance of officers and employees at meetings or conventions of members of societies or associations concerned with their work in not to exceed the following amounts: Office of the Secretary, $650 (House $600; Senate $1,100); Oil and Gas Division, $100; Board on Geographic Names, $150 (Senate, $300); Bureau of Land Management, $1,000 (House, $300; Senate, $2,500); Bureau of Indian Affairs, $1,250 (House, $1,000; Senate, $1,500); Bureau of Reclamation, $6,750 (House, $6,000; Senate, $7,500); Geological Survey, $4,750 (House, $2,000; Senate, $7,500); Bureau of Mines, $5,000 (House, $4,000; Senate, $6,000); National Park Service, $1,250 (House, $1,000; Senate, $1,500); Fish and Wildlife Service, $2,375 (House, $1,750; Senate, $3,000); and soil and moisture conservation operations (all bureaus), $500.

Amendment No. 241 authorizes not to exceed a total of $875,000 of the appropriations contained in the bill to be available for compensation of employees engaged in personnel work, instead of a limitation of $750,000 proposed by the House for such work and $1,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 242 inserts language proposed by the Senate in the provision which limits per diem rates for services of experts to $35 under certain conditions, so as to provide that such rate shall apply "unless a higher rate is otherwise authorized by law"; the language permitting the Director of the Budget to approve rates up to $50 per day is also retained in the bill.

Amendment No. 243 restores to the bill certain rescissions, aggregating $560,197, as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 84, relating to authorization for Bureau of Reclamation to make payments to school districts for instruction of dependents of employees and contractors on reclamation construction projects: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 101, providing a contract authorization of $2,000,000 for construction on the Palisades project, Idaho, under the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 125, providing funds for rehabilitation and betterment of existing reclamation projects: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

The proposal of the Senate is a new program not heretofore undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. The conferees on the part of the House will insist that each project be authorized by basic legislation and that such legislation be enacted before additional funds are provided.

Amendment No. 126, relating to a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 150, providing for the transfer of certain land at the Grand Island Army Air Field to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 151, providing for the transfer of certain unexpended balances of property management funds from the War Assets Administration to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 152, providing for the transfer of a certain parcel of land from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Bureau of Reclamation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 178, providing authority for the transfer of a certain parcel of land from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Interior: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 189, providing funds for acquisition of lands by the National Park Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 190, providing a contract authorization for construction of certain parkways, National Park Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 199, clarifying the language of an appropriation as to its availability for construction of certain fish cultural facilities, Fish and Wildlife Service: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 211, providing for purchase and operation of wildlife management areas in California: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

This is a cooperative effort for which the State of California has arranged by legislative action for an appropriation of $9,000,000 over a three year period. A special act has been passed by Congress, (Public Law 534, 80th Congress), which provides for this special situation. The conferees do not intend by approving this special situation that the action shall be regarded as a precedent.

Amendment No. 212, adjusts a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 214, adjusts a total: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 231, appropriating to meet deficits of municipal governments of the Virgin Islands and authorizing them to make purchases for certain of their public institutions through the Federal Bureau of Supply: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

BEN F. JENSEN,
IVOR D. FENTON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 84: Page 39, line 20, insert "payments (not to exceed the average per pupil cost in the State where construction is in progress) to school districts as reimbursement, while projects are actually under construction, for the instruction of dependents of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation and of contractors engaged on such projects: *Provided*, That a tuition charge of $25 per semester shall be charged and collected by the Bureau of Reclamation for each such dependent attending such schools.

Amendment No. 101: Page 44, line 14, insert:

"Palisades project, Idaho, the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $2,000,000."

Amendment No. 125: Page 48, line 24, insert:

"REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT

"For rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That, at the discretion of the Secretary, repayment may be scheduled after the completion of repayment of existing obligations of the water users' organizations concerned."

Amendment No. 150: Page 61, line 11, insert:

"The War Assets Administration or other Federal agency having ownership or custody thereof or interest therein is hereby directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation without exchange of funds, the following-described lands, together with improvements, buildings, facilities, equipment, and interest."

Amendment No. 151: Page 62, line 20, insert:

"The War Assets Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation unexpended balances of funds available for maintenance and protection of transferred property under the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act of 1947 (Public Law 478, 79th Cong.) to reimburse the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditures made for the maintenance and protection of the Yuma Army Air Base and such transfer shall be made hereafter for the maintenance and protection of the Yuma Army Air Base, pending its final disposition as contemplated in the Interior Appropriation Act of 1948 (Public Law 247, 80th Cong., 1st sess.)."

Amendment No. 152: Page 63, line 7, insert:

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, all of its right, title, and interest in and to a certain building and improvements under Defense Plant Corporation project, Plancor 1437, constructed on the War Relocation Center at the Heart Mountain Division of the Shoshone project, Wyoming."

Senate amendment No. 178: On page 81, line 5, insert the following:

"The Department of the Army is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior, for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of a parcel of 10 acres, more or less, from that portion of Fort Douglas Military Reservation in the county of Salt Lake, State of Utah, which lies immediately north of the site of the Bureau of Mines Intermountain Experiment Station and is situated between a line beginning at a point 400 feet north of the northwest corner of the United States Bureau of Mines property granted by deed from the University of Utah May 21, 1938, said point being on the south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard and running thence south 320 feet to the east-west boundary line between the University of Utah and Fort Douglas; thence east 604⅓ feet to the north-south boundary between the University of Utah and Fort Douglas; thence south along said north-south boundary 480 feet to a line on the south boundary (extended) of the United States Bureau of Mines property above mentioned; thence east 262 feet; thence north 952⅓ feet to the south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard; thence westerly along said south curb of Fort Douglas Boulevard to the point of beginning, said enclosure embracing 10 acres."

Senate amendment No. 190: On page 86, line 16, insert the following:

"Parkways, National Park Service: The Secretary is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding a total of $2,680,000, for the construction of the Blue Ridge, Natchez Trace, George Washington Memorial, and Foothills Parkways."

Senate amendment No. 199: On page 90, line 2, after the word "thereto" insert the following: "and not to exceed $35,000 for the construction and operation, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), of fish cultural facilities on lands owned by the State of South Dakota."

Senate amendment No. 231: On page 106, strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive, and insert:

"Municipal governments: For expenses of the government of the Virgin Islands in excess of current local revenues for the fiscal year 1949, municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, $194,400, and municipality of St. Croix, $325,800; in all, $520,200, to be paid to the respective municipal treasuries in monthly installments; and the said municipal governments are hereby authorized to make purchases for their hospitals, schools, and other public institutions, through the Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231, and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 126: On page 50, line 3, strike out "$30,605,997" and insert "$37,308,855."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$34,132,439."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 189: Page 85, line 23, insert:

"Acquisition of lands: For the acquisition of privately owned lands or interests therein within the authorized boundaries of established areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including expenses incidental thereto and personal services in the District of Columbia, $200,000, to remain available until expended, of which $150,000 shall be available only for lands within Colonial National Historical Park; Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial and Gettysburg National Military Parks; Manassas National Battlefield Park; Badlands, Dinosaur, George Washington Birthplace, Joshua Tree, Petrified Forest, and Scotts Bluff National Monuments; and Big Bend parcel of land adjoining Big Bend National Park necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway No. 227, Glacier, Grand Canyon, Great Smoky Mountains, Kings Canyon, Lassen Volcanic, Mesa Verde, Mount Rainier, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, Sequoia, Yosemite, and Zion National Parks."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 13 and 14 of said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(parcels of land adjoining Big Bend National Park necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway 227)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 211: Page 96, line 13, insert:

"California wildlife management areas: For the purchase or rent, and development, maintenance, and administration of wildlife management areas in the State of California, as authorized by the act of May 18, 1948 (Public Law 534), $300,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 212: Page 96, line 19, strike out "$9,226,979" and insert "$10,257,309."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,928,509."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 214: Page 97, line 16, strike out "$9,226,979" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,257,309."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$9,928,509."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. As the gentleman knows, I am very much interested in the development in the Missouri River Basin, particularly in the Republican Valley in Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado. In that area the Bureau of Reclamation is not only carrying on construction for irrigation, but for flood control also. I appeared before the gentleman's committee and also the Senate committee, urging the full budget amounts for these projects.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska has been most diligent, not only this year, but throughout the years that I have served on this committee. I am sure that everyone on that committee knows about the problems of the Republican Valley and we are interested in the early completion of Frenchman-Cambridge project, the Bostwick and all the rest of them.

Mr. CURTIS. The amounts carried in the conference report for these projects is an increase over what we started out with, but it is not yet quite up to the budget estimates.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say that the committee has gone over these figures very carefully? We have taken the testimony of the engineers as well as the Bureau of the Budget. We want these projects to go forward at an efficient and economical rate, and we believe that the figures finally agreed upon will do that.

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to have the assurance of the Chairman of the committee that this irrigation and flood control work will go on at an efficient rate.

Mr. JENSEN. We have taken into account the amount of money that the projects were able to use last year, and all the other factors, and if what has been done proves to be erroneous I can assure you that this committee will be willing to look into the matter when and if such a time comes. And may I say further to the gentleman from Nebraska that he has been most diligent in presenting the needs and wants of his district before this committee, and that because of his efficient work, more flood-control and irrigation projects are under construction in his district than perhaps in any other congressional district in the country?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. When this bill was passed by the House it contained adequate provision for the improvement and rehabilitation of Bedloe Island. May I ask the gentleman whether that provision is undisturbed in the conference report?

Mr. JENSEN. It was not disturbed. The $500,000 for the improvement and rehabilitation of Bedloe Island, on which the Statue of Liberty is located, is in the bill exactly as the House approved it and I am happy to state that the work will go forward and this disgraceful situation which has existed for the past 16 years or longer will be taken care of in the proper manner. I want to thank the gentleman from New York for the great interest he has taken in that great symbol of our freedom.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman for his helpfulness in this matter.

As chairman of the subcommittee charged with the National Park Service appropriation, the able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], recognized the need for correcting the disgraceful conditions which have prevailed on Bedloe Island for years, and which have sullied the Statue of Liberty. He felt that this shrine of Americanism merits surroundings of beauty, rather than ugly decrepitude. He therefore included in the bill a sum sufficient for a proper job of rehabilitation, and was diligent in protecting that sum against any attempt at deletion.

All patriotic Americans are indebted to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for this fine accomplishment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note a small increase in the appropriation for the Missouri River Basin program. Was that increase proportionately applied to the several projects phase A and phase B?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, generally speaking, they were.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note also that in the report on the appropriation with reference to the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, it is referred to as the Standing Rock Indians of North Dakota. The Standing Rock Reservation is about equally in South Dakota and North Dakota. Is this $50,000 for the Standing Rock Indians of North Dakota, or does it apply to the entire reservation?

Mr. JENSEN. Apparently the amendment covers only those in North Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us get that clear.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] handles the Indian problems of this committee. I wish the gentleman from Oklahoma would comment on that.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. In reference to this particular item I do not think there was ever any question but what the item was taken as it was presented to us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I suggest that the agency headquarters happens to be across the line in North Dakota, but the reservation is almost equally in both States.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. My understanding is it applies to all of the interested parties, regardless of their status of residence.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To the Standing Rock Reservation?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Rather than to the North Dakota members.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the new Alaska Indian Service sanatorium and hospital for the care of the tuberculous will be located in southwestern Alaska?

Mr. JENSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. Further, may I ask the gentleman this question: During the hearings I appeared before the committee and urged that the hospital be located in the Matanuska Valley at or near Palmer. The chairman of the subcommittee has been there and I should like to ask him if he does not agree that Palmer would be a very suitable location for this hospital.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it would be a very suitable location. However, of course, it is not up to this committee to designate the placing of the hospital, but it is a very beautiful valley and I think it would be a good place for the hospital if the authorities felt so inclined. I certainly would be glad to see it at Palmer.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an editorial appearing in the Anchorage Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. There has been some discussion of locating the sanatorium at Anchorage as well as Palmer. I should like to suggest that because of the great concentration of Government work and development at Anchorage, the housing shortage is constantly becoming more acute, and the labor supply is short. Palmer in the Matanuska Valley is less than 50 miles from Anchorage and if the sanatorium were located in that vicinity, there would be convenient access to Anchorage. Furthermore there are many important advantages of having the institution located in the Palmer area. As we all know, the Matanuska Valley is the center of the largest farming community in Alaska which means the sanatorium would be conveniently located with reference to farm produce.

Construction of a great new airport will probably start at Anchorage this year, there will be considerable road work, the Army will continue its activities, and thus it would seem it would be the sensible thing to construct the tuberculosis sanatorium elsewhere where the competition for living quarters, workmen, and so forth would not be so great.

I should like to insert an editorial from the Anchorage Daily News dated Wednesday, May 26, 1948.

THE OBVIOUS PLACE

Ever since the Joint Appropriations Subcommittee began its deliberations on a bill calling for the building of a 400-bed hospital in Alaska, as the first step in a move designed to alleviate the growing incidence of tuberculosis among the native Indians, there has been a great deal of pressure exerted to bring the hospital to Anchorage.

With the bill due to be reported out of committee on Thursday there seems to be a growing fervor to bring more pressure to bear for its location here. Normally we would be inclined to feel the erection of such an institution in the nearby Anchorage area, a sound proposition for the city.

However, we feel there are several points which should be given full consideration before exerting pressure for its construction here. We realize the cost of the structure will total some $5,000,000 and that the annual pay roll will amount to approximately $1,000,000, but one of the biggest hurdles for this area would be to find the necessary land that would meet the requirements of the Office of Indian Affairs who will administer the activities of the hospital.

In the meantime Palmer residents have been spurred on by their interest in the project to the extent that several tracts of land have been offered free to the Government. Needless to say, the Government will not bypass such an offer if the various tracts made available meet their needs.

It seems to us that Palmer offers other advantages which Anchorage cannot meet, such as the nearby availability of garden fresh foodstuffs which are required in the treatment of tubercular patients. Important, too, is the fact that such an institution would provide part time work for many of the homesteaders in the Matanuska Valley.

And there can be no doubt but that Anchorage would also profit in the long run, as much of the funds needed to run the hospital would ultimately be spent here, as would salaries.

But more important than just the bringing of more money to Anchorage is the long-range view—the necessity for development of the territory as a whole. If Alaska is to prosper, it will never occur if Juneau, Fairbanks, and Anchorage keep running to the pot with a gravy spoon.

We say, let's help Palmer get the hospital.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How much is contained in this bill for the construction of the Natchez Trace?

Mr. JENSEN. We have a contract authorization of $2,680,000 which the conferees will recommend for parkways. There is no cash in this bill earmarked for that particular parkway. The Park Service has in excess of a $5,000,000 carry-over. We are also recommending a contract authorization in the amount of $2,680,000. So, they have sufficient funds, I am sure, to take care of most of the needed construction on parkways.

Mr. RANKIN. They ought to begin to use it. These parkways ought not to just be used to furnish jobs for individuals. They ought to go ahead and do this work.

Mr. JENSEN. We certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall insist on it from now on.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, it is rather apparent that a lot of pushing has not been done because of the great carry-over they have. But, they promised us they would go forward and get this work done. That, of course, is an administrative function of the Department.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I note here that the Senate has decreased the amount for the construction of roads and trails in the national parks.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will permit, that all applies to Alaska; not to the mainland.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. I note here that the Senate has stricken out the language with reference to regional offices as written in, in the House for the Bureau of Land Management, and I note this language in the conference report:

That none of the appropriations made in this act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel assigned to regional offices of the Bureau of Land Management in excess of the average total number of all personnel assigned to such regional offices during the fiscal year 1948; and the Senate agree to the same.

Will the gentleman explain that language to me?

Mr. JENSEN. The purpose of that amendment is to keep the Department from expanding other than in district offices where the tract books are supposed to be, so that we can get these thousands of leases adjudicated, some of which may be from two and a half to six years old. I might say to the gentleman that the job of the Bureau of Land Management is now the baby of the Congressmen from the West who objected to getting this thing straightened out according to the House version so that we could get these leases adjudicated. But, they seem to think that they should have the say, and so it is now their baby. If we do not get these leases expedited, they will know exactly who is going to be held responsible.

Mr. BARRETT. This amendment will not prohibit automatic increases in pay for these people?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. The chairman will remember our colloquy with regard to the Lower Marias and the Montana pumping. I gather that part of the funds for these two projects are in the conference report carried up to phase A.

Mr. JENSEN. $450,000 of the Lower Marias was carried up to phase A, but the Montana pumping has not been changed from phase B to phase A. It is still in phase B.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The House put in a provision which I greatly question. What became of the amendment that provided that the Commissioner of Reclamation must be an engineer?

Mr. JENSEN. The House agreed to the Senate version of that provision.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. Under the appropriation to carry out the Bureau of Mines program in regard to synthetic fuels, the budget requested how much, and how much was finally allowed in this appropriation?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] will answer that. He is in charge of the mines and mining section of this bill.

Mr. FENTON. In the conference the Bureau of Mines got every nickel they asked for.

Mr. DURHAM. That is good.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 724)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75, enabling the United States to render financial, technical, and material aid to the Governments of Greece and Turkey, I submit herewith the third quarterly report on the activities and expenditures of funds under the authority of this act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 18, 1948.

INCREASING THE RATES OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH COMPENSATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2825) to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: That paragraph IV of part I of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided in part I, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified next below:

"'Widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $100 (with $15 each additional child); no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $60 (or both), $35 each.'

"SEC. 2. Subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Any veteran or the dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in part I of this regulation, if the disability or death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while engaged in extra hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) while the United States is engaged in war.'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent mother or father of any deceased person who died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service as provided for in part II, paragraph I hereof, shall be entitled to receive compensation at 80 per centum of the rates specified for such dependents in paragraph IV, part I hereof, as now or hereafter amended.'

"SEC. 4. The increases provided by this Act shall be effective from the first day of the second month following the passage of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2825) to increase the compensation payable to the surviving children of certain deceased veterans whose death was wartime service-connected, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The substantial differences in rates between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following schedule:

	Existing law	H. R. 3748	S. 2825	Conference agreement
Widow but no child	$60.00	$75	$70	$75.
Widow with 1 child	78.00	115	94	$100 (with $15 for each additional child).
Widow with 2 children	93.60	135	112	
Widow with 3 children	109.20	155	127	
Widow with 4 children	124.80	175	142	
Widow with 5 children	140.40	195	157	
No widow but 1 child	30.00	50	58	$58.
No widow but 2 children	45.60	70	82	$82 (equally divided).
No widow but 3 children	57.60	90	106	$106 (equally divided) (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided).
No widow but 4 children	69.60	110	126	
No widow but 5 children	81.60	130	146	
Dependent mother or father	54.00	75	54	$60.
Dependent mother and father, each	30.00	40	30	$35.

The House bill placed an annual income limitation to $1,800 for one parent or $3,000 for two for use in determining dependency. It also excluded life-insurance payments from any source in an amount less than $3,000 received in any one year. The conference agreement eliminates this provision. It was pointed out that complaints were made that the criteria in the Veterans' Administration regulations for determining dependency of parents were not liberal enough to meet present-day requirements. Accordingly, the conferees agreed that the Veterans' Administration should survey such regulations with a view toward revision to meet current needs.

The Senate bill provided that widows and orphans of peacetime veterans should receive 80 percent of the rates specified for wartime cases. No provision of this character was contained in the House bill. The House managers agreed to accept it.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2825, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The conferees on S. 2825, providing increases for widows and dependents of veterans who lost their lives in the service of their country have reached, in my opinion, a reasonable compromise.

The rates for widow but no child, $75; widow with one child, $100—with $15 for each additional child; no widow but one child, $58; no widow but two children, $82—equally divided; no widow but three children, $106—equally divided (with $20 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided); dependent mother or father, $60, or both, $35 each.

These figures mean a slight increase over the House bill rates for orphans and a slight increase for widows and widows with one or more children over the Senate bill rates.

The House managers have agreed to accept the Senate amendment providing 80 percent of wartime compensation for widows and dependents of peacetime veterans.

The House receded from its section providing an increase of income limitation for parents. However, the conferees agreed that the present Veterans' Administration formula is antiquated and in serious need of revision. It was agreed that unless the Veterans' Administration revised their formula to fit existing economic conditions, legislation to accomplish this purpose would be enacted in the next session of the Congress.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "That any person entitled to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in part I, or paragraph I (c), part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and restored with limitations by Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $21;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $35;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $45.50;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $56;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $14;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $24.50;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $35;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $17.50 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 2. That any person entitled to compensation at peacetime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service as provided in paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph I (c) thereof, and whose disability is rated not less than 60 per centum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

"(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

"(a) has a wife but no child living, $16.80;

"(b) has a wife and one child living, $28;

"(c) has a wife and two children living, $36.40;

"(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $44.80;

"(e) has no wife but one child living, $11.20;

"(f) has no wife but two children living, $19.60;

"(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $28;

"(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $14 for each parent so dependent.

"(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 per centum, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

"SEC. 3. The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this Act shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of compensation or of subsistence allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That he may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

"SEC. 4. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this Act.

"SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment."

And the House agree to the same.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
HUGH BUTLER,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2821) to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The substantial differences in rates between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following schedule:

Totally disabled	H. R. 5588	S. 2821, wartime	S. 2821, peacetime	Conference agreement	
				Wartime	Peacetime
Wife, but no child	$30	$15.00	$12	$21.00	$16.80
Wife, 1 child	50	25.00	20	35.00	28.00
Wife, 2 children	65	32.50	26	45.50	36.40
Wife, 3 or more children	80	40.00	32	56.00	44.80
No wife, 1 child	20	10.00	8	14.00	11.20
No wife, 2 children	35	17.50	14	24.50	19.60
No wife, 3 or more children	50	25.00	20	35.00	28.00
Dependent parent or parents, each	25	12.50	10	17.50	14.00

The conference agreement also provides that if and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 60 percent, the amount of additional compensation shall be in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in the above schedule under heading of "Conference agreement" as the degree of disability bears to the total disability.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.,
JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2821, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The conferees agreed on 70 percent of the House rates on this bill which would increase the compensation received by veterans who are 60 percent or more disabled and who have one or more dependents.

The House accepted the Senate provision providing for 80 percent of wartime rates for peacetime veterans—a provision which was not included in the original House bill.

I think we have reached a reasonable compromise and the best that could be done under existing conditions. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is in control of the time. Does the gentlewoman yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agreed not to take any time in order to have the bill come up promptly and be sent to the other body. So I have not yielded any time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has control of the time.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, our first duty is to the disabled veterans.

You have heard a good deal of demagoguery about my attitude on the Negro question. I got through the committee a bill to establish a Negro veterans' hospital in Virginia because the real Negroes wanted it. It would give them an opportunity to supply their own doctors and nurses and to show what they can do. This outfit which calls itself the Association for the Advancement of the Colored Race has interfered with it in the other body, although it passed the House without opposition.

The one Negro in America whose name stands out as a representative of his race is Booker T. Washington. I am going to read you a telegram I received from his daughter this morning about this hospital. The telegram is from New York. It is as follows:

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
Washington, D. C.:

This is to express my deep appreciation to you for your tireless efforts in trying to get a veterans' hospital at my father's birthplace for our people. I am praying that you might yet find a way for this bill to get through the Senate, since it has passed the House.

PORTIA WASHINGTON PITTMAN.

That is Booker T. Washington's daughter. They want this hospital, and the white people of the South want them to have it.

It will furnish them an institution where they can be to themselves, where they can have their own doctors and their own nurses. We have one such hospital at Tuskegee, Ala. I was chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation for 16 years, and I saw to it that they got what they needed. They have done a good job. We have one established in Mound Bayou, Miss., for the same purpose.

These Negroes came here asking for this one in Virginia, and the House voted unanimously for it.

Yet it is being held up in the Senate because of the pressure being used by an outfit, that I regard as a Communist-front outfit, that is doing infinite harm to the Negroes of this country.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I heartily agree with the gentleman that the colored doctors have done a remarkable job, as well as the colored nurses.

Mr. RANKIN. The passage of this bill would be to the best interest of both the Negro veterans and the white veterans in Virginia and adjoining States. It passed the House unanimously, and I feel sure it would pass the Senate unanimously, if the Members of that body are permitted to vote on it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 3 OF THE STANDARD TIME ACT OF 1918

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 6318, an act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out all after "*Provided*", over to and including "time" in line 4, page 2, and insert: "That common carriers within such portion of the State of Idaho may conduct their operations on Pacific time."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERSTATE BOUNDARY COMPACT BY AND BETWEEN THE STATES OF MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, AND WISCONSIN

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 206 consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the following interstate boundary compact by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin:

A COMPACT

Entered into by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin, States signatory hereto.

The contracting States solemnly agree:

1. That the boundary between the State of Michigan and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Michigan be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A-B-C-D-E-F-G on the map, exhibit A, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point A, a point equidistant from either shore on the line which is the eastward continuation of the boundary line between Wisconsin and Illinois or latitude 42°29'37" north;

Thence to point B, a point equidistant from either shore on the line drawn through the Port Washington fog signal and storm signal and the White Lake storm signal, on a true azimuth of 354°12'00", a distance of 61.55 statute miles;

Thence to point C, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Sheboygan Coast Guard storm signal, fog signal, radio beacon, and Little Stable Point Light, on a true azimuth of 03°01'15", a distance of 22.18 statute miles;

Thence to point D, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Twin River Point Light and fog signal and Big Sable fog and light signal, on a true azimuth of 10°04'30", a distance of 30.33 statute miles;

Thence to point E, a point equidistant from either shore on a line from Baileys Harbor inland light and Point Betsie fog signal, radio beacon, and distance finding station, on a true azimuth of 17°09'55", a distance of 54.20 statute miles;

Thence to point F, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Pilot Island Light and fog signal and Sleeping Bear Point Light, on a true azimuth of 33°29'10", a distance of 17.24 statute miles;

Thence to point G, the point determined by the United States Supreme Court decree of March 12, 1936, which is a point 45,600 meters from the center of Rock Island Passage on a bearing of south 60° east, on a true azimuth of 49°34'10", a distance of 15.66 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points are as follows:

Point A—Latitude 42°29'37"
Longitude 87°01'15"
Point B—Latitude 43°22'50"
Longitude 87°08'50"
Point C—Latitude 43°42'00"
Longitude 87°07'20"
Point D—Latitude 44°07'55"
Longitude 87°00'45"
Point E—Latitude 44°52'50"
Longitude 86°41'10"
Point F—Latitude 45°05'20"
Longitude 86°29'30"
Point G—Latitude 45°14'10"
Longitude 86°14'55"

2. That the western boundary of the State of Michigan in the waters of Lake Superior and the eastern boundary in the waters of Lake Superior of the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked M-N on the map, exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point M, the point where the line through the middle of the main channel of the Montreal River enters Lake Superior,

Thence in a direct line to point N, the point where a line drawn through the most easterly point of Pigeon Point and the most southerly point of Pine Point intersects the international boundary, on a true azimuth of 23°27'24" and a distance of 108.86 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points is:

Point M—Latitude 46°34'05"
Longitude 90°25'05"
Point N—Latitude 48°00'50"
Longitude 89°29'00"

3. That the boundary between the State of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Superior be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A-B-C-D on the map, exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

Starting at point A which is the midpoint on the line M-N described in paragraph 2, supra;

Thence to point B, the midpoint in a direct line between the mouth of Cross River, Minn., and the lighthouse on Outer Island in Wisconsin, on a true azimuth of 272°17'10", a distance of 33.15 statute miles;

Thence to point C, the midpoint in a direct line between the lighthouse on shore at Two Harbors, Minn., and the light on the lakeward end of the Government east pier at Port Wing, Wis., on a true azimuth of 235°27'40", a distance of 49.60 statute miles;

Thence to point D, the midpoint in a direct line at right angles to the central axis of the Superior entry between the tops of the eastern ends of the pierheads at the lakeward ends of the United States Government breakwaters at the Superior entry to Duluth Superior Harbor, on a true azimuth of 239°50'20", a distance of 26.43 statute miles.

The latitude and longitude of the named control points are as follows:

Point A—Latitude 47°17'30"
Longitude 89°57'00"
Point B—Latitude 47°18'35"
Longitude 90°39'15"
Point C—Latitude 46°54'10"
Longitude 91°31'25"
Point D—Latitude 46°42'39.875"
Longitude 92°00'24.571"

4. All azimuths are measured clockwise from true north.

5. That this compact shall become operative immediately upon its ratification by any State as between it and the other State or States so ratifying. Ratification shall be made by act of the legislature of the ratifying State.

6. That immediately upon ratification of this compact by all three States, each State will appoint two members to a Joint Survey Commission to survey and mark the boundaries defined in this compact by establishing and perpetuating monuments at the reference points on shore by means of which the control points of said boundaries are located. The expense of marking the Lake Michigan boundary shall be borne jointly by the States of Michigan and Wisconsin; the expense of marking the boundary line described in paragraph 2 above shall be borne equally by the States of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The expense of marking the Lake Superior boundary between Minnesota and Wisconsin shall be borne jointly by the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Kim Sigler, Governor of the State of Michigan, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of Act No. 267, of the Public Acts of 1947, approved June 27, 1947, which ratifies paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Michigan and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Michigan.

Done at the city of Lansing, in the State of Michigan, this 3d day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1948.

[SEAL] (S) KIM SIGLER,
(S) F. W. ALGERE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Luther W. Youngdahl, Governor of the State of Minnesota, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 589, Laws of Minnesota for the year 1947, approved April 26, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Minnesota, and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Minnesota.

Done at the city of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, this 30th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1947.

[SEAL] (S) LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor.
(S) MIKE HOHN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

In witness whereof:

I, Oscar Rennebohm, Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Acting Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 222, Laws of Wisconsin for the year 1947, approved June 12, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Wisconsin and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Wisconsin.

Done at the city of Madison in the State of Wisconsin, this 22d day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1947.

[SEAL] (S) OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
Acting Governor.
(S) ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
Assistant Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect any right of the United States.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELEGATION OF CERTAIN POWERS BY CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO THE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4435, an act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 4, after "airspace", insert "immediately adjacent thereto and needed in connection therewith."

Page 3, line 11, after "Congress", insert ": *Provided*, That in the case of condemnations of easements through or other interests in airspace, in fixing condemnation awards, consideration may be given to the reasonable probable future use of the underlying land."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain this amendment that has to do with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which makes changes which may affect our responsibility as far as appropriations are concerned.

Mr. HINSHAW. This bill was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously and was passed by the House. I am sure it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. If there is to be much discussion about this, the request will have to be withdrawn.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has explained the amendment to me, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3566, an act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 5 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the below quoted language appearing in lines 9 to 20:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than ninety days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress passes a resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or if a case is reported less than ninety days prior to the close of the session, then during the next session of the Congress, the Congress does not pass such a resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And insert in lieu thereof the below quoted language:

"If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress does not

pass such a concurrent resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 3566, to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the House bill strikes out all after the enacting clause and rewrites section 1 of the bill with amendment. The House agrees to the Senate amendment of section 1 of the bill providing for congressional review of the Attorney General's recommendations in deportation cases submitted to the Congress under section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 but insists on its amendment that the Congress shall have an opportunity to review these cases, not only in the session in whicl they are presented but also during the session next following, if so desired. To this amendment the managers on the part of the Senate agree.

The managers on the part of the House agree to the Senate amendment striking out section 2 of the bill.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
EMANUEL CELLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPLACED PERSONS BILL

Mr. FELLOWS submitted the following conference report on the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) entitled "An Act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That, this Act may be cited as the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

"SEC. 2. When used in this Act the term—

"(a) 'Commission' means the Displaced Persons Commission created pursuant to this Act;

"(b) 'Displaced person' means any displaced person or refugee as defined in Annex I of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization and who is the concern of the International Refugee Organization.

"(c) 'Eligible displaced person' means a displaced person as defined in subsection (b) above, (1) who on or after September 1, 1939, and on or before December 22, 1945, entered Germany, Austria, or Italy and who on January 1, 1948, was in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria; or a person who, having resided in Germany or Austria, was a victim of persecution by the Nazi government and was detained in, or was obliged to flee from such persecution and was subsequently returned to, one of these countries as a result of enemy action, or of war circumstances, and on January 1, 1948, had not been firmly resettled therein, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such person, and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges and will have safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age of such an eligible displaced person shall, if otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence, also be deemed eligible displaced persons.

"(d) 'Eligible displaced person' shall also mean a native of Czechoslovakia who had fled as a direct result of persecution or fear of persecution from that country since January 1, 1948, and (1) who is on the effective date of this Act in Italy or the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such person, and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges and will have safe and sanitary housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age of such an eligible displaced person shall, if otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence, also be deemed eligible displaced persons.

"(e) 'Eligible displaced orphan' means a displaced person (1) who is under the age of 16 years, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, and (4) who, on or before the effective date of this Act, was in Italy or in the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna or the American zone, the British zone or the French zone of either Germany or Austria, and (5) for whom satisfactory assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commisison have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, will be cared for properly.

"SEC. 3. (a) During the two fiscal years following the passage of this Act a number of immigration visas not to exceed 202,000 may be issued without regard to quota limitations for those years to eligible displaced persons as quota immigrants, as provided in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That not less than 40 per centum of the visas issued pursuant to this Act shall be available exclusively to eligible displaced persons whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power: *Provided further*, That not more than 2,000 visas shall be issued to eligible displaced persons as defined in subsection (d) of section 2 of this Act.

"(b) Upon the issuance of an immigration visa to any eligible displaced person as provided for in this Act, the consular officer shall use a quota number from the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the Act of May 26, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current at the time or, if no such quota number is available for said fiscal year, in that event for the first succeeding fiscal year in which a quota number is available: *Provided*, That not more than 50 per centum of any quota shall be so used in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That eligible displaced orphans may be issued special nonquota immigration visas, except that the number of such special nonquota immigration visas shall not exceed three thousand.

"SEC. 4. (a) Any alien who (1) entered the United States prior to April 1, 1948, and (2) is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, and (3) is a displaced person residing in the United States as defined in this section may apply to the Attorney General for an adjustment of his immigration status. If the Attorney General shall, upon consideration of all the facts and circumstances of the case, determine that such alien is qualified under the provisions of this section, the Attorney General shall report to the Congress all of the pertinent facts in the case. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the end of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the granting of the status of permanent residence to such alien the Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a fee of $18.00, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts, to record the admission of the alien for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last entry into the United States. If prior to the end of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress does not pass such resolution, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law: *Provided*, That the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to this section shall not exceed 15,000. Upon the grant of status of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this section, the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was a quota immigrant at the time of entry, reduce by one the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in Section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, for the fiscal year then current or the next succeeding fiscal year in which a quota number is available, but not more than 50 per centum of any quota shall be used for this purpose in any given fiscal year: *Provided further*, That quota deductions provided for in this section shall be made within the 50 per centum limitations contained in section 3 (b) of this Act.

"(b) When used in this section the term 'Displaced Person residing in the United States' means a person who establishes that

he lawfully entered the United States as a non-immigrant under section 3 or as a non-quota immigrant student under subdivision (e) of Section 4 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, and that he is a person displaced from the country of his birth, or nationality, or of his last residence as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II; and that he cannot return to any of such countries because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinions.

"SEC. 5. Quota nationality for the purposes of this Act shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 160–161; 8 U. S. C. 212) and no eligible displaced person shall be issued an immigration visa if he is known or believed by the consular officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws, with the exception of the contract labor clause of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136), and that part of the said Act which excludes from the United States persons whose ticket or passage is paid by another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly; and all eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans shall be exempt from paying visa fees and head taxes.

"SEC. 6. The preferences provided within the quotas by Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155–156; 47 Stat. 656; 45 Stat. 1009; 8 U. S. C. 206), shall not be applicable in the case of any eligible displaced person receiving an immigration visa under this Act, but in lieu of such preferences the following preferences, without priority in time of issuance of visas as between such preferences, shall be granted to eligible displaced persons and their family dependents who are the spouse or the unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age, in the consideration of visa applications:

"(a) First. Eligible displaced persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits: *Provided*, That not less than 30 per centum of the visas issued pursuant to this Act shall be made available exclusively to such persons: *And provided further*, That the wife, and unmarried dependent child or children under twenty-one years of age, of such persons may, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, be deemed to be of that class of persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits.

"(b) Second. Eligible displaced persons who are household construction, clothing, and garment workers, and other workers needed in the locality in the United States in which such persons propose to reside; or eligible displaced persons possessing special educational, scientific, technological or professional qualifications.

"(c) Third. Eligible displaced persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the rules of the common law.

"SEC. 7. Within the preferences provided in section 6, priority in the issuance of visas shall be given first to eligible displaced persons who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States and are unable or unwilling to return to the countries of which they are nationals because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinions and second, to eligible displaced persons who, on January 1, 1948, were located in displaced persons camps and centers, but in exceptional cases visas may be issued to those eligible displaced persons located outside of displaced persons camps and centers upon a showing, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, of special circumstances which would justify such issuance.

"SEC. 8. There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Displaced Persons Commission, consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term ending June 30, 1951, and one member of the Commission shall be designated by him as chairman. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to enable the Commission to discharge its duties. Within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to the Commission or as may be allocated to it by the President, the Commission may employ necessary personnel without regard to the Civil Service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provisions for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this Act. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this Act, and in compliance therewith, for the admission into the United States of eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons. The Commission shall formulate and issue regulations for the purpose of obtaining the most general distribution and settlement of persons admitted under this Act throughout the United States and their Territories and possessions. It shall also be the duty of the Commission to report on February 1, 1949, and semiannually thereafter to the President and to the Congress on the situation regarding eligible displaced orphans, eligible displaced persons and displaced persons. Such report shall also include information respecting employment conditions and the housing situation in this country, the place and type of employment, and the residence of eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons who have been admitted into the United States pursuant to the provisions of this Act. At the end of its term the Commission shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress.

"SEC. 9. Every eligible displaced person, except an eligible displaced person who shall have derived his status because of being the spouse or an unmarried dependent child under twenty-one years of age of an eligible displaced person, who shall be admitted into the United States shall report, on the 1st day of January and on the 1st day of July of each year until he shall have made four reports to the Commission, respecting the employment, place of employment, and residence of such person and the members of such person's family and shall furnish such other information in connection with said employment and residence as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe: *Provided*, That if such person enters the United States within 60 days prior to either the 1st day of January or the 1st day of July, the first report need not be made until the next date on which a report is required to be made. Such report shall be made to the Commission during its term and thereafter to the Attorney General. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $500, or be imprisoned not more than 6 months.

"SEC. 10. No eligible displaced person shall be admitted into the United States unless there shall have first been a thorough investigation and written report made and prepared by such agency of the Government of the United States as the President shall designate, regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under this Act. The burden of proof shall be upon the person who seeks to establish his eligibility under this Act. Any person who shall willfully make a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an eligible displaced person shall thereafter not be admissible into the United States. No eligible displaced orphan or eligible displaced person shall be admitted into the United States under the provisions of this Act except in pursuance of the regulations of the Commission, but, except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, the administration of this Act, under the provisions of this Act and the regulations of the Commission as herein provided, shall be by the officials who administer the other immigration laws of the United States. Except as otherwise authorized in this Act, all immigration laws, including deportation laws, shall be applicable to eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons who apply to be or who are admitted into the United States pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 11. After June 30, 1948, no preference or priority shall be given to any person because of his status as a displaced person, or his status as an eligible displaced person, in the issuance of visas under the other immigration laws of the United States.

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to immediately resume general consular activities in Germany and Austria to the end that the German and Austrian quotas shall be available for applicants for immigration visas pursuant to the immigration laws. From and after June 30, 1948, and until July 1, 1950, notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, 50 per centum of the German and Austrian quotas shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, or Yugoslavia and who, on the effective date of this Act reside in Germany and Austria.

"SEC. 13. No visas shall be issued under the provisions of this Act to any person who is or has been a member of, or participated in, any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

"SEC. 14. Any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of this Act, except section 9, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000, or shall be imprisoned not less than two or more than ten years, or both."

And the House agree to the same.

FRANK FELLOWS,
E. WALLACE CHADWICK,
ED GOSSETT,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
FRANK L. CHELF,
Managers on the Part of the House.
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation to the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

In a free exchange of opinions and arguments the conferees endeavored to compose the numerous differences of the measures passed by their respective Houses.

The compromise bill would admit into the United States for permanent residence up to a maximum of 220,000 displaced persons, and it is the confident expectation of the conferees that the enactment of this legislation will be regarded by other countries and particu-

larly by the members of the International Refugee Organization as an inducement to further recognition of their obligations to accept a relative share of the displaced persons. This legislation has proceeded upon the assumption that other nations will soon accept for resettlement a proportionate number of displaced persons, and that by doing so they will cooperate with the United States in expediting the closing of the camps and terminating the emergency.

It is further the consensus of the conferees that the language of the proviso to section 3 (a) of the bill providing for a special priority for displaced persons "whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power" has been used exclusively for the purpose of the definition of a certain class of eligible displaced persons and that it cannot and shall not be understood or interpreted as implying any recognition on behalf of the Government of the United States of the territorial status in eastern Europe.

The main differences between the House amendments and the bill as agreed to in conference are noted below, except for changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and clarifying changes made in order to perfect the legislation.

The "cut-off" date of December 22, 1945, for certain of the displaced persons has been agreed upon as representing the concept that persons displaced from their countries of origin during the war should be offered now immediately resettlement opportunities.

The consent of the Senate conferees has been obtained for the 15,000 displaced persons residing in the United States to be offered the opportunity to obtain the status of permanent residents subject to final approval by the Congress of recommendations made in that respect by the Attorney General.

The special preference accorded to persons engaged in agricultural pursuits is prompted by the desire for general basic distribution of persons admitted pursuant to the bill and also because the housing situation is much less acute in the rural areas.

The special preference granted under section 3 (a) is prompted by the fact that nationals of countries and provinces made de facto parts of the U. S. S. R. represents the real "hard core" of the displaced persons in view of the fact that their repatriation is highly improbable because of the political situation prevailing in their countries and places of origin.

The Senate conferees agreed to two House amendments (*a*) admitting up to 2,000 recent refugees from Czechoslovakia provided that they are at the date of the enactment of the bill in the zones specified therein, and (*b*) admitting nonquota up to 3,000 eligible displaced orphans provided that satisfactory assurances have been given that such orphans if admitted into the United States will be cared for properly.

The Senate conferees have also agreed to those sections of the House amendment which provide that all visas issued under the bill, except visas issued for eligible displaced orphans, should be properly charged to quotas, as established by the existing law.

The House conferees have agreed to an amended version of a section of the Senate bill which would make 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas available from and after June 30, 1948, and until July 1, 1950, for persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia.

The various differences between the measures passed by both Houses pertaining to the administration of the bill were composed so as to insure the proper enforcement of the law, a suitable resettlement of displaced persons all over the United States, its Territories and possessions, and by preserving all safeguards with respect to exclusion of subversives and by providing for proper assurances that new immigrants shall not become public charges.

The managers on the part of the House believe that this is the best displaced persons bill upon which the conferees could agree and that if any legislation upon this subject is to be enacted, it is incumbent upon the House to give its approval to the compromise bill as reported.

FRANK FELLOWS,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
E. WALLACE CHADWICK,
FRANK L. CHELF,
ED GOSSETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. I wish an opportunity to speak briefly on the conference report. Also the gentleman from Maine desires to speak on the conference report. Will I have the right to do so without making a reservation of objection?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will have 1 hour on the conference report which he may yield. The Chair expresses the hope, however, that he will not be too liberal in his yielding.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not, nor will I take up any time of the House, but I am asking that the gentleman from Maine will explain whether or not the amendment I placed in the bill with reference to bringing Czechs into the United States is still in the bill.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is not much longer than the statement. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Will I be deprived of making a motion to recommit the conference report—not desiring to take up any time—if I consent to the reading of the statement in lieu of the report?

The SPEAKER. That motion will be in order after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is rather late for anyone to criticize the displaced persons bill or the final conference report. To attempt amendments now or to refuse its acceptance would mean the death of the bill and all that it seeks to accomplish for the relief of the hopeless people who yearn for the day when at least some among them will be saved.

The bill should have been more liberal according to my viewpoint, but the rule of the majority decreed against expansion of its provisions and said it should be confined within rigid limits. I accept the dictum of the House and now accept the conference report. I believe the displaced persons' bill will prove itself so that we might expect Federal relief later. Meantime more than 200,000 unfortunates, including 3,000 orphans, 2,000 refugee Czechs, and others will be permitted to come to our shores. I regret more than I can ever say, how much I deplore the injection or the consideration of religious bias or intolerance in connection with such a bill. Such references have no basis in our American legislative system. I deplore it and abjure any contact with it. My only hope is that this bill, after having served a good purpose, will lead to further and final relief of the distressed.

The report has weaknesses not to be condoned, but its total virtues outweigh its gross deficiencies.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

(The Clerk began reading the conference report.)

Mr. MICHENER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understood, there was no objection to reading the statement in lieu of the report. The report is technical and just consumes time on a matter that is difficult to understand.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he did not put the request.

Mr. MICHENER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the technical report be dispensed with and that the statement be read in lieu thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls for the regular order. It will either be the reading of the full report or the statement. The Chair is not depriving any one of his opportunity later to find out what is in the bill or to get time from the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I want to find out, whether or not we are going to have time for somebody to explain the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will have 1 hour. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has had a long, hard road; the hills have been steep and difficult to climb. Your committee has met and after several days has agreed. Except for two of our conferees we have signed the report.

I am not going to discuss the House bill. You are all familiar with that. I will discuss very briefly the salient features of the conference report.

The number, for example, is the same except for a ceiling of 3,000 orphans. So I can say that the number, 220,000, has been accepted.

The bill as reported by the Senate contained a provision that 50 percent of the 200,000 should be farmers. We have agreed upon 30 percent. You know, I come from a State where they trade sometimes.

In the bill reported by the Senate was a provision that 50 percent of the 200,000 should come from east of the Curzon Line, namely, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Eastern Poland. That has been reduced to 40 percent.

A provision that 15,000 be charged to the quota of those people who are in this country and have no place to go, has been accepted provided the House and Senate concur in the Attorney General's finding after his investigation, which is the same provision as will be found in 3566, the conference report on which has just been accepted.

The 2,000 Czechs, which were covered by an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], have been accepted.

The ceiling on the orphans has been put at 3,000. According to the best figures available there are 3,000 orphans. In the House bill there was no limit on age. We agreed to 16 years in this report.

In this conference report also will be found the provision which appeared in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], providing that certain men and women of German ethnic origin who had to flee to Germany after the Potsdam agreement may be allowed to come to this country by having assigned to them 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas over a 2-year period, if they qualify under all the immigration laws. This has nothing to do with the displaced person problem, as such. It is an amendment to the immigration law, permitting, to the extent indicated, the quota charge against Germany and Austria rather than their land of national origin.

It has nothing to do with the 200,000, however. It does give some relief to these people for a 2-year period only.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that some difficulties will be encountered in view of the fact that the International Refugee Organization Charter specifically excepts those people from consideration as displaced persons?

Mr. FELLOWS. Does the gentleman mean without that?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. FELLOWS. I think so. I think we will have further trouble along the line. So we have accepted that provision, and that provision was offered, I think, by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

The real bone of contention is this date December 22, 1945. The House bill had the cut-off date of April 21, 1947. We felt that that was a fairer date, taking into consideration all of the circumstances. But we could not and have not changed the date of December 22, 1945, the effect of which is this: That the people who fled Poland after 1945—the exodus beginning somewhere in July 1946—will not be considered when they come to choose or applications are made for those people who are coming in under this so-called DP bill. We figure it is a matter of some 100,000.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, while I voted against this bill, I think this is the best that anyone could devise. There is no abler or finer man in this House than the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] and I think we should adopt this conference report.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. As one who served with the chairman all during this proceeding, from the day we began the hearings on the 4th day of June 1947, on the so-called Stratton bill, down to the close of the conference last night, I want to say this in justice to our chairman that no one has been more tolerant or more willing to hear all of the facts or has rendered more able assistance than has the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]. In my judgment, no man could have done better. My own opinion is that this is a much better bill than the so-called Stratton bill. I do not think it is as good a bill as we had prepared in the House. But we either had to take the report that we did take or lose everything. Having spent the months that we did on this matter, I signed the report in the honest belief that we were doing the best thing for all the people of this country and for the people in the displaced-persons camps.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I say in relation to him that we would not be here today with this report or any bill whatsoever were it not for the efforts and the ability of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I also want to say that I think that this particular piece of legislation will be marked as one of the constructive pieces of legislation coming from this Congress. May I ask the gentleman also whether or not he was able to keep in the bill the inclusion of miners as one of the labor categories that would be recognized?

Mr. FELLOWS. I am very sorry. We did, however, agree on this: The word "miners" was stricken out, and then with the help of men like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], and two or three others, we were able to incorporate the words, after the divisions were set up, section 6 (b), providing for eligible displaced persons, "household, construction, clothing and garment workers and other workers needed in the locality of the United States in which such person proposes to settle." That is the best we could do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That, it seems to me, would embrace miners.

Mr. FELLOWS. I think so, too. That was our idea of it.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. As the gentleman knows, I have been exceedingly interested in this whole problem for some time, and I want to join my colleagues from Pennsylvania in paying a very high tribute to the statesmanlike quality exhibited by the gentleman from Maine in his handling of the bill. The conference report does not do everything that we would have liked, but I believe it is a fine piece of work even as it stands, and I shall support the conference report.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman. I signed this report. Without this there would be no legislation, and legislation is needed. Under this bill, although it does not perhaps satisfy everybody—it does not satisfy me—we are going to receive into this country some 220,000 of these people which will, I think, solve the question of the displaced-persons camps, will rid Europe of this cancer, and at the same time help us rehabilitate Germany.

I do not like a lot of it, and I can see that many people would disagree. It is much more restrictive than the so-called Fellows bill, because it provides, to start with, for 30 percent farmers. It also provides that 40 percent must come from east of this line. Among the 30 percent farmers will be included their wives and children. This is the best solution we could get, and in my judgment it is not wholly unfair, although I would prefer the date of April 21, 1947.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Without any criticism of the gentleman, because I think he tried very hard and really did a splendid job, and that there is any bill at all I think is attributable to the gentleman from Maine, is it not a fact that there still remains in this conference report the mortgaging of the quotas to the extent of 50 percent?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. If that is so, have we not taken the worst features of the Senate bill and the most onerous features of the House bill and put them together

and brought in this conference report? I say that without any criticism, because, as I said before, the gentleman from Maine has moved heaven and earth and has done a terrific job.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, but my answer would be that that is largely a point of view, of course. Much of this I would have preferred to eliminate if I could have done it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman is making. I hope he takes enough time to make his statement complete, because this is a big proposition. As I understood the gentleman's statement with reference to the farmers, the conference report provides that 30 percent of the 20,000 shall be farmers.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman also said something about the farmers' families.

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, the wife of the farmer is going to be catalogued as a farmer, and I suppose his son is also. They will come within the 30 percent.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. I presume all those above the quota age will be counted in the quota?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The children naturally would come in without being considered in the quota?

Mr. FELLOWS. I think they are all charged to the quota.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Maine and the members of his committee for preserving in the bill my amendment which permits 2,000 Czechs to come into this country. I have looked over the conference report on the Senate side and I know that you had a tremendous task to perform in order to bring out the best bill that could possibly be brought out. I compliment the gentleman and the members of his committee, and again express my deep appreciation for the preservation of the amendment I had in the bill.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. I congratulate the chairman on the work he has done, and appreciate the fine attitude evidenced by the gentleman from New York, that he took this so well, because a lot of us that voted for this bill gagged quite a bit in voting for it.

My question is, What now is going to be done with the DP camps? Are we going to do away with them?

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, we cannot compel other nations to do these things, but we do ask and urge that they be done. The best information we can get is that if we will give them this bargaining proposition so that they can use it around the table, we can close these camps. I believe fully that it will be done, because everybody connected with it is just as anxious as the gentleman and I that that question be solved.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I was off the floor and came in just this minute. There are two points I should like to have cleared up.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Have you increased the quotas in the conference report to something like 220,000? That is, instead of 202,000?

Mr. FELLOWS. No; we had 220,000 in the House bill, H. R. 6396, and there are 220,000 here.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, there are 15,000 already here.

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. And 3,000 orphans and 2,000 Czechs?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

Mr. VURSELL. That is my understanding. Now are all the children counted in the 220,000?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes.

Mr. VURSELL. Are they counted as citizens?

Mr. FELLOWS. Orphans are especially exempted from the operation of the quota.

Mr. VURSELL. And not more than half of the 220,000 came come in in any 1 year?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not say that, because that is a matter of shipping. They say now "not over 200,000."

Mr. VURSELL. They will be not over that in any 1 year; is that correct?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not think we have to worry about that, because it will not be until next fall until this thing is set up.

Mr. VURSELL. That is probably true, but I just wanted to know.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CHADWICK. If the gentleman will permit me to revert to the very concise statement of his own views and his own motives which preceded the colloquy which we just heard. In order to save the time of the House, I desire to be associated not merely with the very effective result of the gentleman's leadership, but with the line of thought and the persuasions which induced him to take such action. He expressed better than I could possibly express them the views which I entertained, not only in Committee and in the House, but in the Conference Committee, and which caused me to sign this report on the part of the managers of the House with confidence that we have been able to make a contribution in a field which touches not only practical economics but the strongest motivations of humanity.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman has made a fine statement, and I thank him.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. MASON. As one who served as the ranking Member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House for 10 years, I want to say that the gentleman and his committee have done a magnificent job. It is not exactly as I would have it, of course, but it is a magnificent job, and I want to give him full credit for it.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I want to agree with the gentleman from Maine, our able chairman. This is the best we could get under the circumstances. I can speak my own sentiments, and I think I can speak the sentiment of all those who served with the House conferees to the extent that we wholeheartedly favored the so-called Fellows bill, because in our honest estimation and sincere belief, it was fair and it was a more equitable approach to and solution of the problem. However, we had a gun barrel at our heads. That gun barrel was the element of time. The legislative sands in our congressional hourglass are running out. I repeat, 't was either this compromise or nothing. Of course, there are features in the report that we did not want—one or two items almost gagged me to swallow but we have done the best we could, believe me. I want to congratulate our chairman and commend him upon his untiring efforts and his loyalty and devotion to this most difficult problem; truly, he has done a wonderful job. I know because I sat by him and watched him for three long days during sessions of the conference of the House and Senate. We did not capitulate—we did not surrender our principles. We did not raise any white flag—had it not been for the time element and immediate adjournment slapping us in the face I would have hung the jury until Gabriel blew taps on his trumpet. I would have never compromised. I would have demanded the Fellows bill. But my colleagues, 200,000 poor, miserable, pathetic people were hanging in the balance, their fate was in our hands—with this upon my conscience and in my heart—I therefore reluctantly signed the conference report—for it was better than no bill at all.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question has been asked me by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] as to the disposition of these displaced persons who have come to this country. Would the gentleman care to answer that question as far as he can at this time?

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, they are taken care of in that part of the country where that type of worker or professional person is required and can be assimilated in the community. These people who come here can be settled in the part of the country and in a community where their services or professions can best be utilized.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. Am I correct in believing that in the House bill there was a provision by the terms of which these people would be admitted in accordance with the proportion that existed in the various camps by racial or religious groups?

Mr. FELLOWS. That is true.

Mr. DEVITT. Is that provision retained in the conference report?

Mr. FELLOWS. It is not.

Mr. DEVITT. Was there not a provision in the House bill giving preferential treatment to farmers?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes, but this is really preferential in the sense that the 30 percent has to be farmers. In our bill we set out farmers, doctors, dentists, and so forth, but in this bill 30 percent farmers have the preference.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Of course, it stands to reason that all who come here will stay here because there is no place to which they can be sent if they violate our laws.

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes. They will come in anyway, only they are coming in at present under provisions that do not screen—under the provisions that do not require that this group or that group or any other group have a fair share. There have been 32,000 already brought in, and there has been no plan as to the manner of doing it. This will not add a single, solitary person that will not be here anyway in the next 5 or 6 or 7 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The parliamentary debates in the Australian Parliament in the last few days shows conclusively that Britain will have to move 10,000,000 people out of England during the next few years. If 10,000,000 are to be moved out of England, we might as well get clear that pressure will be put on this country to take a great many of them.

Mr. FELLOWS. May I say this, in submitting our original displaced persons legislation, the committee felt it offered you an elegant garment—a "creation," if you will—which clothed a delicate situation suitably, adequately, and becomingly. Each nationality and group received fair consideration. The fact that one or another had perhaps had preferential treatment in the past might have explained but could not have excused any other procedure on our part.

This conference report now offered for your action represents something less than I hoped, and better than I feared. If, as I believe, we are faced with a problem requiring solution, this is one offered by the Senate and House conferees, and the only one to be hoped for. This conference report is not the bill that passed the House, but is a compromise between the position of the Senate and this body. This legislation will permit admission of 220,000. I believe some legislation is necessary. I believe it should be adopted.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this the best we can do?

Mr. FELLOWS. Indeed it is. It is this or nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. ROSS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the statement of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons urged by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I will vote in favor of his motion to recommit this conference report, and will vote against the adoption of the report if the motion to recommit fails. The bill in its present form is worse than no bill. It is viciously discriminatory. It is hard for me to believe that, in a country that fought nazism so successfully, and is now attempting to stop communism, any Member of Congress can consider voting in favor of a bill that would grant priorities to prospective immigrants who were part and parcel, if not the backbone, of the Hitler regime during its worst days. Rather than to give them priorities in seeking admission to this country, Congress should bar them forever. No bill is better than a bill in the form now before us.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when we had before us for consideration a few days ago the Fellows bill which provided for the bringing into this country of 202,000 foreigners without much regard as to who they are or where they come from, we were told that we must pass that bill or some great calamity might befall us. Many of us refused to be persuaded. They said many times that the Fellows bill represented a great amount of labor done by many members of the Judiciary Committee and that it was the best possible bill that could be worked out. They said that they would oppose all amendments to the Fellows bill and they did their best in that respect, but some amendments were made. They accepted those amendments and still claimed the bill was the best that could be made.

The Fellows bill went to conferees and now it comes back changed beyond recognition. Some of the conferees say the changes are terrible. But those who said that the original Fellows bill should not be changed are now advocating this conference report claiming that it is absolutely necessary that we pass it and that it will solve the problem.

This only proves that this method of trying to solve this problem is absolutely wrong. This displaced persons problem is a matter of relief. It is not an immigration problem and should not be solved by the Immigration Department. It should be solved by the United Nations. This conference report should be voted down.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker there is one aspect of the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] which gives me concern. I have every respect for his views, and I recognize that the position he takes is consistent with his whole approach to the question. But when he suggests that some of the rest of us, who in association with him shared the responsibility of the conference on behalf of the House, were in any way less attached to our House bill than he, or less alert in its support, he both misappraises the realities of the then situation and underestimates his colleagues' contribution.

There was no "abject surrender" of anything which was practically obtainable. The distinguished Senators who sat with us had a right to their views, and it was obvious that they proposed to adhere to certain of them. At one stage of the negotiation, the gentleman from New York gave the strongest possible evidence of sharing this view; he joined us and the Senate conferees in what was at very least a tentative meeting of the minds.

Subsequently we all reviewed the basis of this honestly intended attempt at agreement the next day, at the request of my friend from New York; recognizing that he had misjudged the effect of the formula upon one group of displaced persons. But that neither he or we had misjudged the mettle of the Senatorial conferees became increasingly clear in that very discussion.

The gentleman gives his case away as it seems to me, when he admits that he prefers even now no bill to the present bill; that was the real alternative with which we were confronted. Five of us on the contrary preferred to save the bill; we wanted to get started with the DP problem, and to give immediate relief to more than 200,000 human beings, even if in so doing we missed keeping some individuals (a substantial number, in fact), who were certainly also entitled to sympathetic consideration. The House has intentionally failed these unfortunate individuals at no point. Our bill included them, but in the last resort we thought it better to postpone their hopes than completely to disappoint the hopes of so many more of their equally deserving companions in misery.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the conference report now under consideration which would admit 220,000 displaced persons to this country. As has been emphasized in this debate, the Senate and House conferees have determined that this is the best bill which could be agreed upon.

I have strongly advocated the passage of legislation which would provide for the admission to the United States of a fair share of the unfortunate and homeless displaced persons of Europe. I have felt for some time that it was not only our moral obligation, but that it would also be economically sound for us to take the lead in providing a haven for these persons who were made homeless through no fault of their own.

I supported and would have preferred the so-called Fellows bill as enacted by

the House, and I think it is unfortunate that the provisions contained in the House bill did not prevail. However, since it appears it is a question of taking this measure now before the House or nothing at all, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield to nobody in my affection and regard for the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], and in my affection and regard for all Members who were managers on the part of the House, but I do nevertheless feel that there was a surrender by them too quickly, and that this bill is not a compromise. It is an abasement. It is a complete surrender, because the Fellows bill which was universally, throughout the length and breadth of the Nation, recognized as a fair bill, has been utterly and completely scuttled and sabotaged. In its place we have the Revercomb bill with slight modifications which was universally condemned as highly discriminatory, racially and religiously.

The House rejected the Revercomb bill which my colleague of the House conferees now asks you to accept.

I had hoped that the members of the conference, as far as the House was concerned, would have stood by their guns and insisted upon the Fellows bill, and not hoisted the white flag as quickly as they did and accept almost in toto the Revercomb bill, which was generally objected to by all well-known commentators and editors, by all religious organizations interested, and by every fair-minded man and woman who examined it. It was not a case of this bill or nothing at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Were we not told by the managers on the part of the Senate after we had consulted for two whole days that if we did not make the recession there would be no bill, that they were prepared to walk out?

Mr. CELLER. I do not like to have a gun held at my head in that fashion. That is what was done. The Senate conferees said to us: "Stand and deliver."

I was not going to quail, I am too long in this business to shiver before any Member of the other body who tried to bulldoze me in that fashion. It would have been far better if we had no bill at all and allowed the present situation to stand with the President's directive of December 21, 1945, concerning the DP's and the normal operation of the quota law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Is not the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the same kind of statement one always hears in a conference with the Senate, the usual statement made by every conferee who yields?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman from Maine will yield me five additional minutes I will yield. Otherwise I must proceed with my explanation.

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Did not the gentleman agree with the rest of us that we would accept the proposition made by the Senate; and then did not the gentleman come forward and say that his conscience would not permit him to go along with it?

Mr. CELLER. That is not the exact situation. I will reflect the exact situation.

The Members on the part of the House offered several compromises to the Senate conferees which they turned down with all emphasis. They were adamant and most intransigent and unyielding save that two of their number, the distinguished Senators from Michigan and West Virginia, HOMER FERGUSON and HARVEY KILGORE, were most understanding and aware of the human side of the problem. Then in the interest of getting something harmonious, I said I would accept the cut-off date Senator REVERCOMB demanded, with the Balts originally constituting a 50 percent chunk of the 200,000 quota reduced to 40 percent and the preference for farmers reduced from 50 percent to 30 percent. But overnight I discovered that what I had accepted was an abject and unwarranted surrender and that the officials of the State Department told me that the so-called cut-off date, which was demanded, namely December 21, 1945, would make the act utterly unworkable in that there was a paucity of records on that date and that most of the more unfortunate DP's had come into the camps after that date. They would be excluded.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Just let me finish, then I will gladly yield.

The experts of the State and Justice Departments told me December 22, 1945, as a cut-off date, would make the act utterly unworkable and that it would deliberately discriminate against the Jews who crowded into the DP camps after that date. Many of these pillaged and plundered Jews had fled from Poland after the Kielce pogrom which had occurred July 3, 1946. They would be denied any relief by the Revercomb bill and the conference report, now before us. We had set in the Fellows bill a cut-off date as of April 21, 1947; you must remember that the cut-off date December 22, 1945 was only a few months after the shooting stopped and there were 8,000,000 people wandering hither and tither with no place to rest their weary heads and there was no developed procedure in the camps, there were no records. There was naught but confusion. The date April 21, 1947, was the date the camps were ordered closed by General Clay with agreement of the International Refugee Organization. It is utterly impossible to enforce and administer this bill as envisaged by this conference report if you use the cut-off date of December 21, 1945. Furthermore you deliberately proscribe Jews. Only about 6,000 Jews can be helped out of the 200,000 by this conference report.

Furthermore, those who are most deserving, those who fled from religious and racial persecution, those who suffered most, those who were the most hopeless, helpless, and homeless, the Jews—six million of whose coreligionists were martyred—came into these camps after the date set by this conference report.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. The stand-and-deliver attitude of the Senate produces a bill in which we are not merciful. There is not an ounce of humanity in it. A situation developed in the conference where a certain gentleman on the other side of the Capitol because of his proscriptive attitude sought to bend the House conferees to his proscriptive viewpoint. I refused to yield as did the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. We refrained from signing the report. Even the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] said publicly they signed the report "with reluctance."

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FELLOWS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman himself agreed on the date of December 22, 1945, with the proviso, of course, that the other provisions were changed—50–50?

Mr. CELLER. I do not deny that, but we were still in conference and you cannot tell me that while we are still in conference the provisions of the whole bill cannot be opened and reopened and again reopened for reconsideration. I had only tentatively agreed to certain provisions. There were many questions and differences still unresolved and unsettled.

After the night of the second conference I consulted with those who were in position to know, the Immigration Service and the State Depaartment, and I was told that that cut-off date was highly unfair, utterly unjust, and deliberately discriminatory. After such—shall I say newly discovered information—I reopened the question of cut-off date. I had that right. No one shall gainsay me that right. If there is injustice I am not going to allow protocol to stand in the way of stamping it out.

Now, see what you have done in this conference report. You are going to admit not deserving people, you are going to help not the displaced persons in the main. You are going to help whom? The Volkdeutsche. You are going to take for 2 years the combined quotas for Germany and Austria, and you are going to issue an engraved invitation to the Volkdeutsche to come in to the extent of 50 percent of those combined quotas. You will thus admit 27,000 of them.

Who are the Volkdeutsches? You ought to know something about them. They were the advance guard who fertilized the field for Hitler's Panzer divisions. They were the natives, citizens, and subjects of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Hungary, Rumania, of German ethnic origin. They were what Hitler called the Herrenvolk. They were like the German-American Bunds in the United States who turned against the Allies. These Volkdeutsche did all in their power to make it easy for Hitler's advance. Hitler's capture and overrunning of Czechoslovakia and Poland was

made far easier for him because of the fifth column work that was done by these Volkdeutsches. Fritz Henlein was one of them. Others come to mind readily. If Hitler were alive today he could qualify. He was born in Austria of German ethnic origin.

Are we going to forget so soon the purpose of which this recent war was fought? Are we going to admit these people against whom our veterans fought, bled and died, and went through the valley of the shadow? I cannot subscribe to this kind of procedure. This is the uttermost injustice.

You must in good conscience, and if humanity is your guide, if decency is your guide, reject this report if only because of the admission of these Volkdeutsche. These Volkdeutsches are not DP's. They are not in DP camps. They have no relation to the solving of the DP problem. They should have no place in this conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that I agree with him. I went through the DP camps and the only way you can distribute the admission of these people fairly is according to the elements now in the camps. The dating back is distinctly a discriminatory act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not want to make a speech, but I would like to know specifically who we bring in under this bill, without covering all the history of it.

Mr. CELLER. The lady should read the report.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. We have not the report. We are going to vote soon. We want to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. The lady had that explained. I want to go into other matters.

Let us see what else happens in this bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What effect will our participation in the International Refugee Organization have on this section permitting these Germans who are not displaced persons to come in?

Mr. CELLER. It will have a very deleterious effect, because the International Refugee Organization deliberately said these Volkdeutsches were not displaced persons and the International Refugee Organization would have nothing to do with them. Why? Because they were the ones who sought to balk and sabotage the efforts of the Allies.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is the gentleman preaching the doctrine of hate?

Mr. CELLER. I am not preaching the doctrine of hate, but I do not want to reward my enemies, I do not want to bring in those who did everything in their power to make it impossible for the allied effort to succeed.

I would rather have the gentleman who just interrogated me speak of "mercy." I would remind him as I would remind those plumping for the Revercomb formula the remarks of Matthew:

> Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.

I ask gentle consideration, I ask mercy for those who have suffered tortures of the damned just because they were born of a certain race but yet prayed to your God and mine.

I also ask for fair judgment and remind you of James, who said:

> For he shall have judgment without mercy that showeth no mercy and mercy rejoiceth against judgment.

Beyond all that, see what else is done by this conference report? There was a rape by Russia of the independent Republics of Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania. This report gives the imprimatur to Russia's rape and "annexation" of those Republics. It says in so many words that there is recognized the de facto annexation by Russia of these three independent Republics made independent as the result of the First World War, and beyond that recognizes the annexation by Russia of that part of Poland east of the Curzon line. They do that in order to bring in to the extent of 40 percent of the quota of 200,000 the so-called Balts and Poles east of the Curzon line. Whoever heard that a committee of conference should indicate what the foreign policy of the United States should be? We never recognized that annexation by Rusisa of those Republics, but if we pass this bill we have the temerity—and I say "temerity"—to tell Russia "You have a free hand; you can do anything you d—— please with those republics."

Now, the State Department has violently objected to this indirect recognition given to Russia's action.

This bill, I want you to know, gentlemen—and you are going to hear from the people back home—is not without religious significance; it is not without racial preference. You cannot keep religion out of it no matter what you try. Hitler did not keep religion out of his cunning calculations and the victims of his cunning and mania are in these camps. Those people who first felt the scourge of Hitler, those who were the greatest victims of Hitler's sadism, those who perished to the extent of 6,000,000 in the crematoria and in the suffocation chambers, and who were held to languish and die behind the barbed wire, namely those of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are caught between the upper and the nether stones of the report's discrimination. Yes, you say, "Come in, you 28,000 Volksdeutsche." What do you say to those of the Jewish faith because of this cut-off date? You say, "We will only take in of the 200,000, 6,000 Jews." Think of it—only 6,000 Jews of the quota of 200,000 are admissible under the conference report.

I am making a special plea for my people. Why should I not? They have suffered immeasurably. Their fate was and still is like one on a sea without a shore. Where can they go?

I have before me the Fulton House Foreign Affairs report containing the passengers from the ship manifests of some of the refugee ships that went to Canada and to Brazil and to Venezuela and to other countries. You will find among those listed Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Greek Catholics, Baptists, and Orthodox, but not a single Jew was taken by any of those nations out of these DP camps. We, too, are now saying, "No, we do not want the people of the race of Isaac and Jacob and Abraham; let them go hang; let them be liquidated. Let them die in the camps." Palestine is closed to them by the cease-fire order. We do not know what their future will be as to Palestine. They are apparently unwanted everywhere save in Palestine and even there the barriers are up. Should not the great United States at least show the way for others and take a fair share of these Jewish DP's? The conferees would say "No." I say "Yes."

We do not dissipate the DP problem by adopting the legislation agreed upon by the conferees. The problems of maintaining the camps will still be with us, military personnel will still have to be assigned to DP centers, the necessities of life will still have to be provided for the remaining DP's. Enlightened self-interest, at the very least, should prompt a better solution.

Moreover, the fact that 30 percent preference is to be given to farmers makes the whole situation ridiculous. In the United States camps 17.5 are farmers, in the British camps, the percent is 35.1, and the French camps hold 39.1. The result will be that we will empty the British and French camps before we empty our own.

It must be remembered, also that ours is a mixed economy which demands not only farm labor but plumbers, latherers, doctors, dentists, nurses, domestics, garment workers, carpenters, and so forth. No adequate consideration was given to these needs.

NO LAW BETTER

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the displaced persons bill as finally shaped by this conference report is a noxious mess which defies digestion.

It is compounded of large portions of fear, hate, and suspicion, faintly flavored with shame.

I cannot vote for this bitter gruel of legislation.

No law at all is better than this, and I shall vote to send the report back to conference.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on this bill immediately preceding the ordering of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER moves that the conference report accompanying S. 2242 be recommitted to the committee of conference.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 40, noes 75.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 266, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—133

Albert	Griffiths	Multer
Allen, La.	Hagen	Murray, Tenn.
Angell	Harrison	Norton
Bakewell	Havenner	O'Brien
Battle	Heffernan	O'Toole
Beckworth	Herter	Pace
Bender	Heselton	Passman
Blatnik	Holifield	Peterson
Bloom	Huber	Pfeifer
Boggs, Del.	Isacson	Philbin
Bolton	Jackson, Wash.	Pickett
Brehm	Javits	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Jenkins, Ohio	Potts
Bryson	Judd	Powell
Buchanan	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Buckley	Kean	Price, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearney	Rankin
Carroll	Keating	Reeves
Celler	Kefauver	Richards
Colmer	Kelley	Riley
Cooper	Kennedy	Rooney
Courtney	Keogh	Sabath
Cravens	King	Sadowski
Crosser	Kirwan	Sarbacher
Davis, Ga.	Klein	Shafer
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Sikes
Delaney	Lanham	Smathers
Dewitt	Lewis, Ohio	Somers
Dingell	Lodge	Spence
Donohue	Lucas	Stanley
Douglas	Lynch	Stratton
Eberharter	McCormack	Taylor
Elsaesser	McCulloch	Teague
Elston	McDonough	Thomas, Tex.
Evins	McGregor	Twyman
Fallon	McMahon	Van Zandt
Feighan	McMillen, Ill.	Vinson
Fogarty	MacKinnon	Walter
Forand	Madden	Welch
Fulton	Mahon	Wheeler
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Whittington
Gathings	Mason	Williams
Gearhart	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
Gore	Morgan	
Grant, Ala.	Morris	

NAYS—266

Abbitt	Beall	Burleson
Abernethy	Bell	Busbey
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Butler
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mo.	Byrnes, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bishop	Camp
	Blackney	Canfield
Anderson, Calif.	Bland	Cannon
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, La.	Carson
	Bonner	Case, N. J.
Andrews, Ala.	Boykin	Case, S. Dak.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bradley	Chadwick
Arends	Bramblett	Chapman
Arnold	Brooks	Chelf
Auchincloss	Brophy	Chenoweth
Banta	Buck	Chiperfield
Barden	Buffett	Church
Barrett	Bulwinkle	Clason
Bates, Mass.	Burke	Coffin
Cole, Kans.	Hinshaw	Norrell
Cole, Mo.	Hobbs	O'Hara
Cole, N. Y.	Hoeven	O'Konski
Combs	Hoffman	Patman
Cooley	Holmes	Patterson
Corbett	Hope	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Horan	Phillips, Tenn.
Cox	Hull	Plumley
Crawford	Jackson, Calif.	Potter
Crow	Jarman	Poulson
Cunningham	Jenison	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jenkins, Pa.	Priest
Dague	Jennings	Rains
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Ramey
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rayburn
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Ill.	Redden
Deane	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
D'Ewart	Jones, N. C.	Reed, N. Y.
Dirksen	Jones, Wash.	Rees
Dolliver	Jonkman	Richlman
Domengeaux	Kearns	Rizley
Dondero	Kee	Rockwell
Dorn	Keefe	Rogers, Fla.
Doughton	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Mass.
Durham	Kilburn	Rohrbough
Eaton	Kilday	Ross
Ellis	Kunkel	Russell
Ellsworth	Landis	Sadlak
Engel, Mich.	Larcade	St. George
Fellows	Latham	Sanborn
Fenton	Lea	Sasscer
Fernandez	LeCompte	Schwabe, Mo.
Fisher	LeFevre	Schwabe, Okla.
Flannagan	Lemke	Scoblick
Fletcher	Lesinski	Scott, Hardie
Folger	Lewis, Ky.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Foote	Lichtenwalter	
Fuller	Love	Scrivner
Gamble	Lusk	Seely-Brown
Garmatz	Lyle	Sheppard
Gary	McConnell	Short
Gavin	McCowen	Simpson, Ill.
Gillette	McDowell	Smith, Kans.
Gillie	McGarvey	Smith, Maine
Goff	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Goodwin	Mack	Smith, Va.
Gordon	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Gorski	Maloney	Snyder
Graham	Manasco	Stefan
Granger	Martin, Iowa	Stevenson
Grant, Ind.	Mathews	Stockman
Gregory	Meade, Ky.	Sundstrom
Gross	Meade, Md.	Taber
Gwinn, N. Y.	Merrow	Talle
Gwynne, Iowa	Meyer	Thompson
Hale	Michener	Tibbott
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Conn.	Tollefson
	Miller, Md.	Towe
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Trimble
Hand	Mills	Vail
Hardy	Mitchell	Vorys
Harless, Ariz.	Monroney	Vursell
Harness, Ind.	Morrison	Wadsworth
Harris	Morton	Weichel
Hart	Muhlenberg	Whitten
Harvey	Mundt	Wigglesworth
Hays	Murdock	Wilson, Tex.
Hébert	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Hedrick	Nicholson	Wolverton
Hendricks	Nixon	Woodruff
Hess	Nodar	Worley
Hill	Norblad	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—31

Bates, Ky.	Hartley	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.	Rivers
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Clevenger	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Clippinger	Kerr	Stigler
Coudert	Lane	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	Ludlow	West
Engle, Calif.	Mansfield	Whitaker
Gossett	Peden	Wilson, Ind.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser	Wood
Regan		

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Whitaker.

Mr. HART, Mr. SASSCER, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. BELL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANGELL, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. EBERHARTER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF TEMPORARY HOUSING

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5710) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 6, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 5. The Defense Homes Corporation is authorized to convey, without reimbursement therefor, to Howard University, a corporation organized pursuant to an act of Congress, all of its right, title, and interest in certain lands in the District of Columbia, together with the improvements constructed thereon and the personal property used in connection therewith, and commonly known as Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall, 1919 Third Street NW., and George Washington Carver Hall, 211 Elm Street NW.: *Provided*, That no employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia who, on the date of approval of this act, is a tenant of either Lucy Diggs Slowe Hall or George Washington Carver Hall shall, unless quarters were assigned to such tenant on a transient basis or on the sole basis that the tenant was enrolled at an educational institution be evicted from such halls within 4 years after the approval of this act, except where such tenant commits a nuisance or otherwise violates any obligation of tenancy.

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Defense Homes Corporation to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the Defense Homes Corporation's net investment in these properties as of the date of transfer, as determined by the President of the Defense Homes Corporation, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to discharge the indebtedness of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Treasury in like amount as of the same date.

"SEC. 6. The right, title, and interest in any lands, together with the improvements constructed thereon, which are conveyed pursuant to the authority granted by section 5 hereof, shall revert to the United States upon a written finding made by the President prior to July 1, 1963, that the property is needed by the United States in connection with a national defense emergency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr.

BROOKS] may be excused as a conferee on the bill, S. 2655.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] to fill the vacancy.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PROVIDING FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACTIVITIES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 418) to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) "An Act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance".

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "such interstate water and tributaries thereof", and insert the following words "surface and underground waters".

Page 9, line 11, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$200,000" and insert the figure "$250,000".

Page 11, line 25, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$20,000,000" and insert the figure "$22,500,000".

Page 12, line 25, of the amendment of the House, after the words "study of" insert the word "water", and strike out the word "of" after the word "pollution".

Page 13, line 1, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "interstate waters".

Page 13, line 2, of the amendment of the House, before the word "pollution" insert the word "water", and after the word "pollution" strike out the words "of interstate waters".

Page 14, line 17 through line 23, of the amendment of the House, strike out all after the words "SEC. 9. (a)" and insert the following: "Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b)."

And the House agree to the same.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
TOM PICKETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEO. W. MALONE,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The first two amendments apply to Sec. 2 (a), lines 4, 5, and 6, on page 18 of the bill. The language substituted more clearly defines the authority of the Surgeon General with respect to the preparation and adoption of comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of surface and underground waters.

The amendment to Sec. 5 (line 3, page 25), increases by $50,000 the maximum individual loan which may be made under the Act.

The amendment to Sec. 7 (line 16, page 27), increases by $2,500,000 the maximum authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Security Agency for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1953, for the purpose of making loans under Section 5 of the Act.

The purpose of the amendments to Sec. 8 (b) (lines 16, 17, and 18, page 28), is to expand the service of the Public Health Service station authorized to be erected at Cincinnati, Ohio, in connection with research and study of water pollution and the training of personnel in work related to control of water pollution.

The amendment with reference to Sec. 9 (a), (lines 10 to 16, page 30), substitutes a new Sec. 9 (a), which is required for the purpose set forth in the following letter:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, Zone 25, May 14, 1948.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to S. 418, which your Committee reported out, with amendments, on April 28, 1948.

Section 9 (a) of S. 418 as reported authorizes additional appointments to be made at higher grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service pursuant to section 208 (b) of the Public Health Service Act to assist the Service in carrying out its new or expanded activities under S. 418. Since our letter of January 19, 1948, to you on this bill, however, the Congress has enacted Public Law 425, which amends the provisions of the Public Health Service Act in several respects, primarily in the matter of appointment and promotion of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service. As a result of Public Law 425, the authority to make additional appointments at higher grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, formerly contained in section 208 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, is now contained in section 207 (b) of that Act, in a somewhat revised form. In order, therefore, to accomplish the purposes for which section 9 (a) of S. 418 was intended, the following is suggested in lieu of such section 9 (a):

(a) Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b).

The short time available for necessary action on the amendment suggested by this letter has not permitted us to obtain advice from the Bureau of the Budget as to the relationship of this amendment to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. DONALD KINGSLEY,
Acting Administrator.

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
TOM PICKETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 18

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3190) to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, following:

"13. Laws of States adopted for areas within Federal jurisdiction."

Insert:

"14. Applicability to Canal Zone."

Page 5, line 4, after "States" insert, ", except the Canal Zone."

Page 8, after line 15, insert:

"§ 14. Applicability to Canal Zone."

"In addition to the sections of this title which by their terms apply to and within the Canal Zone, the following sections of this title shall likewise apply to and within the Canal Zone: 6, 8, 11, 331, 371, 472, 474, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 488, 489, 490, 499, 502, 506, 594, 595, 598, 600, 601, 604, 605, 608, 611, 612, 703, 756, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 915, 917, 951, 953, 954, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 1017, 1073, 1301, 1364, 1382, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1546, 1584, 1621, 1622, 1761, 1821, 1914, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2199, 2231, 2234, 2235, 2274, 2275, 2277, 2384, 2385, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 3059, 3105, 3109."

Page 91, strike out

"610. Contributions by national banks or corporations."

And insert:

"610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations."

Page 104, strike out lines 4 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"§ 610. Contributions by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations

"It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political con-

vention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer or any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"For the purposes of this section 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

Page 117, line 8, strike out all after "receiver," down to and including "System," in line 15.

Page 118, line 18, strike out all after "care," down to and including "institution," in line 23.

Page 134, line 19, after "both" insert "; or if he negligently suffers such person to escape, he shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Page 158, after line 12, insert "While any foreign government is a member both of the International Monetary Fund and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, this section shall not apply to the sale or purchase of bonds, securities, or other obligations of such government or any political subdivision thereof or of any organization or association acting for or on behalf of such government or political subdivision, or to making of any loan to such government, political subdivision, organization, or association."

Page 367, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, and insert "The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States.

"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

Page 415, line 10, after "Zone," insert "District of Columbia."

Page 415, after line 17, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 416, after line 21, insert:

"Nothing in this title, anything therein to the contrary notwithstanding, shall in any way limit, supersede, or repeal any such rules heretofore prescribed by the Supreme Court."

Page 448, lines 24 and 25, strike out "the Revised Statutes (1 U. S. C., sec. 1)" and insert "Title 1 of the United States Code."

Page 456, strike out lines 3 to 21, inclusive.

Page 456, line 22, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 457, line 3, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 457, strike out lines 8 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 20. This act shall take effect September 1, 1948."

Page 457, line 16, strike out "22" and insert "21."

Page 463, about middle of page, strike out

[July 3	128	4, 5	40	755, 756	16	705, 706]

Page 467, below middle of page, strike out

[June 20	634	4	49	1556	16	705
Do	635	1, 2	49	1557	22	248]

and insert:

"June 20	635	1, 2	49	1557	22	248"

Page 470, after

"June 8	178	1, 2, 3	59	234, 235	18	241, 241a, 242"

insert:

"July 31	339	9	59	516	31	804b"

Page 471, at the end of the schedule of repeals on this page, insert:

"1947—						
Apr. 16	39		61	52	18	411
May 16	73		61	97	18	744h–1
June 21	111		61	134	18	244
June 23	120	304	61	159	2	251"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FREEDOM DAY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day, and ask for its immediate consideration. I have consulted with the leaders on both sides.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating the 1st day of February of each year as National Freedom Day for the purpose of commemorating the signing by President Abraham Lincoln, on February 1, 1865, of the joint resolution adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill which has been reached on the Consent Calendar today will authorize and request the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day and invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and thanksgiving. As you all know, on February 1, 1865, President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution, which had previously been adopted by the Congress, proposing the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution.

I should like to repeat for you at this time the immortal words of that amendment: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." These words are the foundation of our form of government with its emphasis on the freedom of the individual and the human liberties which belong to every citizen of the United States. It is therefore with pride in our free Nation that I introduced this resolution at the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Since that time I have been striving to obtain approval of the legislation.

I wish to thank the members of the Judiciary Committee and, in particular, the members of the subcommittee which handled the resolution, headed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], for the interest and cooperation they have displayed in reporting the legislation, also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

I should like to pause here to pay tribute to the founder of National Freedom Day, Maj. R. R. Wright. It is regrettable that Major Wright is not with us today to realize the fulfillment of his long years of hard work and inspiring efforts. Born in slavery, Major Wright rose to prominence as a great American and occupied an unequalled position in the hearts of his fellow Americans. The story of Major Wright is truly the story of America, for in no other country today is it possible for a citizen to achieve such outstanding success. His success, however, would not have occurred had the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution not been approved. Since its signing is one of the cornerstones in the foundation of our American traditions, I am proud that we have today passed the resolution commemorating its inception.

PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY OF GOVERNMENT HEADSTONES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4272) to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out all after "cemeteries," down to and including "costs." in line 14 and insert "The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized and directed to compile a list of the names of all members of the armed forces of the United States who died while serving in such forces in the overseas theaters of operations on or after September 3, 1939, and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea. Upon the compilation of such list of names and other appropriate data, the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Secretary of the Army are authorized and directed to provide for the inscribing of each such name and pertinent

data with respect to the individual on the wall of a chapel or other apppropriate memorial erected by the American Battle Monuments Commission or by the Department of the Army. In determining the particular chapel or other memorial on the wall of which any particular name shall be inscribed, the Commission and the Secretary shall follow the general rule of having the name inscribed upon the wall of that chapel or other memorial which is appropriate in view of the circumstances under which the deceased died in the service of his country."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3218) to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 10, insert:

"SEC. 2. The term 'unusual or emergency conditions,' as used in this act, shall be construed to mean canal bank failures, generator failures, damage to transmission lines; or other physical failures or damage, or acts of God, or of the public enemy, fires, floods, drought, epidemics, strikes, or freight embargoes, or conditions, causing or threatening to cause interruption in water or power service."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIDGE OVER DELAWARE RIVER

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6465) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935, be, and the same is hereby, amended and supplemented by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section or of any other Act of the Congress, the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey is hereby authorized (1) to fix and charge tolls for transit over any bridge heretofore or hereafter constructed by it across the Delaware River in accordance with the provisions of the original compact or agreement between said Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and said State of New Jersey which is set forth in section 9 of said Act approved August 30, 1935, as amended with the consent of Congress by the compact or supplemental agreement which is set forth in the Act approved August 4, 1947; and (2) to unite or group any such bridges into a single project for financing purposes and to continue to fix and adjust the tolls for the use of the bridges in such project and pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of said original compact or agreement as so amended: *Provided, however*, That the tolls for the use of any such bridge or the bridges in any such project may be applied by said Commission, if and to the extent permitted by its contract with the holders of its bonds, to the payment of all or part of the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls: *And provided further*, That after the cost of any such bridge or of the bridges in any such project shall be amortized, such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of tolls shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide funds not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge or bridges, and any bridge or bridges now operated by said Commission free of tolls."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 20, strike out the words "that the" and all of lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and lines 1 and 2 on page 3 through the word "further."

Page 3, line 5, after the word "tolls", strike out the remainder of the page.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3735, an act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see page 8937 of today's RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the provisions of H. R. 6263, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,—

TITLE I—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER

SEC. 1. This title may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within 4 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a-4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than one-half the members of the Board.

SEC. 10. The executive staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. The executive staff shall include a controller. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661).

SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

SEC. 13. Records, annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed. 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses.—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money profit, property, or benefits through any

transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine or not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation.

SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

SEC. 18. Effective date: This title shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1948.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW

SEC. 201. Section 8 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 50, sec. 938), is amended by striking out "before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "on or before December 31, 1950."

SEC. 202. Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 15, sec. 713a-8 (a)), is amended by striking out "the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, under the Government Corporation Control Act, no wholly Government-owned corporation is continued beyond June 30 of this year, unless it is incorporated as a Government corporation.

Under that law, the Commodity Credit Corporation would expire on June 30, 1948. The bill that is before the House reincorporates the Commodity Credit Corporation and continues the life of the Corporation in perpetuity. There is no limitation on the life of the Corporation contained in the law. However, each and every one of the functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation is limited in respect to the length of time in which that function may be administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The act provides for the creation of this Government-chartered Corporation with a board of five appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. Their terms are for 5 years. The Board appoints a chairman who presumably will be the Secretary of Agriculture.

A section of the bill provides that not more than a majority of the board shall be within the Department of Agriculture, so that there will be at least three members appointed independently of the Department of Agriculture, but, of course, within the executive establishment. We have created this Corporation within the executive establishment.

The Corporation has a capital of $100,000,000 with certain assurances and guaranties in the law that any impairment of this capital shall be restored by the Treasury under an authorization for an appropriation for that purpose.

The borrowing power of the Corporation is limited to the same amount as at present, $4,750,000,000.

I neglected to say that this is now a Delaware corporation.

As I have said, the Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency for the administration of certain very important functions. They come within the following classifications: The price-support program, the supply program, the foreign-purchase program, the commodity credit program, the loan program for agricultural conservation purposes; and, of course, the subsidy program which, although it was active during the war, is now in process of liquidation.

A few days ago we passed an agricultural-support program. Title 2 of the bill now under consideration provides for the continuance of the price-support program. One of the amendments I have offered is that title 2 of this bill be stricken because we have already legislated upon the same general subject. The above, I think, in principle, is the bill.

In substance and in summary, this bill continues the Delaware corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, as a federally chartered corporation, and we are assured that the programs which I have mentioned will be continued if the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued and if the Congress, of course, supports those programs.

I reiterate that although there is no limitation upon the life of the Corporation, there is a limitation upon the period in which each and every one of these programs may be administered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no objection to the passage of this bill.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has exercised a most useful function. It has been the means by which agricultural prices have been supported, and it has done a good job in that respect. Unless it is reincorporated under the Federal Corporations Act it will die on the 30th of this month. It is necessary to pass this legislation in order that its useful functions may continue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency through which price support and stabilization policies are effectuated.

The price-support bill, which we passed Saturday, is useless without the Commodity Credit Corporation as a vehicle to carry out the purpose of the support program.

This bill provides a permanent Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. This action by Congress is made necessary because of the provisions of the Government Corporations Control Act, enacted in 1945, which requires all Government corporations to obtain a Federal charter from Congress on or before June 30, 1948, in order to continue to function as Government corporations.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized pursuant to an Executive order of the President issued on October 16, 1933, and was incorporated as a Government corporation under the laws of Delaware. It has continued to function down to the present time under a Delaware charter that has been amended at various times. Congress, from time to time, also has enacted specific legislation governing the extent and character of its lending and price-support operations and providing various limitations and safeguards with respect to these operations of the Corporation.

For several years, I have advocated legislation to make permanent the setup of the Commodity Credit Corporation. For the reasons I have just given, it is

imperative that Congress act now to provide the Corporation with a Federal charter. I feel very strongly that in doing this, Congress should provide a permanent charter, and not deal with this matter on a temporary year-to-year basis or even on a 2- or 3-year basis.

At this point, it is important to distinguish clearly between the question of providing a permanent charter for the Corporation and the question of what levels and for what period of time the Corporation is to support farm prices. Regardless of whether price-support legislation is to be developed in a long-range farm program or whether a temporary extension of existing price support legislation for 1, 2, or 4 years is to be provided, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be needed permanently and it will need a permanent charter under which to operate.

The consuming public has a vital stake in maintaining the Commodity Credit Corporation and its successful functioning in carrying out the price-support functions and ever-normal granary features of the national farm program. Had it not been for the successful operations of the Corporation in carrying out these programs, food prices to consumers would be much higher than they are.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has, during the past 15 years, become a keystone of our over-all farm program. It has helped us establish and maintain fair prices and incomes for our farmers. It has assisted us in maintaining an adequate supply of foods, feed, and fiber—even during the war years, when many farmers found that manpower, machinery, fertilizer, and other production needs were scarce or nonexistent. It has given us flexible authority to meet emergency farm problems as they have arisen.

In view of the vital service the Corporation has rendered to American agriculture, I say that the Corporation should be continued as a Federal agency—a permanent Federal agency—with authority to move promptly and decisively.

The Corporation under the Delaware charter was authorized, among other things, to engage in buying, selling, lending, and other activities with respect to agricultural commodities. Those are broad powers. Congress, however, has kept a firm control over the Delaware Corporation and would continue to keep a firm control over the Federal Corporation. That is why Congress is faced today with two important questions with respect to the Corporation: First, should Congress grant a Federal charter, and, second, should that charter give the Corporation the authority it needs to deal decisively with farm problems. Of course, the answer is "Yes."

Unless Congress is going to repeal the basic agricultural laws, there will be a continuing need for the Corporation to operate. Therefore, it is just good common sense to provide a permanent charter for the Corporation. This will be reassuring to farmers. Some of the laws which require the use of the Corporation in order to effectuate congressional price-support policies are already permanent statutes, but without the Corporation to make good on these policies, the statutes would be of no value.

This does not mean that Congress from time to time cannot change the rules, powers, duties, and limitations under which the Corporation operates. The fact is, Congress has done this in the past by various statutes all during the period under which the Corporation has operated under a Delaware charter. Congress, of course, can revoke the proposed charter at any time it desires. Hence, there seems to be no valid reason why Congress should not provide a permanent charter for the Corporation.

It is also important to provide adequate powers with sufficient flexibility to enable the Corporation to carry out its statutory responsibilities. The Corporation is charged by law with providing mandatory commodity loans and price supports at various levels. It is vitally important that the Government be prepared to make good on its commitments to farmers in these basic statutes, if the confidence of farmers in the integrity of their Government is to be preserved. Therefore, the Corporation must be clothed with adequate powers to discharge these responsibilities effectively. The proposed charter is an improvement on the Delaware charter; its powers are not as sweeping in scope, but nevertheless they appear to be adequate and they are better defined than in the old charter.

This is one issue upon which farmers everywhere are united. They realize the vital necessity for continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which is the largest and most representative of the farm organizations and which represents more than one and one-quarter million farm families in 45 States and Puerto Rico, strongly urged a permanent charter for the Corporation. I fully agree with their views of this matter. It is vitally important that Congress act now so that farmers will be assured that their Government is not going to let them down.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the drive to destroy the rights of farmer cooperatives in the United States continues unabated. As in the past, the drive is spearheaded by an organization known as the National Tax Equality Association. It is being aided and abetted by other groups, including the National Associated Businessmen. Their latest move, Mr. Speaker, is the attempt which is now being made to stampede the resolution committees of the Democratic and Republican Parties for a proposed platform plank against farm cooperatives. They have undertaken a Nation-wide drive to obtain a million signatures in behalf of their mischievous program. A recent circular issued by the National Tax Equality Association illustrates the means they are using to obtain these signatures. It states in part as follows: "You will probably receive petitions sent out by other organizations. Use them. This is one case where duplication can be made to pay dividends—in more and more signatures." It looks like the National Tax Equality Association will be satisfied with all the petitions they can obtain even if some of them are duplicates. This should be ample warning to both major parties to scrutinize most carefully the petitions which will be presented to them.

Another tactic of the National Tax Equality Association is its attempt to smear the cooperatives as "Red" and "communistic." Nothing could be more ridiculous or further from the truth.

Farmer cooperatives are among the strongest foes of communism in any of its forms. Cooperatives are strongest in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and England, and in none of these countries has communism been able to gain the slightest foothold.

In the United States there are more than 5,000,000 members of farmers marketing and purchasing cooperatives, many farmers belonging to more than one association. Well over half of all the farmers in the United States are stanch members of cooperatives, and I have never heard of anyone but the National Tax Equality Association and its affiliates who has conceived that the American farmer was a Communist.

It is pertinent to inquire as to just who are these persons and these organizations who are spearheading the drive to strike at the very heart of the cooperative groups of farmers throughout the Nation. Who are these persons and organizations who would have the Republican and Democratic Parties repudiate the major contributions that farmer cooperatives have made in bringing health and prosperity to American agriculture and thereby to our whole Nation?

What are the selfish motives of those persons and individuals who would have us forget the prostrate condition of American agriculture only a few short years ago and the success of farmer cooperatives in making our system of free enterprise work on American farms?

The full story of the identity and financing of this giant anticooperative endeavor is not known to the public because of the conscious effort of its sponsors to obscure it. I do know that the parent organization organized in 1943 with the demonstrated objective of crushing the successful operation of farm cooperatives is the National Tax Equality Association, with headquarters in Chicago, Ill. I do know that Mr. Ben C. McCabe, chairman of the board and formerly president, attempted to hide the true nature of the NTEA when he told the House Ways and Means Committee on November 25, 1947, that:

> NTEA is devoted solely to research and educational activities and no deviation from these limitations is permitted either by the association's charter or by vote of its board of directors.

In order to try to retain its professed character of a research and educational organization, the NTEA has sponsored other organizations through which to channel to the public and to the Congress its propaganda advocating the overthrow of co-ops.

Up to about the first of this year, the NTEA had the United States Business Organizations, Inc., as its Washington agent to carry the frontal attack against

cooperatives. Karl S. Dixon, as executive vice president of the United States Business Organizations, was the $12,000-a-year man until a few months ago in Washington spearheading the drive against cooperatives. Now I understand Dixon is back in Chicago and, as vice president of the National Tax Equality Association, is taking an active part in contacting trade associations, chambers of commerce, business firms, and private individuals to get signatures to the anti-cooperative petition for presentation at the Republican and Democratic Conventions.

Is not this sufficient to indicate that NTEA has departed far from the research and educational activities professed by Mr. Ben McCabe?

Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, conducted extensive hearings during 1945 and 1946 on the subject of cooperatives. On page 42 of the report submitted to the Congress by the committee on April 9, 1946, we made the following findings and recommendations:

> There is substantial evidence to show that the cooperative movement operates as a very successful means of combating monopolistic concentrations and, as such, is a very healthy addition to the American economy.
>
> There is no evidence to show that cooperatives have been granted a type of preferential financial treatment by the Federal Government that has not likewise been made available to and accepted by other forms of business enterprise, including banks, savings and loan societies, manufacturers, distributors, and other types of private enterprise operating for the principal purpose of making profits. An examination of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other Federal financing agencies gives proof that thousands of private firms operating for profit have sought and enjoyed the benefits of such agencies' financial assistance in a manner comparable to that received by cooperatives from the Farm Credit Administration and its allied financing groups.

In 1947 the same committee conducted further hearings on this subject. During the course of these hearings, a request was made on August 22, 1947, by the gentleman from Texas, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, a member of the committee, for the National Tax Equality Association to submit a complete statement of its receipts, contributions, and disbursements for the past 2 years. The gentleman from Texas, Representative PATMAN, pointed out that certain cooperatives had been asked by the committee to submit their full records and that every one of them had fully complied with the request. Although this information was requested of the National Tax Equality Association, to date they have failed to submit to the committee any of the information called for in the hearings.

A recent estimate made after a survey of the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives shows that almost a million dollars a year is being spent by the National Tax Equality Association and its affiliates. Yet we have no record of who is contributing these vast sums of money to destroy farmer cooperatives. I think that it is time we find out who is behind this campaign.

Farmers in my own district in Washington have grown tired of the baseless charges which have been leveled at them during the past 4 years by such organizations as the National Tax Equality Association and the National Associated Businessmen. Farmer cooperatives pay all the local, State, and Federal taxes which are paid by other businesses which operate in the same manner. Cooperatives pay property taxes, sales taxes, social-security taxes, stamp taxes, and income taxes if they make any profits. Members of farmer cooperatives pay a tax on every cent of income which comes to them from patronage refunds paid by their own associations. Cooperatives are taxed in exactly the same manner as are partnerships and individual businesses.

I would like to remind the leaders of both political parties that the farmers of this Nation will not stand by and permit the representatives of organized greed and wealth to deny them their right to organize and operate their own farm business enterprises. From the depths of economic depressions and personal hardships, the farmers of this Nation have built their own cooperative organizations to insure to themselves and their families the just financial returns from their toil and labors.

I am sure that the millions of farmers of this Nation will not allow a selfish few to destroy the cooperatives which farmers have struggled to build up over a quarter of a century.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we witness in the consideration of this bill the Congress legislating in accordance with the rules of both branches, and with the intent of Congress to get legislation enacted into law as quickly as possible. We have a situation here where a bill has passed the other body and the House committee has reported out a bill. If the House bill was brought up and passed, it would go over to the Senate, and we will have the situation of a bill passing the Senate over in the House and a bill passing the House over in the Senate, and no final action taken. In order to expedite legislative procedure and to get legislation enacted into law, where there is a sincere purpose to legislate, where a bill has passed one body and the other body has reported out a bill from the committee, the proper thing to do is to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute the bill of the body in which the bill is pending, in this case the Senate bill pending in the House, with the House passing the committee differences between the two bills. That means that there is complete legislative action to its final conclusion. When that is done the bill goes back to the Senate, and the Senate can agree to the House amendments insofar as there is a disagreement between the Senate bill and the bill as it passed this body. It goes back as a Senate bill with the House bill including all after the enacting clause. If the Senate decides not to concur, then they can ask for a conference, and after the conferees have discussed the matter, a conference report is brought in. If, in the first place, the Senate agrees to the House action, that is the end of it, and the bill, after engrossment and final action and signature by the presiding officers of both bodies, goes to the President. The same happens after a conference report is agreed to by both branches.

We are now witnessing the regular way of legislating, where there is a sincere desire to legislate. As to the housing bill, I am wondering if my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is going to take the same course. The housing bill will come up soon. There is a Senate bill now on the Speaker's table. I wonder if my good friend from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is going to, when he moves to suspend the rules, take the Senate bill and strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House bill, whichever one he is going to propose, and I assume it is the last bill he reported out.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman should know, for the very simple reason that there is no Senate bill at the Speaker's table.

Mr. MCCORMACK. There is a Senate bill over here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is in committee.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is immaterial. It does not have to be on the Speaker's table. The bill has passed the other body. The Speaker could recognize to suspend the rules. It would not have to be reported out of committee. The bill is in committee, but it has passed the other body, so that is immaterial. The gentleman could move to suspend the rules and call up the Senate bill, and then strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House bill. That would be the orderly way, just as he is doing now. May I ask my friend from Michigan if it is the intention to do so?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is not the intention to do so.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That being so, it is not the intention of the Republicans, as far as the House is concerned, to have any real housing legislation enacted in this session of Congress, because if they did intend to do so, they would take up the Senate bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the House bill, and then it would immediately go to conference. If they did that, then we would support it in order to get it into conference. The frank answer of my friend from Michigan is, again, what I said yesterday, a powerful message to the people of the country that everything that President Truman has been saying on his trip West about the Republican-controlled Congress is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that this bill is being brought up under suspension of rules which does not permit amendment. This is a very important measure. The Commodity

Credit Corporation furnishes the machinery through which the price-support programs on agricultural commodities are carried out. Without the Commodity Credit Corporation, it would be impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the mandate of Congress that prices on certain agricultural commodities be supported.

There are two very serious defects in the bill as it now stands. One of them is that the bill prohibits the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein except the rental of office space. The bill also contains a provision reading as follows:

In the Corporation's leasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

These provisions which severely restrict the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation would, in my opinion, make it very difficult for the agency to carry out the duties imposed on it by law. However, I shall not detain the House with a detailed discussion of these points because my time is limited and this particular matter will be discussed by the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] a little later in this debate.

The provisions of this bill to which I particularly wish to call attention and to discuss in some detail are those which provide for setting up the Board. Section 9 of the bill provides that the Board of Directors shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be the Secretary of Agriculture or his nominee, and the remaining four to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than one-half of the members of the Board could be employees of the Corporation or any Department or agency of the Government. The Secretary of Agriculture is divested of the authority which he has previously had, of general supervision of the Corporation.

This means that three members of the Board of Directors must be appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Government, and that the control of the operations of the Corporation would be in the hands of the appointed members. What would occur under those circumstances is that, while the Secretary of Agriculture would have the responsibility for carrying out the provisions of law relating to support prices, under the terms of this bill he would lack the authority to do so effectively. It would simply be another case of what we already have too much of in the Federal Government—that is divided authority. Under the arrangement provided in this bill the Board could, if it desired, adopt policies and carry out programs to which the Secretary was opposed. Congress and the President would have to look to both the Board of Directors of the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the Congress does not give the Secretary of Agriculture full power over this board, how can we hold the Secretary of Agriculture to account for the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOPE. There is no way that we can do so.

The principal purpose in putting the Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture, where it has been since 1939, was to get away from the division of authority and to assure that the activities of the Department and those of the Commodity Credit Corporation which are so closely related, would be coordinated and integrated.

At present the officers of the Commodity Credit Corporation are officials of the Department of Agriculture who are also in charge of departmental programs relating to the production and marketing of agricultural commodities. The programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation are necessarily closely related to the others of the Department of Agriculture. They are tied in with programs which involve section 32 funds. Price supports are tied in closely with production goals. The programs of the Corporation at the State and county levels are carried on largely through committees of farmers who are also responsible for other departmental activities. If the Corporation were under the control of a separate Board which had no knowledge of these activities and no part in them, there would without question be a tremendous amount of overlapping and confusion, and there would always be the possibility of conflicting programs.

Another factor which, it seems to me, should be taken into consideration is that there is no way by which members of the Board appointed from outside the Department of Agriculture could devote full time to the affairs of the Corporation. I mean by that that there is no necessity for full-time directors to pass on the matters which would ordinarily come before the Board.

It would be expected, I presume, that the members of the Board would be men who were acquainted with and experienced in the buying and selling of agricultural products. There is nothing in the bill which requires that they divest themselves of outside interests in those activities before becoming members of the Board. I believe that most men who are qualified for a position on the Board would not feel that they could afford to divest themselves of conflicting private interests. If they did not do so, they and the Board would certainly be subject to criticism. Thus, in practical operation, it would probably turn out that members of the Board will be those with conflicting private interests or persons without adequate experience to conduct such important business activities.

The provisions of this bill to which I have alluded are matters of deep concern to farmers everywhere. Some of our leading farm organizations have gone on record as being greatly disturbed by the provisions now contained in this bill. I have here in my hand a letter from Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, reading as follows:

JUNE 15, 1948.

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: We sincerely hope the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be amended to eliminate the divided responsibility under which the Secretary is charged with the duty for supporting commodity prices, but with means for carrying out this duty under the control of a board not responsible to him. We believe that the bill should also be amended to eliminate those sections which would channel all operations through the grain trade who might easily wreck the Corporation's essential stabilization operations or make them prohibitively expensive.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

I also have the following telegram from Mr. John J. Riggle, assistant secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives:

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives:

Urge that H. R. 6263, Commodity Credit Corporation bill, be amended to eliminate divided authority between Secretary of Agriculture to support farm prices and handle surplus and the independent Board to direct affairs of Corporation, and to provide for Corporation to own real and personal property necessary to handle surpluses of farm products which normal channels of trade do not handle at or above support levels.

JOHN J. RIGGLE,
Assistant Secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has stated its position in the following wire, signed by Roger W. Fleming, director of its Washington office:

Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE:
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge support amendment to H. R. 6263, Federal charter CCC, eliminating restrictive grain-trade provisions, and substituting language requiring CCC, in buying, selling, and other operations, to use normal trade channels insofar as practicable. Because of congressional mandates on loans, price support and other operations control of Corporation should be left with Secretary of Agriculture.

ROGER W. FLEMING,
Director, Washington Office, American Farm Bureau Federation.

If this bill had been brought up under such circumstances that amendments were permitted, I would offer the following amendments, which, if adopted, would cure the serious defects to which I have referred:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "its Board of Directors" and insert in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as 'Secretary')."

Page 8, line 12, strike out section 9 in its entirety and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Directors: (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), subject to the general direction and control of the Secretary, who shall be a director and serve as Chairman of the Board. The

Board shall consist of four members (in addition to the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum and shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of 1 year, and one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, and one at the end of 4 years, after the date of enactment of this act. In addition to their duties as members of the Board, such appointed members shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum, except that any such member who holds another office or position under the Department of Agriculture, the compensation for which exceeds such rate, may elect to receive compensation at the rate provided for such other office or position in lieu of the compensation provided by this section.

"(b) Vacancies in the Board, whether arising from failure of the President to nominate or the Senate to confirm the original or subsequent members of the Board, so long as there shall be four members in office, shall not impair the powers of the Board to execute the functions of the Corporation, and a majority of the members in office shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the Board."

Page 9, line 13, strike out section 10 in its entirety and substitute the following:

"SEC. 10. Personnel of Corporation: The Secretary shall appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as he may determine, require that such of them as he may designate be bonded, and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661)."

Since it is not possible under this procedure to offer amendments, I have inserted them in the RECORD, with the hope that when this bill goes to conference, the conferees may agree upon provisions which are substantially the same as those contained in the amendments above-quoted.

As indicated in the beginning of my remarks, I regard this matter as one of the greatest importance to the agricultural producers of this country.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. Because of the unusual parliamentary situation, has the gentleman from Kansas any information as to how these matters may be handled in conference if this bill is passed by this body?

Mr HOPE. We have a Senate bill, and I understand that the Senate bill will be substituted for this bill, and that everything after the enacting clause will be stricken out of the Senate bill, and the subject matter of the House bill inserted. That would get the bill into conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree 100 percent with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had to say about the divided authority which is created by the provisions of this particular bill. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, regardless of who is Secretary of Agriculture, if we in Congress want to hold that official responsible for Commodity Credits operations, we must give to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to make decisions. I sincerely trust, as Mr. Hope has stated, that this subject will be considered in confidence.

There is another defect in this particular bill. If you will turn to Section 5 of H. R. 6263, you will see a mandatory provision there in which it is required that practically all operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in regard to the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities shall utilize—note the word "shall"—the customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

What does that amendment mean? May I say first that the gentleman from Michigan has very kindly agreed that an amendment will be placed in this particular paragraph after the word "shall", which will not make this particular section mandatory. But under this particular section if left in the bill as it is, the Commodity Credit Corporation alone with other things could not purchase commodities directly from producers. It could not sell commodities directly to farmers. It could not extend the price support to farmers through purchases in areas where dealers are not willing to participate in the program. Frankly it would render ineffective entirely the great sealing program that we have had in effect throughout the Middle West in corn especially and other grains.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan and the committee for their willingness to accept this amendment, which will not make this section workable.

I am also disturbed about page 24, line 22. The language as written there practically says to the Commodity Credit Corporation: "You cannot utilize the 22,000 or more small steel-grain bins which you have had as extra storage space. We can plainly see that in case of a glut on the railroads or in the terminal markets the present language would mean that it would be practically impossible to carry out a grain-sealing program. Here, again, I am glad that the gentleman has agreed to an amendment, which does not go as far as I would like to see it, but nevertheless it does help a great deal. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has been very helpful in getting the matter adjusted.

Will the gentleman state what, in his opinion, his particular amendment to that section on page 4, line 22, would do? Would it assure the right of the Commodity Credit Corporation to own personal property? There is no such definite assurance in the bill. I would like a definite assurance that the Corporation can own these 20,000, or more, steel tanks, if needed, to carry out its functions as the vehicle for price-support programs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I am in a position to assure the gentleman—surely, I would state it is my understanding—that there is no limitation upon the amount of personal property which the Corporation may own. There is a limitation which applies only to leases and real estate, and, as the gentleman says, they will be authorized under this amendment to continue existing leases.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this is another measure to guarantee continued high prices and high cost of living.

I read two of the specific powers granted the Corporation as set forth on page 6 (a): "Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations." Then, having bought the commodities, subsection (d) permits the Corporation to "remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities." It buys the commodities in section (a), and pours kerosene on them in section (d).

Members who want a continuation of the high cost of living should vote in favor of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1322, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 107, noes 13.

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING ACT OF 1948

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 101. (a) Section 1 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever appearing in said section and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

(b) Section 2 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended:

(1) by striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000";

(2) by striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) by striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure in order to provide additional housing accommodations for two or more families:".

(4) by amending the last sentence of subsection (b) to read as follows: "The Administrator is authorized to prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to veterans of World War II and their immediate families occupancy priority with respect to any additional housing accommodations referred to in the first proviso of this subsection."

(c) Section 5 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Administrator shall make an annual report to the Congress not later than the 1st day of April in each year of his activities during the preceding calendar year under this title and titles II, III, VI, and VII of this act."

TITLE II—DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED PERMANENT WAR-HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(2) The term "Lanham War Housing Act" means the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

(3) The term "war housing" means any interest, owned by the United States and under the control of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in (A) housing (other than temporary housing) acquired or constructed under the Lanham War Housing Act, under the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public, No. 781, 76th Cong.), as amended, under the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public Law 9, 77th Cong.), or under the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 375, 78th Cong.), and (B) such other property as is determined by the Administrator to be essential to the use of such housing.

(4) The term "veteran" means (A) any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, or (B), during the present war, any person in the active military or naval service of the United States.

(5) The term "dwelling" means a war-housing building designed for residential use of one or more families.

(6) The term "dwelling unit" means a dwelling, or that part of a dwelling, which is designed for residential use of one family.

SALE OF WAR HOUSING

SEC. 202. (a) All war housing (except mortgages, liens, or other interests as security) shall, subject to the provisions of this title, be sold for cash as expeditiously as possible and not later than December 31, 1949. Wherever practicable each dwelling in a war housing project shall be offered for sale separately from other dwellings in such project. Any mortgage, lien, or other interest in war housing held by the Administrator or acquired by him pursuant to a contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, may, subject to the provisions of this section, be sold for cash.

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the price to be paid for war housing sold under this title shall be a price not less than the reasonable value thereof at the time of the offer for sale as determined by appraisal made by an appraiser or appraisers designated by the Federal Housing Commissioner.

(2) The price to be paid for any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security sold under this section shall be a price not less than the unpaid principal (plus accrued interest thereon) of the obligation with respect to which the mortgage, lien, or other interest as security is held.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (a) and (b), the sale of war housing under this title shall be with or without warranty and upon such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems proper.

TRANSFER OF WAR HOUSING TO THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 203. Notwithstanding the provisions of this title or any other provision of law, the Administrator may, in his discretion, transfer to the jurisdiction of the appropriate department in the National Military Establishment any war housing situated within the proximate vicinity of any permanent Army, Navy, or Air Force Establishment if the transfer of such war housing was requested on or before April 15, 1947, by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

PREFERENCES

SEC. 204. (a) Preference in the purchase of any dwelling designed for occupancy by less than five families shall be granted to veterans and their families and to occupants over other prospective purchasers of such dwelling in the following order:

(1) A veteran and his family who occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold.

(2) A veteran and his family who do not occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold but who intend to occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be purchased; but if the dwelling is designed for occupancy by two, three, or four families, equal preference shall be granted to a private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans and their families who intend to occupy the dwelling purchased by such corporation, associations, or society.

(3) A nonveteran who occupies a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold.

(b) In the case of any war housing project where it is not practicable to offer each dwelling for sale separately from other dwellings in the project and in the case of any dwelling designed for occupancy by more than four families, preference in the purchase thereof shall be granted to any private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the war housing purchased by such corporation, association, or society.

(c) The Administrator shall give such notice in such manner as he deems reasonable to enable prospective purchasers who have a preference under this section in the purchase of war housing to exercise such preference. Any prospective purchaser having a preference under subsection (a) in the purchase of any dwelling may apply for the purchase of such dwelling (1) if the preference is under paragraph (1), within 30 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale, (2) if the preference is under paragraph (2), within 60 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale, and (3) if the preference is under paragraph (3), within 90 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale. Any corporation, association, or society having a preference under subsection (b) in the purchase of any war housing may apply for the purchase of such housing within 180 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale.

SALES WITHOUT PREFERENCE

SEC. 205. If any dwelling or war housing project is not sold to a purchaser who is granted a preference under section 204 and who applied within the time prescribed in subsection (c) of such section, such dwelling or war housing project shall be sold as provided in this title without regard to any preferences granted under section 204 and without regard to any restrictions contained in any other law as to whom war housing may be sold.

TITLE OF PURCHASER

SEC. 206. A deed or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the Administrator purporting to transfer title or any other interest in property under this title shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this title insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers for value is concerned.

VALIDITY OF CONTRACTS

SEC. 207. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to impair or modify any contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, for the sale of property, or any term or provision of any such contract, without the consent of the purchaser or his assignee, if the contract or the term or provision thereof is otherwise valid.

DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS

SEC. 208. Moneys derived by the Administrator from the disposition of war housing under this title shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 301. Title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"CREATION AND POWERS OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 301. (a) The Administrator is further authorized and empowered to provide for the establishment of a Federal National Mortgage Association (hereinafter referred to as the 'association') which shall be authorized, subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Association—

"(1) to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, which are insured after June 19, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided, however,* That—

"(A) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by Federal, State, or municipal instrumentalities;

"(B) no mortgage may be purchased for an amount exceeding 98 percent of the unpaid principal balance thereof, plus accrued interest, at the time of purchase;

"(C) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan;

"(D) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase unless offered by the original mortgagee prior to any other sale thereof;

"(E) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by any one mortgagee (1) if dated prior to June 19, 1948, and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all such mortgages purchased by the Association from such mortgagee, exceeds 25 percent of the original principal amount of all such mortgage loans made by such mortgagee after June 19, 1948.

"(2) to borrow money for any of the foregoing purposes through the issuance of notes or other such obligations as hereinafter provided.

"(b) the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and established pursuant to the provisions of this title as in effect prior to June 1, 1948, shall be the Association referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Board of Directors of the Association shall consist of not less than five persons to be appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Acting Chairman in the case of a vacancy in the office of Chairman, from the Directors, officers, or employees of such Corporation, and the officers shall be appointed by the Board of Directors from the Directors, officers, or employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(c) The Association created under this section shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by order of the Administrator as hereinafter provided, or by act of Congress, and shall have power—

"(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) to make contracts;

"(3) to sue and be sued; complain and defend, in any court of law or equity, State or Federal;

"(4) to conduct its business in any State of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, and to have one or more offices in such State, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, one of which offices shall be designated at the time of organization as its principal office;

"(5, to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(d) The Association shall have a capital stock of $20,000,000 and paid-in surplus of $1,000,000, subscribed in full by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(e) The Association, for the purpose of al. actions by or against it, real, personal, or mixed, and all suits in equity, shall be deemed a citizen of the place in which its principal office is located.

"(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation, except the Association organized under this section, shall hereafter use the words 'Federal National Mortgage Association' or any combination of such words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days, or both, for each day during which such violation is committed cr repeated. The provisions of section 5243 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the Association created under this title.

"OBLIGATIONS

"SEC. 302. The Association is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time notes cr other obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed (1) 40 times the amount of its capital and surplus, and in no event to exceed (2) the current unpaid principal of mortgages held by it and insured under the provisions of titles II and VI of this act and guaranteed under section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, plus the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit and the amortized value of its investments in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 303. Moneys of the Association not invested in first mortgages or in operating facilities shall be kept in cash on hand or on deposit, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that the Association shall keep and maintain such reserves as it may deem necessary.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 304. The Association, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, mortgage loans, income, and stock, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Association shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

"SEC. 305. The Association shall have power to deal with, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash, with a view to assuring a maximum financial return to the Association, any property acquired by it as a result of foreclosure proceedings or otherwise.

"LIQUIDATION

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall have power to terminate the existence of the Association and order its liquidation and the winding up of its affairs whenever the Administrator determines, in his judgment, that the need therefor no longer exists. The Association shall make a report of its activities to the Administrator in January .nd July of each year for the preceding 6 months' period, which report shall be transmitted to the Congress, together with the Administrator's recommendations thereon."

SEC. 302. Nothing in the amendment made by section 301 of this act shall limit the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to service or sell any mortgage purchased prior to the date of the enactment of this act, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgage with respect to which a commitment to purchase was made prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

TITLE IV—TAX INCENTIVE FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL RENTAL HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

SEC. 401. (a) The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 124 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 124A. Amortization Deduction for Rental Housing.

"(a) General rule: Every taxpayer, at his election, shall be entitled to an amorization deduction for a period of 60 months with respect to any necessary rental housing facility defined in subsection (d). Such amortization deduction shall be an amount, with respect to each month of such period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of the facility at the end of such month divided by 60 plus the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the 60-month period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 23 (l) (relating to exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence), but shall be allowable only if a deduction under section 23 (l) would otherwise be allowable for such month with respect to such facility. The amortization deduction shall be allowable only to the taxpayer to whom a certificate is issued under subsection (e) with respect to such facility; and, if such certificate is revoked by the Federal Housing Commissioner for any violation of the conditions and specifications contained therein, the deduction shall not be allowable for any month ending after a violation upon which such revocation is based. The 60-month period shall begin as to any such facility at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year.

"(b) Election of amortization: The election of the taxpayer to take the amortization deductions and to begin the 60-month period with the month following the month in which the facility was completed shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for the taxable year in which the facility was completed. The election to take the amortization deduction and to begin such period with the taxable year succeeding such year shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for such succeeding taxable year.

"(c) Termination of amortization deduction: A taxpayer which has elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) may, at any time after making such election, discontinue the amortization deductions with respect to the remainder of the amortization period, such discontinuance to begin as of the beginning of any month specified by the taxpayer in a notice in writing filed with the Commissioner before the beginning of such month. The deduction provided under section 23 (l) shall be allowed, beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction is not applicable, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deductions with respect to such facility.

"(d) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'necessary rental housing facility' means any rental housing facility with respect to which a certificate under subsection (e) is issued to the taxpayer.

"(2) The term 'rental housing facility' means—

"(A) any dwelling unit or units held by the taxpayer for rental purposes, the construction of which is begun at any time on or after July 1, 1948, and before the close of July 1, 1950; or

"(B) any dwelling unit or units held by the taxpayer for rental purposes provided by the alteration or remodeling of an existing structure if such alteration or remodeling is begun at any time on or after July 1, 1948, and before the close of July 1, 1950, and if such dwelling unit or units are in addition to the number of dwelling units contained in such structure prior to such alteration or remodeling.

"(3) The term 'dwelling unit' means any dwelling unit containing its own kitchen and bath facilities.

"(4) The adjusted basis of any necessary rental housing facility shall include only so much of the amount otherwise constituting such adjusted basis as is properly attributable to the construction, or to the alteration or remodeling, covered in the certificate issued under subsection (e). In no event shall the basis of the land on which such facility is located be included in such adjusted basis.

"(e) Issuance of certificate: (1) The Federal Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized to certify as necessary any rental housing facility (A) which is or will be located in an area in which he finds there is a shortage of rental housing and (B) in which the dwelling units are or will be of such character and will be rented at such rentals as will, in his judgment, tend to relieve such shortage. Such Commissioner is authorized, upon any violation of the conditions and specifications contained in a certificate issued by him, to revoke such certificate.

"(2) An application for such certificate shall be filed with the Federal Housing Commissioner prior to the commencement of the construction, or alteration or remodeling, of the rental housing facility, and such certificate shall be issued only to the person filing such application.

"(3) The Federal Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized, from time to time, to prescribe forms and regulations with respect to such certificates.

"(f) Life tenant and remainderman: In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowable to the life tenant."

(b) Section 23 (t) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(t) Amortization deduction: The deduction for amortization provided in sections 124 and 124A."

(c) Section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out "of emergency facilities."

(d) Section 190 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "emergency facilities" the following: "or necessary rental housing facilities."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 2. Section 3403 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The tax imposed by subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of trailer coaches of the housing type (including parts or accessories therefor sold on or in connection therewith or with the sale thereof) sold prior to July 1, 1950, and after the close of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this subsection."

TITLE V—GI HOME LOAN INCONTESTABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 501. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 601. (a) Section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,950,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,950,000,000";

(2) by striking out "April 30, 1948" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1949";

(3) by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding a comma and the following: "and that, of the total authorization provided in this subsection, not less than $800,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on rental properties under section 608, and not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available for the insurance of mortgages on multifamily dwellings under section 603, on which commitments for insurance are issued subsequent to March 31, 1948."

(b) Section 603 (b) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting "unless insured under paragraph (2a) of this subsection," before "involve" in paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(2a) if insured under this paragraph, involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 95 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That mortgages shall be insured under this paragraph only if the Administrator determines that such insurance of mortgages would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property in cash or its equivalent, at least 5 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value of the property, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the value of the property;".

(c) Section 603 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) of this subsection or not to exceed 30 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2a) of this subsection".

(d) Section 603 (b) (5) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(5) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any one time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it."

(e) Section 603 (c) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out in the next to the last sentence the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

SEC. 602. Section 604 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: "*Provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 603 (b) (2a) or under the third proviso of section 608 (b) (3) (B) there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator, on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator, an amount not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75, whichever is the greater:".

SEC. 603. (a) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located: *And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph (B), a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members, may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed and not exceeding 95 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the project on the basis of the cost prevailing on December 31, 1947, for projects of comparable quality in the locality where such project is to be located; and".

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided*, That the Administrator may increase this amount to $9,100 where in his discretion cost levels so require."

(c) The next to the last sentence of section 608 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The mortgage shall provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it."

SEC. 604. Section 609 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended:

(a) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted, or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (1) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses."

(b) By striking out all of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loans, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums

payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower. The loan shall have a maturity not in excess of 1 year from the date of the note, except that any such loan may be refinanced and extended in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe for an additional term not to exceed 1 year, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum (or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that special circumstances demand it) on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time."

(c) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(d) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum (or in excess of 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that special circumstances demand it); nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under section (h) of this section, such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(j) To further carry out the purposes referred to in subsection (a) the Administrator is authorized to insure loans to finance the manufacture of housing equipment used on the job site in the actual construction of housing (including advances on such loans) in the same manner and under the same conditions applicable with respect to loans eligible for insurance under subsection (b): *Provided*, That to the extent the proceeds of the loan are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery.

"The other provisions of this section insofar as they are applicable shall apply in like respect and effect to loans insured under this subsection."

SEC. 605. Section 610 of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, including projects known as Greenhills, Ohio, Greenbelt, Md., and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

SEC. 606. Title VI of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than twenty-five families consisting of a group of single-family or two-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve; and

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows:

"(i) $8,100 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling, and

"(ii) $12,500 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each two-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof; and

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed 5 percent per annum if the Administrator finds that in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE VII—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 701. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this Act by a special system for insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insurance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the 'insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ percent per annum, on such outstanding investment as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate

amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued interest: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary, in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intention so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Housing Investment Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the

Housing Investment Insurance Fund, to pay out of said Fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a Housing Investment Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such Housing Investment Insurance Fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the Housing Investment Insurance Fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor of books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of two or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) of an investor, designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of twelve consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of twelve consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first twelve consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real-estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real

property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 801. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000."

SEC. 802. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(h) The Corporation may subscribe for the nonassessable stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association: *Provided*, That the total face amount of stock so subscribed for and held by the Corporation shall not exceed at any one time $20,000,000."

SEC. 803. The import duties imposed under paragraph 405 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on plywood shall not apply with respect to imports entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of enactment of this act and ending with the close of June 30, 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Obviously, no quorum is present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Andrews, N. Y.	Keefe	Robertson
Brown, Ohio	Kerr	Simpson, Pa.
Case, S. Dak.	Lane	Smith, Maine
Celler	Ludlow	Stigler
Clippinger	Macy	Taber
Dawson, Ill.	Morton	Thomas, N. J.
Engel, Mich.	O'Toole	West
Hartley	Peden	Wigglesworth
Havenner	Powell	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Ind.	Preston	Wood
Johnson, Okla.	Regan	
Johnson, Tex.	Rivers	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a highly controversial measure. The interesting thing about this particular legislation which is presented to the House, is that the controversy concerning the measure is not what is in the bill but that which is not included in the bill. The bill which is presented to the House today is a housing measure, supported and passed by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, and establishes procedure to alleviate the critical housing shortage which exists in America today.

Those portions of the bill which have been eliminated are the controversial sections of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. So the bill is presented today on the issue whether or not the bill shall be passed by the House, or whether or not it shall be defeated because the so-called controversial issues in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill are not included therein.

In order that we may understand the issue more clearly, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill contained three main segments. The first segment was in general provisions which are in this bill today. Those had to do with the expansion of credit and the establishment of devices to assist the construction of homes for veterans and others in the country who are in need of housing.

The second provision is the slum-clearance provision, which is controversial. But the most highly controversial provision of the legislation, of course, is the public-housing feature.

The issue which has been presented by the proponents of the public housing feature of this bill is this: They say, first, there is a critical housing shortage in the country today, and, secondly, that we need housing for the poor of the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is my point that this bill, so far as the public housing feature is concerned, does neither. It neither takes care of the critical housing feature nor does it house the poor. Of course, as the gentleman from Louisiana said yesterday, the bill does have the support of a great many organizations.

I sat upon the committe day after day and week after week, listening to the testimony of people representing these organizations. They came before our committee and said, "There is a critical housing shortage in America today. There are people living in conditions which are not safe or sanitary. Therefore, we should alleviate that condition."

So what? So we should pass the public housing measure.

I want, in my brief time, to analyze that particular position. The real issue, as I see it, is not whether there are poor people in the country who require housing. The real issue is not whether there are slums in the country which should be cleared and rebuilt. The real issue is the method by which these things may be done. That, Mr. Speaker, is the issue which I challenge the proponents of the public housing bill to talk about today. Not talk about the fact that we have poor people in the country who should be helped; not talk about the critical housing shortage, but talk about the method by which they say we should approach this particular problem.

What is that method? There are a large number of families whose average income is $150 per month. The question is, Shall the Government build homes for a select few of those people, and then pay a portion of their rent? That is the real issue in connection with the public housing feature of this program.

I oppose the public housing program because I believe it is discriminatory. I believe it grants a privilege to a select people in the country.

The program suggested by the public housing proponents provides a discrimination as to areas within the United States. How does it provide for discrimination as to areas? Let us look at the record and see what has happened under the program as it has been conducted in the past. As you know, there are a number of housing programs in existence. Four States, for instance, in the United States, have the most housing units in the country. It is rather interesting to note of two out of the four States one is Texas and the other is Florida.

The State of Missouri, with two great industrial cities, has no housing units. Fifteen States have no public housing units. Miami, the playground of the rich, stands high in the number of housing units in any city. Peoria has almost twice as many as has Chicago.

Thus, we see the helter-skelter discriminatory distribution of public housing. Why is it that the people of St. Louis who are in exactly the same circumstances as the people of Miami, are not treated with the same consideration? It is because of the administration and method of distribution provided for in the public-housing law.

The law permits discrimination between persons. It gives to a select few a privilege not afforded a great number of similarly situated persons. Pete Smith is permitted to live in a nice apartment at low cost, but his neighbors, John

Jones, Joe Doakes, and many others are not afforded this privilege. These other folks have low incomes, but they will pay taxes to contribute to Pete Smith's rent.

Pete Smith has been selected by an administrator, not because he is the poorest, but because he is able to pay the amount of rent required and is just one of the needy among all of the applicants.

The occupants of slums are not, by the public-housing legislation, automatically placed into the new homes. Their dwellings may be demolished and, in many instances, the record shows that they are moved to further and worse slums and other more fortunate people are granted admission to the public-housing units.

Discrimination and privilege, and even political expediency is permitted by the public housing law which our committee considered.

The Government grants assistance to the needy. It aids in education and the building of roads. In all of these programs, however, the money available is distributed to all of the States so that all persons similarly situated may receive at least some benefit. Here, for the first time, it is proposed to ignore the needs of a great majority and grant benefits to a select and privileged few.

The motives of those great organizations and well-meaning people who want to solve the critical housing shortage and who want to provide decent housing for low-income people cannot be questioned. I do, without fear of contradiction, however, state that these people have not carefully analyzed the operation of the public housing law proposed by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

There are others, however, who have no interest in maintaining private enterprise, initiative, and the American approach to problems such as these. These people would regiment our citizens, control them by a bureaucracy in Washington, all under the guise of humane activity. It is with this latter group that I part company. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposing the public-housing feature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and am supporting the present measure which will provide homes for veterans, homes for the young people of our Nation, and maintain our Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we recently fought a war that cost us not less than $350,000,000,000, and the best blood of the youth of our country. We achieved a victory, but we have not yet achieved the peace we fought for. Probably the greatest domestic issue that now presents itself to the American people is housing, to house the men who fought our battles and who came home and had no place to live. That is a question that deserves the greatest consideration.

In our committee we have always had friendliness, kindliness, and sportsmanship. I have an admiration and affection for our chairman, but this bill seemed to do something to him that I have not seen heretofore. We prepared a bill and voted it out and we went before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee made a proposition that I have never heard made to a legislative committee in all the long years I have been here. They told us that if there were some members of the committee who would stultify themselves and change their vote we might get a rule. I am glad to say no Democratic Member accepted that invitation and the rule was tabled. Then in the evening we got a notice to appear at 9 o'clock the next morning in the Banking and Currency Committee, and at that meeting the bill which you are now considering was read rapidly. When the reading was completed, although Members were asking for recognition, no one was recognized to offer a substitute, no one was recognized to offer an amendment, no one was recognized to make a point of order that the House was then in session and the bill could not be reported according to the rules of the House; but the bill was arbitrarily reported out. The rules of the House and the democratic processes were thrown out of the window.

You have heard a good deal of talk about socialism in the housing bill. The exercise of arbitrary power anywhere in a republic by the elected officials is more dangerous than socialism; and that is the bill you have here today, all of the provisions in which the people of America had expressed the greatest interest were taken out of the bill: Low rent housing for the veterans, which we greatly need, and many other desirable provisions are out of the bill; and they bring back here a bill that will have no effect, it seems to me, upon the housing problem of the American people except to give special and unconscionable privileges to a favored few.

I have done everything I could to assist in passage of legislation that would result in more housing for our veterans and other citizens, but I am confident this bill will not accomplish that purpose. S. 866, which has been passed by the Senate, is now on the Speaker's table and after the passage of this bill it could be taken from the table, everything stricken out after the enacting clause, and the provisions of the House bill inserted; and the Senate bill as so amended, passed by the House. This bill would immediately go to conference and would expedite the final passage of a bill. As the Chairman says, he will not adopt this procedure I feel confident we will have no housing bill at this Congress that will in the least degree solve the problem that is presented.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL].

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with misgivings and uncertainty that I approach the necessity of making a decision as to how to vote on this housing bill. In my opinion, this bill in its present form is incomplete without the public housing provisions. The very group most in need of assistance in order to obtain adequate and decent housing, namely the lowest income group, will not participate in the benefits of this bill. As the report of the Joint Congressional Committees on Housing has said: "The committee does not see how, as a matter of simple justice, it can recommend a housing program which would aid all groups of our citizenry except the very one which is most in need of aid."

Many of my colleagues have raised the contention that for the Government to undertake to assist in providing public housing for the lowest income group is socialism. It seems that whenever anyone suggests the utilization of Government resources for those most in need, he is branded a Socialist. It certainly is not socialism for the Government to plan a mere 500,000 living units over a period of 10 years when the need is so great and the shortage so acute. When we needed guns, tanks, planes, and ships during the war, the Government provided them and provided them hurriedly. We need decent, habitable living quarters for the lowest income group of our population today, and the Government should assist. Private enterprise is not interested, and venture capital is unwilling to provide houses for those most in need. It therefore seems indispensable for Government to implement and augment the inadequacies and deficiencies of private enterprise. This is not socialism. It is democracy in action—not a static democracy heedless of the less fortunate, but a live democracy that concerns itself with the welfare of its people. Socialism, communism, and delinquency are nourished in poverty and nurtured in squalor. Their seeds do not find root in wholesome, clean, and habitable living conditions.

In what way is it socialism to provide housing assistance to the lowest income group, but not socialism to assist others who are better able financially to provide themselves a home? In what way is it more socialistic to seek to assist those most in need of assistance than it is for the Government to guarantee repayment of loans to those who lend money with real estate as security?

The bill as passed by the Senate with the public housing provisions contained therein has been years in the making. It has been discussed and debated in the Houses of Congress, in the press, in periodicals, on the air, and in public forums. Extensive committee hearings have been held in all sections of the country. I sincerely regret that the Members of this House will not have the opportunity to vote on public housing as embraced in the Senate bill.

Senator TAFT, who perhaps knows as much about this subject as anyone, has said that there are 6,000,000 homes which are slum dwellings, in which children should not be reared. It is abundantly clear, both on the record of performance and from the testimony of witnesses before congressional committees, that private housing for our lowest income group cannot be provided by private industry with building costs, labor costs and material costs as high as they are at the present time, because they cannot earn a reasonable return on their investment and at the same time charge rentals which members of the lowest in-

come group can afford to pay. Why is it proper for the United States Government to guarantee a mortgage loan on a private house, and fail to guarantee a reasonable return on private investment made to build low-cost housing?

In my own city of St. Louis, a recommendation which has the support of representative citizens of all groups and of all parties and of all classes has been made by the antislum commission of the city of St. Louis, that a bond issue be authorized in the amount of $16,000,000 which sum will be used to acquire slum property to raze it, and to turn over the land to private individuals for the construction of low-cost housing. The authorization of this bond issue will appear on the ballot at the next general election. Without congressional authorization for public housing, such projects as this cannot possibly succeed.

The members of the antislum commission of St. Louis in their report stated, with reference to the need for Federal aid:

> It does seem likely that the necessities of the case and the needs of the cities cry aloud for relief.

The individuals who prepared this report are not socialists, but industrialists, businessmen and labor leaders in my community. Their report virtually has the support of all enterprising civic groups in St. Louis. In my sincere belief it is indeed unfortunate that the courageous citizens who have undertaken such a project cannot obtain the support of Congress to overcome what is rapidly becoming our number one national problem—adequate housing for all groups and classes of the American people.

In the area of the city covered by this report of the antislum commission, it was found that 58 percent of the present structures have no baths, 25 percent have outside toilets, and 10 percent are without any running water.

Another gloomy picture appears in the St. Louis Veterans' Service Center. Since January 1, 1946, a total of 14,297 applications for homes for World War II veterans have been received. During that period only 8,847 units have been registered with that office. Typical listings of residential units appeared last month. Of 126 listings received last month, only 35 would accept children. One hundred nineteen of the 126 units were merely furnished rooms. Not a single listing in more than 5 months contained a private bath. The record shows that the housing director of the veterans' service center in St. Louis has been unable to provide one apartment or flat during 1948.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing figures impress me with the dire need of adequate legislation in the housing field. The only complete answer and solution to the problem would be the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as passed by the Senate. Since the Members of the House will not have an opportunity to vote on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, it is with reluctance that I cast my vote in favor of the pending legislation before us. Since there is no alternative, I shall vote for this bill rather than nothing at all.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

HOUSING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill should be defeated for the reason the House has already passed a bill to extend title VI, which is in the Senate now and has been there for months; the House has already passed what is known as the Fanny May bill or the Federal National Mortgage Association. It is in the Senate right now. Any other part of this bill that is desirable could be put on by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has some very undesirable parts in it. Members who understand this bill will not vote for it unless they vote for something that I believe is against their convictions. I refer to the fact that in title IV of this bill the tax incentive for production of additional rental housing accommodations provides a tax bonus—I repeat, a tax bonus—to people to build rental houses, including hotels, penthouses, apartment hotels, any kind of a rental-housing unit. For that they will get a tax bonus. That will cause certain people to have an advantage. They can pay higher prices and get a tax bonus. It will increase the price of building materials. Do you want to increase the price of building materials? It will increase the price of housing in this country.

In addition to this skyrocketing of prices it has another great disadvantage. There is a petition on the Clerk's desk now with 167 names on it to bring out a certain bill—the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Up until a few years ago 145 names were sufficient on the theory that that when one-third of the Members of the House want a bill considered they should be given an opportunity to consider that bill. Notwithstanding that the Rules Committee tabled an application for a rule that was pending before it to consider that bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Congress appropriated $100,000 and set up a joint housing committee of the House and Senate, which committee went all over the country conducting hearings and spending that $100,000, the Committee on Banking and Currency heard testimony on housing since December 5, 1945, and presented a bill to the Rules Committee which it turned down flatly because we would not agree to take out certain things that we want in that bill which the testimony proved to us conclusively should be in the bill.

Now, we are asked to consider a bill here under a gag rule. It is not brought up in a way that you can get legislation. A few minutes ago we had the Commodity Credit Corporation Act up for consideration and the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, moved to take up the Senate bill, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House Commodity Credit Corporation bill, all because he wanted action, he wanted to expedite it. Why does he not do that now? Why does he not take up the Senate bill S. 866, strike out all after the enacting clause and send this bill to conference where it can be ironed out? The absence of any action in that direction and the failure to do that is an indication to me that an effort is not being made to expedite this legislation. So, if you pass it like it is it will be an excuse as to why housing legislation cannot pass. So, the thing to do, Members of the House, is to kill this bill. It is not needed; it is objectionable. It is a millionaire's bonus bill, that is what it is. I repeat, it is a millionaire's bonus bill. It is a tax bonus to the rich to skyrocket prices. I hope you will vote against this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as a proponent of the T-E-W bill, I would like to serve notice that we will continue unremittingly in our efforts to enact into law the so-called hotly disputed issues which, nevertheless, found favor with the majority of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. These are the titles on governmentally aided housing research, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment, federally assisted low-rent housing, and rural housing.

Veterans and other citizens regard the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill passed by the Senate, S. 866, as the key to whether or not Congress will authorize a comprehensive attack on the drastic housing shortage. The country will take our action on the bill before us now as being a refusal to make such a comprehensive attack. This may be unjustified, but it is the fact. The confidence of the people concerned with the need for housing would have been immediately established by passage of S. 866 in the House. This confidence would itself have done much to stimulate the broadest housing program for all classes of the population. The real difficulty is one of costs. Although there are likely to be over 900,000 home units built this year, both for rental and for sale, they are generally way out of reach in price of the veteran of modest income and of the ordinary citizen whom the housing shortage hurts the most. In fact, the gravest danger of this construction is that it will flood the market with high-priced housing and bring on a housing-market debacle interfering with all construction. The passage of S. 866 would have given us a balanced housing program and preserved an active and prosperous housing market for years, as indeed the economic conditions require that it should be preserved. There is little question that the House will pass the bill before us, but to those who have worked so long and so hard for the T-E-W bill I say that they are right, and the work must continue, as before long the whole Congress will see that what it has done is not enough and that a general housing program by the enactment of the omitted titles of the T-E-W bill is essential if we are to lick the housing shortage.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "present" on this bill because I cannot and will not abandon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the final section of this bill. It would remove the present tariff on plywood for a period of 1 year. This section suddenly appeared on this housing legislation without notice or warning, without hearings, and from a committee which has no right to submit legislation on the subject of tariffs. Before any such legislation is reported to the House or enacted, the American plywood industry should have the right to state its case. It should have the right to show, as it easily can, that our plywood production increased 25 percent in 1948 and that 65 percent increase in production above the 1947 figure is anticipated in the year 1949; that there are 41 plywood plants in Oregon, Washington, and northern California, which number will be increased to 50 by the end of this year and will total 60 by the end of 1949. There will be ample American-produced plywood for American building needs. It would be a crime against a great American industry which employs thousands upon thousands of people, to break its financial back in this way without allowing fair and ordinary consideration of the facts involved. If this section is enacted into law such action in the haste of the closing hours of this session will be in direct violation of the fundamental principles of our legislative system.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Oregon who preceded me, I am opposed to the concluding section of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this housing bill (H. R. 6955) contains in its last provision—section 803—a proposal for the removal of all tariffs on plywood for 1 year.

The present tariff on fir plywood is 40 percent ad valorem. Section 803 of this bill proposes to remove this tariff entirely for the next year.

Not a minute of hearing has been given to the plywood industry upon how this proposal would affect this industry or its tens of thousands of employees.

To rush this tariff-removal proposal through without an opportunity for any member of a great industry to be heard is not right, not just, and not fair.

What will the effect of this removal of the tariff on Canadian and Mexican plywood be? Some of the makers of plywood in my district tell me the result well may be that they will have to close their plants. They cannot compete, without a tariff, against the cheaper wages and cheaper costs of Canadian and Mexican plywood manufacturers.

In Canada the average wage in the plywood industry is 92½ cents an hour. In our plywood mills of Oregon and Washington the average wage is $1.62 an hour, or 65 percent higher than in Canada.

The cost of logs in Canada also is about 65 percent cheaper than in the United States.

How can an American manufacturer of plywood paying a 65-percent higher wage than a Canadian manufacturer compete with him unless a tariff compensates for the differences of wages in this country and abroad? He cannot.

The American plywood manufacturer has been doing a good job in increasing production to meet increased building needs. No industry has done a better one.

In 1947 the weekly production of plywood in the two States of Oregon and Washington was 29,000,000 square feet a week.

At the present time the weekly production is averaging 36,000,000 square feet weekly or an increase of almost 25 percent above last year.

It is now estimated that by the end of this year the output will be 40,000,000 square feet weekly and by 1949 will be 44,000,000 square feet weekly.

At the present time nine new plywood plants are under construction in the two States of Oregon and Washington. Five of them are expected to be finished and in operation by the end of this year and the four others are scheduled to go into operation next year.

If we remove this plywood tariff will the men who are pouring new capital into building new plants go ahead with these new projects? I doubt it. If we enact here a law that says to American plywood manufacturers that the Congress is going to compel Americans who pay wages of $1.62 an hour, wages to compete with Canadian producers where the wages are only 92½ cents an hour, and with Mexican producers where wages are much less than in Canada, we are going to put a brake on the risk capital going into plywood factories. In the long run that will do more harm to housing than it will do good.

Section 803 of this bill proposes to open our doors to the free import of Canadian plywood. But Canada at the same time has an embargo on logs. Our plywood manufacturers cannot get a single log out of Canada, even if they want to. They cannot ship those logs out of Canada even if they own timber in Canada. Canada will not permit them to ship these logs over the border into the United States. If Americans who own timber in Canada want to cut that timber into plywood, they have to go up to Canada and build their plywood mills in Canada.

The great unfairness in this whole proposal is that the plywood industry, which would be disastrously affected by this free-trade policy, has not been given a single minute of time before any committee of Congress to tell its side of the story. We are denying this industry its traditional right to its day in court.

Sometime ago, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] introduced a bill into Congress proposing to do just what section 803 of this housing bill proposes to do. It was very properly referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which handles tariff-making matters. I talked to five or six members of the Ways and Means Committee. They all assured me that before any action was taken on the Grant bill that the plywood industry would be given an opportunity for a hearing.

That was fair.

But, now a new committee, a committee which never heretofore has handled tariff matters, the Banking and Currency Committee, steps into the picture. This committee, without giving Members of Congress or members of the affected industry a chance to be heard or to tell its side of the story, presents this section 803 which may wreak great damage to an industry that employs tens of thousands of workers. That is not fair to this industry. It is not in keeping with the American tradition of fair play.

Before any great and far-reaching reform to our tariff system is made, the industry or industries affected ought to have a chance to be heard. They ought to get their day in court.

Furthermore, if Canadian plywood is to be admitted duty free into the United States we at least ought to insist that Canada remove the embargo against Canadian logs being permitted to cross the border into the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I am likewise opposed to this provision of the bill which would remove all import restrictions on plywood. There is no person in this House more anxious than I am to see the housing situation alleviated but certainly by taking the restrictions off of only one of the hundreds of items which go into building a house, we are not going to accomplish that purpose. If this House were considering removal of restrictions on all building materials in short supply, that would be, indeed, a totally different story, but here we are acting on only one small segment of the building material industry. As such it is objectionable to me. I realize that under the status of this bill that it cannot be here amended but I earnestly request the conferees to consider these objections during the conference meetings and to there remove this particular clause.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill as it is the only vehicle which we have to do anything about housing in this Congress. I am one of those that had hoped we would have had a chance to consider some of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill that provide for slum clearance, subsidized housing, and so forth. I do not know whether these provisions are sound or not, as I have not had the opportunity to study them. But I would have welcomed the opportunity of listening to a debate on these provisions by the members of the committee who listened to the evidence.

However, this bill and others do provide some very substantial benefits that will aid veterans and will, I believe, stimulate the building of houses. It is very significant that in 1946 when the Government was building houses we only had 437,800 houses built. But in 1947 when private enterprise got into full swing we completed 835,100 houses and the trend for the first 5 months of 1948 indicates that we will exceed that total.

Of course, the most sound system is one where each person needing a house is able to buy it and not rely on the

Government to furnish him a house. Those of us who have gotten our homes in that way realize the satisfaction of buying and owning our own home, no matter how small it may be. We are hoping that especially those who served us during the war and who made us secure through their sacrifices may be able to get help from the provisions of this act and obtain a start on a home of their own.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to protest the high-handed action of the leadership of this House in bringing about the defeat of the comprehensive Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

The sell-out to the real-estate and building lobbies that have swarmed over this Hill for the past 2 years, is complete—public housing for the benefit of veterans and civilians in the low-income groups is gone—slum clearance to rid this country of the slums that are a stench in the nostrils of every American, has been put aside.

I am voting against this so-called housing bill as a protest against the betrayal of the veterans of this country who have waited in vain for 3 years for Congress to act on housing. They will have to go on waiting due to the action of the House this day.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who favored the T-E-W bill, I shall vote for the passage of the Wolcott bill with the hope that it may go to the Senate and that through that method it may reach a conference committee. There are numerous features in the bill which do not meet with my approval, but unless it is passed by the House there will be no opportunity for action at this session.

THE SUPPORT FOR THE BILL

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the House had reason to believe that it would have an opportunity to vote on the comprehensive Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Instead we are confronted by the Republican leadership with a bill which makes a mockery of our efforts to enact a housing program.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has behind it the united support of hundreds of national and local public interest groups, veterans' organizations, and labor unions whose combined memberships total tens of millions of American citizens. Let us start with the veterans of World War II, who perhaps more than any other segment of our population have felt the pinch of insufficient housing. We in Congress have made all sorts of extravagant promises to these veterans. But have we enacted any legislation to aid the veteran who does not earn enough to buy the $12,000 and $13,000 houses that private enterprise is building today, or the veteran whose income is too small for the pitifully small amount of rental housing on today's market?

Every major veterans' organization in the country sees in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill the promise of decent homes. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, American Veterans of World War II, Catholic War Veterans, and Disabled American Veterans endorse and vigorously support this measure. The American Legion approves the public housing provisions of the bill. Just last March more than 1,300 delegates representing these and several other national organizations met in this city. Many of you were visited by veteran delegates whose only objective was to secure passage of the bill that would mean decent homes at prices they could afford. This is surely an objective no Member of Congress can afford to ignore.

The National Conference of Catholic Charities has been in the vanguard of the fight for better housing. The Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the conference, has consistently taken issue with those who brand all advocates of public housing as Communists or Socialists. He points out that—

> Those of us who are committed to private enterprise would like to see private capital provide housing for all the people, but so far as I am aware, private capital has never presented a feasible plan for reaching this objective.

People from all over the country have gone on record in support of public housing. Leading professional and occupational organizations have taken a positive stand in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Among these are the United States Conference of Mayors, the National Institute of Law Officers, the American Institute of Architects, and the American Municipal Association. Mayor George W. Welsh, Grand Rapids, Mich., president of the Conference of Mayors, made this splendid endorsement of the federally aided public-housing program:

> The improvement in health, happiness, and good citizenship of the families rehoused has been dramatic. Public housing has served families of low income and has not competed with private homebuilding. But much remains to be done and all of us must dedicate ourselves to the task of seeing to it that this great program is continued.

Time will not permit me to list the hundreds of organizations which have gone on record in favor of public housing. However, you all recognize these groups: The National League of Women Voters, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Such organizations as the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Federation of Postal Clerks, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, the American Association of Social Workers, the American Public Health Association, and the Family Service Association of America, all support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

What other segments of America endorse the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill? Last month the National Conference of Family Life met here in Washington. Nine hundred delegates from 125 national organizations, whose membership totals more than 40,000,000 people, heard President Truman say that the housing shortage is the most pressing problem for American families. Calling for passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, the President said that the problem was a vital one that prevented millions of veterans from finding homes for themselves, their wives, and children.

At this same conference, Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, said:

> In my opinion one of the great disruptive factors in American family life is our lack of decent housing. Slums are the curse of our society. No one of our big cities is without them, but they are not confined to metropolitan areas. * * * They are the national disgrace of the most gifted, richest, and most powerful nation on earth. They are festering sores in our social structure.

Certainly none of us can deny that Eric Johnston is representative of private enterprise. However, he recognizes that on the issue of decent homes, private and public enterprise must join forces. He advocated a course of action that is implemented by the T-E-W bill, when he further said:

> I would like to see industry move in on the housing front in a forceful, determined way. There is no doubt in my mind that if the industrial leaders of this country wished to do so they could bring about, in cooperation with the widely used organizing power of the state, a housing program which would meet our needs and stimulate private construction at one and the same time.

The housing committee of the National Conference on Family Life concluded its sessions with a ringing endorsement of the T-E-W bill.

Less than a month later, in a letter to my distinguished colleague from New York, Representative JACOB JAVITS, Mr. Eric Johnston again took the occasion to urge passage of the T-E-W bill which has been called socialistic and the forerunner of communism by these myopic leaders of the opposition forces. Mr. Johnston said:

> If there ever was a "must" bill, this is it. It has been a "must" bill for a long time. It is a "must" bill today. It should be taken up and passed by the House with all possible expedition. It would be a tragedy, in my judgment, if this bill were to be sidetracked or defeated at this session. This bill fills a need which must be met in the interest of all the people of America.

There are other open-minded supporters of a free-enterprise system who stoutly defend federally aided public housing.

Last year, Jerome M. Ney, chairman of the board of the American Retail Federation, testified before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I have the honor of membership on this important committee. Mr. Ney himself operates several retail stores, the principal one being the Boston Store Dry Goods Co., of Fort Smith, Ark. No one could be more typical of private enterprise than this merchant. This is what Mr. Ney said about the T-E-W bill:

> Let's put good sense ahead of emotion. A substantial portion of the Nation's families at the bottom of the income pyramid simply cannot afford adequate housing. We agree with Senator TAFT that subsidized public housing, at least for a time, is the only sensible answer to this problem.

Mr. Ney is another one of those enlightened American businessmen who scoff at the socialism label tied to public housing by those who rant the loudest and say the least. He declared that:

We cannot agree that this type of public housing contains the threat of socialism in the housing industry. On the contrary, we believe that the greatest threat to private enterprise in housing is the failure to meet the housing problem head-on.

This intelligent American went on to say:

I can think of no other sphere in which there is a greater need for the advocates of private enterprise to display enlightened self-interest and the qualities of initiative, imagination, daring, and energy which have made our Nation great. I can think of no other area where blind emotion and unenlightened selfishness can cause private enterprise to fail more miserably and more quickly than in housing.

Permit me to pursue this vein a bit further. I am proud that among the realtors of America there are some wise men who regard the T-E-W bill as the answer to the Nation's housing shortage. Mr. William Reinhart, of Philadelphia, berates the lobbyists who would condemn our low-income citizens to shack homes. Mr. Reinhart boasts of the fact that he has been a Philadelphia realtor for more than 40 years. He has been a director of one of the largest Federal savings and loan associations in Philadelphia and is chairman of that city's housing authority.

Perhaps there are some fellow realtors who regard Mr. Reinhart as a traitor to their business. What does Mr. Reinhart think of the T-E-W bill? In writing to Members of Congress last week, he said:

I wish to say to you that I believe that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill provides the best method of meeting our present housing shortage.

To illustrate just how absurd are the lobby's charges that public housing lacks the support of private enterprise, let me tell you what an executive of one of the Nation's largest insurance companies said last year. George S. Van Schaik, executive vice president and head of the mortgage loan department, New York Life Insurance Co., declared:

If and when certain segments of the population are in an income group where they cannot pay an economic rent for safe and decent shelter, then there should be provided adequate standard housing so subsidized as to bring it within the grasp of those who qualify for it.

Substantial public support for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill comes from community leaders throughout the country. These are the people who have an intimate knowledge of and a sympathetic understanding of the human problems caused by poor housing. These are the priests, the pastors, the rabbis, the social workers, the doctors, the lawyers, and other local and national figures who have waged an unceasing fight for better housing.

Last year more than 100 New York organizations joined forces in behalf of the T-E-W bill. For these people, decent housing for low-income families is not socialism or communism or an infringement of the rights of private enterprise. Three vice presidents of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Committee of New York were Rt. Rev. Charles E. Gilbert, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York; the Very Reverend Msgr. E. Roberts Moore, archdiocesan representative of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, and the Reverend Dr. David De Sola Pool, representative of the Synagogue Council and the New York Board of Rabbis.

It seems obvious to me that even the most obstinate of my colleagues must realize by now that support for public housing comes from so large a segment of our population that we can no longer afford to ignore its opinions.

In contrast to this overwhelming support, the opposition to public housing comes principally from four or five national organizations representing the real-estate interests, the property owners, the home and apartment house builders, and their various affiliates throughout the country. These are the people who say to the Government, "Leave us alone, and we'll build all the houses the country needs." But, alas, they cannot build for the great mass of veterans, or for the store clerk or the factory worker and still show a profit. The so-called spokesmen for the opposition maintain that they have the best interests of the Nation at heart. Yet one well known lobbyist for the real-estate interests, Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, had the brazen effrontery to write the following in his official journal, Headlines, for June 9, 1947:

Today the great threat to democratic institutions, to the republican form of government, and ultimately to freedom itself lies in our big cities. They are populated for the most part with the mass-man, devoid of intelligence, devoid of civic responsibility.

Does Mr. Nelson believe that those Members of Congress who conscientiously represent millions of Americans in urban areas will applaud the following conclusion:

Our one hope of survival as a free country is that rural and semirural areas still dominate most of the State legislatures through their representatives and still dominate the House of Representatives in Washington. Our best hope for the future is to keep it that way.

As a corollary to these devious arguments, these opponents of public housing have seized upon a convenient shibboleth. Anybody who believes that the Federal Government should be concerned with decent housing for low-income families is immediately labeled a Communist and/or a Socialist. Mr. Nelson himself last year tagged Senator ROBERT TAFT, one of the bill's three sponsors, as a follower of the Communist Party line. He later apologized publicly to the Senator, but still continued to smear other supporters of decent housing who openly fight for their beliefs.

Public housing has recently been labeled, "The key to socialism." But public housing is not the key to socialism or communism or any other alien ism. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, with its various aids to private enterprise, will open the door to a new and better life for the thousands of our fellow citizens now living in slums and broken-down tenements. The T-E-W bill means decent homes for our veterans who are getting tired of empty promises and who find little comfort in the advertisements featuring twelve- and thirteen-thousand-dollar homes for "GI's only." We cannot continue to shut our ears to the pleas for decent homes for America's low-income families. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is the answer to these pleas. After all, do we represent only the real-estate interests, the property owners, the home and apartment builders, or do we represent all of America, including the ill-housed?

THE REPUBLICANS HAVE FAILED TO SOLVE THE HOUSING PROBLEM

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress has failed to solve the Nation's No. 1 social problem—the need of 15,000,000 families for 15,000,000 houses in which to live. Among these 15,000,000 families are many veterans who fought to preserve our Nation in World War II. During the war, we promised them a new and shining world, awaiting their return. We promised them jobs, cars, homes, furnishings, and all the comforts of a high standard of living.

That was when Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini threatened the national life of our Democracy. The veterans did the job we asked them to do. They defeated the dictators. Our American way of life was saved. The veterans sacrificed years of their lives, suffered a million casualties and over 300,000 lost their lives.

They have been home 3 years. What have we done to make good on our promises? The record is shameful. We have welched on our promises. We as a Nation have lied to them and let them down. Congress protected the people from inflation during the war by price control and rationing. It was not pleasant, but it was fairly successful. Its success can be measured now, by the inflation disaster which has occurred since OPA was killed.

Since June 1946, the last month of OPA, the cost of food has increased 42.8 percent. The over-all cost of living has increased more than 27 percent.

The cost of building supplies has skyrocketed and the new homes we promised the veterans have become so expensive they cannot buy them. A six-room house that sold in 1940 for five or six thousand dollars is now priced at twelve to fourteen thousand dollars. The ordinary wage-earning veteran cannot buy and pay for a home on today's inflated price level.

Why has this situation developed?

First, because Congress killed price control in June 1946 and took the brakes off of inflation. Congress listened to the propaganda of the profit hogs, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the real-estate lobby.

Second, Congress has consistently failed to pass housing legislation to solve the housing problem. While Congress has placed the credit of the Government behind the real-estate and builders' lobby

to build high-priced homes, they have failed to encourage slum clearance, public housing for the lowest income group, and the building of medium-priced homes on a basis which the average wage earner could buy and pay for. This great class of veterans and nonveterans are completely priced out of the market.

It is common knowledge that over 40,000,000 taxpayers earn less than $3,000 per year. I submit to you a fact which is acknowledged by any intelligent person, these people cannot buy and pay for $12,000 to $15,000 homes out of this modest yearly wage. After income-tax deductions and the expense of today's inflated food, clothing and other commodity prices, people in the $3,000 per year or less income bracket cannot make the large monthly payments necessary to carry such a debt burden.

We are faced then with a situation which forces millions of fine American citizens to "double up" in crowded, substandard dwellings. The social impact of this housing deficiency contributes to divorce, sickness, crime, and juvenile delinquency.

Society has to pay the cost either way. Why not then try the preventative way?

Federal assistance in slum clearance, and low-income bracket rentals of decent modern homes in clean and healthy surroundings, will in my opinion, pay for itself in the reduction of our present crime and charity costs. Although the cry of "socialism" has been raised by the real-estate and builders' lobby, whose only thought is the perpetuation of their present guaranteed profit set-up under title 6 of the FHA, we are not deceived by this ancient "red herring."

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, against which they protest so loudly and bitterly, a bill which calls for slum clearance and Federal aid in low-income rental construction, is no more socialistic than title VI. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has been endorsed by the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, the Catholic and Protestant church groups, and all the great American labor unions. It bears the name of the most conservative Republican candidate for the Presidency, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

The real-estate and builders' lobby are strong for a $2,000,000,000 guaranty of mortgages under title VI, FHA. Let us analyze this extension of Federal credit for the benefit of a private business group. What does it do?

First, the Government guarantees the builder 90 percent insurance on his mortgages. In other words, the builder is guaranteed that he will receive 90 percent of his capital back from any house he builds. It removes the risk from his business by protecting his capital investment, with taxpayers' funds. It also guarantees him a profit and interest on his profit equity, by protecting the banks in the discount of mortgage paper.

And yet, there are the people—the real-estate and builders' groups—who yell "socialism" when the Government proposes aid for the low-income people.

They are perfectly willing for the Government to use tax funds to fill their pockets with inflated building profits, but they scream "socialism" when people who cannot afford their high-priced houses have an opportunity for release from the shacks and tenement slums.

As far as I am concerned, my position is clear. I intend to do all in my power to provide decent homes for the people of my district and the Nation. Charity begins at home, and the need of an American family for a decent home in which to rear their family transcends the selfish desires of hypocrites who benefit by Federal mortgage guaranties in their private business. These people remind me of the dog in the manger—while they are enjoying the profits guaranteed by Federal credit, they wish to deny the unfortunate people who cannot afford to pay their inflated profit prices the right to live in decent homes erected by the Federal credit aid.

I shall support the efforts of free enterprise to fill the need for additional houses, but when free enterprise refuses or cannot profitably meet society's need, then and then only, I shall discharge what I conceive to be Federal responsibility for the welfare of the common people, who do the work and fight the wars of our Nation.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am disgusted with the action of this Congress on many things, but I am particularly disgusted with the manner in which it is proceeding to consider the housing bill. The tactics leading up to the consideration of the bill before us are not the tactics of a representative form of government. They are the tactics of special privilege. They are clearly the tactics of the real-estate lobby.

During the final days of the first session of the Eightieth Congress an appropriation of $100,000 was made for the Joint Housing Committee to study the problem of housing. This committee toured the country from one end to the other and submitted a report recommending legislation to meet this critical problem. The other body a few weeks ago passed legislation known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which embodied most of the recommendations of the committee that investigated housing. The measure then went to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. Extensive hearings were held, but no new testimony was developed. Finally the committee was forced to report a bill to the House similar to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and many of us hoped we would see the enactment of a comprehensive housing program. Our hopes were short-lived, because the Committee on Rules declined to permit the matter to come before the House. Instead of a comprehensive program of housing, we are today offered a weak substitute—something the real-estate lobby will permit the House to consider. Housing legislation in this Congress must first be cleared through the real-estate lobby before the elected representatives of the people have a chance to vote on it. This bill has the approval of the real-estate lobby. That is the only reason it was permitted to come before the House. It is good for the lobby. It will make the lobby stronger. It will make the lobby richer, but it is not going to provide the thousands of homes and rental units we need so badly at prices people can afford to pay. It is not going to help metropolitan centers like St. Louis wrestling with the problem of slums. The cities of America are eager and willing to assume their share of the obligation in clearing blighted areas, but they cannot do it alone. In my own city a large bond issue has recently been suggested as a means for eliminating some of the blighted areas. This will give St. Louis an excellent start, but still desperately needed is a program of low-cost public housing to provide houses for those whose homes in the present tenements will give way for this new development. Private industry can and perhaps will meet the bulk of our housing needs, but it is not interested in trying to help the millions whose incomes are so low they are unable to afford standard new housing or standard rental units.

Also desperately needed is a program of housing that will provide for the thousands of veterans and others with homes and rental units at prices they can afford to pay. Practically every house of rental units being built today is in the high-price brackets. We need low-cost housing—and when I say "low cost" I mean just that—not 10- and 15-thousand-dollar homes.

The Republican housing bill before us is going to be just about as effective in solving our housing problems as the Republican anti-inflation bill was in solving the problem of inflation. As many of you will remember, 6 months ago we passed a law against inflation. It is Public Law 395, which many call the "HTGB" law. That stands for "hope things get better." We have all been hoping very vigorously for the past 6 months, but we have not been able to hope down the cost of living one cent. Instead of improving, inflation is worse and prices are higher.

The housing bill before us today is in theory similar to the anti-inflation law. It is little more than a hope that the housing problem will be solved. We are going to "hope up" houses and "hope down" the cost of living. It is important that we hope the right way on the right thing and do not become confused. It would be a sorry day if we should start to "hope down" houses and "hope up" prices. The anti-inflation law and the housing bill we are considering today are the tweedledum and tweedledee of the Eightieth Congress. They are both fakes.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I shall support H. R. 6959, a bill to amend the National Housing Act, because I sincerely believe some housing legislation is better than none at all.

Although H. R. 6959 does not include the public housing provisions which I favor at this time, it does possess many meritorious features for the veterans, who are in need of rental housing.

I shall, of course, continue to favor and press for the enactment of the public-housing section embodied in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The public-housing section of the T-E-W which has been urged by Pennsylvania's able Governor James Duff, the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, Bernard Samuels, and

practically every veteran and civic organization in the country. Again, Mr. Speaker, I will support this legislation and hope that we may be able to take positive action toward the T-E-W before this Congress adjourns.

NEED FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the democratic free enterprise system is the greatest political and economic institution ever devised by man. It has given us under justice the highest standard of living in the world. Through an unparalleled productive process the cost of goods has been brought within the means of an ever greater number of people. No one would contend, however, that ours is a perfect economy. Housing is one part in which there has been a conspicuous lack of success. Instead of bringing good housing to a greater number of families we find today that the gap between the cost of decent housing and the ability of families to pay is greater than ever. Senator FLANDERS of Vermont in his report for the Joint Committee on Housing said:

> We, the American people, have long been unable to supply our own housing needs. For half a century the housing industry has barely provided enough new homes to accommodate our population increase. It has failed to replace depreciation and protect our capital investment in housing.

Today, our economy is operating at a high level. Admittedly, as a Nation we are in prosperous times, despite the fact that much of the gain has been wiped out by sharp price increases. The average family income in urban places is in excess of $3,000—and yet, according to the Census Bureau, there are more than 5,000,000 urban families with incomes below $2,000 and 3,000,000 with incomes less than $1,500.

What does an income of $1,500 or even $2,000 mean today? In a study by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, it was shown that in June 1947 it took an average 4-person urban family $3,240 per year to maintain itself at a minimum adequate standard of living. This ranged from a high of $3,458 in Washington, D. C., to a low of $3,000 in New Orleans. These figures will be even higher in view of the price increases which have occurred since last June.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of what appears to be plenty, we have millions of people—including many, many veterans who fought for better—living in shacks and slums which are a disgrace to the American way of life. These human beings, Mr. Speaker, are living in places—no one could call them houses or homes—in which it would be unlawful in most States to keep farm animals. Of course, the reason for the enactment of State laws for the protection of farm animals is clear. Kept in filthy surroundings, the animals which give us meat and milk would contaminate and destroy us.

But what about human beings? Are we as much concerned about the way the slums contaminate our cities? I say to you—if we do not destroy our slums, they will destroy us. Oh, I know some of you are thinking that if we would only pass sanitary housing laws in our States and cities similar to those we have for animals, that the problem would be met. There is a very important difference, however. Every bottle of milk, every pound of meat we buy, has included in the price an amount sufficient to keep the animals under sanitary conditions. The cost of cleanliness for farm animals is borne by all the people.

We do now, in many cities, have laws to protect housing. There is only one trouble. They cannot be enforced to any great extent. If they were, the cost of housing to the people who live in the slums would be so great that it would rob them of necessary food, clothing, and medical care. I know that some of you are probably thinking of the much publicized Baltimore plan—a plan which has been misrepresented by the real-estate lobby as being the solution to the slum problem. Listen to this editorial from the Baltimore Sun:

> Baltimore's housing-law-enforcement drive is an excellent one and deserves wide recognition. The city can blush with fitting pride at the publicity given its efforts by the home builders. But no one should assume that Baltimore is doing anything more than making a few dilapidated buildings a little more inhabitable. Housing-law enforcement is not slum clearance, and nothing will make it so.

The solicitor of the city of Pittsburgh testified before the Joint Senate-House Committee on Housing:

> In the city of Pittsburgh during the last couple of years we had committee upon committee from the hill district come to us and say health conditions were so intolerable—the plumbing, the ordinary, decent facilities were such it was unsafe to live there. They have asked the city to force the landlords to keep these properties in condition so they can live there. The result of a 2-year effort in that direction—and I think it bears on the basic problem you are considering—all the landlords who have property in the slum area are just milking those properties of all they can get and are not putting any money into repairs. These properties are so old that rehabilitation is impossible, and none of these private industries, who have milked the property and put nothing back in it, have made any effort to solve the problem.
>
> We have a problem of human beings who have nowhere to sleep. When a building gets into such condition that there is fear of killing the people in the building and killing the passersby in the street, we condemn the building and tear it down, but in any way where our inspectors find they can still stay another month, another 2 months, we cannot be so soulless as to forget the needs of our people and put them out on the street, just to penalize the landlord. We would be glad to padlock the houses and penalize the landlord, but we cannot penalize our citizens.

We can enforce our sanitary laws for farm animals, because we, all the people—not the animals—pay for their decent surroundings. As I have already pointed out, the people living in the slums cannot afford to keep themselves in absolute minimum food, clothing, and medical care—let alone pay any more for housing.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, as proven to us over and over again by city officials, health and law enforcement officers, judges, welfare workers, and the clergy, the danger to our society of contamination from the slums is even greater than that from tubercular cattle.

The slum is the breeding place of physical and social disaster. How can children be brought up in the slums to their full potentialities as American citizens?

The children first encounter the cops when they are playing in the streets and get chased, or when they are having a ball game in a narrow alley and a home run crashes through a window. To them, the law means torment and oppression—not justice and protection.

The children never have a chance of growing up in their homes. Their lives are ones of constant escape from the mean surroundings. Where do they turn? The dreary beer joints, the dingy poolrooms and dance halls. Yes; and the houses of prostitution. These are their places of escape.

I could go on and on, with volumes of unquestioned testimony, as to the direct relationship of the slums to health, to juvenile delinquency, to infant mortality, to crime, to mental disorders—testimony given in city after city and by county officers in rural areas. But why must I do this? There cannot be a single Member of this body who does not know these plain facts. The only question, as I see it, is whether we will do something—or nothing.

What we must do is clear. We must rid the Nation of its slums and see that ultimately every American family lives in a dwelling which he can, in decency and dignity, call a home. I freely admit that we cannot do this all at once. It will take years to accomplish. The 500,000 public-housing units provided in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill together with what we have already accomplished, is a good start.

I do not see how in common decency and humanity we can pass any bill without the slum-clearance and public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Seven congressional committees over the Seventy-eighth, the Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses have come to the same conclusion. Twice the Senate has enacted slum-clearance and public-housing legislation. Mr. Speaker, we are a Congress dedicated to the welfare of all the people—and we must act in the interest of all the people. With all the earnestness I have, from the bottom of my heart I ask this body to set us on the road toward a good America—an America with homes fit for Americans.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the housing situation is one of our most vexing problems, I regret that the housing legislation we are now considering is woefully inadequate as a means in remedying present conditions.

For the past several years, family life in America has been shadowed by the lack of suitable living quarters for millions of our citizens. This fact has been continually called to our attention by the newspapers of the Nation, even though it has been common knowledge to all of us.

I have made frequent inquiries during the Eightieth Congress in an effort to

obtain information as to when we would have the opportunity to consider housing legislation. Each time I made such an inquiry I was assured we would get a housing bill that would satisfy the needs of the American people.

The Senate considered and passed its version of housing legislation. Yet, the dying days of the Eightieth Congress were upon us and still the House had no opportunity to consider this pressing problem of the shortage of housing facilities.

These delaying tactics, although they may have been sincere, aroused many of us to the realization that delay meant disaster; and to avoid the spectacle of the Eightieth Congress failing to present a solution to the housing problem, I joined many other Members of the House in signing the discharge petition placed in circulation for the purpose of making certain that we would take action on the Nation's housing problem before adjournment.

Today we are being asked to consider a housing bill, which, while it contains some necessary provisions, is far from satisfactory. This bill does not go far enough in seeking a solution to the housing problem.

I am sure there are many of you who are as disappointed as I am in being denied the opportunity to discuss and amend the present bill. Instead of liberalizing its provisions, we have been given but one choice—either to vote for or against the bill. We have no other alternative, despite the fact that we know deep in our hearts that this bill will not accomplish the objectives of a real housing bill. It is simply a question of casting a negative vote and be accused of being against some of the necessary and desirable features in the bill, or voting for the bill and realizing that we are calling a job finished that is only half done.

Under the circumstances, like many of you, I have no choice but to vote for this bill; but in so doing, I assure you it is a vote cast with great reluctance. It was my fervent hope the past several months that we could perfect a real housing bill that would convey to the average American citizen that we meant business in our efforts to cope with the housing situation.

While we try to point with pride to the activity in the building industry and quote figures on the number of housing units being made ready for occupancy, families continue to live doubled up simply because the average citizen cannot afford to pay housing prices, since they are far beyond his means.

Thousands of veterans are camping out or living in trailers because they have not the income to permit them to raise their families in a typical American frame house.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my assertion that I am voting for this bill with marked reluctance. It is said "a half loaf is better than none," but this is not true with respect to providing a solution to America's most critical problem—the housing situation.

It is too great a problem to attack with halfway measures, and I regret that we can be charged with short-sightedness in trying to solve the housing shortage in a half-hearted manner.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I regret that under suspensions of the rules Members of the House are precluded from offering amendments to this phony housing bill. If we were operating in a democratic manner this afternoon I would offer an amendment to change the title of this monstrosity to read "The Pent Housing Act of 1948."

We have before us today a choice between two housing bills—H. R. 6959, and S. 866, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Normally, of course, we would have expected a Senate-passed bill to be reported out with such amendments as the committee felt desirable. However, on an analysis of the provisions of H. R. 6959 I can well understand why it was not deemed appropriate to report these provisions out as an amendment to S. 866. For it certainly would be a travesty to consider the provisions of H. R. 6959 as an amendment of the provisions of S. 866. In fact, it would be a travesty to consider it as a housing bill at all.

In analyzing the provisions of H. R. 6959, I think that the approach that would be most helpful and significant would be from the point of view of who would be helped by it. Or to put it more succinctly—who counts under its provisions.

Obviously, under H. R. 6959, it is not the farmer who counts. For the bill provides absolutely no aids whatsoever to meet the farm housing needs of our rural population. Not only are the modest provisions in S. 866 completely omitted but there is no attempt whatsoever to provide even the semblance of an alternative program.

Obviously, also, our low-income families do not count. As in the case of the farmer, H. R. 6959 makes this crystal clear not so much by the fact that the S. 866 provisions were omitted as by the fact that H. R. 6959 does not bother to include provisions of any nature whatsoever for the relief of our families and their children who through no fault of their own are now consigned to living in slums.

Obviously, also, under H. R. 6959 our moderate-income families do not count either. While the bill does condescend to include the yield insurance program, it does not contain, except in a drastically modified and aborted form—and even then only on a 9-month basis—the necessary programs to extend FHA mortgage insurance to meet the needs of families of moderate income—and this is true both in connection with home ownership and rental housing. Likewise, H. R. 6959 completely and cavalierly ignores the necessary long-range research programs contained in S. 866 which are effectively designed to help reduce construction costs and so help bring home ownership and rental housing costs within the reach of the pocketbook of our middle-income families.

It is further clear, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 6959 is wedded to the premise that our local communities do not count. Certainly, no one would deny that one of the most serious threats to both the social and economic welfare of our communities today, large and small alike, is presented by the extensive slum conditions and blight that our communities have found themselves completely unable to cope with. Again, H. R. 6959, in distinct and disheartening contrast with S. 866, contains absolutely no provision to give our cities and towns the aids they need in this connection.

And if it is any solace to our farmers, and our low-income families, and our moderate-income families, and our communities, if they do not count under H. R. 6959, neither does the veteran. It is very interesting to note in this connection that the very first two titles of H. R. 6959, as does also its title VI, contain provisions purporting to give special preferences to veterans that are not contained in S. 866.

But what kind of help is it to the millions of our veterans who need housing aid to provide, as does title I of H. R. 6959, for an occupancy preference in connection with any additional dwelling accommodations that may happen to be provided by remodeling of dwellings with FHA title I loan insurance?

What kind of aid is it to our veterans to provide—as does title II of H. R. 6959—for first preference to veterans in the disposition of permanent war housing when such preference has been in operation by administrative action since last August? What kind of aid is it to the veteran to authorize FHA to use its title VI program to insure mortgage loans on veterans' cooperative projects up to 95 percent of long-term value, when nonveterans can get a loan of 90 percent of necessary current costs?

Clearly these provisions in H. R. 6959 pay only lip service to the needs of our veterans. Yet, in return for these paltry aids, H. R. 6959 would deprive the low-income veteran who, under S. 866 would have first preference to the low-rent housing provided by that bill, of all hope for decent housing. Likewise, H. R. 6959, in return for its paltry aids, would deprive the veteran, who would get preferential treatment under the farm-housing title of S. 866, to give up his hopes for obtaining decent housing.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, the real tip-off as to how definitely the veteran does not count under H. R. 6959 is not its paltry and shabby provisions supposedly in aid of the veteran. The fact is that the necessary effect of the provisions of H. R. 6959 would be to deprive the veteran even of those aids he now has under existing law. I say this because H. R. 6959 while providing a secondary market program for FHA-insured loans, specifically refuses to provide such a program for GI first-mortgage home loans. I say this because, while H. R. 6959 authorizes an increase in interest rate on FHA-insured loans if required by the mortgage market, specifically refuses to authorize such an increase in connection with GI home loans.

Mr. Speaker, if a secondary market is necessary in connection with the FHA program where the Government insures 100 percent of principal, why is it not necessary in connection with GI home loans where the Government guarantees

only 50 percent? If an increase is necessary in connection with the interest rate on FHA-insured mortgages, why is not an interest-rate increase equally necessary on GI home-loan mortgages? And let me ask this very pertinent question that surely did not escape the sponsors of H. R. 6959, What financing institutions will, if H. R. 6959 is enacted, care to make a GI loan when it has no secondary market protection and has to be made at a 4-percent-interest rate when they will be able under H. R. 6959 to make loans under the FHA program with secondary market protection and at an interest rate 25 percent above what it can get on the GI loan? There can be only one conclusion drawn from the provisions of H. R. 6959—that they represent a deliberate attempt to sabotage the GI home-loan program.

So then, Mr. Speaker, under H. R. 6959 the farmer does not count, the low-income family does not count, the moderate-income family does not count, the local community does not count, and the veteran does not count. Who then does count?

First of all, there is the speculative builder, for H. R. 6959 would continue the FHA title VI program for another year under which the Government takes the risks and the builder takes the profit. I, too, believe that an extension of title VI is necessary, or perhaps I should say, a necessary evil. But it is one thing to provide for an extension to that title in combination with other programs which will restrict its inflationary effects and facilitate a transition from the program of emergency aids to a stabilized permanent program of housing as S. 866 does. It is quite another thing to provide for an extension of the title VI program on a basis where the primary beneficiaries are the speculative builders and the high-income families.

Who else counts? Pretty clearly also those in the high-income-tax brackets. The best indication of this is the program contained in H. R. 6959 providing for an especially high depreciation allowance on rental housing which plan would be beneficial only to those in the very high income brackets. Likewise, the 1-percent increase in interest rates provided in the bill as compared with the one-half of 1 percent increase authorized in S. 866 would not, I take it, be particularly distasteful to those who have the money to invest. And, of course, it would be the high-income families that would benefit because it would be for them that housing could continue to be produced.

Finally, of course, it is the lobbies who count under H. R. 6959—the lobbies who have so brazenly succeeded in stifling any decent housing legislation for 4 years now and who have had the audacity to make clear before the Banking and Currency Committee that they distrust the Congress because it may desire to consider the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, we have a choice between a bill that is a housing bill, and a bill that is no housing bill at all. We have a choice between a bill that is designed to provide help to those who need the help and a bill which would help those who need help the least. Let us put an end to the mockery and enact S. 866.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is one of the most important legislative proposals introduced in the House during the entire life of the Eightieth Congress. It is important for two reasons. The first reason is found in the magnitude of the need in America for decent housing. The current housing shortage, the millions of substandard homes, and the slum conditions existing in most large cities, makes housing the No. 1 social problem in the United States. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is also significant in that it presents a positive and constructive Federal program to correct the present acute housing shortage, and to meet America's long-run housing requirements.

I will use the few minutes at my disposal to discuss the general housing situation in the United States, and to present facts and figures to prove conclusively that Congress is obligated—in the interests of the general welfare—to approve the T-E-W housing bill. For the purpose of analysis, it is necessary to divide the housing problem into two categories: First, the immediate or emergency housing shortage; and, second, the long-run housing problem in the United States. I will begin by discussing the immediate critical housing shortage.

THREE MILLION NEW HOMES NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

All official reports indicate that America needs to build 3,000,000 new homes at once in order to place a roof over the heads of our people. Although World War II ended over 3 years ago, the housing shortage remains most critical—there are just not enough homes available to provide shelter for all the families in the United States. According to a recent estimate of the Housing Expediter, there are nearly 3,000,000 American families who are unable to find homes of their own, and are therefore forced to live doubled up with relatives and friends. The situation becomes doubly tragic when you realize that about 40 percent of these homeless families belong to veterans of World War II.

This shortage exists in nearly every metropolitan area throughout the 48 States. It is especially acute in a number of cities in my district. In Duluth, for example, there are several thousand families without homes, and it has been estimated that 20 percent of all GI families are now living doubled up with other families. Hibbing needs 800 additional housing units in order to shelter its population—a required increase of 16 percent over its present housing facilities. In Virginia, Minn., where 1 family out of every 8 is living with relatives or friends, there is a need for 500 new homes.

This lack of adequate housing prevails all over the country, and at the present rate of private home construction, it will take about 4 years for the housing supply to catch up with demand. It is upon the basis of this evidence that I maintain that Congress should enact into law the T-E-W housing bill. This bill would stimulate the building industry and speed up home construction right now when our people need additional housing so desperately.

GENERAL HOUSING CONDITIONS ARE DEPLORABLE

The general housing situation in the United States may be characterized as being most deplorable. This conclusion is supported by the evidence presented in the various housing surveys, and is backed up by the weight of authority. According to the 1940 housing census, there are some 37,000,000 dwellings in the country. Of these 37,000,000 homes, some 7,000,000, 19 percent, need major repairs; 17,000,000, 46 percent, had no private baths; 8,000,000, 22 percent, had neither gas nor electricity; 11,000,000, 30 percent, had no refrigeration; and nearly four and one-half million had neither central heating nor stoves.

Although the condition of city homes throughout the country is somewhat above the national average, yet we find two-fifths of all nonfarm dwellings are definitely substandard—38.3 percent of them either need major repairs or lack running water and other sanitary facilities. On the other hand, housing conditions in rural areas are decidedly worse than in the cities. Less than 50 percent of the 6,500,000 farm dwellings in the United States have electric lights, and only 25 percent of them have running water. According to the former Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, about two-thirds of all rural homes are substandard, and some 25 percent of them are beyond repair.

As a Member of Congress from Minnesota, I regret to report that the housing situation in Minnesota follows the national pattern. Only 75 percent of Minnesota's city homes have central heating, and less than 52 percent of them have refrigeration. Ten percent of these homes need major repairs at the present time, and about the same proportion lack running water. Rural housing in Minnesota, according to a University of Minnesota agricultural survey, follows the national rural housing parallel. Only 12 percent of the farm homes in my State have running water, less than 20 percent of them have central heating, less than 10 percent of them have refrigeration and 27 percent of farm homes need major repairs today.

A FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAM IS NEEDED

Mr. Speaker, the conditions which I have described are real—they picture the deplorable state of American homes in which we, who are citizens of the richest Nation in the world, are forced to live. They also emphasize the crying need for the Federal Government to take concrete action to meet the housing needs of the American people. This need has been estimated by the national authority as at least 15,000,000 homes to be constructed during the next 10 years—12,600,000 homes to eliminate urban substandard housing, and to provide for our increasing population, and at least 2,500,000 new homes to establish minimum housing standards for our farm population.

Of course, the real-estate lobby and other selfish interests will tell us that a

Government housing program is neither necessary nor practical. They will argue that the housing field is not the proper sphere for Government activity, and that "if private enterprise is only left alone, then the private building industry will provide all the homes necessary." But these calamity howlers ignore past experiences and the lessons of history. They forget that the rate of private construction follows the general business trend, and that while construction increases during boom periods, it falls during depression years. They ignore the fact that the private construction industry has never been able to build more than 900,000 new homes during any 1 year, and that the 1910–40 average was less than 500,000 homes per year. Even during 1947 only about 800,000 new housing units were constructed by private enterprise—at this rate it will take about 4 years to alleviate the current housing shortage.

I am not condemning the private construction industry itself for the present housing situation. But I do maintain that private enterprise cannot provide decent housing for all Americans by its own efforts, and that it needs the assistance of the Federal Government in order to do the job. This is the underlying assumption of the T-E-W bill—to provide Government financial assistance to help the private building industry construct decent homes for all Americans.

T-E-W HOUSING BILL IS MUST LEGISLATION

I am convinced that the T-E-W housing bill offers the only practical and constructive solution to America's housing needs. To furnish our people the new housing units needed to correct the present housing shortage, the bill would, if enacted into law, result in the construction of several million homes within 2 years. By providing for the construction of 15,000,000 homes during the next 10 years, it offers a plan of meeting our long-run housing needs.

In brief, this is what the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill—(S. 866 as passed by the Senate—provides: First, the authorization of $2,000,000,000 for mortgage-insurance and FHA loans to finance rental housing and private-owned homes during the next year through long-term, low-interest loans; second, the authorization of Federal funds to construct 500,000 public low-rent housing units during the next 5 years; third, the authorization of $50,000,000, in RFC loans to finance the manufacture of prefabricated homes; fourth, the authorization of $268,000,000 in loans and grants to improve substandard farm homes, with additional funds being made available for financing new farm homes and to eliminate rural slums; and, fifth, the authorization of Federal funds to finance city slum-clearance programs.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the T-E-W housing bill, as passed by the other body, provides a broad and constructive program to meet the housing requirements for America. It will provide 15,000,000 new homes during the next 10 years. It will furnish low-rent public housing for those who cannot pay rents at inflated rates. It will eliminate farm slums by furnishing funds to raise rural housing standards and build several million new farm homes. It will go far to eliminate city slums through its slum-clearance program. In my opinion, this program which the bill sets forth is the only logical answer to the housing problem in the United States.

THE COST OF FAILURE

My economy-minded colleagues tell us that America cannot afford to spend a few billion dollars for additional American homes. I say that we cannot afford not to build enough homes to furnish decent and healthy homes for all our people. Few people realize the important role that housing plays in the physical and social well-being of the Nation, nor do they realize how much less juvenile delinquency, disease and crime there is in modern housing projects as compared to slum areas.

I will mention a few statistics to prove my point. For example, the pneumonia death rate in slum areas is three times as great as it is in normal residential areas, the infant mortality rate is six times as great, and the tuberculosis rate is ten times greater in the slums than in areas where decent housing prevails. I might also mention that the crime rate in slum areas is five times greater than in the better residential areas. Although city slum areas contribute but a small part of the cities' real-estate revenues, the cost of police protection, fire protection, health and other local government services, is much greater in slum areas than in other parts of the city.

In other words, bad housing and slum conditions mean that society pays a terrific price in terms of disease, crime, and other social costs. It means that our veterans cannot find homes for their families, and that our entire population must endure the inconveniences and threats to their health which substandard housing represents. I say that America must accept the goal of a minimum standard of housing for all its people, and that the Federal Government must take the lead in achieving this goal. The cost of failure to do this is too high, and we cannot afford to pay the social costs.

CONGRESS FAILS THE PEOPLE

When the other House finally passed S. 866 on April 22, all supporters of decent housing for America were overjoyed. We were further encouraged when the House Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably on a similar housing bill last Friday, June 11, after a 14 to 13 vote. These events seemed to indicate that at long last relief for the 40 million ill-housed Americans was in sight, and that there was a good chance that Congress would enact into law the kind of housing legislation that the people need and want.

But our hopes for decent housing were short-lived—we had not taken into account the reactionary, antisocial attitudes of the Republican leadership, and the influence of the real-estate lobby upon the policies of the majority party. For yesterday's developments make it clear that the GOP leadership is not interested in any kind of housing legislation, and is now resorting to every parliamentary trick and device to block action upon the T-E-W housing bill. This is the only possible interpretation of the high-handed action of the House Rules Committee in refusing to permit this important measure to come to the floor for debate. This explains why the committee now comes forward with this emasculated housing bill (H. R. 6959) as a substitute for genuine housing legislation.

In sponsoring this so-called housing bill H. R. 6959, my Republican colleagues claim that it is a substitute for the T-E-W housing bill. An examination of its provisions, however, show that this claim is deceitful and that the bill is a fraud and a sham. All the major provisions of the T-E-W housing bill—the public housing, slum clearance, urban development, veterans' housing, and housing research features have been eliminated from this measure now under debate. This bill does nothing more than increase the authorization for FHA mortgages for the benefit of the real-estate interests and includes a few minor changes in existing law such as permitting the sale of war housing and modification of housing credit terms.

This bill is only acceptable to the selfish real-estate lobby—certainly the common people of America and the veterans who are now living in slums, shacks, trailers, or crowded into spare rooms and sleeping porches have no reason to rejoice. This bill cannot furnish our Nation with the homes we need and want. The Republican majority, in sponsoring this measure, is attempting to convince the people that the GOP is interested in housing legislation without doing anything constructive about the housing problem. In doing this, the Republicans are guilty of political fraud—they are breaking their pledges to the veterans, and they are betraying the welfare of the people in favor of selfish real-estate interests.

I refuse to become a part of this gigantic hoax—I will not support this measure that represents a sell-out of the common people whose housing needs are being neglected.

I call upon the Members of the House to vote down this sham so-called housing bill, H. R. 6959, and demand that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, as passed by the Banking and Currency Committee, be brought up for consideration and final vote.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the last section of H. R. 6959 removes for 1 year the duty on imports of plywood. I am strongly opposed to this provision because I feel that it will result in discrimination against the plywood industry. If the duties were removed it would make it impossible for the plywood industry of my State to compete with foreign plywood industries because of the great disparity in costs. Furthermore, the suspension of the duty is unnecessary and inadvisable in view of the domestic industry's increased and increasing production to meet domestic requirements. It is estimated that where heretofore the

industry production was 29,000,000 feet per week it has currently been increased to 35,000,000 feet per week. When new plants now being constructed are completed it is estimated that the production will be 40,000,000 feet before the end of this year. This should relieve any existing shortages of plywood for housing purposes.

Under the suspension of rules I appreciate that the bill cannot now be amended. It is my hope that this section of the bill will, therefore, be removed in conference.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the housing bill now under consideration.

As I have indicated for some time, and as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] well knows because of my conversations with him, I favor the enactment of housing legislation embodying the principle incorporated in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I can agree somewhat with the position of the gentleman from Michigan with respect to relying upon private industry to build the great majority of homes which are needed so badly. However, I would call to his attention, and I would like to emphasize that Federal aid to States and municipalities to construct decent living quarters for persons in the low-income groups and in slum areas is nothing new.

It appears that the bill before the House, which unquestionably has much merit, will be the only housing measure to come before the House. It does not look as if we will have an opportunity to vote on the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, nor does it look as if there would come before the House the Rogers bill, the Veterans' Homestead Act, which was approved unanimously by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This is regrettable. Both of these measures are worthy of consideration by the Congress.

Notwithstanding the fact that private industry is now building houses in unprecedented numbers, unless private builders are able to construct habitable living quarters which can be rented at reasonable rates, then the Congress must at the next session meet this issue and enact necessary legislation to provide such homes.

The veterans throughout the country living in temporary makeshift housing projects want decent homes in which to live—I know whereof I speak because in my district there are probably more veterans in these projects than in any other district in the United States. Unless homes are forthcoming, these veterans will look to the Congress at the next session for the immediate passage of adequate legislation which will provide sufficient housing.

MILLIONAIRE BONUS HOUSING BILL WITHOUT HOUSING

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill should not be called a housing bill. It might better be called the millionaires' bonus housing bill, without any housing. It is a subsidy bill for the real-estate interests, with tax exemptions and bonuses that have no place in this bill. There is not a word in the bill that will even tend to clear a single slum area or build a single multiple dwelling for the housing of low-income groups.

The manner in which this bill is foisted upon this Congress is a travesty upon our American traditions.

A bill providing for public housing and slum clearance, both rural and urban, and for housing research, was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee by a majority vote, and the committee chairman instructed to obtain a rule from the Rules Committee to bring the matter before the House for consideration and action. Instead of following the instructions of the Banking and Currency Committee, its chairman urged the Rules Committee to prevent consideration of the bill. When the Rules Committee by a vote of 6 to 2 acceded to his request he then conceived the idea of foisting this bill upon the Congress.

The bill was introduced on the 16th of June. At 8 o'clock that night some of the members of the committee were advised of an executive session to be held at 9 o'clock the following morning, and other members did not get notice until after 9 o'clock on June 17 that the committee was meeting in executive session to consider this bill. Although at least a half dozen members of the committee sought recognition for various purposes, including the offering of amendments to the bill, the chairman could hear and see no one except the member with whom he had arranged in advance to present a motion to vote the bill out. The motion was entertained and forced through without permitting anyone to say a single word about the bill. Not only was no discussion called for, but none was permitted. And now we are asked to pass this bill under a suspension of the rules of the House, permitting a total of 40 minutes of debate, 20 minutes of which are controlled by the chairman of the committee and without any right to offer a single amendment to the bill or a motion to recommit the bill. Those tactics alone warrant the defeat of a motion to suspend the rules and to pass the bill.

In my district, city, and State the public-housing and slum-clearance provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill are not political issues. They have the almost unanimous support of every person in every walk of life, regardless of their political leanings.

Borough President John Cashmore, Mayor William O'Dwyer and Governor Thomas E. Dewey, have all indicated their all-out support for those provisions. Every veteran, religious, and fraternal group in my State favors the enactment of such legislation. Yet a small handful of men in this Congress are preventing the Congress from considering and acting upon those measures, and are arrogating to themselves the powers of a dictator.

If there was merit in their opposition, and if they genuinely felt they were right, they would have no hesitancy in letting this Congress debate the issues and vote upon them. The entire Republican Party, unfortunately, must be compelled to bear the consequences of this ill-considered action on the part of its leadership in this House.

The American public is too smart to be fooled by the passage of a bill labeled a housing bill, that is not a housing bill, that is nothing more nor less than a rich man's subsidy bill and which denies the American public the relief to which it is entitled.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress with the purpose of assisting, in every way possible, in the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. For 2 years, week after week and month after month, I have been meeting and conferring with other Members of this body, who also are interested in the passage of a proper housing bill. It therefore comes as a grave disappointment to me that we have only this type of a housing bill before us.

Many of us have had intimate knowledge of the powerful forces lobbying against the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill but having set ourselves to the task, we were able to overcome their influence in the Committee on Banking and Currency, where this legislation has been sleeping for the past 3 years.

Just a few days ago a majority of the Banking and Currency Committee—yes, all of the Democrats and three Republicans—reported a bill incorporating the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill out of that committee. The forces blocking this legislation for 3 years were given a tremendous set-back. That fine housing bill then proceeded in the normal manner to the Rules Committee, where we had every reason to expect that in the normal course of events a rule would have been granted and the bill soon would have been brought forth on the floor for debate and vote. How foolish we were to expect that the opponents of this measure would cease their fight. Their activity increased, and great pressure was brought to bear upon the Rules Committee itself. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, the chief opponent to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, led the fight in the Rules Committee against the majority report of his own committee.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the opponents were successful for I am reliably informed that by a vote of six to two, the Rules Committee refused to grant this splendid housing bill a rule, and back it went to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Another amazing part of this story is that the chairman of that committee, the same Mr. WOLCOTT, then brought forth his own bill and submitted it to the committee for consideration. This bill is the bill which has the approval of the powerful lobby of which I have just spoken. As Mr. Wolcott, the chairman, presented this watered-down housing bill to his committee, the Democratic members were prohibited from amending or objecting to the present bill in any manner whatsoever. The debate on this measure reveals that the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee refused to recognize any of the Democratic members during the entire session of that committee. Hence we have the bill before us in its present form.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. Does the present bill come to us through the Rules Committee? Does it come to us under a rule permitting the membership of this great body either to amend it on the floor of this House or as a last resort to move to reconsider this measure? The answer is clearly "no." The answer is "no," Mr. Speaker, because the chairman of that committee and the Republican leadership who support this legislative maneuver do not want the people to know where they stand on the vital items which have been stricken out of this bill now under consideration. They do not want to go on record as showing where the Republican Party stands or each Republican Member of this House stands on the questions of rural housing, slum clearance, and public housing.

So, here we are again, Mr. Speaker, voting an important measure under a suspension of the rules which neither permits an amendment nor a motion to reconsider. In my opinion this is the rankest kind of political cowardice.

I can appreciate a difference of opinion on this important subject and I do not condemn those who may not agree with me, but I have an utter contempt for any individual who is unwilling to record his stand for the information of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this procedure in the hope that the leadership of this body will be compelled to bring forth the housing bill recommended by a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Clearly, if this present bill is voted down, there is ample time for the Republican leadership and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to do one of two things. As I have indicated, they may again present to the Rules Committee the bill which was first reported out by a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency or, and of equal importance, they may take the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which was passed recently by the Senate and is now in the Committee on Banking and Currency. I repeat, there is ample time for either of these bills to be presented to this body before adjournment, should the pending measure be voted down.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation want a housing bill. They are entitled to a housing program. If given an opportunity the Members of this body will join with the Senate of the United States in giving them a housing program. Only political and legislative chicanery will prevent the enactment of adequate housing legislation.

The present bill is a fraud and a subterfuge. It adds nothing to a program for housing legislation. Actually, the important provisions of this bill already have been passed by this body. These other housing bills now are resting in the Senate. The reason for that is that the Senate has incorporated most of their provisions in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which was passed by the Senate with a substantial majority. It is that bill of which I have spoken which now rests in the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. Speaker, there has been entirely too much talk about socialism in connection with the housing bill. Everyone of any intelligence knows that Senator TAFT, whatever else he may be, is not a Socialist. Certainly Governor Dewey is not a Socialist. In fact, most of the outstanding leaders of this Nation are in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Therefore, let us stop this childish talk about the danger of traveling along the road to socialism. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to your attention that a proper housing program can lend strength to the moral fabric of this Nation. The lack of proper housing facilities not only has cost this Nation billions of dollars in the suppression of crime, juvenile delinquency, etc., but great moral problems have arisen from the increase in divorces which, too, has a bearing on the problem of juvenile delinquency.

And fundamentally, there is that problem of satisfying the needs of our people and overcoming the bitter resentment of veterans—two or three millions of them who have been looking for homes now for almost 3 years.

If this pending measure passes, those of us who have worked so hard and so long can only hope that the Republican leadership in the Senate of the United States may strike from this bill all below the enacting clause and include the original provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, eventually reporting the same to this body for a record vote. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility rests with the Republican leadership and unless a proper housing program is forthcoming from this Congress, it will be an issue you will have to meet again and again in the coming campaign.

HOUSING BILL A FRAUD

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this so-called housing bill is a fraud on the American people which alone is enough to insure defeat for the present Republican majority in Congress at the hands of an aroused country.

Furthermore, the ignominious methods used in jamming the bill through the House prove the utter and cynical bankruptcy of the Republican leadership.

The malodorous deal is proof irrefutable that there is no Republican Party, but only a collection of factions struggling for the privilege of outraging public interest.

The House Republican faction has disowned the Senate leadership flagrantly, publicly, and maliciously, by the instrumentality of this bill. The political implications are obvious, and to Democrats hilarious.

But to 12,000,000 Americans seeking shelter at prices within their reach, this farce is rank tragedy.

The bill makes it impossible for a private real-estate operator to lose money.

It makes it equally impossible for the ordinary ex-GI or common citizen to gain a decent place to live.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to socialized housing in this country, and I shall support this bill which, in my opinion, will be a great aid to private construction.

The improvement of our critical housing situation should not be crippled by a nationalized building program.

This legislation increases mortgage insurance authority by $1,600,000,000, which should encourage increased building by individuals and help thousands of veterans as well as other individuals to finance their own homes.

Since the Eightieth Congress removed controls from building materials some 835,000 dwelling units were completed in 1947, which is almost double the number constructed in 1946. Three hundred and fifty-six thousand homes were started the first 5 months of this year and every indication points to the construction of 1,000,000 homes this year which will be an all-time record.

I am sure that this legislation will be particularly helpful in the solving of our housing problem.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the proposed housing bill does not include any provision for low-rent public housing or slum clearance. As a matter of simple justice, I cannot be satisfied with a housing program which would aid all groups of our citizenry except the very one most in need of it. On July 24, 1947, the Congress, by Concurrent Resolution No. 104, created a Joint Committee on Housing with instructions to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of housing. This committee was composed of seven Members of the House and seven of the Senate, appointed from the respective Committees on Banking and Currency. This committee during the summer, fall, and early winter of 1947 conducted hearings in all the principal cities from Boston, Mass., to San Francisco, Calif. I recall attending the hearing held at Boston and the one in New Haven, Conn. Volumes of testimony have been taken concerning the situation and hardly a week passes that one does not receive the printed record of the proceedings held in some city in this country. The joint resolution provided that this committee should report to the Congress not later than March 15, 1948, the result of its finding, and on that day, the gentleman from New York, Hon. RALPH GAMBLE, chairman of the committee, submitted a final majority report, which is a matter of record. In this report certain conclusions and recommendations were made, and I particularly call attention to recommendation No. 13, reading as follows:

> Provision should be made now for Federal aid to local communities to enable them to undertake the clearance of their slums and blighted areas so as to make such areas available for redevelopment with the active participation of private enterprise. For this purpose, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator should be authorized to undertake a program of loan and subsidy assistance to communities. This program should be wholly distinct and separate from the low-rent public-housing program. The subsidy should be on a capital-grant basis and should involve a sharing of the net costs of slum clearance between the Federal Government and local communities on a 2-to-1 matching basis. As an initial program, the Administrator should be authorized to make, over the next 5-year period, $1,000,000,000 in loans, repayable with interest, and $500,000,000 in subsidy commitments, at the rate of $100,000, a year. Such a program should be authorized immediately in order to make posible the preparatory steps necessary in connection with such a program.

And recommendation No. 14, reading as follows:

Provision should be made for assistance to local communities under the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the provision over a period of the next 5 years of a maximum of 500,000 units of low-rent public housing for families of low income with (1) additional safeguards written into the act to increase local responsibility, make sure that tenancy is restricted to low-income families, and avoid any competition with private housing; (2) preference to the families of veterans and servicemen for a period of 5 years; (3) revision of the applicable cost limitations, which have not been revised since the original act of 1937, so as to bring them in line with current housing costs; (4) shortening the period for the payment of annual contributions from 60 years to 40 years; (5) an increase of the rate of maximum Federal contribution by 1 percent per annum of development cost, which increase will be more than compensated for by the shortened period over which Federal contributions can be paid; (6) provision that, in the event of a major default by a local authority in its contractual obligations, the Public Housing Authority may take over a low-rent housing project until such default is cured, and may continue to pay annual contributions not in excess of the original amount contracted for; and (7) revision of the present $800,000,000 borrowing authorization of PHA to make it clear that amounts repaid are available for reloaning.

(It is believed that with the aid of the financing amendments recommended above it would be possible for local authorities to sell bonds to private investors covering substantially the entire cost of low-rent projects and at a substantial saving in interest costs as compared with the cost of borrowing from the Government. The reduction in interest rate, estimated to be approximately one-half of 1 percent per annum, would permit more rapid amortization of bonds, and combined with the shorter period during which bonds are outstanding, should result in a very great decrease in total interest costs.)

Attention was called to the undisputable fact that in the spring of 1947 there were 2,800,000 families living doubled up with other families, the vast majority forced to accept unsatisfactory living arrangements because of the acute housing shortage. An additional 500,000 families are living in temporary housing, trailers, rooming houses, and other makeshift accommodations. The committee stressed the urgency of the housing shortage and the necessity for prompt and effective action by the Congress. The note of urgency so deeply pervaded the local hearings held by this committee that no summation or analysis of these hearings would possibly be considered an accurate reflection of them without clear-cut emphasis of this fact. This was true whether the testimony was with respect to our northern, southern, eastern or western communities; our urban or rural areas; the needs of our veterans, minority groups, or our people generally; or the needs of our low-income or middle-income families.

The committee also recognized that this problem was one that could not be solved by State and local governments alone, and that Federal financial assistance to our communities was imperative, and stated as follows:

This note of urgency, struck over and over again throughout the course of the hearings, indicates clearly that the housing situation has been so serious in our communities generally, and that the pressures upon our State and local governments to act have therefore been so great, that there can be little doubt as to the intense desire and determination of our local communities and officials to assist in meeting the housing problem to the best of their abilities. They are especially concerned with two major problem areas—the clearance and redevelopment of slums and blighted areas and the provision of decent housing for low-income families now living in slums. Nevertheless, these matters are entirely beyond their control and beyond their financial capacities. Senator Wagner's report summarizes the ample evidence attesting these facts. It is clear that we cannot deal effectively with these deep-rooted phases of the housing problems without adequate Federal financial assistance to our communities for such purposes. It is clear also from the overwhelming evidence that these phases of the housing problem are of such magnitude and seriousness that adequate solutions depend on treating them as part of the housing problem.

Whether it be with respect to Boston, or New York, or Jacksonville, or Birmingham, or Cleveland, or Chicago, or Louisville, or Seattle, reports from source after source have been almost monotonously similar. The well-being of our local communities is threatened by the excessive fiscal and social costs of our slums and blighted areas. The hearings and studies of this committee have served only to corroborate the evidence of survey after survey made over the years, national and local alike, that the bad-housing areas, the social-problem areas, the areas of relatively high municipal costs, and the areas of relatively low returns, are practically identical.

The committee concluded that—

Local self-government is a cherished part of our democratic process. From this fact, however, it is entirely specious to argue that the problems of housing for families of low income and slum clearance must be the responsibility of our localities alone, with the Federal Government in the role of an onlooker. The simple fact is that it is because these special problems have proved so entirely beyond the capacity of our local governments that the situation has become as acute as it has.

This joint committee also concluded that it was evident that the home-building industry is providing homes which only the higher income families can afford and seems to indicate that the only feasible solution of this question is by the Federal subsidy.

In Connecticut we have a particularly severe housing problem because of our greatly increased population, particularly in the former defense industrial areas, and this is particularly true in New Haven in my congressional district. Thousands of persons who came to Connecticut to be employed in defense industry during the war remained as they liked our State so well. During recent months in Connecticut, the problem has rapidly become even more serious. In 1946 an estimated 25,000 new housing units were needed. The need today is estimated at some 40,000. In New Haven alone, there are some 1,400 families who are seeking shelter in low-rent housing units. While private industry has done a great job, at the same time it is evident that it is now providing homes which only the higher income families can afford and this seems to indicate that the only feasible solution to this question is by Federal subsidy.

It has been suggested most sincerely that federally financed low-rent housing and slum clearances are "socialistic." I cannot agree. If this is so, then the majority of the Members of Congress comprising the Joint Housing Committee have gone socialistic. I doubt very much if it will be accepted by the veterans and the persons who are without a roof over their heads at the present time. Nor do I believe that they will be very much impressed by the argument of the excessive cost of such a program. In this connection we have recently embarked upon a program for the relief and rehabilitation of the peoples of 16 foreign nations wherein we will build shelter for them and even furnish them with tobacco and it has not been suggested that this is socialistic or that it is un-American.

I shall vote for the Wolcott bill, not because I am satisfied with it, but so that we may have a housing bill that will go to the Senate for conference in the hope that as a result thereof, the conferees may agree on a housing bill which will establish a long-range housing policy, and relieve the intolerable conditions which now prevail.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, certain groups in this country have been demanding enactment of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. I could not support that measure in the form that it reached the House for the reason that it is based on socialistic principles.

Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to lend my support, however, to the Wolcott bill, H. R. 6959, which in my opinion will meet the pressing demands for housing in the American way. Clearly, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would put Government in the housing business to the detriment of private enterprise which has a building record unsurpassed in the history of this country. The basis for the Taft bill is, in my opinion, socialistic in that the Government would take over and superimpose itself upon private building if the building industry fails to meet a given situation which would arise in the minds of the bureaucrats administering the program.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely interesting to note that private enterprise last year built 835,100 units and it is estimated that it will build more than a million units this year. When the Government was in the building business under the so-called Wyatt housing program and controlled all of the items that went into housing and with several billions of dollars from the Government it produced only 437,800 units. It is a further fact that when the Government had the power to command the channeling of every inch and every ounce of building materials that went into the home-building field its record for building homes was a miserable one. It cannot be said that private enterprise in the building field has failed. In fact it has an unbelievable record of achievement; it is building many homes today.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the provisions of H. R. 6959 the bill contains provisions which make it possible to build houses to meet a continuing emergency without calling upon the Government to finance public projects to the extent of

some $6,000,000,000. It has been rightfully said that a Government housing program would be expensive for the taxpayers, it would raise the cost of houses where the so-called little man could not purchase them, and it would certainly add to the inflationary spiral.

And further, Mr. Speaker, if we are to adopt the principles of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which are based upon a socialistic principle that Government must step in when private enterprise does not meet a situation, it is reasonable to believe that once Government monopolized the building field it would be justified to move into any field where shortages occur on the theory that private enterprise had failed. Today there is a shortage in automobiles. Is it contended that Government should step in and take over the automobile industry of this country? There is a shortage of coal. Does the same principle apply there? Many other instances might be cited but certainly we have not reached the point in this country where we must resort to socialism; when government steps in to meet production shortages. Such a program is un-American. In effect, the Wolcott housing bill says to the building industry of this country: "Go ahead and do this job; we will lend whatever assistance we can in the field of financing, but the job is yours." The general purposes of the bill are designed to meet the needs for low-cost housing, rental housing, and continuance of veterans' preference under title 6 of the National Housing Act, and in the disposition of Government-owned permanent war housing. Further, it provides a secondary market for insured FHA mortgages and GI guaranteed home loans.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and meets the problem in the good old American way.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are two real and cogent objections that must be lodged against this bill being brought in today in this comprehensible way. In the first place, the methods being used to gag and bind not only a legislative committee of this Congress, but the entire membership by forcing this bill through without amendment, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," and to deny the legislative Representatives of the people of America even to stand up and be counted on such a vital issue as housing alone would be reason enough for defeating this bill.

The dictatorial methods, used by the Republican leadership, and the usurpation of authority belonging to a legislative committee by the Republican controlled Rules Committee, should be enough to defeat this use of the most vicious form of "gag" rule being practiced on the House in bringing this legislation to the floor under rules suspension.

That should be enough to defeat this bill, but even a greater and more compelling reason for defeating it is the plain fact that it is a complete phony, as far as housing legislation is concerned.

I want to elaborate on that. The only thing in this bill that will actually and genuinely help get houses for the millions in this country who are crying desperately for a place to live is title VI of FHA. Title VI has passed this House long ago and has been pending in the Senate since March 24 of this year. The bill can be passed by the Senate today or tomorrow and become law. That extends $2,000,000,000 worth of FHA insurance under title VI, which the chairman of the committee will admit has been the most useful instrument of getting housing. The other portion of this bill is the sale of Lanham war permanent housing, which also passed the House and has been pending in the Senate since June 19, 1947. So almost three-fourths of this bill, the part that will get housing, has already been passed by the House.

It is not going to do any good to pass it two times or three times or four times through the same House. It has to go through the other House before it becomes a law.

The main issue before the House is the question of what Federal aids are going to be given to the housing, Federal aids in the nature of a subsidy, if you please.

By dictation of the Republican leadership of the House and by dictation of the Republican control of the Rules Committee of the House they have decided that the poorest and most underprivileged class of people in the United States, the people who hopelessly live in America's slums, cannot get any subsidies to improve their housing conditions, even under a locally managed program administered by the cities themselves.

So they have killed out all the subsidies to these underprivileged people—those for decent farm housing and veterans—but have left in the bill the subsidies for the people who are best able to pay their own way—these investors.

There is not one dime of subsidies that will reach the underprivileged but there are millions if not hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of subsidy that will go to the rich investors. Let me elaborate.

This bill contains the best worked out tax dodge I have ever seen come before this Congress. If you are a wealthy man, you can insure a $500,000 apartment house built under FHA insurance up to 90 or 100 percent of its actual cost. Thus the wealthy investor is protected by this insurance at about 100 percent. Then what tax advantage do you give on that $500,000 house? Get this clear. You write off $250,000 of depreciation on the $500,000 investment in 5 years under tax exemptions for fast depreciation. That is in the report. Have you ever seen a better tax dodge than that? This is what the Treasury says it amounts to. If you have an income of $500,000 a year you have a tax dodge of better than $41,000 a year, $210,000 in the 5-year period, out of Uncle Sam's pocket. Subsidies? No subsidies for the underprivileged people in the slums but a nice fat subsidy for the "barefoot" millionaires that are looking for a way to beat Uncle Sam's tax. You get 100-percent insurance on your investment and then a write-off of 50-percent depreciation during 5 years.

This bill also contains a so-called yield-insurance provision, further designed to subsidize the big investor, as well as guaranteeing him against loss. No subsidies for the slum dweller, but always for the investor.

One of the strangest and most unusual procedures, however, is contained in the so-called FHA mortgage support market under the Federal National Mortgage Association. For several years this agency furnished a secondary market, where holders of mortgages could sell them, at par, to the Government corporation. The operation has netted a big profit to the Government.

But under this strange section, for the first time I believe in our history, the Congress is deliberately depressing the market on Government-insured mortgages. Instead of offering a secondary market for FHA or GI loans at par, this bill announces to the world that they are only worth 98 cents on the dollar. They will not be purchased by the Government for what the Government insurance says they are worth—for Congress under this bill says they are worth to us only 98 cents on the dollar.

Already this hastily conceived and ill-considered move has caused a wholesale withdrawal of investors from the home mortgage market—as well as threaten many builders with bankruptcy.

The net effect of this 98 cents on the dollar provision is the same as if the Federal Reserve banking system announced tomorrow that it would support the Government bond market at only 98 cents on the dollar. Do any of you think that the market would not immediately decline to the figure that Government itself set?

Thus it will be with this provision, which wrecks, instead of helps, the market for Government-insured FHA title VI loans.

Other provisions of this same section, changes without notice, financial aids which builders have for the past two or more years relied upon to build large-scale housing projects.

Conscientious builders, who heeded the Government's plea for large-scale production of housing, now find themselves faced with bankruptcy because the bill here denies them access to a ready Federal market.

This bill provides that unless a mortgage was insured after June 19, these Government-guaranteed mortgages cannot be marketed. With the confusion created by the introduction of this bill existing in the mortgage market, insurance companies and other investors have stopped buying title VI mortgages. Why should they, when the Congress is depressing the value of their mortgages by legislative action?

And so these builders, who relied on our good faith in building these houses, now find themselves heavily indebted to banks on short-time interim financing for construction, without a market to rely on when the house is completed.

This is a dangerous provision and one that you will live to regret. Already it has set the housing program back heavily—and if this bill becomes law, will further retard home financing.

In addition, it is certain to force up by 1 or 2 percent the cost of financing

these veterans' homes because of the uncertainty that has already been created.

In the bill killed by the Republican leadership yesterday, and on which you in the House were denied the right to vote upon, provision was made for a secondary market for GI home-building loans under the GI bill of rights. The bill here today strips away this help for the veteran and throws him a crumb.

Only an infinitesimal amount of help is given him on his financing problem—that of being able to have his second-mortgage GI loan eligible for the Federal secondary-market support. This, under the FHA combination loan, amounts to only 10 percent of the cost of his house.

Unless the veteran's house is built in a large community or in a neighborhood acceptable to the FHA authorities, he is denied completely any help on this score. The net effect of striking this valuable veterans' provision from the original bill, as was done in this new bill, is to deny any Government help to the veteran who wants to build on the farm, or in the small rural community. This is completely a housing bill for the cities and the rural people of America are being left out completely from any help in their housing problems.

All in all, this bill is so bad that it should be overwhelmingly defeated. There is still time to enact a general housing bill—one that will help all—the slum dwellers, the farmers, and veterans, as well as investors who ask tax subsidies to build our much-needed housing.

More than $6,000,000,000 in housing insurance has been provided for city dwellers—but the record does not reveal where one house has been so aided on a farm or in the small rural communities.

The issue here today is, whether you want to pass one-sided legislation to help only investors, or whether you want a genuine all-around housing bill.

If this bill is voted down under suspension of the rules, it can be brought back immediately under a rule, and can be open for amendments to correct the glaring defects. The tax dodge can be taken out, and help for farm and slum housing written in. And above all—the Congress can be counted on a roll-call vote so that everyone can see just where every Member stands on providing effective, rather than phony, housing legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I expect to support this bill. I am supporting it because I know that unless this bill passes we will have no housing legislation. There are some things in the bill to which I am opposed. I was one of the most active advocates, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, seeking to bring to the floor of this House a comprehensive bill involving practically all of the main issues relative to meeting the housing shortage. I think the Members of the House were entitled to have these matters thoroughly discussed, so by amendment they could add other provisions to the bill seeking to help solve the housing shortage or strike out any unwise provisions. Public housing and slum clearance have been an issue for some time, and I think the Members on the floor of this House should have an opportunity to settle this issue once and for all. It is regrettable that this bill cannot be amended in any form, under the rule by which it is being considered, nor can a motion be made to recommit the bill, but this is water over the dam, and to vote against the bill, as I have stated, means the end of housing legislation this session, as I see it.

Over in the other House, under the rules of that body a Member may offer an amendment and speak as long as he desires on it, so by voting for this bill there is a chance of getting some bill that would aid in solving the housing problem.

The housing problem affects every family in the United States directly or indirectly, and with the chance of this bill remedying the housing shortage I do not see how I could vote against the bill: I must say that I am certainly against the procedure under which this bill reached the floor of the House. The original Wolcott bill was reported out of the committee by a vote of 14 to 13, and the Rules Committee refused to give a rule. Then the Banking and Currency Committee was reconvened and the present Wolcott bill was voted out by the committee and none of the Democrats were given a chance to offer any amendment.

The present bill extends title VI of the Federal Housing Administration under which more than 40 percent of our housing has been constructed during the last year, and we will at least get this much out of this bill, and if amended in the Senate, it may be perfected to be more effective in solving the housing problem and a chance for the House to express itself on slum clearance and public housing. I think the question of taxes raised in this bill is bad and probably this will be eliminated in the other body or if brought to a conference.

Title III of the bill is not very effective for a secondary market, especially for GI loans. I advocated and introduced the first amendment in my committee in 1946 which became a law creating a secondary market for GI loans in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I offered an amendment to the first Wolcott bill which was adopted, and the entire bill was adopted later on by the committee, and this is the bill that the Rules Committee tabled. I had an amendment prepared yesterday to this effect and intended to offer it when the present Wolcott bill was considered, but I was not given an opportunity to present it. This proposed amendment was fair and equitable. It involved no cost to the Government. It meant that the promises contained in the GI bill of rights could be kept. It was approved not only by the House Banking and Currency Committee in H. R. 6888 but by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House.

A united veterans' organization was earnestly asking our support of this provision. Are we going to say that the promise made by this Government in 1944 to the men and women fighting for this country is an empty promise? It will be unless a secondary market is created for the GI loans. Since July 1, 1947, when the secondary market was withdrawn, it has been very difficult for the veterans to secure loans to build houses in many places of this country. So I say that in hope of the other body or the conferees of both bodies improving the situation I do not see how I could afford to vote against the present bill. Without it there would be no other chance of any housing bill at this session.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a conglomerate collection of previous titles that we have already sent over to the other body. For example, H. R. 5854 and H. R. 3492, and S. 2287—now Public Law 548. A good many Members here today have been led to believe, and a member of the committee who spoke before me has said that in order to have a continuation of title VI you would have to support this legislation, H. R. 6959. We have passed and sent to the other body the bill H. R. 5854 for the sum of $2,000,000,000. In this legislation today the difference between a temporary extension of some $400,000,000 that was cleared through the other side, and which is now a public law, was deducted from the so-called Wolcott bill, H. R. 6959, now under consideration. So do not be deluded into believing that if you do not vote for this bill you will not have an extension of title VI. The other body has had this legislation before it. It has not acted as yet. Just because you happen to vote for this legislation again today does not necessarily mean that they will take up this particular legislation. The gentleman from Oklahoma has pointed out to you the feature known as the fast tax amortization plan. That, of course, is a plan that will be of benefit to speculative builders. The guise is, of course, the offering of an opportunity to dodge the tax. If we were operating under an open rule we could question whether or not it is germane. Then we have another come-on in this legislation known as the yield insurance, which is a come-on for financial institutions or insurance companies to build in a particular price class.

To present this bill as a housing bill is a travesty. It is in reality a bill to offer financial aids to private enterprisers in the building business. It is a boon to home financing, with Government subsidy. Who will benefit by this legislation? Certainly not the farmer—not the communities, not the low-income families—not the moderate income families—not the veteran. The provisions for these groups are shabby and paltry. The bill frustrates one who appreciates the needs of the Nation for an over-all comprehensive housing program. But it certainly appeals to the speculative builders and those in the high income-tax brackets, and especially the real-estate lobby. All the "fat cats" of the industry will benefit. Those who need the help will benefit least, and those who need help the least will benefit most.

It is a shallow gesture at housing legislation and a mockery on this House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a sham and a delusion. To pass it would be a vain and futile thing. To begin with, its principal provisions have already been passed by the House of Representatives and are pigeonholed in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

If we pass it this afternoon, one of two things will happen. It will either be repigeonholed in that committee or it will be brought up on the floor of the Senate where S. 866 will be substituted therefor. So the net result of all the debate, the net result of all the hard work by the joint committee, made up of the House and Senate, seven Senators and seven Representatives, is that the veterans of this country, the people of this country, the farms of this country, and the cities of this country, when this Congress adjourns tomorrow night, will not have any housing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Banking Committee and of the Rules Committee for their success in denying to this House the opportunity to vote on a comprehensive housing bill. Last Thursday the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee stated that a majority of this House would vote for a comprehensive housing bill if it was presented to them. He stated that the only hope was that the Rules Committee would refuse to let the House vote on such a bill. He has succeeded in his maneuver.

I think the Members of this House will want to know just what is included in the comprehensive bill which the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Rules Committee have so successfully blocked. Every Member ought to know what the American people think of this bill—in terms of their needs for homes in which to live as Americans should, in which children can get a fair start in life and which will provide the aspirations which all of us must have to make life worth living. I am thinking of the needs of nearly 3,000,000 families who do not have any homes at all, but are crowded in, most of them involuntarily, with their in-laws and other families and of the 500,000 families living in trailers, rooming houses, temporary housing and other makeshift accommodations. I am thinking of the needs of more than 5,000,000 families in cities and surrounding areas, whose homes fall below decent standards for living. I am thinking also of the families on the farms whose homes are shacks which should be replaced or, at a minimum, need major repairs in order to make them livable. I am not even counting the great majority of farm homes which do not have the sanitary facilities which have become so essential for safe living in our cities, even though I deplore the lower housing standards we seem to accept for farm people.

Not even the best housing legislation we could enact is going to solve the housing problem for 10,000,000 families overnight. That is why we must consider legislation that looks ahead into the future, and not try to solve a long-range problem with short-run emergency measures. It is obvious that when you extend the solution of present problems into the future, you are also going to have to take into account the future increase in demand, losses in supply and the deterioration of additional housing to the point where it should be replaced. And finally, in order to bring about a normal relationship between needs and supply, it is important that there is a sufficient amount of housing available for rent or sale to give American families some flexibility within their price range and to make it possible for them to move about without having to be plagued with the difficulties of obtaining housing or being separated for long intervals.

Now what are the facts about housing needs? I know of no better place to turn to than the majority report filed just last March by the Joint Committee on Housing which was created by this Congress to study the housing problem. I think this House should know that while a few members of the committee dissented on a few of its recommendations, there was no disagreement with the findings reached after executive hearings in Washington and 32 other cities, after careful studies by individual members. I should add that these findings corroborated earlier conclusions reached by other committees, particularly the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1945 and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1946 and 1947, and that its estimates of need were determined after careful consideration of other estimates from a variety of sources. Data obtained from the Bureau of the Census reports as to population and housing inventory provide the basis of these estimates of need.

Putting aside farm needs for the moment, America will need 15,441,000 new homes by 1960 to provide decent homes for the 39,500,000 families which the Bureau of the Census estimates we will have by that time. That means 1,285,000 homes a year. Discounting the considerable number of farm dwellings that can be rehabilitated, we shall need 200,000 farm homes a year, bringing the total up to 1,500,000 new houses annually.

It will take over 7,000,000 nonfarm homes, or more than 600,000 units a year, just to bring the present supply up to the shelter requirements of American families, and to provide a 4 percent effective vacancy rate. Before the war, real estate people used to think the supply was normal when 5 percent vacancies existed. That is about all we have been doing in this country for the last quarter of a century. Over the long pull, housing construction has just been keeping ahead of the increase in number of families. We have done practically nothing to replace the slums, to replace the losses from fire, demolition, and floods. That is all we will do during the coming years if we do not make a comprehensive attack on the housing problem through effective legislation. If that is all we do, we will have more, instead of fewer slums, for houses wear out every year. As one witness before the Banking and Currency Committee observed, a house begins to deteriorate the minute it is finished.

If we really meet America's housing needs, if we really want to eliminate the slums that imperil the health and morale of several million of our people, we are going to need another 8,000,000 homes during the next 12 years, or nearly 700,000 homes a year, to provide replacements for urban and suburban slum dwellings which are presently, or will become, substandard, for dwellings lost by fire, demolition, and floods and for temporary dwellings, most of them built during the war for only short-time use.

This Congress will be neglecting its responsibility to the American people if it does not create the tools for reaching the larger housing goal set forth in the joint committee's report. We can no longer tolerate, in this Nation, bad housing conditions which are a financial drain on the communities, which sap the energies of the people, which deprive them of the incentives that a wholesome home life provides and which create conditions in which crime and delinquency are bred.

Despite the findings of the joint committee and of other congressional committees, there are still those who say we can solve this housing problem without enacting comprehensive housing legislation. Despite the record of festering urban slums and dreary rural shacks, there are those who say that if Government will just let things alone—except provide a little credit assistance—everything will work out all right.

I am conscious of the record that the private building industry has built up since the war. I hope that private builders will start a record-breaking million homes this year, as everything seems to indicate. I am in favor of the credit aids from the Federal Government which are contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which will help them achieve and maintain that record.

But I see nothing in the present situation that offers the hope that even with these credit aids, the private building industry will be able to achieve and maintain the production necessary to fill the enlarged goals that have been envisioned by the Joint Committee on Housing. Neither does the joint committee.

Let us take a look at the record. The previous peak in home building was reached 23 years ago, way back in 1925, when 937,000 dwelling units were started. Then construction began to slide down, helping to take the whole economy with it, until, in 1933, 93,000 homes, only 10 percent of the peak volume, were produced. Conditions in 1925 were very similar to what they are today. Homes were being built at prices and rents which only a small portion of American families could afford to pay. When that limited demand was filled, and when people who had overextended themselves in a desperate search for homes became unable to meet mortgage payments, home building started down the toboggan slide. The result was that average housing production during the two decades before the war was only 500,000 homes a year, just enough to keep up with the increase in families and not enough to take worn-out and other bad houses out of use and send them to the junkyard.

This example which all of us remember characterizes the history of home construction and this history will not change until one fundamental characteristic of the industry as it existed then and exists today is changed. That characteristic is that not enough people can afford new housing at the prices and rents at which it is made available to permit a sustained production sufficient to meet American needs. There are two ways of assuring enough housing for the American people—one is through a vast public housing program, the other is to bring the costs of private housing down, in relation to incomes, so that there will be enough demand to sustain the high rate of production which America needs. I think our emphasis should be on the latter. I think the Government should utilize its resources fully to help private enterprise get its costs down. I would like to see this filtration theory we hear about work, but it will work only if you pour in enough new houses to crowd out the slums at the bottom.

It is hardly germane to say that the costs of housing have not increased any than other prices, although there is good evidence that building costs, and the selling prices of both new and used houses, have exceeded the general rise in the costs of living and income. What is important is that new houses cost too much today to sustain production at the levels needed, just as they did in the thirties and the twenties.

What is needed is for the home building industry to catch up with the modern industrial parade. It needs to develop mass production methods to serve the mass markets awaiting for it. It needs to have the shackles of outmoded building codes and restrictive practices removed. The Federal Government can help in two principal ways. It can adapt its credit aids to the needs of builders using modern production methods. And it can inaugurate a program of research into new methods, materials, and techniques and to encourage their adoption. The authority would be, and should be, broad enough to permit the Government to cooperate with home building in all aspects of housing, from the improvement of production methods in the factory down to the modernization of building codes. Congress will have ample opportunity to control the extent of these activities from year to year through the appropriations procedure.

I would be amazed at the shortsighted opposition of some of the leaders of the home-building industry to this research program if the same sort of thing had not happened before. It took years of actual experience, for example, before home-financing institutions came to recognize the benefits to their own business of the FHA system of home financing. The Government undertook the mortgage insurance program of the FHA because no single segment of the home-building industry had sufficient resources to assume the risks it involved. The Government will have to assume leadership for a broad research program, because no element of the home-building industry has the resources with which to do the kind of a job that needs to be done. Those who fear the socialization of the housing industry should be the first to support this kind of a program, for the best way to avoid socialization of this or any other industry is to maintain the confidence of the people that private enterprise is serving their needs. This research program will help private enterprise serve the housing needs of the American people.

I am hopeful that with the improved credit aids to private industry and a broad program of research, private enterprise will, in time, be able to take care of the housing needs of most of the American people. But I do not believe that with these aids private enterprise will be able to assume the burdens unaided of clearing out the festering slums in our cities. The changes in methods of production and distribution which we hope to see accomplished will not be sweeping or rapid enough to permit any early solution, by private enterprise, of the problems of low-income families living in urban slums or in the bad housing in our rural areas. Any comprehensive housing program must deal with these problems, too, if it is to accomplish decent homes for all American families. So the modest programs in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill of Federal assistance for slum clearance and public housing and of direct credit and subsidies for the improvement of farm homes are essential parts of that bill. I would like to remind this House that these are modest programs, limited to 5 years, during which private enterprise may demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Congress, whether it intends or will be able to take care of the needs of lower income families.

I have heard it said that the way to clear slums is to get rid of them, but nobody has ever explained to me how private builders are going to be able to buy up slum land at its present costs, remove the old houses, and then replan and redevelop the areas with homes which people can afford to buy. Private builders will do as they always have done, and do their building on raw, inexpensive land. The essence of the urban redevelopment program contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is for the Government to share with local communities the excessive costs of acquiring and clearing slum areas so that the cleared land can be made available, primarily to private builders at prices which represent a fair value at its new use.

Neither has anybody ever explained to me how private builders are going to provide decent homes at prices and rents which present slum dwellers or other low-income families can afford to pay. The people who have talked so glibly about the fine workings of the filtration theory have recently come along with some figures which, assuming certain things happened, purported to show that private enterprise was building for low-income families. I am sure those figures are small comfort to the low-income veteran looking for a place in which to live, or to the low-income family huddled together in a decaying tenement. They certainly are not believed by 90 percent of governors, mayors, and prominent individuals, including a majority of those connected with the home-building industry, who, according to a report issued by the Joint Committee on Housing, said that private enterprise would not be able to provide decent homes for all low-income families within the foreseeable future. If, as opponents of housing legislation attempt to prove, 20 percent of the houses built last year finally were priced at $4,500 or less, they are not in localities of greatest housing need or else they are shacks which are substandard to begin with or soon will be. There are certainly no such numbers of decent homes in Washington or in my home city at that price. A recent Census survey indicates that the average prices at which new homes are being sold today in Washington is $13,000 to $15,000. This is beyond the means of four-fifths of the families in Washington.

There is only one way I know of at the present time to hope that these families will have decent homes in which to live, and that is through public assistance.

The only other argument against public assistance for slum clearance and public-housing programs that deserves serious consideration is that these are problems that the local communities can and should solve. The fact is that most cities cannot afford to take on the additional burden and that the few cities which can will be able to handle only a part of the problem. The governors and mayors who replied to the joint committee questionnaire sent out by Senator WAGNER agreed that the cities and States could not take care of all the needs of low-income families, and only a few thought they could go beyond local tax exemption for public-housing projects. Their judgment is sustained by the report, Coordination of Federal and State Taxes, filed by Senator BRICKER. This report describes the financial strains being imposed upon the cities and States by higher costs of services, by the necessity for making up for wartime postponement of replacements, maintenance work, and new construction, and by the inflexibility of their principal source of revenue, real-estate taxes. It is sustained by the heavy bond flotations of municipalities and by the increase in interest rates on such issues. It is obvious that if we leave the problem of slums and bad housing exclusively to the local communities it will not be solved. I believe that the Federal Government, together with the local communities, has a responsibility for the people's housing needs. I think it has some responsibility of seeing that children start out in life with the equality of opportunity that only decent homes can provide.

So I urge passage of a comprehensive housing bill. We need to retain and improve the financing aids to private industry which this Government has been supplying since the middle thirties. We need to institute a program of research to help private industry do a better job of supplying the Nation's housing needs. And finally we need to provide financial assistance in those areas in which private enterprise is unable to operate. Only by

a program containing all these measures will this Nation be able to work toward a solution of its entire housing problem.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 1 minute, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I impugn the motives of nobody, but if I were to vote for this bill under these conditions, I would feel that I was perpetrating a fraud upon the American people, for the simple reason that I think I know that this means there will be no housing legislation at this session of Congress. I think we should show our resentment of this procedure and this kind of a bill by voting down this motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think the issues in respect to housing have been crystallized to the point where almost everyone's position is known.

I was a little amazed that the gentleman from Texas, my exceptionally good friend, the minority leader, would make a statement which is in effect that we cannot provide shelter in America through private sources; that the Government has got to build the houses. I do not think my esteemed friend from Texas wants to put himself in the same category of those many witnesses who came before the Committee on Banking and Currency and admitted that the provisions of the bill, which was rejected by the House Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday morning, were socialistic in purpose. The very basis of socialism is that the Government shall take over when private enterprise has failed to meet a demand or a production program. I do not call anyone a Socialist in respect to this legislation. There has been so much loose talk about it, so much demagoguery about it, so much misunderstanding, and so few facts.

However, let me call attention, after making the statement that almost every one of the witnesses for the proponents of this legislation, predicated the necessity for public housing on the ground that private enterprise had failed, although private enterprise had built 835,100 units last year, and this year will build more than a million units, in face of the fact that when the Government did at one time have control over this subject in 1946, the Government, with all the power at its command to channel every inch and every ounce of building materials into the home-building field, produced only 437,800 units.

Now, has private enterprise failed? If private enterprise has not failed, then this House has no business turning this program over to the Government.

There was a very honest-minded, serious, conscientious Socialist who testified before our committee. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] asked him to define the differences, to point out the differences between the different political parties, and he did; and on page 776 of the hearings he said:

> The Socialist Party—
>
> Have in mind this is a Socialist, the mayor of Milwaukee, Mr. Zeidler—
>
> The Socialist Party or the Socialists as a whole, and they are well represented all over the world, particularly by that element in the British labor movement, conceive the function of government to be democratic in its essence and feel that wherever there is a basic activity or a basic production method which is not being met or which is not being carried fully by the private-enterprise system, that there it is a responsibility of the community to step in and try to meet that need.

I do not say that this is a socialistic program; the Socialists themselves say that it is a socialistic program.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I cannot; I am sorry.

The bill which you have before you is a bill which will provide and will assure that every ounce and every inch of available building materials and every minute of available labor will be utilized to the fullest extent in the next 12 months, making possible a program of building more units than have ever been built in a comparable period of time by any country under the canopy of God's heaven.

We should be proud of this Government of ours, and I am; and whatever I have done and whatever those of us who have sincerely since 1939 opposed socialized housing, whatever we have done has been in the interest of preserving the American system. If we have sinned in that respect we have sinned in accordance with and not in defiance of the Constitution of the United States.

A coalition of constitutionalists in this House in 1939—and the gentleman from Oklahoma was one of them then—on this floor by a good substantial majority defeated a rule for the continuance of this program. The principle of this program was before us at that time.

I wish some of your Members who are here now and who voted on that rule would turn to the record before you vote in order that you will not be in the inconsistent position of bravely and conscientiously voting against public housing then and now because you see in it some political advantage voting for socialized housing.

Let us be careful of what we do here. We are setting a precedent, perhaps, we are setting a precedent.

If private enterprise has failed to produce enough houses to justify the Government's taking over, then does the same philosophy apply to the failure of private enterprise to produce enough automobiles, enough shoes, at reasonable prices, enough food at reasonable prices? You have identically the same thing involved.

Is the next step to ask the automobile industry to move aside and let the Government get into the production of trucks and automobiles? Are you going to Brockton and other towns in the New England States and say that because shoes cannot be bought in the United States for less than $10 that the Government must step in and manufacture your shoes? Are we going out on the farms and say to the farmers: "Because you cannot produce enough food at low enough cost, the Government must come in and operate your farms?" In the rural provisions of this bill which we refused to report out of the committee, there was the socialistic provision that the Government should step on to each and every farm which asked for relief under that bill and virtually operate the farm by setting up the standards under which that farm should be operated, the crops that should be put in and so forth.

That, Mr. Speaker, is socialism. I do not care who it is that goes along with it, he has got to answer to the people. He has got to reconcile the position which he takes on this bill with the definition of socialism. I have tried to do so. Now, if there is any doubt at all, let us resolve the doubt in favor of the American form of Government which has resulted in a production effort during the war and since the war which is the envy of every socialistic country in the world.

This bill will make it possible to build houses to meet the emergency. If you had adopted the provision we struck out of the bill on public housing, you would have superimposed a public housing program, a Government project, on top of the present demand, amounting to something like $6,000,000,000 which, of course, would have resulted in further inflationary tendencies, making the cost of houses so high that nobody could possibly afford to buy any houses whatsoever. It was inflationary. Government housing is inflationary. One of the sponsors in the other body said that to permit the spending of $7,000,000,000 at the present time is the most inflationary thing that we could do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I know the provisions in the bill before us and I think they will do much to help the housing problem. I wonder if the gentleman would not sketch through what those are, very briefly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. You are all familiar with title VI. I am glad the gentlemen who are seemingly opposed to this bill have found so many good things in it that should be enacted into law. The continuance of title VI is one of them. Title VI makes possible the organization of veterans' cooperatives and they may have the financing of the cooperative ventures insured up to 95 percent. We make possible the building of thousands of multiple-dwelling units and apartment houses in cities through accelerated depreciation.

You will understand that we are not robbing the Treasury of anything in that particular provision of the bill because if the houses are not built, then, of course, the Treasury will get no revenue whatsoever incident to the production of the houses. All taxes stem from production. If the houses are built the Government's

revenue will ultimately increase. Without this provision we may expect very little risk capital to venture into the field of multiple-apartment buildings. At today's high prices few builders will take a chance on realizing on their investment. The alternative is Government subsidies which in the end would be very costly to the American taxpayers. With the provision, revenues to the Government will materially increase and we will get the production of much-needed housing in the big-city areas.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the House should pass this bill and houses will be built under it. We want to adjourn tomorrow night and I may say with reasonable certainty that this is probably the only housing bill which we can get through.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Gladly.

Mr. KEOGH. Section 603 (b) of the pending bill amends section 608 (b) (3) (C) of the National Housing Act to permit the Administrator to increase to $9,100 per family unit the amount of the mortgage when, in his discretion, cost levels so require. Will the gentleman express his opinion as to whether this amendment will permit the Administrator to hold that the construction of a family unit in excess of 4½ rooms, for example, to 5½ rooms, will so affect the cost level as to justify increasing the amount of the mortgage to $9,100 per family unit of 5½ rooms in any approved project?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can assure the gentleman that the Administrator may increase the insurance to $9,100 per unit regardless of the number of rooms. We have removed the limit per room and put the limit on a unit basis. In directly answering the gentleman's question, I believe I can give him better than reasonable assurances that, under the example cited, the Administrator would not only be justified in using this discretionary authority but it is our intent that he do so, especially in the case of veterans' rental projects.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 319, nays 90, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—319

Abernethy	Bender	Byrnes, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Bennett, Mich.	Camp
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mo.	Canfield
Allen, La.	Bishop	Cannon
Andersen, H. Carl	Blackney	Carson
Anderson, Calif.	Bland	Case, N. J.
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, Del.	Case, S. Dak.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bolton	Chadwick
Angell	Boykin	Chenoweth
Arends	Bradley	Chiperfield
Arnold	Bramblett	Church
Auchincloss	Brehm	Clark
Bakewell	Brooks	Clason
Banta	Brophy	Clevenger
Barden	Brown, Ga.	Coffin
Barrett	Bryson	Cole, Kans.
Bates, Mass.	Buck	Cole, Mo.
Beall	Bulwinkle	Cole, N. Y.
Bell	Burke	Colmer
	Busbey	Cooley
	Butler	Cooper
Corbett	Hull	Phillips, Calif.
Cotton	Jackson, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.
Coudert	Jenison	Pickett
Courtney	Jenkins, Ohio	Ploeser
Cox	Jenkins, Pa.	Plumley
Cravens	Jennings	Potter
Crawford	Jensen	Potts
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Poulson
Crow	Johnson, Ill.	Preston
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Jones, N. C.	Priest
Dague	Jones, Wash.	Ramey
Davis, Ga.	Jonkman	Rankin
Davis, Wis.	Judd	Redden
Dawson, Utah	Kean	Reed, Ill.
Devitt	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Kearns	Rees
Dirksen	Keating	Reeves
Dolliver	Kee	Rich
Domengeaux	Keefe	Richards
Dondero	Kefauver	Riehlman
Dorn	Kerr	Riley
Doughton	Kersten, Wis.	Rizley
Durham	Kilburn	Rockwell
Eaton	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Elliott	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Ellis	Landis	Rohrbough
Ellsworth	Lanham	Ross
Elsaesser	Larcade	Russell
Elston	Latham	Sadlak
Engel, Mich.	Lea	St. George
Evins	LeCompte	Sanborn
Fallon	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Fellows	Lemke	Sasscer
Fenton	Lewis, Ky.	Schwabe, Okla.
Fernandez	Lewis, Ohio	Scoblick
Fisher	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hardie
Fletcher	Lodge	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Folger	Love	Scrivner
Foote	Lucas	Seely-Brown
Fuller	Lyle	Shafer
Fulton	McConnell	Sheppard
Gallagher	McCowen	Short
Gamble	McCulloch	Sikes
Garmatz	McDonough	Simpson, Ill.
Gathings	McDowell	Smith, Kans.
Gavin	McGarvey	Smith, Maine
Gearhart	McGregor	Smith, Va.
Gillette	McMahon	Smith, Wis.
Gillie	McMillan, S. C.	Snyder
Goff	McMillen, Ill.	Somers
Goodwin	Mack	Stefan
Gossett	MacKinnon	Stevenson
Graham	Macy	Stockman
Granger	Mahon	Stratton
Grant, Ind.	Maloney	Sundstrom
Griffiths	Manasco	Taber
Gross	Mason	Talle
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mathews	Taylor
Gwynne, Iowa	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, Tex.
Hagen	Meade, Md.	Tibbott
Hale	Merrow	Tollefson
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meyer	Towe
Hall, Leonard W.	Michener	Twyman
Halleck	Miller, Conn.	Vail
Hand	Miller, Md.	Van Zandt
Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Nebr.	Vinson
Harness, Ind.	Mills	Vorys
Harris	Mitchell	Vursell
Harrison	Morrison	Wadsworth
Harvey	Morton	Weichel
Hébert	Muhlenberg	Welch
Hedrick	Mundt	Wheeler
Heffernan	Murdock	Whitten
Hendricks	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington
Herter	Murray, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Heselton	Nicholson	Williams
Hess	Nixon	Wilson, Ind.
Hill	Nodar	Wilson, Tex.
Hinshaw	Norblad	Winstead
Hoeven	Norrell	Wolcott
Hoffman	O'Hara	Wolverton
Holmes	O'Konski	Wood
Hope	Pace	Woodruff
Horan	Passman	Worley
	Patterson	Youngblood
	Peterson	

NAYS—90

Abbitt	Chapman	Gordon
Albert	Chelf	Gore
Andrews, Ala.	Combs	Gorski
Bates, Ky.	Dawson, Ill.	Grant, Ala.
Battle	Deane	Gregory
Beckworth	Delaney	Hardy
Blatnik	Dingell	Hart
Bloom	Donohue	Havenner
Boggs, La.	Douglas	Hays
Buchanan	Eberharter	Hobbs
Buckley	Engle, Calif.	Holifield
Buffett	Feighan	Huber
Burleson	Flannagan	Isacson
Byrne, N. Y.	Fogarty	Jackson, Wash.
Carroll	Forand	Jarman
Celler	Gary	Jones, Ala.
Karsten, Mo.	Miller, Calif.	Rayburn
Kelley	Monroney	Rooney
Kennedy	Morgan	Sabath
Keogh	Multer	Sadowski
King	Norton	Schwabe, Mo.
Kirwan	O'Brien	Smathers
Klein	O'Toole	Smith, Ohio
Lesinski	Patman	Spence
Lusk	Pfeifer	Stanley
Lynch	Philbin	Teague
McCormack	Poage	Thompson
Madden	Powell	Trimble
Mansfield	Price, Ill.	Walter
Marcantonio	Rains	Whitaker

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Javits

NOT VOTING—20

Bonner	Knutson	Rivers
Brown, Ohio	Lane	Robertson
Clippinger	Ludlow	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Iowa	Stigler
Hartley	Morris	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	Peden	West
Johnson, Tex.	Regan	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Ludlow.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Regan.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Morris.

Mr. WOLVERTON and Mr. KERR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. ENGLE of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE HAROLD KNUTSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution offered by me and unanimously adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was offered by the Honorable ROBERT DOUGHTON on June 17, 1948, and was unanimously approved by the Committee on Ways and Means:

RESOLUTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the Committee on Ways and Means during the first and second sessions of

the Eightieth Congress has made definite progress in the enormous task of converting the wartime Federal tax structure to a simplified, equitable, and permanent peacetime basis; and,

Whereas extensive hearings and studies on tax revision have been carried on simultaneously with fulfillment of the other responsibilities of the committee in the fields of social security, tariff, and reciprocal trade, customs, and the public debt; and

Whereas the effective coordination of the work of the committee and its subcommittees has been attributable largely to the diligence, persistence, and guidance of our able, courageous, and distinguished chairman, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota; and

Whereas the aforesaid chairman has consistently conducted the deliberations of the Committee on Ways and Means as to provide an amiable atmosphere for the prompt consideration and expeditious disposition of committee business, thereby earning the highest esteem and regard of the members of the committee, regardless of party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives, hereby express our appreciation for the forceful, courageous, tireless, and able statesmanship and service of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means during the Eightieth Congress, and that an engraved copy of this resolution be presented to the chairman as a tangible token of our gratitude.

TRIBUTE TO HON. HAROLD KNUTSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each member of the Ways and Means Committee may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives met on June 18, 1948, in the Capitol to pay a well-deserved tribute to the present Chairman HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota. A resolution was introduced by Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, accompanied by appropriate words of praise for the excellent record made by his colleague. The resolution was unanimously and enthusiastically adopted by the committee.

I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for the many courtesies and kindnesses received at the hands of my chairman. He has now entered the Ways and Means Hall of Fame of the illustrious men who have attained to the chairmanship of this powerful committee of the greatest legislative body in the world, the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

I am inserting at this point a brief historical sketch of the House Ways and Means Committee and the distinguished members thereof who later in life filled other important Federal positions. In some instances the State in which a member was born appears rather than from the State from which he was elected:

BRIEF HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Article I, section VII, of the United States Constitution provides: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

The House of Representatives since the beginning has adopted the system of committees to carry out its public affairs program. In fact, there are a few committees which are as old as the House itself. Historically, some even antedate the United States Constitution.

In May 1785 the Continental Congress had a committee, of which George Washington was chairman, "to consider ways and means to supply these Colonies with ammunition and military stores." This committee of "ways and means" functioned as a select committee up until 1802. As early as 1796, Mr. Gallatin moved that a standing committee on Ways and Means be appointed to watch over the national finances. But it was not until January 7, 1802, that the committee became an organization of the type which we now know.

Originally the Ways and Means Committee considered not only the methods of raising the revenues of the Nation, but the committee also made whatever appropriations were necessary to make the money available for public expenditure. In 1865 the business of initiating appropriations was transferred to the Committee on Appropriations and certain other classes of bills which originally had been considered by the Ways and Means Committee were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The jurisdiction which the Ways and Means Committee now has is extended (outside the consideration of duties on imports and the raising of internal revenue taxes) to such related subjects as: transportation of dutiable goods; the organization and definition of collection districts; ports of entry and delivery; customs unions; reciprocity treaties; seal herds and other revenue producing animals of Alaska; the revenue relations of the United States with Puerto Rico; the revenue bills relating to agricultural products generally; and the tax on future sales of cotton and grain; social security and other activities.

In addition, the committee has jurisdiction over bills relating to the Treasury of the United States and the deposit of public moneys. It also reports the resolutions giving recommendations of Presidents' annual messages to the appropriate committees of the House.

The following list shows former members of the Ways and Means Committee who have risen to the office of President, Vice President, became members of the Cabinet, served as Justices of the Supreme Court, or were elevated to the Speakership of the House of Representatives:

PRESIDENTS

James Madison, Virginia; Andrew Jackson, Tennessee; James K. Polk, Tennessee; Millard Fillmore, New York; James A. Garfield, Ohio; William McKinley, Ohio.

VICE PRESIDENTS

Elbridge Gerry, Massachusetts; Richard M. Johnson, Kentucky; John Tyler, Virginia; Millard Fillmore, New York; John C. Breckenridge, Kentucky; Charles Curtis, Kansas; John N. Garner, Texas.

SECRETARIES OF STATE

James Madison, Virginia; Louis McLane, Delaware; John Sherman, Ohio; William J. Bryan, Nebraska; Cordell Hull, Tennessee.

SECRETARIES OF THE TREASURY

Albert Gallatin, Pennsylvania; George W. Campbell, Tennessee; Samuel D. Ingham, Pennsylvania; Louis McLane, Delaware; Thomas Corwin, Ohio; Howell Cobb, Georgia; John Sherman, Ohio; Charles Foster, Ohio; John G. Carlisle, Kentucky; Ogden L. Mills, New York; Fred M. Vinson, Kentucky.

ATTORNEYS GENERAL

John Breckenridge, Kentucky; Caesar A. Rodney, Delaware; Joseph McKenna, California; A. Mitchell Palmer, Pennsylvania.

POSTMASTERS GENERAL

Cave Johnson, Tennessee; Samuel D. Hubbard, Connecticut; James Campbell, Pennsylvania; Horace Maynard, Tennessee; William L. Wilson, West Virginia.

SECRETARIES OF THE NAVY

Thomas W. Gilmer, Virginia; Hilary A. Herbert, Alabama; Victor H. Metcalf, California; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Jacob Thompson, Mississippi.

JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT

Philip P. Barbour, Virginia; John McKinley, Alabama; Joseph McKenna, California; Fred M. Vinson, Kentucky.

SPEAKERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Theodore Sedgwick, Massachusetts; Langdon Cheves, South Carolina; John W. Taylor, New York; Philip B. Barbour, Virginia; Andrew Stevenson, Virginia; James K. Polk, Tennessee, John W. Jones, Virginia; Robert C. Winthrop, Massachusetts; Howell Cobb, Georgia; Nathaniel P. Banks, Massachusetts; Michael C. Kerr, Indiana; Samuel J. Randall, Pennsylvania; John G. Carlisle, Kentucky; Thomas B. Reed, Maine; Charles F. Crisp, Georgia; Champ Clark, Missouri; Nicholas Longworth, Ohio; John N. Garner, Texas; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois.

(Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

CHAIRMAN, WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

First Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Second Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Third Congress: Thomas Fitzsimmons, Pennsylvania.

Fourth Congress: William Smith, South Carolina.

Fifth Congress: R. G. Harper, South Carolina.

Sixth Congress: Roger Griswold, Connecticut.

Seventh Congress: John Randolph, Virginia.

Eighth Congress: John Randolph, Virginia.

Ninth Congress: Joseph Clay, Pennsylvania.

Tenth Congress: George W. Campbell, Tennessee.

Eleventh Congress: John W. Eppes, Virginia.

Twelfth Congress: Langdon Cheves, South Carolina.

Thirteenth Congress: John W. Eppes, Virginia.

Fourteenth Congress: William Lowndes, South Carolina.

Fifteenth Congress: William Lowndes, South Carolina.

Sixteenth Congress: Samuel Smith, Maryland.

Seventeenth Congress: Samuel Smith, Maryland.

Eighteenth Congress: Louis McLane, Delaware.

Nineteenth Congress: Louis McLane, Delaware.

Twentieth Congress: George McDuffie, South Carolina.

Twenty-first Congress: George McDuffie, South Carolina.

Twenty-second Congress: Gullion C. Verplanck, New York.

Twenty-third Congress: James K. Polk, Tennessee.

Twenty-fourth Congress: Churchill C. Chambreleng, New York.
Twenty-fifth Congress: Churchill C. Chambreleng, New York.
Twenty-sixth Congress: John W. Jones, Virginia.
Twenty-seventh Congress: Millard Fillmore, New York.
Twenty-eighth Congress: James J. McKay, North Carolina.
Twenty-ninth Congress: James J. McKay, North Carolina.
Thirtieth Congress: S. F. Vinton, Ohio.
Thirty-first Congress: James H. Bayley, Virginia.
Thirty-second Congress: George S. Houston, Alabama.
Thirty-third Congress: George S. Houston, Alabama.
Thirty-fourth Congress: Lewis D. Campbell, Ohio.
Thirty-fifth Congress: John S. Phelps, Missouri—J. Glancy Jones, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-sixth Congress: John Sherman, Ohio.
Thirty-seventh Congress: Thaddeus Stevens, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-eighth Congress: Thaddeus Stevens, Pennsylvania.
Thirty-ninth Congress: Justin S. Morrill, Vermont.
Fortieth Congress: Robert C. Schenk, Ohio.
Forty-first Congress: Robert C. Schenk, Ohio.
Forty-second Congress: Henry Dawes, Massachusetts
Forty-third Congress: Henry Dawes, Massachusetts.
Forty-fourth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Forty-fifth Congress: Fernando Wood, New York.
Forty-sixth Congress: Fernando Wood, New York.
Forty-seventh Congress: William D. Kelley, Pennsylvania.
Forty-eighth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Forty-ninth Congress: William R. Morrison, Illinois.
Fiftieth Congress: Roger Q. Mills, Texas.
Fifty-first Congress: William McKinley, Ohio.
Fifty-second Congress: William M. Springer, Illinois.
Fifty-third Congress: William L. Wilson, West Virginia.
Fifty-fourth Congress: Nelson Dingley, Maine.
Fifty-fifth Congress: Nelson Dingley, Maine.
Fifty-sixth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-seventh Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-eighth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Fifty-ninth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixtieth Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixty-first Congress: Sereno E. Payne, New York.
Sixty-second Congress: Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama.
Sixty-third Congress: Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama.
Sixty-fourth Congress: Claude W. Kitchin, North Carolina.
Sixty-fifth Congress: Claude W. Kitchin, North Carolina.
Sixty-sixth Congress: Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan.
Sixty-seventh Congress: Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan.
Sixty-eighth Congress: William R. Green, Iowa.
Sixty-ninth Congress: William R. Green, Iowa.
Seventieth Congress: William C. Hawley, Oregon.
Seventy-first Congress: William C. Hawley, Oregon.
Seventy-second Congress: James W. Collier, Mississippi.
Seventy-third Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-fourth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-fifth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-sixth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-seventh Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-eighth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Seventy-ninth Congress: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina.
Eightieth Congress: HAROLD KNUTSON, Minnesota.

Chairmanship of Ways and Means Committee by States and sections

North and Middle West:	*Congresses*
Maine	2
Vermont	1
Massachusetts	2
Connecticut	1
New York	12
Pennsylvania	8
Delaware	2
Ohio	6
Illinois	4
Michigan	2
Minnesota	1
Iowa	2
	43
South and Southwest:	
Maryland	2
Virginia	6
West Virginia	1
North Carolina	11
South Carolina	7
Tennessee	2
Alabama	4
Mississippi	1
Missouri	1
Texas	1
	36
Far West: Oregon	2
Total	[1] 81

[1] During the 35th Cong. J. Glancy Jones (Pennsylvania) was chairman first session; John S. Phelps (Missouri) second session.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN FROM NEW YORK

G. Crommelin Verplanck

Mr. Verplanck was a New Yorker, the son of a clergyman, a graduate of Columbia in law, a man of much travel and a professor of the Evidences of Christianity in the General Theological Seminary before he took to politics. He was a Democrat of the school of Andrew Jackson and made his first appearance in Congress in the term which began in 1823. After that, was out of the House until 1831, when he was returned to the Twenty-second Congress, in which he was chairman of Ways and Means. This term was his last appearance in Congress, but not in politics. He was defeated for mayor of New York in 1834, but seems to have spent most of the remainder of his life in one or another compensated public pursuit, dying as vice chancellor of the University of the State of New York, of which he had been a regent for 45 years.

Churchill C. Cambreleng

Mr. Cambreleng was chairman of Ways and Means in the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Congresses. He was born in Washington, Beaufort County, N. C., October 24, 1786; attended school in New Bern, N. C.; moved to New York City in 1802, where he became a clerk and subsequently engaged in the mercantile business; elected as a Democrat to the Seventeenth and to the eight succeeding Congresses; unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1838 to the Twenty-sixth Congress; appointed United States Minister to Russia by President Van Buren, and served from May 20, 1840, to July 13, 1841; member of the State constitutional convention, 1846; retired from active business pursuits; died at his residence near Huntington, Suffolk County, N. Y., April 30, 1862; interment in Greenwood Cemetery, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Millard Fillmore

Mr. Fillmore was chairman in the Twenty-seventh Congress. He was born in Locke Township (now Summerhill), Cayuga County, N. Y., January 7, 1800; was admitted to the bar in 1823; member of the State assembly, 1829–1831; elected as a Whig to the Twenty-third Congress; elected to the Twenty-fifth, Twenty-sixth, and Twenty-seventh Congresses; declined to be a candidate for renomination in 1842; unsuccessful Whig candidate for Governor in 1844; elected State comptroller in 1847, and served until his resignation in 1849; elected Vice President of the United States on the Whig ticket headed by Zachary Taylor in 1848; became President upon the death of President Taylor, and served from July 9, 1850, to March 3, 1853; unsuccessful Whig candidate for President in 1852 and as the National American candidate in 1856; died in Buffalo, N. Y., March 8, 1874; interment in Forest Hill Cemetery.

Fernando Wood

Fernando Wood was chairman in the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses. He was born in Philadelphia, Pa., June 14, 1812; moved with his father to New York City in 1820, was engaged in business as a shipping merchant in 1831, was elected as Tammany Democrat to the Twenty-seventh Congress, unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1842 to the Twenty-eighth Congress, appointed by Secretary of State John C. Calhoun dispatch agent for the State Department at the port of New York, reappointed by Secretary of State James Buchanan and served from 1844 to 1847; unsuccessful candidate for mayor of New York City in 1850; mayor of New York City in 1855–58, 1861, and 1862; elected Democrat to the Thirty-eighth Congress; unsuccessful candidate for reelection to the Thirty-ninth Congress; elected to the Fortieth, and each succeeding Congress, including the Forty-seventh, until his death at Hot Springs, Ark., February 13, 1881, before the beginning of the Forty-seventh Congress; interment in Trinity Cemetery, New York City.

Sereno E. Payne

Sereno Payne was chairman from the Fifty-sixth to Sixty-first Congresses, inclusive. He was born in Hamilton, Madison County, N. Y., June 26, 1843; attended the Auburn Academy and was graduated from the University of Rochester, N. Y., in 1864; studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1866, and practiced in Auburn, N. Y.; city clerk of Auburn in 1867 and 1868; supervisor in 1871 and 1872; district attorney of Cayuga County, 1873–79; president of the Board of Education of Auburn, 1879–82; appointed a member of the American-British Joint High Commisison in January 1899; elected as Republican to the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses; elected to the Fifty-first Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Newton W. Nutting; reelected to the Fifty-second and to the 11 succeeding Congresses, and served from March 4, 1889, until his death; had been reelected to the Sixty-fourth Congress; died in Washington, D. C., December 10, 1914; interment in Fort Hill Cemetery, Auburn, N. Y.

(Source: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1927.)

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution of commendation of the distin-

guished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my good friend, HAROLD KNUTSON, is a sincere expression of the esteem in which he is held by all the members of our committee. I appreciate this opportunity to speak from the heart the personal satisfaction that I have enjoyed in serving with the gentleman from Minnesota on the Committee on Ways and Means. When I came to Congress Mr. KNUTSON had already served more than a score of years. He was then a militant leader of the minority, but he has ever been willing to make available to me his kindly and experienced counsel.

When I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1942, this friendship became firmly cemented in the bonds of day to day association in the disposition of common problems.

Notwithstanding his heavy load of increased respnsibilities during the Eightieth Congress as chairman of the committee, I have felt free to consult and confer with him on any matter pending before the committee—whether on taxes, reciprocal trade, or social security. It is because of this close friendship and constant association that I am so much aware of the diligent, devoted statesmanship and public service of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON in the interests of the taxpayers of the Nation. I trust that we may share many more happy and fruitful years together on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who are paying respect to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

The resolution which was on yesterday passed by the Ways and Means Committee was presented to that committee by the distinguished former chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON. As we all know, he is one of the most highly respected Democrats in this House and is the oldest Member of this House and has the second longest record of service of any Member in the House. Mr. DOUGHTON'S action is significant in view of the further fact that Mr. KNUTSON is the oldest Republican Member in the House from the standpoint of service. Mr. DOUGHTON is serving his nineteenth term and Mr. KNUTSON is serving his sixteenth term. Mr. DOUGHTON served longer as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee than any man in the history of that great committee.

Mr. KNUTSON has been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for a great number of years and his service has been conspicuous. As chairman of the committee he has been very successful in leading this great committee in the preparation and passage of many measures of great importance to the Nation. The Knutson bill which passed in the present session of Congress will go down in the legislative history of Congress as a very important enactment. The bill was well drawn and met with the approval of the Members of Congress and of the country. This is proved by the fact that this bill was passed by the House in spite of the veto of the President. Mr. KNUTSON has shown great organizational ability in the manner in which he has conducted the business of the Ways and Means Committee. He has the respect of all those who serve with him. I concur most heartily in all the sentiments expressed in the resolution.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress draws to a close, the members of the Ways and Means Committee have recognized in a small way the fine service of our chairman the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON.

Yesterday, the committee adopted a resolution of congratulation and commendation of our distinguished colleague, and I take this opportunity to say that I subscribe 100 percent to the expressions contained in the resolution and extend to our chairman my best wishes for good health, a well-deserved vacation, and a return to this great body if it is his wish.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to render the best service to our country while serving as chairman of a committee in the House of Representatives, it is not sufficient to be a patriotic legislator who has the best interest of all the people in mind and who can weigh fairly the pros and cons of bills which may come before him, but it is also necessary to have the executive ability to delegate those duties that can be delegated to other members of the committee—to encourage them to cooperate and to engender in the committee that spirit of fellowship and teamwork which will result in legislation being reported with as much unanimity as is possible among any group with divergent political views. To find such a man is rare.

The record of accomplishment of the Ways and Means Committee during the Eightieth Congress is proof that in its chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, we have a leader with these qualities.

During this past session the committee has been faced with the highly technical matters of tax reduction, tax revision, social security, reciprocal trade, and much other legislation of vital importance to the country. The fact that all bills reported out of the committee which have been voted on by the House have passed by overwhelming majorities is proof of the efficient work of the committee under his able leadership.

May our chairman give many more years of fine service to his country and his district in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to felicitate the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, upon the wonderful record he has made in his thirty-odd years as a Member of the House of Representatives; and especially to thank him for his leadership as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee during the busy and difficult days of the Eightieth Congress.

The work of this great committee during the time this country has been adjusting from a war economy to a reconstruction and peacetime program has been difficult and tedious.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has presided over our work with poise, dignity, and ability. His experience and farsighted statesmanship has guided and sustained us.

As a member of the committee of a different political faith, I appreciate his fairness, his kindness, and his desire at all times to serve his country first.

This veteran legislator and leader is loved and respected by us all.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, indeed, to join with my colleagues of the Committee on Ways and Means in extending recognition and highly deserved praise of our colleague and good friend, the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, for his outstanding service as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the Eightieth Congress.

This is my first term as a member of the committee and I have been tremendously impressed by the sincere devotion to duty of the members of the committee and the good fellowship that prevails on the committee.

The good fellowship of this committee is exemplified by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, chairman for so many years prior to the Eightieth Congress, whose interest and leadership in the drafting and adoption of the resolution by the Committee on Ways and Means commending the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] speaks for itself.

I am delighted and honored to have this privilege of joining in the recognition and commendation my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] so richly deserves.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to add my voice in commendation of the service performed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It has been a great honor to have had the opportunity to serve on this great committee. It has also been an honor to serve under its distinguished chairman. He has conducted its affairs in a most honorable and fair manner. His direction of the committee has been courageous and statesmanlike. My service with him will always be one of my fondest memories.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in the splendid resolution unanimously adopted by the committee honoring our chairman, Mr. HAROLD KNUTSON, It is fine recognition of the services rendered by the chairman in handling the legislation and the work of the committee in such an efficient and fair manner.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee submits for the RECORD its written testimonial to its distinguished chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota. It is a testimonial to the man and to his work—to the outstanding service he has rendered as head of that important committee during the reconstruction days of the Eightieth Congress.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and also to join in this tribute to one of America's outstanding sons.

HAROLD KNUTSON came to these shores as a very young man. The story of his life, of his years of experience in the school of hard knocks is a story that is typically American. HAROLD KNUTSON is a living example of the opportunities that awaited a poor immigrant boy who had the determination, the ambition, and the perseverance to forge ahead in the land of equal opportunity for all.

During his long years of service in the House of Representatives he has represented his people and the people of America faithfully and well. He has served them in many and varied capacities. He has previously served as chairman of two other committees of the House of Representatives. All of that service today is climaxed by his chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means. As our beloved friend and fellow Member from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, has pointed out, the chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee has provided outstanding Americans for service in almost every capacity in the administrative branch of our Government, including six Presidents of these United States. That chairmanship was never in abler hands than it is in the person of Mr. KNUTSON.

It is so fitting and so representative of the unanimity and the nonpartisanship with which problems are approached by that committee that the resolution expressing the tribute of the members of the committee should have been brought forward by the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, the ranking minority member, who himself served so illustriously as chairman of this committee for many, many years.

Twenty-four members of the Committee on Ways and Means serving under our beloved chairman, Mr. KNUTSON, are as one man in wishing for him a long and happy life, and in wishing for the people of America many, many more years of his valiant and illustrious service in the Congress of the United States.

CHAIRMAN HAROLD KNUTSON IS A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a resolution has been presented which reflects the sentiments of every member of the House Committee on Ways and Means. May I say that I believe that our beloved chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, merits every tribute expressed therein.

The story of the life of HAROLD KNUTSON is typical of the American way. He came to this country as a boy from Norway. By hard work, determination, thrift, endurance, and perseverance he made a success in business. In addition, he has served his country in the Halls of Congress for all these many years. It is fitting that he should occupy one of the most powerful positions in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KNUTSON espouses a philosophy that brings hope to every young American. He believes in a government that permits an individual to prepare himself, work, earn, save, and achieve. This philosophy is the hope for the young man who makes his own way. It is the ladder by which he can climb to success. It is the American way. Our beloved chairman is one of the foremost champions of that way.

TRIBUTE TO HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion a Member of Congress must be judged by the ability, the courage, and the resourcefulness with which he represents the people of his district, his State, and his Nation. Although I have differed frequently with my friend, the eminent chairman, and often we have engaged in sharp debate, I can sincerely say that I have never felt, nor have I detected in him, any lingering rancor or resentment.

Our personal relationship has ever been cordial, and in the deliberations of the committee no member has received more fair, courteous, nonpartisan consideration than I.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy for a leader to be ever gracious and kind to those who always agree with him. But it takes a rare quality of statesmanship to be equally considerate of those in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman KNUTSON has demonstrated these qualities, and I want him and the membership of this House to know that I shall ever admire, respect, and thank him for them.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives yesterday passed a resolution praising the chairman of the committee, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, for the manner in which he presided over our deliberations.

I wish to add my own word of appreciation. As a member of the Democratic minority, I can honestly say that he has upheld the high traditions of the Committee on Ways and Means and has, like his distinguished predecessor, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, presided most fairly and impartially over our many and long sessions. Although a strong partisan Republican, he never in the years of his chairmanship, has permitted his partisanship to blunt his sense of fairness. He has given us, on the minority, a fair deal and a square deal.

The characteristic of Chairman KNUTSON that, in my opinion, is most outstanding is his unfailing sense of humor, no matter how rough the going may be at the time. Many times during heated discussions on some proposed legislation, when the tempers of other members of the committee were on edge, our distinguished chairman and our distinguished former chairman have engaged in humorous colloquy that relieved the tension and brought a new approach to the subject under discussion. I have no doubt that HAROLD KNUTSON'S sense of humor has successfully carried him through many seemingly imponderable difficulties.

I wish him many years of health and happiness.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in paying tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON. Their tributes have been accurate and generous. I concur in what they have said.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving in this House with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] for 28 of my 30 years of service here. No Member is more familiar with his character, his ability, or his motives in approaching the problems which daily face us. Those who know him best agree that before taking a stand on any question, he first determines whether or not the measure is for the best interests of the people generally throughout the Nation. If he believes it is, he supports it. If he believes it is not, he vigorously opposes it.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is endowed with high intelligence and a degree of patriotism not excelled by any individual. His service has been honorable, and it has been distinguished by an intense desire to represent his constituents in a way every constituency should be represented in this body. I congratulate the people who send him here and trust they will show their appreciation of his fine service by returning him to this House so long as he desires to serve.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, since I have had the honor of serving on the Committee on Ways and Means, it has been my pleasure to serve under two distinguished chairmen—our present chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, and the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina.

I am glad to join with the other members of the Ways and Means Committee in congratulating Mr. KNUTSON upon the outstanding record he has made in his long period of service to his country as a Member of the House of Representatives. His accomplishments and record as a first-generation American should be a beacon light to all American citizens. Particularly do I wish to felicitate him upon his leadership as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. As a member of the committee of a different political faith, I appreciate the difficulties of his task, his fairness, his wisdom, and his desire at all times to serve his country first.

I am delighted and honored to have this privilege of joining in this recognition of Mr. KNUTSON.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in making a statement at this time is to place in the RECORD my hearty approval of the resolution offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, commending the services of our chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, which has received the unanimous approval of the Ways and Means Committee.

As a new member of the committee, it has been a most interesting experience to serve on this great committee, during the Eightieth Congress, under the leadership of Chairman KNUTSON.

Members who have served on the committee for a great number of years inform me that not in their memory has the committee accomplished so much in a single session in the way of major legislation. The tax-reduction bill heads the list of numerous bills in the public interest voted out of the committee. This in a very large measure is due to the courageous and able leadership of the chairman. I have found the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] to be eminently fair in his consideration of

all questions. He is a stout-hearted fighter for the right; an able statesman and a great public servant. He is the type that built this Republic and is the type that will sustain it.

I wish for my friend and colleague, Chairman KNUTSON, many more years of health, happiness, and service to his country.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, among the many treasured memories of legislative associations, there is none I shall cherish longer than that of serving in the Eightieth Congress under the inspiring leadership of Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The duties of the chairman of this important committee are most arduous. The legislative subjects of taxation, tax revision, tax reduction, the tariff, reciprocal trade and social security are all highly technical and the handling of these and other matters just as involved, through the process of committee hearings, executive committee consideration, report, clearance for House consideration and conduct of debate call for the highest qualities of generalship. HAROLD KNUTSON has demonstrated his possession of these qualities in a high degree.

His distinguished service to the country marks him as a statesman worthy to follow in the footsteps of the illustrious and distinguished gentlemen who have preceded him as chairman of this great committee not the least of whom is his immediate predecessor, the beloved gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

I am honored to have the privilege of joining with my committee colleagues in wishing for him a full measure of health, happiness, and success for the future and a triumphant return to further distinguished service in Congress.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly privileged as a member of the Ways and Means Committee to join my colleagues in paying this merited tribute to our distinguished chairman, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

Any member of that committee, charged with the duty of preparing tax legislation, must recognize in the chairman one who from a maze of conflicting testimony is able to reach a correct conclusion. Once having reached the conclusion he believes right, HAROLD KNUTSON adheres to it unflinchingly until the final decision.

Early in the Eightieth Congress, our chairman, convinced as he was of the need for income-tax reduction, and believing firmly that the good of his country required it, introduced legislation to accomplish his purpose. Despite the utmost opposition which included two Presidential vetoes, HAROLD KNUTSON, never deviating an iota in principle, led his colleagues in Congress to final passage of his legislation.

His wisdom and courage are already proved—by his courage, perseverance and hard work, he thus raised his own monument in the minds and hearts of all American citizens.

Born in another land, our chairman has proved himself an honored and capable leader of his Nation's destiny. He has the courage and ability to meet the challenge of his times and as chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, has become a guiding light in the government of the greatest Nation in the world.

In all ways fair and impartial as chairman of the committee, HAROLD KNUTSON has endeared himself to both the majority and minority members of that committee, by recognizing the importance and vital part played by the minority in a truly representative Government, while adhering to his belief that the majority party should assume its responsibility. By his fairness he has strengthened representative government as exemplified in our committee. It is this quality which has made him a great leader and brought about the teamwork so essential for efficient committee action where constructive work is required by both the majority and minority of the committee.

HAROLD KNUTSON has proved himself qualified to take a place in the roster of other distinguished chairmen who have preceded him. I consider it a great honor to have worked with him, to have had the benefit of his counsel and cooperation and I look forward to future years in which our mutual associations will continue.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, of all of those who have risen to national prominence in the public service during our times, none is held in higher respect or warmer affection than is Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, present-day chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means. The high esteem in which he is held in the hearts and minds of his colleagues did not come by chance. Under every test to which a legislator can be subjected, he has been found worthy of the trust and confidence of which others have spoken so earnestly.

Because I, as a Member of the House of Representatives for 14 years and of the great Committee on Ways and Means for ten, have had an exceptional opportunity to appraise the works and measure the character of this great and good man, I have no hesitancy in joining the many others who have risen from their seats to honor him on this touching occasion, each one in his turn to proclaim him one of the great legislators of our times, one whose name and accomplishments will ever be written large in the annals of this Republic.

The steadfastness with which he adheres to that which he conceives to be right; the intelligence and driving force which he throws behind that which he considers good; the successes which he has achieved in the promotion of the general welfare, will mark him indelibly as a courageous, fearless, able and very efficient representative of the people. In his effective management of the public business, he commands the admiration of the entire membership, regardless of political affiliation.

But aside from all this, the elements of his character which have won for him so large a place in the hearts of his colleagues, are found in his, the lovable personality of an ingenuous man; his quick sympathy for the weak and oppressed; his helping hand which is ever extended to those who are troubled; his words of encouragement to the despondent; his spontaneous wit and rollicking good fellowship which is so quickly revealed as the dark clouds fade from the once troubled skies and good men can once again make merry. No one is poor who can claim such a man as his friend.

So I, with all of the others, am happy to rise and to salute HAROLD KNUTSON, the genial gentleman from Minnesota. There is not, there could not be, a finer, a better, a more lovable man. May his life be long and full of happiness; his public service, with success and honors great, for, indeed, no one is more deserving of these.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, membership on a major congressional committee entails much work and study. Membership on the great Ways and Means Committee, of which Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, is chairman, is no exception.

A chairman can do much toward making a record for the committee. We believe that HAROLD KNUTSON has set a new high mark in that capacity. Under his leadership the work of the Ways and Means Committee has been most effective and harmonious. In expressing its appreciation the committee on June 17, 1948, assembled in special meeting to tell our chairman our feelings toward him.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure I take advantage of this opportunity to commend the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, for his constructive work and aggressive leadership, as well as for the fair and impartial manner in which he has conducted the committee. His years of service as an outstanding statesman bears witness to his enterprise and initiative and industry. He has contributed much to the welfare of this Nation, giving a guaranty of a greater and more splendid future for our country.

It has been a real pleasure to work with Mr. KNUTSON, and I hope our paths may cross often in the future. He has my best wishes for his continued health, happiness, and success.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement made by me in presenting a resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means in honor of the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, which was unanimously adopted:

> Mr. Chairman, I have served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means for about 24 years and was its chairman for 14 years. Prior to becoming chairman, I have served on the committee with the following chairmen: Hon. William Green, of Iowa; Hon. William Collier, of Mississippi; and Hon. Charles Crisp, of Georgia, who was acting chairman during the illness of Chairman Collier.
>
> In my opinion our present chairman, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, is the equal of any chairman within my experience in point of ability and the fine service he has rendered as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means since the opening of the Eightieth Congress.
>
> Mr. KNUTSON has also extended to me many personal courtesies and kindnesses which I shall always appreciate and I offered the resolution which was adopted unanimously,

expressing our high estimate and profound appreciation of the wonderful record made by Chairman KNUTSON.

Mr. KNUTSON is not only an excellent chairman but a great legislator and an outstanding American citizen who is rendering most unusual service to our Nation.

Mr. KNUTSON. My friends, I am deeply touched by your action. No man is better qualified to bear testimony on the greatness of this wonderful country and the many opportunities it has to offer to those who are willing to work and strive for advancement than am I, who was born in a foreign land.

I well recall, as a small boy, how our beloved mother would gather her brood of little ones about her each night preparatory to being put to bed. Placing her arms about us she offered up the evening prayer and always that prayer included a note of thanksgiving to Providence for having permitted our family to come to this wonderful country where each and every one is free to carve out his own career. I learned at her bedside the great lesson of Americanism, and if at times it may have appeared that I am strongly nationalist it is altogether due to the fact that I love my country and am zealous of her welfare.

George Washington's admonition to us to avoid entangling alliances has ever had the force of a command from on high for me.

Being chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, an honor that had never before come to my great State, carries with it heavy responsibilities, as you well know.

My sainted mother often impressed upon our young and plastic minds that life is like a bank account and we can draw on that account only as much as we put into it. It was a proud moment in my mother's life when I was first sworn in as a Member of Congress, but it was not the pride of position. Rather, it was pride that her son had been placed in a position where he could be of service to others, and during my long tenure here I have always looked upon my position as an opportunity to be of service to others. How well I have succeeded is not for me to say.

As chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee I have tried to be fair and helpful to my colleagues. I am happy to say that except when party issues were involved there has been little partisanship in our deliberations and in our labors. All were animated by the same lofty ideal—to render the best and greatest possible service to the land that we love and which has done so much for each and every one of us.

May I say at this point that the loyal and effective help of my old and most valued friend, Mr. DOUGHTON, has contributed much to whatever measure of success I may have attained as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. His wise counsel has on more than one occasion smoothed the way for reporting necessary legislation. My friend places country above party, which is the hallmark of statesmanship. He has served longer as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means than any other—a fine tribute to a fine gentleman.

Regardless of my future plans I shall ever cherish the memory of the friendships formed while a member of our great committee. To me the recollection of my service here will ever be a cherished memory.

In closing, let me again thank you from the bottom of my heart for the fine cooperation you have always given me. It was your helpfulness that enabled me to carry on and garner whatever success that has been attained. In return I wish for each and every one of you life's richest blessings, peace of mind, good health, happiness, and length of years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain article.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to have printed in the RECORD the majority and minority report in the election contest of Wilson versus Granger.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the general subject of the REA and AAA legislation, including his own roll call records, letters, communications, and newspaper articles.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made today on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and include certain letters and telegrams.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 691, Rept. No. 2415), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized, empowered, and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection and appointment of personnel, and in the conduct of its functions and activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest, including (but not limiting the foregoing authority) a study and investigation of the Commission's licensing and license-renewal activities; the Commission's power and authority, if any, to promulgate and issue its so-called Blue Book and the extent to which, if any, the same has been, or is being, used as the basis or excuse for regulation by the Commission, directly or indirectly, of radio-program content at licensed radio stations; whether the Commission has licensed, or proposes to license, any radio station or stations owned or controlled by persons who are members of, or affiliated with, subversive or Communist-front organizations or who might permit the facilities of such radio stations to be used contrary to the public interest; and whether there has been, or is, any concerted movement or effort to procure the concentration of radio-station licenses, including FM, AM, and television, in the hands of a limited class of persons or concerns rather than a distribution of such licenses on a geographical and equitable basis, as provided by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date, for during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present session of Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, records, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

POSTAL RATE REVISION AND SALARY ACT OF 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be cited as the "Postal Rate Revision and Salary Act of 1948."

TITLE I—ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTMASTERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 101. All postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service whose rates of

compensation are prescribed by the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $450 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 25 cents per hour: *Provided further*, That postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall receive additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 25 per centum of their basic annual compensation.

SEC. 102. The provisions of this act shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

SEC. 103. This title shall take effect as of July 1, 1948.

TITLE II—POSTAL RATE REVISION

AIR MAIL

SEC. 201. The rate of postage on all domestic air mail as defined in Public Law 730, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall except in the case of postal cards and private mailing or post cards, be 6 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof. The rate of postage on postal cards and private mailing or post cards (conforming to the conditions prescribed by the act entitled "An act to amend the postal laws relating to use of postal cards", approved May 19, 1898 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 39, sec. 281)), when sent by air mail, shall be 4 cents each.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

SEC. 202. The rate of postage on third-class matter shall be 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including 8 ounces in weight, except that the rate of postage on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants not exceeding 8 ounces in weight shall be 1½ cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That upon payment of a fee of $10 for each calendar year or portion thereof and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails, separately addressed identical pieces of third-class matter in quantities of not less than 20 pounds, or of not less than 200 pieces, subject to pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time: *Provided further*, That the rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under the foregoing provision shall be 14 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent, except that in the case of books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants the rate shall be 10 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent: *And provided further*, That pieces or packages of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing throughout shall be subject to a minimum charge of 3 cents each.

CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 203. Publications containing 24 pages or more issued at regular intervals of four or more times a year, 25 percent or more of whose pages are devoted to text or reading matter and not more than 75 percent to advertising matter, which are circulated free or mainly free, may, upon authorization by the Postmaster General and under such regulations as he may prescribe, be accepted for mailing at the postage rate of 10 cents a pound or fraction thereof, computed on the entire bulk mailed at one time, but not less than 1 cent per piece, provided the copies of such publications are presented for mailing made up according to States, cities, and routes as directed by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That publications owned and controlled by one or several individuals or business concerns and conducted as an auxiliary to and essentially for the advancement of the main business or calling of those who own or control them shall not be accepted under this section.

FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL POST) MAIL

SEC. 204. (a) On fourth-class matter (limit of weight over 8 ounces to 70 pounds) the rate of postage except as herein provided for catalogs (limit of weight over 8 ounces up to and including 10 pounds), books, and library books, shall be by the pound as hereinafter provided, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by stamps affixed thereto or as otherwise prescribed by the Postmaster General.

(b) The rate of postage on matter of the fourth class shall be as follows:

(1) On all matter mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and on all matter mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and three-fourth cent for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 2⅒ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 2 cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(3) For delivery within the third zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 2⅗ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 4½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 4¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 5½ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 16 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 7½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 7¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 17 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 9½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 9¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 18 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 11½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including 10 pounds, and 11¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding 10 pounds.

(9) On parcels measuring more than 84 inches but not more than 100 inches in length and girth combined the minimum postage charge shall be the zone charge applicable to a 10-pound parcel.

(c) Catalogs and similar printed advertising matter in bound form weighing more than 8 ounces but not exceeding 10 pounds shall be subject to postage rates based on the eight parcel-post zones as follows:

(1) When mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and when mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 7½ cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound.

(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is 300 miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the third zone, 9 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(d) Books, permanently bound for preservation consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for student's notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books and when in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight, may be sent at the postage rate of 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(e) Books, consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when sent by public libraries, organizations, or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, as a service to county or other unit libraries or as a loan to readers or when returned by the latter libraries or readers to such public libraries, organizations, or associations shall be charged with postage at the rate of 4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection for books under this classification: *Provided*, That this rate shall apply only to such books as are addressed for local delivery, for delivery in the first, second, or third zone, or within the State in which mailed. Public libraries, organizations, or associations before being entitled to the foregoing rates shall furnish to the Postmaster General,

under such regulations as he may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of their net income inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

(f) To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable of mail matter of the fourth class, special-handling stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, 15 cents; matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, 20 cents; matter weighing more than 10 pounds, 25 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-handling stamps herein specified.

SPECIAL DELIVERY

SEC. 205. To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable and the immediate delivery of mail matter at the office of address, special-delivery stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than 2 pounds, if of the first class, 15 cents; if of any other class, 25 cents. Matter weighing more than 2 but not more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 25 cents; if of any other class, 35 cents. Matter weighing more than 10 pounds, if of the first class, 35 cents; if of any other class, 45 cents: *Provided*, That under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary postage stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-delivery stamps.

MONEY ORDERS

SEC. 206. A money order shall not be issued for more than $100, and the fees for domestic money order shall be as follows: For orders less than $5.01, 10 cents; for orders from $5.01 up to and including $10, 15 cents; for orders from $10.01 up to and including $50, 25 cents; for orders from $50.01 up to and including $100, 35 cents.

POSTAL NOTES

SEC. 207. (a) The Postmaster General may authorize postmasters at such offices as he shall designate, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to issue and pay money orders not exceeding $10, to be known as postal notes. The fee for insurance thereof shall be 8 cents each.

(b) Postal notes shall be valid for two calendar months from the last day of the month of their issue; but thereafter may be paid by the Postmaster General or refund may be made in case of loss, upon evidence satisfactory to him, under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no claim for the amount of a postal note will be considered unless filed within 1 year from the last day of the month of issue. Postal notes shall not be negotiable or transferable through endorsement.

REGISTERED MAIL

SEC. 208. (a) Mail matter shall be registered on the application of the party posting the same. The registry fees, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this subsection, shall be as follows: For registry indemnity not exceeding $5, 25 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25, 35 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50, 40 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $75, 45 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $75 but not exceeding $100, 50 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200, 60 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300, 70 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400, 85 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500, $1; for registry indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600, $1.10; for registry indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700, $1.20; for registry indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800, $1.30; for registry indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $900, $1.40; for registry indemnity exceeding $900 but not exceeding $1,000, $1.50.

(b) For registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as "surcharges") as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid by not more than $50, 2 cents; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 3 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 4 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 6 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 7 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 8 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 10 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fees for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 14 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 15 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 16 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 18 cents.

(c) For insured mail treated as registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as "surcharges") as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid by not more than $50, 1 cent; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 2 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 3 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 4 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 5 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 6 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 7 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fee for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 8 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 9 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 10 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 13 cents.

(d) All such fees shall be accounted for in such manner as the Postmaster General shall direct. Mail matter for the official business of the Post Office Department which requires registering shall be registered free of charge, and pass through the mails free of charge.

RETURN RECEIPTS FOR REGISTERED MAIL

SEC. 209. Whenever the sender of any registered mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such registered mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for registered mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

FEES FOR INSURED MAIL

SEC. 210. The fees for insurance, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this section, shall be as follows: 5 cents for indemnification not exceeding $5; 10 cents for indemnification exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 15 cents for indemnification exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 20 cents for indemnification exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 25 cents for indemnification exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 30 cents for indemnification exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. Whenever the sender of an insured article of mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such insured article of mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for insured mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

FEES FOR COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

SEC. 211. The fees for collect-on-delivery service for sealed domestic mail matter of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate and for domestic third- or fourth-class mail matter shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be as follows: 20 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $2.50; 25 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $2.50 but not exceeding $5; 35 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25; 45 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 55 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 60 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $150; and 65 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $150 but not exceeding $200. The fee for notifying the sender or his representative of inability to deliver a collect-on-delivery article shall be 5 cents.

RESTRICTION IN DELIVERY

SEC. 212. The Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to collect an additional fee of 20 cents for effecting the delivery by carrier or otherwise of domestic registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, the delivery of which is restricted to the addressee only, or to the addressee or order: *Provided*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for this service unless request for refund is made and erroneous delivery of the article or articles was made by the postal service or nondelivery of the article or articles was due to some fault of the postal service.

REGISTERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

SEC. 213. (a) The fee for collect-on-delivery service for registered sealed domestic mail of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be 55 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $10; 70 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $50; 90 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; and $1.15 for collections and indemnity exceeding

$100 but not exceeding $200. The maximum amount of charges collectible on any registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery article shall be $200.

(b) When indemnity in excess of $200 is desired, the fee for such registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery mail shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be $1.20 for indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300; $1.25 for indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400; $1.30 for indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500; $1.35 for indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600; $1.40 for indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700; $1.45 for indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800; and $1.55 for indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 214. This title shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of this legislation to provide a permanent increase of $450 per year in the salaries of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department and to offset a portion of the increased cost by an increase in postal rates.

Title I of this bill is concerned with a salary increase for postal employees. Under the provisions of title I employees paid on an annual basis will receive a $450 permanent increase in their annual salary. Increases are provided for employees paid on an hourly basis in the amount of 25 cents an hour and for fourth-class postmasters of 25 percent. First-, second-, and third-class postmasters will receive the $450 annual increase given other postal employees.

The increase for fourth-class postmasters is provided on a percentage basis because, as you know, for many of these postmasters the return for their services from the Post Office Department is not the major portion of their income. Fourth-class post offices are the smaller post offices which have gross receipts varying from $100 per year to a top of $1,500 per year. Since fourth-class postmasters are paid based upon their gross receipts, you can see that it would be completely out of proportion to increase their salaries on other than a percentage basis.

The committee devoted much time and study to the problem of increased salaries for postal employees. Testimony presented to the committee by postal employees' national organizations stressed the necessity of a salary increase based upon the recent increase in the cost of living.

To offset part of the rising cost of living in the past, postal employees in the field service of the Post Office Department to whom this bill applies have been granted two substantial permanent pay raises. The first was the adjustment in salaries and classifications under Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, amounting to $400 annually for each postal employee beginning July 1, 1945. The second was under Public Law 386, Seventy-ninth Congress, which granted an additional permanent salary increase of $400 a year, effective January 1, 1946.

In connection with its efforts to secure a meeting of the minds between the executive and legislative branches with respect to this problem, the committee requested the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General to submit reports concerning pay-raise legislation.

In his budget message to the Congress in January 1948 the President stated that he was not recommending cost-of-living increases in pay for Federal civilian employees. The President stated:

The rapid increase in living costs during the last 18 months has placed a serious burden on these groups. Yet, to offset the cost-of-living increase since the last time pay or benefit rates were advanced for each group would add at least $2,400,000,000 to budget expenditures in 1949—apart from increases that would be paid from the trust funds. This large expenditure would add greatly to the inflationary pressure in our economy.

Further, the committee secured a report from the Bureau of the Budget, the right arm of the President, with respect to pay raises for Federal employees, dated July 1, 1947, which stated:

In view of the recent substantial increases in the base pay rates of Federal employees generally, it appears that these rates for the lower and middle pay brackets are now fairly well in line with salaries outside the Government.

In an additional report, dated February 25, 1948, the Bureau of the Budget stated:

In reply, you are advised that by reason of the position taken by the President in his budget message of January 12, 1948, on this subject, it is not believed that the enactment of the proposed legislation (salary increases for postal workers) could be considered, at least at this time, as being in accord with the program of the President.

At hearings conducted by the committee, the Postmaster General stated:

We have to rest upon the President's budget message to the Congress.

As the Members of the House can see, the committee has had little cooperation from the executive branch with respect to working out a fair solution to pay increases for postal employees. Yet, our committee undertook to approach this problem realistically, and title I of this bill providing for a $450 annual increase in the salaries of postal workers is, in the judgment of our committee, the best solution to this problem.

In my opinion—and I am sure this view is shared by the members of the committee—our faithful postal workers richly deserve this permanent increase in their base salaries.

It is true that the cost of the bill will be approximately $211,000,000 annually. However, title II of the bill provides for recovering approximately $125,000,000 of this cost by moderate increases in postal rates and postal services. The $450 increase is probably not as much as the postal workers desire. However, it is a permanent increase; and taking into consideration the fact that the Congress has, within the past 3 years, approved increases amounting to $800 a year, the committee believed the increase is fair and equitable.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, our majority floor leader.

Mr. HALLECK. What is the estimated deficit in the post office for this year?

Mr. REES. I understand the estimated deficit is approximately $375,000,000 at the present time.

Mr. HALLECK. I commend the gentleman and his committee on bringing in a bill that contains in it, in addition to the pay raise, a provision for raising at least a substantial part of the money, because obviously we cannot go on and on having deficits in the Post Office constantly increasing.

Mr. REES. The President in his budget message in January stressed the need for increased postal rates to meet the large deficit, presently running to $375,000,000 annually. I may say, however, that the Post Office Department has suggested much larger increases in rates than are proposed in this legislation. However, our committee tried to be practical about this matter and to be fair to all parties concerned. For that reason we have brought in what we believe to be moderate rate increases in dealing with this problem.

The President in his budget messages in 1947 and 1948 has stressed the need for increasing postal rates to meet the large postal deficit. The Postmaster General on March 23, 1948, recommended to the Congress increases in postal rates which would have raised revenues of $243,970,000. In the opinion of the committee the rates recommended by the Postmaster General are more in some categories than should be imposed upon the users of the mail at this time. The rates contained in title II of the bill provide for increases for the considerably lower amount of $124,225,000. These increases for the categories of mail and postal services included in the bill are as follows:

	Amount of proposed increase
1. Air mail (domestic)	$9,850,000
2. Circulars, printed matter, seeds, etc., in parcels weighing less than 8 ounces (third-class mail)	14,600,000
3. Parcel post	60,500,000
4. Catalogs	2,400,000
5. Books	3,300,000
6. Special handling	300,000
7. Special delivery	3,600,000
8. Money orders	17,500,000
9. Postal notes	1,650,000
10. Registered mail	4,200,000
11. Insurance	3,575,000
12. C. o. d. service	3,300,000

AIR MAIL

At the present time we are experiencing an annual loss of $18,000,000 in handling air mail. As I have stated, increasing the rate on air mail from 5 to 6 cents will increase the revenue by approximately $10,000,000.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

Third-class mail is circulars, printed matter, seeds, bulbs, and so forth, sent in parcels of less than 8 ounces. A special rate is provided in this classification for seeds and bulbs. Also there is a special rate provided for bulk mailers sending more than 200 uniform items at one mailing. In this bill there is no change of the 1-cent minimum rate charged for these bulk mailings. The increase in this rate comes in the smaller mailings of third-class mail and an increase in the pound rate of 2 cents. The third-class mailers have expressed themselves as being favorable to H. R. 3519 and I believe I can say they have been quite generously treated in this bill.

FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

Fourth-class mail has several subcategories—parcel post, catalogs, books and library books. Fourth-class mail is required to pay its own way according to present law. The Postmaster General, under this law which still remains in effect, is directed to increase parcel-post rates through a procedure involving the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission whenever revenues do not equal expenditures for handling parcel post. We have been experiencing for the past several years a large loss in parcel post and I have brought this fact to the attention of the Postmaster General. It has been his position that since Congress has under consideration a revision in parcel-post rates he is delaying taking proper action under the law. I have noted that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has also brought this fact to his attention and requested that he take action. The loss in parcel post in 1947 was $41,000,000. The rates provided in this bill will increase revenues in parcel post by $60,000,000. We must consider, of course, at the same time, this bill is increasing cost to the postal service so that with the increased rates the revenues from parcel post should approximate the expenditures in this class of mail.

There has also been a lot of controversy whenever the question of book rate increases is considered. In this respect I should like to point out that books are, after all, merchandise, and as a matter of fact they are carried under regular parcel-post rates. Books do not have a high time priority and in the majority of cases, could actually go by freight instead of expensive postal service. For this reason it does not appear that the Post Office Department should be carrying books at a great loss. The proposed increases on books leave them at a flat rate, that is, there is the same charge for sending a book across the country as there is for sending it into the next county. This flat rate is justified because book printing is concentrated in a few areas and it is felt that this does assist in a wide distribution of books. Even with these increased rates on books, we will still be carrying them at less than cost.

Most of the other increases concern postal services. I do not believe there has been as much controversy over increasing these rates as over increasing rates for mail.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, one of the distinguished members of our committee who has worked very diligently in trying to work out this problem.

Mr. COMBS. First I want to say that in my judgment no committee of the House has done its work more conscientiously or more studiously avoided partisanship than the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Our distinguished chairman has been patient and worked hard and every member of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, has worked hard to report out fair, well-considered bills for enactment. It is true, is it not, that a great deal of the deficit of the Post Office Department is occasioned by the fact that we use that Department as an agency to subsidize air mail and even the railroads in the carrying of mail. In other words, the money appropriated for the Post Office Department is not all used in expanding the mail service, but some in subsidies to build air lines and things of that kind.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I think he well knows that our committee has made a strenuous effort to separate those two proposals. We subsidize the air lines through the Post Office when we should subsidize them separately. We do have a policy that has been adopted whereby it is agreed that the air lines shall be supported in order to provide for commerce and national defense.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield again to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it would be well for the RECORD if the gentleman would state the amount of that subsidy. Certainly it does not begin to amount to as much as the over-all deficit in the Post Office.

Mr. REES. As near as it can be figured out, the subsidy amounts to between 15 and 20 million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state that we are increasing air mail 1 cent. Third-class mail, which includes circulars, printed matter, seeds, and parcels weighing less than 8 ounces, is being increased. With reference to fourth-class mail, which includes catalogs and books, under the law as it now stands the rates on fourth-class mail should be sufficiently high so it will pay its own way. It is the responsibility of the Postmaster General to initiate such rate revision with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have failed to act.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Do you propose in this bill to fix rates without having had any hearings on those rates?

Mr. REES. I will say to the gentleman that we held hearings for weeks and weeks on these matters. This bill has been pending in the Committee on Rules for exactly 13 months.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Is that with reference to rates?

Mr. REES. We held hearings and the first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail people came in and testified. We have reams of testimony on this.

Mr. GWINN of New York. On rates?

Mr. REES. Oh, yes, indeed. We have them all in. We have full and complete hearings on this. It has been threshed up one side and down the other.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, a member of our committee.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to state that all during the Seventy-ninth Congress, our committee held hearings on the question of increasing rates. We spent about 3 years trying to provide a means of fixing postal rates.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, a former member of the Post Office Committee of the House.

Mr. BREHM. To answer the question of the gentleman from New York, hearings were held on this legislation when I was a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. To tell you the truth, I regret that I am no longer a member of that committee.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. The problem has been threshed out over and over again.

I want to pay tribute to the members of our committee on both sides, each and every one of them, for the splendid effort they put forth in trying to reach a solution of this very important problem. Some of the rates included in this bill perhaps ought to be adjusted. However, we did the best we could in an effort to bring equitable legislation to attention. We ask for your approval of this legislation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who has for some time been looking into this problem.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and disappointed to learn that the bill we have under consideration to increase the salaries of postal employees only provides for an annual increase of $450.

The Members of this House know I am just as economy-minded as anyone else and that I try to guard the taxpayers' money very diligently.

The facts are simply these: It has been a disgrace and a shame the lack of consideration that has been given postal employees for many, many years. They are a group whose patriotism has never been challenged. They stuck to their jobs through the war years when it would have been to their advantage to go into war plants where they could have made large salaries. Because of the low wage scale now paid postal employees,

they have had to secure work on the outside after hours in order to make enough money to meet their family expenses. In many cases they could not hang on any longer because of the heavy expenses, notwithstanding the fact that they would have liked to retain their positions with the Post Office.

I say to you in all sincerity that if we can send billions and billions and then more billions of dollars to Europe, most of which is squandered and for which we shall never get any return or benefit, the least amount that should be granted the faithful postal employees is an increase of $600 per year.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the able chairman of our committee, this bill does two things: It provides a permanent increase of $450 per year to all postal employees except those employees who are paid by the hour, and to fourth-class postmasters. Those employees who are paid by the hour get a raise of 25 cents per hour. The fourth-class postmasters get an increase of 25 percent in their present compensation.

Second, the bill provides for an increase in postage rates. It affects all classes of rates except second-class mail.

The committee thought those rates for second-class mail should be increased, because at the present time the Post Office Department is losing $160,000,000 on the carriage of second-class mail. But be that as it may, the increase in the other postage rates in this bill will produce about $124,000,000 in additional revenue. The cost of the increase in salaries of the postal employees in this bill will be about $211,000,000 per year. There are approximately 480,000 employees in the postal service. So the revenue brought in by the increase in postage rates in this bill will be about $85,000,000 less than the cost of the increases in salaries.

Let me say in the beginning your committee brought in a bill which provided $585 temporary increase per annum for the postal employees, but the powers that be would not permit that bill to be considered, and we were required to bring in another bill, making the salary increase $450.

This increase is deserved. It is just. It is fair to meet the increased cost of living. From 1923 to 1945 our postal employees had no increases. On July 1, 1945, they were given $400 a year increase. In 1946 they were given another $400 increase. This increase of $450 now is certainly needed to help these employees pay their increased cost of living.

To my mind, there is no more faithful, no more just, no more loyal group of employees in our Government service than our postal employees. There is another bill pending in the House. It is H. R. 6917. It provides compensation to other employees of our Government, other than postal employees. There is a rule on this bill, and I trust that the majority leadership will permit consideration of this measure also.

Mr. Speaker, it would be grossly unjust, unfair, and discriminatory to increase the payments to postal employees and not to increase the pay for other Federal employees.

The Republican leadership has always been fair and considerate, and I implore the Republican leadership to permit this House, before the sun sets this evening, to pass H. R. 6917, increasing the compensation of other Federal employees.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not true that our distinguished chairman, when he originally introduced the bill, had all Federal employees in one bill, and "the powers that be," to use your expression, required a separation?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is exactly correct.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I am happy to see these postal rates increased. I thoroughly agree in the gentleman's hope that this Congress will not adjourn until other classified employees, Government workers, are given this much-needed raise.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to commend the very fine work the committee has done in bringing out this bill in behalf of the employees of the postal service, and especially my colleague from Tennessee who has rendered hard and meritorious work in a good cause.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LOVE].

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of legislation providing for a permanent increase of $450 annually to our hard-working and very deserving postal workers.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have received many requests from all parts of the United States asking that the proposed increase should be at least $800. I regret that it is not possible to reach this figure. However, I wish to call to the attention of all postal employees that they will receive a substantial income-tax reduction as of January last. This reduction should amount to about $100 annually to the average letter carrier. Therefore, your raise will, in effect, be approximately $550 for those who pay Federal income taxes.

We have also amended the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase annuity benefits 25 percent, or $300.

In providing a permanent pay raise of $450, a greatly improved retirement system, and a substantial income-tax reduction, I, for one, am not ashamed of what the Eightieth Congress has done for our loyal postal employees.

This proposed legislation will cost the Federal Government approximately $203,000,000. The bill also includes increased mail rates to provide estimated additional revenue of approximately $124,000,000. During fiscal 1947, the United States Post Office Department operated at an approximate loss of $300,000,000. It should be pointed out here, very clearly, that the Post Office Department is one of the few Government agencies that provides revenue. Since our Post Office Department should be considered partly as a great public service to our people and to our Republic, I do not believe that we should criticize it too severely if it does not pay its way in full. What Government agency does pay its way? We should also realize that it costs money to service our vast amount of penalty and free mail. However, a large portion of the United States mails are used strictly for business and commercial purposes. This service should not be donated. Many rates should be increased to help decrease the deficit in the Department and to partially support a deserved increase for the postal employees.

In fiscal 1947, air mail operated at a loss of almost $19,000,000. This bill proposes a rate increase from 5 cents to 6 cents, which would increase revenues by about $10,000,000. Parcel post lost $41,000,000 in 1947 and the proposed rate increase of 28 percent would provide an additional $60,000,000. Money orders lost $32,000,000 and a 50-percent increase would add $17,000,000. COD service lost $6,000,000, and a 20-percent increase proposes revenues of more than $3,000,000.

Third-class mail, including circulars, seeds, and so forth, lost $74,000,000, and an 18-percent increase would provide some $14,000,000. Other rate increases, not including second-class mail, aggregate a total increase of revenue to some $124,000,000.

I repeat, in conclusion, that the United States Post Office should be considered as a great public service and that we should not expect it to operate entirely out of the red. However, insofar as strictly commercial postal rates are concerned, these rates should be increased as in the present bill to eliminate unjustified deficits in the Post Office Department and also to support increases to postal workers.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVE. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I am heartily in favor of the immediate passage of H. R. 6916 under suspension of the rules and take this opportunity to commend the untiring efforts and persistence of our committee chairman, the likable, distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Much deserving and meritorious legislation has emanated from our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the Eightieth Congress. Predominantly deserving, however, is this bill which will bring some needed economic relief to very loyal and devoted public servants, assure them that their employer is appreciative and make possible the retention of experienced employees

as well as recent appointees who decided to make careers in the post office service. It will also provide an incentive to others who hesitate in making this selection because of the entrance salary. And, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the latter, the eligible registers in every large city post office bespeak the urgent need of a change in this respect or serious difficulties may arise.

I am sure that it is well known that I worked for the passage of a larger increase of these salaries and that I also was active and deeply interested in all Federal workers and shall endeavor to get action on H. R. 6916. Knowing well the mechanics by which legislation is enacted, I urge the acceptance and approval of H. R. 6916.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOVE. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wish to commend the gentleman at this time and to express the hope that it may be possible to bring out the bill for the other Federal employees before the session ends.

Mr. Speaker, last February I appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service through the courtesy of its chairman, and asked for the maximum of $1,000 salary increase which the postal workers of my district requested. I have publicly proclaimed my position again and again and flatly stated these deserving people must have first consideration.

The postal employees that I represent made it plain to me they want a larger raise than we are giving them today. I think they are right.

However, the time is late, the House is adjourning, and this important matter has been held up until the last minute. There is no chance to offer amendments to increase this proposed amount of $450.

Naturally, I am happy that this raise is presented and I gladly support it. I know all the post office people at home will be glad the increase has been brought up.

For some time I was apprehensive over the protests my office received from postal workers each time I returned home. They were honest protests from heads of families who find it difficult to meet the rising cost of living. They were righteous complaints from employees, long faithful to the Post Office Department, who had seen other departments get raises and yet got no satisfaction themselves.

I repeat I am glad to have a part in passing this pay-raise bill today. It is a step in the right direction and spells a measure of justice to our deserving postal workers.

The second part of the bill, I regret I cannot support. It has to do with raising rates of the parcel post. I think they are already too high.

Perhaps it is good politics, but I know many businessmen who will object to having these rates raised. Personally I do not think this rate increase is necessary and I have the right to my opinion. I regret no chance is given here to amend this section or I would certainly try to do so.

The postal pay raise is timely, well-deserved, and necessary. The men I know at home will be grateful and I have looked forward with great anticipation to giving them this lift. I take pleasure in voting for the postal employees' pay raise here today.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I share with the splendid chairman and the outstanding members of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the responsibility of bringing you well-considered legislation in an orderly and democratic manner. We are proud of our record. Unfortunately, we cannot be proud of this bill and, personally, I can accept no compliments from the leadership of the Republican Party for it. It is not a committee bill. We are but the instrument by which the majority policy committee impresses its ideas upon the House in this particular legislation. You, too, have been disfranchised and stripped of the power to offer your ideas as representatives of millions of American people—it cannot be amended. Those responsible for the bill saw to that.

I have always cherished orderly democratic procedure by which the majority may express its will. Such is not the case here, for this is the will of a few. In my judgment the arbitrary use of power by a small group, be it policy or otherwise, which renders a majority of the membership impotent, notwithstanding the character and integrity of the individuals involved, is contrary and harmful to the fundamentals of American representative government. Yet witness such at this hour.

At the beginning of the Eightieth Congress your committee began to study the advisability of increasing Federal salaries for postal workers and others. We held extensive hearings and worked long hours attempting to arrive at justice for the Government and the employee. Many weeks ago your committee recommended favorably the passage of legislation increasing the salaries of postal workers and other Federal workers. The increases recommended were not in the amounts asked, nor were they equal to the increased cost of living. The bills were, however, carefully considered, and while they did not meet with my full approval, they did express the majority opinion of the committee. You have not had and will not have an opportunity to pass upon either of these measures. They lie dormant in the Rules Committee.

More than 14 months ago your committee, after months of careful and deliberate study, recommended postal rate increases. This bill represented the best thought of the members of a committee who had spent months, and many of them, years, studying the problem with no other purpose than the development of a postal system and service that could adequately meet the demands of this great country at rates the people can afford to pay, and with as little loss as possible to the Government. This bill is before the Rules Committee and has been for more than 1 year.

Your chairman and your committee, without political consideration, have attempted to discharge their responsibilities to you and to the people in a useful and helpful manner. I could not praise the committee membership too highly.

Does this bill before you today represent the work and thought of your committee? I regret to say that it does not.

Briefly, I will give you its story. It came as a surprise and a shock to me a very few days ago when it was placed on the doorstep of the committee with word, supposedly from the Republican policy committee—and I do not question its source—which was in the nature of an ultimatum: This or nothing.

It is quite popular, and has been, to use Federal employees as whipping boys. Unquestionably we employ more than are necessary. Unfortunately some are not worthy of their trust and responsibility and do not earn their pay. But I will not join with any demagogic harrangue against the hundreds of thousands of necessary, able, and faithful employees who make possible the orderly functioning of this great Government. They are entitled to the consideration that should be given to every faithful worker of private industry or public service. Hundreds of thousands of Government employees are suffering with millions of Americans as a result of the unprecedented, unchecked, and, assuredly, unfortunate spiral of living costs.

Federal employees must depend entirely upon this Congress for relief. They have no right to strike; they have no right to participate as a body or in groups in politics; they are limited to the interest, thoughtfulness, fairness, and consideraiton of you gentlemen. I feel constrained to compliment the employees, particularly those who have contacted me, for they have been courteous, patient, considerate, and reasonable and they have, under no circumstances, attempted to put pressure upon me, personally or through the mails. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not the bill that should be before the House.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Texas for his very fine statement. I would also like to compliment the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], chairman of the full committee, for reporting out two bills granting pay increases not only to postal employees but to all Federal employees. Had that committee been let alone, all Federal employees today would have had a good substantial pay raise which they all deserve.

Mr. LYLE. And in an orderly manner.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I had not expected to ask the gentleman to yield to me, but I have been very much interested in what he had to say.

Mr. LYLE. I hoped the gentleman would be.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman agree with me that as costs increase in the Post Office Department of necessity and as a part of the over-all budgetary

situation and the Federal Treasury, we have to pay some attention to rates?

Mr. LYLE. For 1 year we have urged the Republican policy committee to permit the consideration of the postal rate increase bill. This bill has been before the Committee on Rules since May 1947. The gentleman is just a year behind the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I join with every Member of this House in a sincere effort to cut the expenses of Government, to reduce the national debt and to help bring about a sound fiscal policy for the Government. No reasonable or thinking man, however, can argue successfully that adequate salaries for Federal employees would be inconsistent with a sound fiscal policy.

All Federal employees are entitled, in my judgment, to increases in salary at this time. There is now a bill, introduced by the great chairman of my committee, ready for consideration but without the blessing of the leadership. It provides for salary increases for classified and other Federal employees. He and the other members of my committee join me, I am sure, in wishing that you might have an opportunity to pass upon it. And with all frankness, Mr. Speaker, if I have the honor of serving on the conference committee between the two Houses, provided there is one, I shall do my utmost to bring back to the House fair increases for all Federal employees. I shall also attempt to divorce postal-rate increases from the salary bill. Postal rates are not properly made in relation to the salaries of postal employees. They cannot be. They should be considered separately and apart.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Why were not the users of second-class mail, who are responsible for the biggest deficit, included in the policy committee's statement?

Mr. LYLE. That is a question the answer to which will be somewhat embarrassing to the policy committee which omitted it from its ultimatum. The answer is, I believe, this: The Post Office Department is calculated to lose $160,000,000 on this class of mail in 1948. In my judgment, nevertheless, they could not face the great newspapers and, perhaps, magazines, which would be affected by a change in second-class mail rates in a year of political campaigns.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The ultimatum was received notwithstanding the fact that better than 218 Members of this House, making up the majority and the minority, appeared before your committee and asked that this pay increase be granted?

Mr. LYLE. Unfortunately, this present bill failed to take into consideration the ideas of the membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the passage of this bill for I have hopes that it may be worked into acceptable legislation before it reaches the President's desk. I could not, in good conscience, refrain from this explanation to the House of the procedure by which it comes to you. Perhaps in frank discussion we may better understand each other and more admirably serve the people who have entrusted us with great responsibilities. We shall, I am sure, always cherish the advice of the leadership of both sides of the House, but seldom shall we, I sincerely hope, subject ourselves to the dictates of either, when by doing so we thwart the will of the majority of the United States Representatives.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of my committee—a committee of which I have been a member only about 2 months—for the splendid work that he has done and is doing. He has always had the interest of the Federal workers at heart; he has had the interest of the postal workers at heart His heart is right, but his hands have been tied by the uncompromising actions of his own party's leaders. I had hoped that a bill would be brought out that would provide for adequate permanent increases for postal employees. I thought it was the duty of Congress to do so. You know, this Congress is in a large part responsible for the chaotic economic conditions which we find prevailing at the present time. I think it is our duty to provide for our Federal employees in order to help them meet the increased cost of living for which we are to some extent, at least, responsible. I cannot say that I am proud of this bill. I concur with my colleague from Texas in that, and I am not proud of the manner in which it was brought about. I contend that this bill should come to the floor under an open rule, giving the Members the opportunity to offer amendments. In this way alone could we formulate a measure that would meet the approval of most of the Members of this House.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Did I understand the legislative history of this particular bill to be that the committee reported out a bill which included both postal as well as other Federal employees, in a greater sum than mentioned in this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, but that was done before I became a member of the committee.

Mr. CARROLL. But that was reported out by this committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I may say that the bills previously reported reflected more nearly the views of the majority of the committee than does this measure. This bill is brought to you as the result of an ultimatum, as the gentleman from Texas told you a few minutes ago, from the Republican Policy Committee. The leadership of the Republican Party dumped it in our laps, and told us to take it or leave it. If we leave it, our postal workers do not get a raise at all.

Mr. CARROLL. They have divided the bill and reduced the salary increase?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is exactly right.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The bill as reported by our committee did not include the other Federal employees. The bill as introduced included postal employees and Federal employees, but the bill as reported out included only the postal employees, and then a separate bill pertaining to Federal employees was reported out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my contention that the committee wanted to be more liberal. I regret that the high-handed action of the majority leadership has dictated otherwise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 6916 and H. R. 6917, and I urge the Members of the House to pass these bills. I cannot oppose such legislation without denying to hundreds of thousands of faithful Government employees a well-deserved and hard-earned cost-of-living increase in salaries. However, I strenuously oppose the procedure used to bring these measures to you.

Although these bills are very important there were no hearings on H. R. 6916 or H. R. 6917 in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee or in any other standing committee of the House. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee which is presenting these bills to you was not even consulted about their construction.

On June 14 the Republican policy committee issued an ultimatum to our Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the effect that no salary increase bills would be passed unless they were in the form of H. R. 6916 and H. R. 6917. Other measures had already been reported out by our committee dealing with the same issues, which provided increases in salaries for postal workers, increases in postal rates, and increases in salaries for Federal employees—all based upon evidence produced during the hearings. These measures were recommended by our committee after much deliberation and in a general sense reflected the bipartisan views of a majority of the members of the committee. No action whatsoever was allowed on these measures by the Rules Committee.

H. R. 6916 is a combination of these committee bills which were previously reported out, minus very important and integral parts of these same bills. The ultimatum which eliminated vital aspects of this legislation and made substantial reductions in the salary raises usurped the prerogatives and responsibilities of your Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I believe in upholding the basic principle that legislation reported out by a major standing committee should reflect

the considered judgment of this committee, and not the coerced political expediency of an outside partisan policy committee. Mr. Speaker, this procedure is dangerous and alarming. If real democracy is to be preserved we must not resort to such tactics, and I hereby protest vigorously against this action.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my approval of the action that has just been taken by the House in granting a pay increase to postal employees. It was altogether fitting that we do this as our postal employees are among our finest and most conscientious Federal workers. Upon them rests much of the responsibility of maintaining the well-being of our Nation and it is only fair that we recognize and reward their faithful service in a highly justified material way.

It is regrettable, however, that the postal pay bill was considered under a suspension of the rules and it was not possible to have an amendment considered for a general Federal pay raise. I sincerely hope that the Senate will take action in seeing that this amendment is added when the bill is considered by that body. I favor a pay raise for all Federal employees and I will support and vote for legislation that will bring this about.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 6916, although the pay increase involved is inadequate to meet the increase in postal employees' cost of living.

I desire to record a vigorous protest against the political maneuvers which have occurred in connection with the presentation of this legislation.

There was ample evidence before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that postal employees and other Federal workers are in dire need of a salary increase adequate to meet the high cost of living. Witness after witness testified that it was imperative that these employees receive not less than a $800-per-year salary increase. Notwithstanding the overwhelming weight of this testimony, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for reasons best known to itself, reported out separate bills—one giving the postal employees a salary increase of $585 per year and the other granting all other Federal employees a salary increase in the sum of $468 per year. Even though those salary increases were insufficient, this represented, nevertheless, a reasonable step in the right direction.

The debate on the pending bill discloses a situation revealing a shocking disregard for the welfare of Federal employees and the legislative findings of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Important members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee openly have charged on the floor of this House that the Republican policy committee has used tremendous pressure to keep these bills from being brought to the floor of the House for debate and vote in the form originally presented by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The record now reveals that the bill concerning postal employees has been subjected to a salary cut from $585 to $450 per year. Moreover, the Republican policy committee has refused to consider any pay raise for other Federal employees. In addition to being subjected to this high-handed program, the Membership of this House now is forced to vote on the pending bill under what is known as a suspension of the rules. Many of the postal and other Federal employees do not understand the effect of this legislative maneuver.

Under a suspension of the rules, Members who are in favor of more equitable treatment of both postal and other Federal employees are prohibited from amending the present bill in any manner. In short, we must either accept or reject the bill in its present form.

Further, it is quite apparent to me that there will be no relief for other deserving Federal employees who are suffering from the increase in the cost of living.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the Republican leadership had permitted both bills to advance in the normal legislative process, the membership of this body would have passed the salary increase both for postal and other Federal employees with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative history of these two bills clearly shows that there has been a denial of the democratic process in their consideration. Such action is detrimental to our system of civil service and will not inspire the confidence of Federal employees in the legislative branch of the Government. These employees are entitled to the same rights and to the same protection in meeting the increase in the cost of living as are those workers who are employed in and who have been given wage increases by private industry.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this bill, but I am not satisfied with it. I favor an increase of $800 for postal service and other Federal employees. The talk of economy comes with poor grace from those who voted and supported our foreign policy. It comes with poor grace for those who saddled $623,000,000,000 of debts and future commitments on our shoulders by voting and supporting the 15 years of global gifts and expenditures.

I feel that this increase is inadequate to maintain the American standard of living. These employees are not able to properly take care of themselves and their families with the present 30-cent dollar that they are getting. The cost of living has gone up at least 200 percent, if not more, since 1937, 1938, and 1939.

For example, on August 11, 1939, in Fargo, N. Dak., a pound of Land O' Lakes butter was 23 cents; eggs were 2 dozen for 23 cents, strictly fresh; a pound-and-a-half loaf of bread was 9 cents; pork loin 12 cents, bacon, 12½ cents; spare ribs, 8 cents; crisp celery, 5 cents; two heads of lettuce, 13 cents; five bunches of radishes, 5 cents; three bunches of carrots, 10 cents; 3 pounds of coffee, 39 cents; and other food and articles and wearing apparel were on a par with these prices. Compare them with today's prices, and then compare the postal service employees' pay and the Federal employees in lower brackets pay increase with price increases.

I feel that an increase of $800 per year for postal service employees and the Federal employees in the lower brackets is a reasonable increase. I especially suggest to this committee that they should bear in mind that Uncle Sam will again step in and take $160 out of that $800, leaving an actual increase of only $640.

I am not criticizing Uncle Sam, but the old gentleman with the striped trousers and stovepipe hat never misses a bet. He takes from the needy as well as the wealthy.

In addition, may I suggest that since we have given directly or indirectly to foreign nations something like $27,000,000,000 since the war ended, and we are about to give another $17,000,000,000, it is about time that we take care of the people who are at home; people who are still proud of being Americans. Charity still should begin at home even though we have temporarily lost our better judgment.

SWEET CHARITY

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the thousands of people who do the work of our vast Government faithfully and patiently have looked to this Congress for a self-respecting increase in pay which would enable them to live in decency.

I am not speaking now for the postal employees alone as covered in this bill, and for whom I have repeatedly and publicly demanded a salary increase of at least $1,000 a year to meet the fly-away prices which resulted from the scuttling of price controls by the Republican Party.

Other Federal workers face the same inflation.

I was prepared to offer amendments to bring the salaries to a livable level, had the measure been permitted to come up under regular procedure weeks ago, when the bill was just as ready as it is now.

I hope the House failure to provide a cost-of-living increase for Federal employees—and I mean the clerks, the typists, the secretaries, the girls in my own office, the laborers, and the minor executives—will be remedied by the other House.

I hope, too, that the majority leadership can be proud of this stale half loaf of charity. I could not be, were the responsibility mine.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this bill H. R. 6916. I regret the raise is not larger, at least $800 which I supported in the committee. We must vote for this or nothing. I regret that it does not cover all Federal employees in the classified lists. I hope we may be able before we adjourn, to pass such a bill covering all employees. I urge that the raise be raised for such employees to $800 and I appeal to the leadership to present such a bill to the House for passage before we adjourn.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for H. R. 6916 but must say that it is a disgrace of this Congress to throw such a crumb to the postal work-

ers of our country. It has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the postal employees and all other Federal employees really need at least $800 per year.

It has come to the point where we have to vote for a $450 raise or nothing.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a crime committed against the Government workers of America. It marks another one of the many broken promises with which the Republican Party has paved its road to hypocrisy.

First, it does not give the postal workers what they were led to believe they would receive.

Second, it completely destroys the morale of all Federal workers at a time when a raise was desperately needed.

Third, in this campaign year it refuses to raise rates on periodicals because of pressure.

Lastly, an increase in postal rates has no place in the same bill as wage increase.

I repeat, this is a crime. We are constantly driving the workers of our country to the wall. Brutalizing them with the Taft-Hartley law, terrorizing with the Mundt bill, fooling them with a phony housing act, and finally refusing to stop run-away prices and refusing to raise workers' pay.

This sop to the postal workers will not fool them or all Federal workers in November.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 6916, which among other provisions will increase salaries of postal employees. I wholeheartedly favor this particular phase of H. R. 6916.

A few months ago I testified before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in favor of an increase for these loyal Government postal employees—actually I supported a larger increase in salary than this legislation permits, but this is a step in the right direction.

I am extremely pleased to see the rules suspended and its passage expedited by the House of Representatives today. I shall vote for H. R. 6916 and continue to press for the final enactment into law of this much-deserved pay raise for postal employees.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, while I am very glad that some measure to grant well-deserved and urgently needed pay raises to postal workers has been at long last presented to this House for action, it is most distressing that its terms are not more generous. I am of course deeply pained that no general pay raise bill granting increases to other Government employees has been brought before us for action before adjournment.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. REES] whom I greatly esteem, is exceptionally able and conscientious, and his committee is comprised of some of the best men in this House. The distinguished gentleman and his committee have labored long and faithfully on pay raise legislation and I deeply regret that in the pressure of the final business of the Congress, the full program of pay increases for all Government workers has not been submitted to this House.

I cannot express enthusiasm about the principle contained in the bill of binding pay raises to rate increases in certain categories because I think that the results are inevitably to confuse the budgetary position of the Post Office Department, and also place burdens inequitably and disproportionately upon various users of the postal system.

The bill provides some measure of relief, however, and grants substantial increases, which coupled with current tax reductions and an improved retirement system, justifies me in voting for it even though I would desire a better, a more generous bill and a sounder-based, better-devised budgetary arrangement to finance it.

Personally I have worked unceasingly to assist our faithful postal workers and other worthy and loyal Government employees to secure well-merited pay raises. I appeared in their behalf before the appropriate committees of both House and Senate and have worked in many other ways to help secure favorable consideration for them.

Without question the House will pass this measure under suspension of the rules and thereby place its seal of approval upon legislation which, if in some respects inadequate, will nevertheless aid and assist, in this period of skyrocketing prices and inflation, our loyal postal workers who, like all our citizens and particularly our working people, are suffering from current high-price levels. I will vote for the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported legislation now pending in Congress providing adequate pay raises for postal employees and other Federal employees. I filed a bill which so provided. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has reported out H. R. 6916. This is the only legislation covering this subject upon which the House has the privilege of voting. The bill is considered under a suspension of rules which permits no amendments. The amount of pay raises cannot therefore be changed during the present consideration of the bill. I shall therefore vote for H. R. 6916, although I would have preferred a larger pay increase. The Federal employees are entitled to a raise in pay. I regret that this legislation does not grant them more than it does.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in suport of H. R. 6916 which is a bill to provide additional compensation for the postal employees. These employees have not received the raises and increases in salary that others have. They have been left far behind in their compensation. They are not receiving adequate salary to meet the high cost of living of today. I have followed closely the various bills that have been introduced and open hearings which have been held in the committees. I had hoped that the Membership of the House would be allowed to consider a much larger salary increase than is provided in this bill, as, in my opinion, the raise provided for in this bill is not adequate nor sufficient to meet present conditions.

We, of course, realize that the leadership in the House has the authority to decide which bills will be considered and which will not. They have offered the present bill as the only one for our consideration. Therefore, not permitted the privilege of supporting a bill providing for a larger increase than the present one, I wholeheartedly support the bill under consideration which, while it is inadequate to meet the high cost of living of today, will afford these employees some measure of assistance which they are entitled to and so richly deserve.

It is my understanding that the postal employees have had only two increases in salary since 1925, which increases have been negligible, whereas the cost of living has soared sky high. I hope that if a larger amount of increases cannot be given that this bill will certainly pass. I desire to say now to the Members of this body that I now stand ready to support an amendment which increases to any reasonable extent the amount allowed in this bill. But I fully realize that under the present rules under which we are proceeding no amendments are permissible. Therefore, is is vitally important to pass this bill as it is now or there will be no raise.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that all of the Federal employees are entitled to an increase in their compensation. The Federal employees' raises have in no way kept pace with the raises of other working people. Their remuneration is far behind those in like employment in non-Government work. It is my earnest desire and hope that this Congress will not adjourn until adequate provision has been made for the faithful employees of our Government. Many of them work long hours and ofttimes work overtime, for which they are not sufficiently paid. I desire at this time to lend my voice in support of the salary raise for all Federal employees, and I trust that the present leadership will see fit to allow this bill to go through, realizing that it is entirely up to the leadership of this body to say whether or not these increases will be made, as, under the rules upon which the House is proceeding from now until adjournment, only such matters as are cleared by the House leadership will be considered.

If an amendment was permitted to the pending bill whereby all Federal employees will be given raises, which I am sorry is not allowed, I would earnestly and to the best of my ability support it, and believe that the increase would be such as to be of real help to these people who so richly deserve the additional compensation.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today the Eightieth Congress passed legislation providing for a permanent increase for all post-office employees in the amount of $460 per year.

I want to state publicly that I voted in favor of passage of the bill and I also want to state that I supported this bill, and other bills, providing for even more liberal allowances in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, of which I am a member.

I think it appropriate to state at this time that if it had not been for the activities of certain members of the committee, particularly the Democratic members, this bill would have been reported out of committee and passed the House long ago. Despite the fact that I was in favor of a retroactive increase, the activities of certain members of the

committee in emasculating the legislation which met my approval, and the approval of the chairman of the committee and some of the members on the Republican side, alienated some Members of Congress who otherwise would have voted for the bill. Under the circumstances and in view of the difficulties which we have met, I feel that this bill is just, fair, and equitable. Our postal workers are certainly deserving of an increase in salary and I hope and trust that the additional money which they receive will, to some extent, give them the additional incentive which they deserve and will add to their morale.

It is indeed unfortunate that this much-needed and beneficial legislation was not passed by the House long ago and it is equally unfortunate that the bill which was passed did not contain the retroactive feature which I hoped for; but I am pleased that I had the opportunity to vote for an increase in wages for these deserving men and women.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Republican leadership has finally consented to let the House pass upon the bill now under consideration which provides for an increase in the salaries of all postal employees. I heartily approve of this legislation and have been for a number of weeks adding my voice to the voices of other Members of the House demanding action on this bill.

I regret exceedingly, however, that there is not included in this bill a substantial salary increase for the other faithful Government employees included in all of the classifications of the Civil Service. The cost of living has increased for them just as it has for all of us. It is manifestly unfair not to grant them also a reasonable increase in their salary so that they can meet the high cost of living.

I regret too that this bill has tied to it an increase in postal rates, especially in the third- and fourth-class rates. I say this because this means an increase in the cost of those things purchased by those of our people who live in rural communities and who must depend upon parcel post for many of the articles they buy.

It seems to me that if an increase in the postal rates were to be made they should have been made in a separate bill after careful consideration of all of the issues involved. Moreover, I can see no reason why third- or fourth-class mail rates should be raised when no raise in rates for second-class matter is provided. This seems especially strange in view of the fact that the main portion of the deficit from the operation of the Post Office Department comes from the second-class-mail matter.

It is my sincere wish, and, I trust, not a forlorn hope, that a bill raising the salary of our Civil Service employees will be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before both the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and advocated a flat and permanent increase of $1,000 for our postal employees. I felt that such an increase was not only justified by reason of the present increased cost of living but also because the general standard of living has been so elevated that it is unthinkable not to enable our loyal postal workers to retain that higher standard.

I was deeply disappointed when I heard that the committee had in the first instance approved a raise of only $585. To my mind that was bad enough but when the bill started to get a tossing around, so that no one knew whether it would ever reach the floor, even $585 became acceptable. But $585 was not to be had for postal employees either, for this bill, H. R. 6916, now comes before us with an increase of only $450.

I appreciate the time spent and effort devoted by the chairman of his committee on this subject, and I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] placing the blame for this reduced amount squarely where it belongs. I am truly sorry for the postal employees who are receiving such shabby treatment but I trust that we may hold out hope for a future increase when a new Congress is elected.

Although I feel that $450 is inadequate I shall support the bill for the reason that no amendment being possible under our present procedure, it is $450 or nothing.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, a wage increase for people holding civil-service positions is long overdue. I am glad this bill to provide more nearly adequate compensation for postal employees has finally been brought up. It deserves the support of every Member of this House.

However, it is regretted that we are not permitted to vote also for increased compensation to other civil servants who also find it virtually impossible to make ends meet. We should no longer delay action which is so sorely needed.

Let me urge every Member of the House to support this measure. In justice to our postal employees we must.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending bill. H. R. 6916, the postal employees salary increase bill may not provide all the salary increase which our postal employees deserve but the increase provided is far better than no salary increase legislation at all during this session. The $450 annual increase for postal employees in the field service is justly deserved. Likewise, the 25 cents per hour increase for hourly paid postal employees and the increase of 25 percent for our fourth-class postmasters is equally meritorious. There are no more loyal, faithful, and efficient employees in our Government service than our postal employees and I am pleased to support this legislation providing the increases for them enumerated. The present day high cost of living, coupled with the faithful and loyal service of our postal employees, makes the passage of this bill highly desirable. I urge support of this salary increase legislation for employees in the Postal Department.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I do so not because I think it entirely satisfactory, but because it is the only bill presented to us on the question, and I believe the postal workers had rather have this bill than no bill at all. This bill is presented to us under a move to suspend the rules which does not permit any amendment being offered. We must vote the bill up or down as it is written.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill some months ago on the subject of salary raises for postal workers and my bill provided for a raise of $800. I have pushed that bill diligently. The bill presented to us today provides for $450. I do not think that is enough, but this is the bill which the Republican leadership has agreed on and presented to us, and we are presented with the choice of taking it or leaving it. Naturally I am voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the House leadership has not presented us a bill to also give some increase to other Federal workers. I note from newspaper reports that there is some hope that when this bill gets over to the Senate, an amendment will be offered to include other Federal workers. I hope this is so. It should be done.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while this bill is not in the sum I would like, and while it is not entirely satisfactory in other respects, I am glad the House leadership has at last decided to let us vote on even this bill. The prospects for this legislation have been rather gloomy at times, and I am glad that the bill was finally presented. I hope it passes unanimously.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we in this House acknowledge the obligation which we owe to the faithful public servants in the Post Office Department. I think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that we adopt this bill in order to provide them with increased compensation.

Mr. Speaker, these people are working for us. These people serve at our will, and because their pay is determined by us, we should no longer dodge the issue. I suppose this group of Federal employees is the largest group of workers within the country which is denied the right to strike for increased wages and better working conditions. They are entirely at our mercy. Not only is it just that we pass this resolution to increase their small incomes in this day of rising costs of living, but it is our public duty to do so before this session ends.

I regret that the Republican policy committee has not seen fit to include all Federal employees in this bill. It is no more right that postal workers receive this increase than it is that all other Federal workers be given increased compensation. I hope that when this bill goes to conference, if it does, that we in the House are given an opportunity to do the right thing, the just thing, the fair thing, and pay our Government workers salaries commensurate with the high cost of living.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of this committee, I personally was in favor of an $800 permanent increase for all postal workers including postmasters, postal workers, and so forth. I was also in favor of another bill for a pay increase for all Federal employees in the amount of $600.

This committee reported out a bill for an increase of $585 for postal employees, and a bill for a $450 increase for all Federal employees. There was not a dissenting vote, and both Democratic and Republican members of this committee voted unanimously for these two bills in

those amounts. They were arrived at through a compromise in the committee.

It is very apparent that it will be impossible to secure an increase of more than $450, as is provided for in this bill now before the House. Notwithstanding the fact that I favor an increase of $800, I am going to vote for this increase for postal workers for $450 on the theory that when it is impossible to get a whole loaf of bread a half loaf is better than none at all.

I am appealing to the leadership here in the House at this time to bring up the bill providing for a pay increase for all Federal employees of $360. While it is true that I was in favor of a $600 increase, I am going to vote for the $360 increase on the same theory that a half a loaf is better than nothing at all.

I personally want to take this opportunity to commend the various witnesses who appeared before the committee on this legislation, and to thank them for their excellent work and cooperation in this pay-increase legislation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I feel it only my duty to urge my colleagues' approval of this legislation. I have, as most of you know, repeatedly appeared before the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees to request their favorable action on the various bills providing for a substantial compensation increase to our postal and Federal employees. With particular reference to the postal employees, I submit that this faithful corps of public servants, by their industry and devotion to their work, deserve the gratitude, respect, and admiration of all our people.

The continued newspaper articles and editorials, urging compensation increases for them, is clear and convincing evidence of the practically universal recognition of their salary adjustment needs. They are compelled to pay for their own uniforms, where required, and their 1945 increase has been nullified by our ever-rising living cost.

It is not necessary for me to take your valuable time, at this hour, in recitation of the changing economic conditions which have cut down materially the size of the purchasing dollar in the hands of the wage earners of America; indeed, the committee hearings clearly reveal the existence of economic factors which seriously handicap our postal employees in their struggle to maintain a decent way of life for themselves and their family. There is pressing and urgent need for pay adjustment, to raise the living standards of our postal employees to a more equitable level, and I earnestly exhort you to pass this bill without delay. I regret exceedingly that the provisions debated here prevent the opportunity for considering and approving a more substantial increase.

I would consider myself remiss in my obligation if I did not, at this moment, urge the Members of the Rules Committee to allow us to act upon a wage increase bill, for all our Government workers, before adjournment.

A comparative study of the revised wage scales in private industry with the compensation levels of our Federal employees will emphasize the inequities currently existing. If this Government is to uphold the tradition of efficient service administered by capable personnel, it must offer the employees wages comparable to other occupations of the same nature. The best guarantee against a turbulent America in these critical times, is the extension of a fair living wage to all our workers both inside and outside of Government employ. Our Government workers, who cannot bargain collectively for increased compensation, or strike, must be provided for by congressional action. I again sincerely request the Rules Committee to enable us to consider and approve a bill for a substantial increase to all our Government employees to permit them to meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this Congress has before it many pressing problems demanding attention, but, in my opinion, and I am confident that this opinion is favored by the majority of my colleagues, none of them are more deserving of our speedy consideration than that of approving a substantial and permanent salary increase for all our faithful and efficient Federal employees.

SALARY INCREASES FOR ALL FEDERAL WORKERS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to declare my support of this measure which provides a $450 pay raise for the employees of the United States Post Office Department. These workers are certainly deserving of such salary increases, and I am happy to see this legislation finally come to the floor. This measure should have been debated and passed long ago, and would have, had it not been for the obstructionist tactics of the enemy bloc who have stalled on this issue for many months.

The fact that I am going to vote for this bill, however, does not blind me to its deficiencies. For it is my opinion that an increase of $450 is little more than a token increase, and one that is wholly inadequate to affect the ever-increasing cost of living. The following facts will support this position. Under prewar legislation establishing salary schedules for postal employees, the average median salary in 1941 was only $1,902. During the war, the salaries of postal employees were raised about $800—a 40-percent adjustment. The effect of this wartime pay raise brought the average salary for postal workers to about $2,700.

Although this increase appears substantial, it is wholly inadequate for several reasons. In the first place, the cost of living has risen about 60 percent during this period when salaries were increasing by only 40 percent, the effect of which has been a reduction in the real wages of the workers, and a general lowering of their living standards. In the second place, the postal workers' salaries have not kept pace with the wages of industry. During this war period, when postal workers were receiving 40-percent pay raises, the wages in durable-goods industries were increased by 61 percent.

Thus it becomes obvious that a 20-percent salary increase over the average postal salary of $2,700 is necessary for postal workers to maintain their living standards in the face of rising living costs. It is likewise necessary to bring these workers' wages into harmony with industrial wage levels established during the war. Such a 20-percent increase amounts to $540, which is $90 above that which is provided by this bill.

But even this amount is not enough. I wish to remind the House that the industrial wage pattern is changing today, and the automobile workers, for example, are now obtaining another 10 percent pay raise. Using this as a standard, the postal workers deserve an additional $270, bringing the total increase to $810 per year. In other words, it would take this amount to give the postal workers the same take-home pay as they enjoyed in 1941, and to fit the Government's wage policy into the emerging pattern of industrial wage levels.

I also want to go on record as saying that I have favored a $1,000 pay increase for all Federal workers—both postal and classified—for some time, and that I introduced the $1,000 pay raise bill—H. R. 5526—in the House—the same bill which the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] introduced in the other body. I am still convinced that the thousand-dollar pay-raise objective is desirable and equitable, and that it would go far to maintain the efficiency and morale of the Federal service. Although I am supporting this bill, it is my hope that the other House will increase the amount, and amend its coverage to embrace all Federal workers.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year I introduced legislation to increase the salaries of both postal employees and Federal employees generally. These measures called for increases of $800 per employee to offset increased living costs. I shall support the pending bill but must express my keen regret that all Federal employees are not included. To provide increases for one group and not for another is an obvious discrimination. I sincerely hope that the Senate can provide a remedy and extend the salary increase to all Federal employees. All of them deserve this benefit.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see legislation finally come to the floor of the House to provide a long-delayed and much-needed salary increase for postal workers. On April 21, nearly 2 months ago, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported out H. R. 5667, which provided a raise of $585 per year for postal employees. This bill also was retroactive by its terms to April 1, 1948.

I have on several occasions, since that bill was reported out by our committee, urged that the House take action to provide this salary increase.

After much uncertainty and apprehension regarding the fate of that bill, we are today taking final action in the House for salary increases to this group of Federal employees. I am glad that this bill by its terms will be permanent, rather than temporary. I regret that it does not provide a figure which will more adequately take care of the increased cost of living.

I introduced on December 17, 1947, H. R. 4772, which, if enacted, would provide a salary increase of $600 per annum

for postal employees. At the time I introduced that bill, based upon a report furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it was my opinion that $600 would take care of the increase in the cost of living. I am disappointed that the raise provided in the bill now under consideration is $150 lower than the figure called for in my bill.

Under all the circumstances, inasmuch as it is a question of supporting this bill or nothing at all, I shall vote for it.

I take this occasion to say, however, that other Federal employees are also entitled to a salary increase to meet the present high cost of living, which they are experiencing just the same as postal employees.

I earnestly urge that legislation to provide such an increase for the other Federal employees be enacted either today or tomorrow, before this present session of Congress ends.

In my opinion the postal-rate increases provided in title II of this bill now under consideration should not be considered along with and as a part of the bill providing a raise for postal employees. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee held extensive hearings regarding postal-rate increases. I am opposed to the increase in air-mail postage, and I am opposed to certain of the parcel-post and third-class mail rate increases. I voted against these rate increases when the postal rate bill was before the committee, and I would vote against these rate increases now if they were being considered on their own merits. They have been attached to this postal employees salary increase bill, and inasmuch as the two items cannot be separated under present procedure, I am voting for the bill as a whole. It is my earnest hope the conference committee may see fit to eliminate that part of the bill which relates to postage rates if this legislation goes to a conference committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported a permanent increase of $800 for all postal workers. I regret that this was not the amount of the increase in the bill we have just passed. However, the $450 raise will help some. I was surprised to learn that this increase is the largest single one ever passed by any Congress for our postal workers.

It is the purpose of this legislation to provide a permanent increase in the salaries of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department and to offset a portion of the increased cost by an increase in postal rates.

Title I of the bill provides an annual increase of $450 in the salaries of postal employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who are paid on an annual basis. Increases are provided in the amount of 25 cents per hour for hourly employees and increase of 25 percent for fourth-class postmasters.

Based upon figures submitted by the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget, the total cost of title I of the bill will be approximately $211,221,797. All of the 479,850 employees in the field service of the Post Office Department will receive pay increases under the provisions of the bill.

The committee devoted much study to this legislation and the hearings lasted from February 25 to March 17, 1948. Testimony presented by the postal employees' national organizations stressed the necessity for an increase in the salaries of postal employees because of the increased cost of living since July 1946. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the present cost-of-living index is 167.5 as compared with the index of 100 in 1939.

To offset part of the rising cost of living, according to the testimony, postal employees in the field service have been granted two substantial permanent pay raises. The first was by adjustments in salaries and classifications under Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, amounting to $400 for each postal employee, beginning July 1, 1945. The second was under Public Law 386, Seventy-ninth Congress, which granted an additional permanent salary increase of $400 a year for the postal employees, effective January 1, 1946.

On the basis of the foregoing, the committee believed that a pay raise of $450 per annum would be ample additional compensation to meet the rising cost of living.

Representatives of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget presented the views of their agencies to the committee. In general, these witnesses stated that in view of the President's budget message which did not include provision for increasing the salaries of Federal employees, they could not at this time recommend additional compensation in the salaries of the employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, from the above it is obvious that a Republican Congress has gone down the line for pay increases to this group of loyal and patriotic Federal workers even though the Post Office Department and the President were opposed to the raise. I applaud this action as meritorious and deserving, notwithstanding this official opposition.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that I shall support and vote for H. R. 6916 with pleasure and confidence. This is the largest single raise that has ever been granted to the postal employees, and a well merited one. They receive this increase, and they have also received a substantial reduction in income taxes. This entire committee has labored ever since I have been in the Congress to bring forth some such legislation, and I think that we have good reason to be proud of it. I know that the postal employees are glad to have a permanent raise.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I will only have time in the 2 minutes allotted me to make a few brief observations on this bill. First of all I want it understood that I am in favor of an $800 permanent increase for both postal employees and other Federal employees. I also feel that the wages of wage board employees should be increased proportionately. Secondly, I want to point out that I am going to vote for this bill because I have no alternative. It is better that we give our deserving postal employees a few crumbs than to give them no legislation at all. Thirdly, however, I want to state that neither the postal pay legislation nor the postal rate legislation included in this bill is the legislation originally reported out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

More than a year ago that committee reported out legislation recommending postal rate increases. I personally did not favor that legislation because I look upon the Post Office Department, as I look upon all departments of the Government, as an agency to serve the public and not as a money-making institution. Much less, however, do I favor the manner in which postal rate increases have been added to this bill.

In this bill we are not increasing the rates of these users of the mail responsible for the largest portion of the present deficit in the Post Office Department. On the contrary, the Republican policy committee has chosen to pick on those of least political influence. They have done this unfairly, because they have added to the postal-pay legislation postal-rate-increase legislation, making it difficult for those affected by such rate increases to come in and protest, since they recognize as over 200 Members of this House, testifying before our committee, recognized that there is a dire need for a pay increase for our postal and other Federal employees. It is unfair to tie up a part of our postal rate legislation with a part of our salary increase legislation and bring it back to the committee with the ultimatum that we take this or get nothing. I insist that both the postal-pay legislation and the legislation designed to increase postal rates should have come before the House on their own respective merits.

Lastly, it has been said that neither the President of the United States nor the Bureau of the Budget has recommended this legislation. May I call the attention of the House to the fact, however, that when the President said he did not favor increases in salary legislation, he hinged that statement specifically upon his recommendation that the Congress had to do something to control the spiral of inflation. The President was thinking in terms of the purchasing power of the money received by our Federal employees.

I am quite sure that since the Congress has failed to do anything about the rising cost of living, the President, as does every Member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, recognizes the need for salary increases for our postal and other Government employees. I have no doubt under these circumstances but that he will give his approval to legislation providing for such increases.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this legislation even though it does not give sufficient relief to our postal employees. It is my understanding that we will not, during this session, have an opportunity to vote for an increase in compensation to Government employees, nor will we have an opportunity to vote for the larger amount in increase for postal employees. This I regret but I shall certainly vote that the postal employees receive something, rather than nothing at all for their faithfulness.

I want to quote from a telegram just received from one of the local federation of post office clerks in my district as follows:

> Efficient postal service most important during peace or war, under Democrats or Republicans, whether rain or shine.

Gentlemen, none of us would deny that the above is true, for our postal employees have been faithful at all times and rendered efficient postal service.

I appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service months ago and urged that the increase in compensation legislation be reported favorably to the House in order that this body might have an opportunity to stand up and vote thereon.

None of us can deny that living costs have increased. I have been advised that many of our faithful and efficient postal workers must retire from Government service and seek employment with private industry in an endeavor to support their families, if they are not allowed an increase. In many instances the wife and mother has had to seek outside employment in an endeavor to supplement a salary paid her husband as a faithful employee, in order that the family might have, not the luxuries of life, but the necessities.

An increase of $800 would be more in keeping with the increase in living conditions and this amount is what I had hoped to have an opportunity to support.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise rather reluctantly to support this bill. I say reluctantly because I feel that it is entirely inadequate. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held extensive hearings, and with only one dissenting vote passed out a bill authorizing $585 a year increase in salaries for faithful postal workers. They passed out a second bill recommending $468 a year for classified workers in the Federal service. These measures are well merited. We had extensive testimony showing the cost of living and its impact upon faithful public workers. It was definitely shown to us that these people had to supplement their earnings with outside employment, and I submit that is not in the best interests of the Government, or they had to have their wives work.

What happened? These bills were reported from the committee about 2 months ago. They have reposed in the Committee on Rules since that time. They came out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with only one dissenting vote. They represent a compromise, because many of us felt that $585 was inadequate. They came out with one dissenting vote, a compromise between the majority and minority members of the committee. I submit that is the factual finding of the committee. Then what happened? Two days ago we were given this bill and told that we would have to take $450 or nothing. I cannot vote against the bill because I know the plight of these workers. I know the condition in which they find themselves. So I am constrained to take it. That is why I say to you I very reluctantly recommend the passage of the bill. The faithful public workers of this country asked for bread, and the Republican policy committee handed them a stone—a stone, if you please, covered with the slime of partisan politics.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. Does not the gentleman believe that with the high cost of living, these postal employees should have at least an $800 raise at this time?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to concur in the thought expressed by my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK. They should have an $800 increase.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. REES. Of course, we were in the unfortunate, or whatever position you would like to call it, of getting no help from the Bureau of the Budget on this problem. The Post Office Department, as the gentleman knows, did not recommend any of this increase.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, but the Democratic Members of your committee without exception support this raise.

Mr. REES. I understand that.

Mr. MILLER of California. We stand on the record that we support the raise and we now want the raise. We are not going to let you and the Republican policy committee hide behind the President's skirts. You could have followed him, sir, on the matter of retaining controls to hold down the high cost of living. To stop inflation. You could have done that.

Mr. REES. Of course, if you are talking about the OPA, that is something else.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. May I say that all members of our committee worked in harmony, Republicans as well as Democrats, and have done a splendid job, including the distinguished chairman.

When the President's Budget Bureau suggested no Federal pay raise, he requested private industry to make no raises. That all had to do with the problem of inflation. Private industry now has had to raise wages because of the continued raise in living costs.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his pertinent observation.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for having the courage and showing their interest in getting a pay raise for the postal workers by bringing to the floor of the House permanent legislation providing for a $450 a year increase for them in the face of the opposition of the President, the Budget Bureau, and of this administration, which is now in power in the executive branch. I want to congratulate them. Secondly, I want to say to those Democratic Members who have made a political issue out of this in the debate, that you are fooling no one, and certainly not the officials of the postal organization employees. It is well known that the men in high union positions representing all the workers, are much more pleased with this $450 a year permanent increase than if they had the bill you Members have been talking about providing for $585 temporary increases. Any of them will tell you that, and doubtless most of them have told you Members who are trying to make a political issue out of this, that they are extremely pleased with this bill and would rather have the $450 permanent increase than a $585 a year temporary increase. Why try to deceive the postal workers in your district by the statements you have made in this debate?

Third, let me suggest to you people that you are following the line that you followed on every bill to spend money since I have been in Congress. If you were not so thoroughly imbued with the idea of tremendous appropriations for flood controls along the Brazos River in the State of Texas—the State from which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] hails—and for flood control, and every other expense, and for the spending of billions and billions of dollars, much of it wasted, we would have more money to give to the postal workers.

From the well of this House I said to you people who were so insistent that we have $6,800,000,000 for the first year of the ERP to give to Europe that the postal workers were coming along; that we better save something for them and for Federal aid to education. Yet, you put into the bill every billion and every million possible. Your record has been to increase every appropriation. Your record has been one of such waste and spending that it is a wonder we have any money left to give any raise in wages for the splendid and deserving postal employees of this country.

Let me repeat, were it not for the fight for economy that the Republican Party has made for the past 5 or 6 years, and particularly the last 2 years, you would not have any money with which to raise the pay of these Federal employees.

This Republican Congress in this session has to its credit the enactment of the most liberal employees' retirement bill for all Federal employees in the history of this Government. It means almost countless millions in benefits to them now and in the future. This Congress has passed dozens of bills, all beneficial to postal and Federal employees, and most every one was reported out of our committee.

Let the undisputed record show that during this and the prior session of the Eightieth Congress that more and better legislation has been passed in the interest of postal employees than was ever before passed by any Congress since the beginning of this Republic. No one can dispute this fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the pay raise for the hard-working postal workers whose living standards are so seriously jeopardized by the high cost of living, and I am very gratified that the House today will perform at least some part of this act of justice. I advocated a $1,000-per-year pay raise before the House Committee on Civil Service and Post Office and believe that this was needed. The House today is making a start in recognizing that because a man works for his Government does not mean that he is not worthy of his hire. On the contrary the Government should be the first to recognize the need for adjusting wage scales to costs of living because individual initiative of the employee in asking for a raise is so much more difficult with the Government. I hope that the next session Congress will again examine this question with a view toward seeing that its action is adequate to the need

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 6916.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for keeping his pledge to bring legislation before the House providing salary increases for postal employees and other Federal workers.

The House has just passed by unanimous vote the bill granting a permanent increase of $450 per annum for postmasters and postal employees. I do hope before the Congress adjourns we will pass a similar bill which is pending providing for a temporary increase of $360 per annum for other Federal workers.

Along with a number of my colleagues, I introduced last December bills which would provide an increase of $800 for workers in both of these categories. I believed then—and I still believe—that an increase in this amount would be fair and equitable and necessary in order to bring their income in line with the increased cost of living. It is regrettable that it has been determined that conditions will not permit at this time an increase larger than that which has been approved for postal workers and that which has been proposed for Federal workers.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly urge and sincerely hope that during the congressional recess the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will make a thorough study of the relation of the pay schedules of postal and other Federal employees to the rise in the cost of living since 1940, so that the Congress when it returns next January may provide for additional compensation for loyal and deserving Government workers. I shall strongly support a further increase.

FEDERAL ALCOHOL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5849) to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and for other purposes, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE—WILSON AGAINST GRANGER

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged resolution (H. Res. 692) relative to the contested election case of Wilson against Granger, First Congressional District of Utah, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include some newspaper articles and other extraneous matter.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

AIR PARCEL POST

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of postage on mailable matter exceeding 8 ounces in weight, but not weighing more than 70 pounds nor measuring more than 100 inches in length and girth combined, when carried by air and including other transportation to and from air-mail routes, shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be determined on the basis of the eight postal zones established for fourth-class matter, as follows:

(1) For delivery within the first or second zones, 55 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(2) For delivery within the third zone, 60 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 8 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the fourth zone, 65 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 14 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the fifth zone, 70 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 24 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the sixth zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 33 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the seventh zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 45 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the eighth zone, which, with respect to air parcel post, shall include all offices located in continental United States beyond the seventh zone, 80 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof over 8 ounces, plus 65 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For air parcels exchanged between offices in continental United States and offices in Territories and possessions of the United States in either direction, and between offices within such Territories and possessions, the applicable zone rate shown in paragraphs (1) to (6) of this section shall apply to and including the seventh zone: *Provided*, That for offices falling in the eighth zone the rate of postage for air parcels weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be 80 cents for each pound or fraction thereof.

(9) Mailable matter of light weight in relation to size shall be subject to such surcharge as may be determined by the Postmaster General to be warranted by reason of the extra space and care required in handling and transporting such mail matter.

(10) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973), as amended, or any order, rule, or regulation made by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder, as may be necessary for the safe and expeditious transportation by air of mail matter weighing in excess of 8 ounces.

(11) The Postmaster General is further authorized and directed for the period of 2 years, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (9), inclusive, of this section, to adjust from time to time the weight limit, size, rate of postage, zone or zones or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public and assure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in the disbursement of the appropriation for domestic air-mail service, to apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing suitable quarters at public airports for use in the handling and distribution of air mail at a reasonable rental to be paid quarterly or monthly, for a term not exceeding 20 years.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 730, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session), entitled "An act to fix the rate of postage on domestic air mail, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The rate of postage on domestic air mail weighing 8 ounces or less shall be 5 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That the rate of postage on air mail of the first class weighing in excess of 8 ounces

shall be the rate provided for air parcels but in no case shall be less than 3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following the month of enactment.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee for 20 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it establishes initial rates for the carrying of parcels exceeding eight ounces and not exceeding 70 pounds by air. These rates are set up in accordance with the regular eight parcel post zones, and the committee has been assured by the Post Office Department that the rates provided will return to the Department sufficient revenue to pay the expenditures of this new service. Not only will this provide a fine new service to the people of the United States but will as well, utilize more than 20,000,000 ton-miles of space for which we are now paying but which the Post Office Department does not have sufficient volume of mail to use.

This unused space is a result of the practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board in establishing rates to the Post Office Department for carrying air mail based upon plane-mile and minimum-load factors. Under the plane-mile rate which applies generally to the feeder lines, the Post Office Department pays a fixed fee covering every mile a plane of a specific line travels. The air line is required to carry all of the mail presented for carriage by the Post Office Department. Because of the low volume of first-class air mail on feeder line runs, only a small portion of this space is used.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the floor with the recommendation of the membership of our committee. I know of no objection to it. On two occasions it was objected to on the Consent Calendar, but I am informed by both these gentlemen that now they have no objection and will support this legislation.

If any of you have questions to ask as I proceed I shall be glad to try to answer them. In that way we may expedite consideration of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 6773, will provide for an air parcel-post service.

The minimum load factor rate applies to the smaller trunk lines. Under this rate the Post Office Department is required to pay at a specific ton-mile rate for a minimum amount of mail whether that mail is carried or not. On a more limited scale this has the same effect as the plane-mile rate and a large volume of space is paid for by the Post Office Department because there is not sufficient mail available to fill the space. This plane-mile and minimum-load factor is where a large part of the subsidy paid to the air lines is hidden.

This procedure permits the ton-mile rates to these respective carriers to be comparable. At the same time by raising the minimum-load factor, different air lines are paid considerably out of proportion to the service performed. I would like to make it crystal clear that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee does not agree with this manner of establishing rates. We have submitted a report, House Report No. 1958, in which it is recommended that the subsidy be separated from the air-mail pay and the Post Office Department be required to pay only for the service performed. However, since it is not within the jurisdiction of our committee to present legislation on this particular phase of our aviation policy, we are forced in establishing our air-mail rates and our air-mail programs to take into consideration the conditions which have grown up under the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It is expedient under the present rates to establish this air parcel-post system and to do it at once—because of the large amount of space which is not being used by the Department for which it must pay, plus the fact that on May 8, 1948, the larger air lines were granted an increase amounting to $5,000,000 annually. Under the new schedule of increases these carriers will receive a reduced ton-mile rate if the volume is increased. It is more advantageous and economical at the present time to establish the carriage of this mail in the manner already provided for regular air mail.

There is a great demand on the part of the public for this service. Coast-to-coast delivery of parcels will be advanced by 2 days. Delivery of parcels on shorter hauls will be advanced proportionately when sent by air. It is estimated that more than 50,000,000 parcels will be sent by air mail annually in order to take advantage of the advance date of delivery. A large portion of these parcels will come from new business which will be developed as a result of this time-saving transportation. Medicines, critically needed by communities, will be sent in this manner. Business experts have told us that this new service will be used for the shipment of packaged flowers, style merchandise, newspapers, and all manner of perishable products. This service will also be used for replacement parts for farm machinery. In many instances this will eliminate delays of 1 or 2 days when these parts cannot be obtained locally and may mean the saving of crops of vitally needed foodstuffs.

In summary, favorable action on this legislation will provide the American public with a desired service and will, at the same time, result in a net saving to the Post Office Department of approximately $10,000,000 annually.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to thank my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] for yielding me 3 minutes. I shall try not to use the full 3 minutes. I have asked for this time for the purpose of telling the House that on January 8, 1945, when I was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, I introduced the first air parcel-post bill. At that time I put quite an extensive amount of material in the RECORD substantiating the policy of inaugurating an air parcel-post service. This, of course, is a different manner of handling packages from the railway-air express as now handled by the air lines.

Air parcel post will provide a great deal of convenience to many people who have access to post offices but do not have access to railway express offices.

My bill was introduced in the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, January 8, 1945. At that time we were engaged in war and the Post Office Department after consideration of the bill expressed itself as being in accord with the principles of the bill, but in a letter addressed to me they said that during the war the burden of mail on the planes then available was too great to put an additional load on them.

The rates provided for air parcel post in this bill may be a little high. However, the important thing is to establish the principle of air parcel post as a part of our great post-office service. After a year's experience in the new field, a factual record of receipts and expenses will be available. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee can then review the rates and adjust them for the benefit of the public and the United States Post Office Department.

The original bill for air parcel post, H. R. 1173, which I introduced, contained a similar schedule of rates. They were purposely made a little high to prevent a deficit to the Post Office during the first trial year.

At the time I introduced the original bill the Post Office Department asked that my bill be considered after the wartime period was over. I am glad the committee has considered the matter and I am glad to see the bill on the floor at this time.

In addition to the mail privileges which it will give to a lot of American people, it will result also in the employment of a great many additional people in the airplane industry. One of the things that our air lines need at the present time is a stable freight income. This will help, I am sure, and I compliment the committee on bringing this bill forward.

I thank the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] for this time and I hope the bill passes without any objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. R. 6773, not because I oppose the principle of parcel post being carried by air but because of the way this bill has been drawn. It is one of the greatest grabs from the American taxpayer that has ever occurred in the history of our country.

The fact is that parcel post under this bill will be carried according to the air-mail letter rates instead of being carried according to the cargo rates. Here is

the difference: According to the air-mail rates the Government pays 65 cents per ton-mile. According to the air-cargo rates it is 13 cents per ton-mile. The fact remains that due to the fact these big five airline companies have complained that they are suffering a deficit, the Federal Government has agreed to give them this tremendous increase to 65 cents per ton-mile. At the same time these airlines are able to carry cargo at 13 cents per ton-mile. If any one in the House can tell me why there should be the tremendous difference between carrying cargo per ton-mile and carrying air mail per ton-mile I would like to hear them.

Under this bill parcel post could very well fit into air cargo and should be carried, therefore, for around 14 or 15 cents per ton-mile instead of 65 cents that they are going to get.

My other objection to the bill is this: As you know, since the war has ended certain veterans coming back from the war have founded airlines. Not one of them has been given a certificate by the CAB; therefore, none of them are able to operate on a regular schedule. None of them can carry air mail, none of them are eligible under this bill to carry parcel post, only the big five air lines, United, American, TWA, Northwestern, and Eastern. All of the lines started by the veterans will be obliged to carry cargo only.

Mr. Speaker, I had two amendments which I proposed that would remedy this bill. The first one is as follows:

SEC. 4. This bill shall be construed to include the services of the noncertificated air-cargo carriers holding letters of registration from the Civil Aeronautics Board for regular service and air-cargo carriers certificated for the transportation of property.

With that amendment, those veterans' lines would be included under this bill.

The other amendment I would have offered reads:

SEC. 5. The cargo carriers referred to in section 4 shall be compensated for the carriage of air parcel post at rates not to exceed by more than 5 cents a ton-mile the minimum air-freight rates prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, this difference to compensate the carrier for the priority to be accorded by it to air parcel post.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these veterans' air lines are willing to carry this parcel post for 20 cents; yet the big-five air lines are to be given 65 cents. In other words, it is going to cost more to carry this air parcel post by the big-five lines than by the veterans' air lines, and for this reason the bill should be voted down.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to controvert the statements of the distinguished gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts. However, I think it is very needful to bring out some truth. As a matter of fact, when it comes to veterans operating air lines, there are thousands of veterans employed in the scheduled air lines, and there are others who are employed in nonscheduled air lines generally financed by persons other than themselves. It is a matter of employment more than anything else.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that statement is not correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. I deny that. That statement is absolutely correct. The gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sorry, but I do. I have the whole list here.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know who finances those companies; some of the oil interests and some by other interests.

Mr. KENNEDY. Take Mr. Slick.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Slick is in a different position. I will take it back as far as he is concerned. But there are plenty of others who are so financed.

So far as the carriage of air parcel post is concerned, it is necessary for the Government to deal with the air lines on the basis of a minimum amount of mail to be carried, and space rates turn out to be pound rates. About 60 percent of the available capacity is now being used. It would be a great saving to the Post Office Department over-all to fill up the available space with parcel post. For that reason air parcel post would be a very fine thing. In addition, we are having great difficulty at the present time in keeping our scheduled air lines going, and they are very necessary to the welfare of the people and the national defense. Under another bill, H. R. 6501, we are making special provision for cargo carrier aircraft, to assist in the development of air cargo. The Post Office Department does not want to put this mail in the hands of the nonscheduled carriers because they must actually schedule the transport of mail. Whether it be first-class mail or other kinds of mail, they must know when the planes are to load and when they are due to arrive, so that they can be met. This nonschedule business of carrying mail, whether it is parcel post or not, is practically impossible for the Post Office Department to arrange for.

While I have deep sympathy, as these gentlemen have, for the veterans, and I know that thousands of them are employed in all of the air lines, both scheduled and nonscheduled, I trust that the House will approve of this measure as it is. It is a good measure and should be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, since I will not be with you in the House in the next Congress, I wish to take a few minutes to express my deep gratitude to my colleagues for your friendship and for the constant spirit of cooperation and fair play you have always shown me during these 9 years I have been privileged to serve in the distinguished body.

While many times we have had our differences on issues, we have always respected and given honest consideration to one another's viewpoint. The work here in the House has been pleasant and inspiring to me; our decisions have been made and our tasks accomplished under the cold light of public scrutiny. This is the most remarkable body of people in the world. Think of it—435 patriotic people from every section of our country meeting to chart a legislative program for our Nation. Every viewpoint and every interest is considered. The end result is a policy and program made by the people through their own Representatives.

During the time I have been here I have served with more than 1,200 Members. I have never had reason to doubt the honesty, good will, or patriotism of any Member—and while we all have honest differences of opinion, I do not believe any Member has ever questioned my loyalty to our country.

The friendships one makes with people from all parts of our country is a great treasure for one serving in this body and I will always remember and cherish my association with you. In spite of the criticism hurled at Congress, I think there is no harder working, more intelligent, or patriotic group of people in the country.

The press endeavors to be fair in reporting our work here in Congress. A free Congress and a free press are the greatest bulwarks of our freedom. I regret though that too frequently the sensational things which occur in Congress make the news, rather than the tedious but most important labor of Members. Some newspapers ferret out this unsensational but necessary effort in making their appraisal of Members. I hope more of them will do so in the future.

Today we are in a critical period of our history. Beset with difficult domestic problems and faced with the fact of world leadership, we have rough and perplexing days ahead. But I know we are going to come through. I have great confidence in this Congress being able to steer the Ship of State through the troubled seas. This body is going to continue to protect the rights of the people. It is going to remain spiritually and materially strong. It is going to carry on a program that will give no ground for the growth of communism or fascism or any kind of ism in our country. Also I have full confidence that the Members of Congress by prayerful patience, sturdy strength, and consistent cooperation with other free peoples will win this struggle with Communist aggression, and will show the way to peace, stability, and order to the end that the world may be saved from a devastation too horrible to contemplate.

In leaving I want you to know that my prayers will always be for you—God bless you—and our great America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, my service with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and my association with him and his family, the charming Mrs. Kefauver, the two lovely little daughters and the one handsome son, have been sources of genuine pleasure and personal friendship. The recognition which has been given to the pa-

triotic and courageous service of my colleague stimulates pride in the hearts of his friends and, along with the many personal joys during his service with us, will, I am sure, occasion many pleasant memories and recollections for him as it will for me and his other friends in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Tennessee has made an outstanding record in the House, and the people of his district can well be proud of his service not only to them but to the people of his State and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members desiring to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the services of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] may do so at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is leaving the House of Representatives. He has been a man of stature and a leader among us. The many valuable contributions he has made in helping to carry on the work of Congress will long be remembered. He leaves with my sincerest wishes for a bright and successful future.

I have just read an advertisement by Mr. Ed Crump, of Memphis, which unjustly defames my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

As a member of the Un-American Activities Committee and one of its former chairmen, I wish to state for the record that the forthright stand my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has always taken in defending and preserving the civil liberties of citizens has in my opinion tended to strengthen the fight against un-American activities. The Un-American Activities Committee is faced with a problem of great import and complexity. There are many factors involved—not the least of which is the careful preservation of the rights of Americans under the Constitution. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has always been sympathetic to our committee and his cool and reasonable judgment has been most helpful.

While I am from Georgia it so happens that my district adjoins that of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I know many of the people whom he has represented so well during his 9 years in Congress. They accord him the same high respect as his many colleagues and I do. The gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, is a fine American true to the ideals of the Constitution. He stands, and has always stood for the principles on which our great democracy was founded. I sincerely hope that the people of Tennessee will not be misguided in their appraisal of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] by the words of a political boss.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as one who came to Congress about the time Representative ESTES KEFAUVER came, I desire to pay tribute to him. Throughout the many years Estes has served in the House, he has been recognized as one of the most able, competent, and conscientious Members in the House. He is known for his hard work and sincere devotion to the principles in which he believes. In many ways, and often, he has demonstrated his courage and initiative. The people of his district have been fortunate to have been represented by so distinguished a person. We, his colleagues, shall miss him as a legislator and as a friend. We are not happy that he is leaving the House; however, we wish him every good fortune in his undertakings.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the retirement from the House of the gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, will be a great loss, particularly to the Committee on the Judiciary, on which committee it has been my privilege to serve with him. His keen legal mind has been of tremendous help to the committee. Mr. KEFAUVER has been quick to recognize restrictive measures in proposed legislation that might deprive the individual of his constitutional rights—rights which he has worked untiringly to protect, strengthen, and preserve. Mr. KEFAUVER has been ever diligent in his efforts to further the opportunities of the ordinary man. This capable, personable gentleman leaves the House of Representatives, where he has so ably served his constituency and our Nation, with the best wishes of his colleagues, and we, as one, bid him good fortune.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that it has been a distinct pleasure and privilege to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. He has served with marked ability and unusual fidelity to his duties. As a legislator and a good friend, we shall miss him.

May I express to the gentleman the hope, if the great State of Tennessee is to be represented in the other body by a member of the Democratic Party, as seems to be a reasonable, if not desirable prospect to contemplate, that the senatorial crown by action of the electorate may rest upon the brow of our colleague who will carry it with dignity and credit to those who select him.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with other Members of the House in expressing appreciation for the services in this body of our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and in voicing our regret that he is leaving the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has given conscientious and faithful service to the Third Tennessee District, to the State of Tennessee, and to the Nation.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee he has been a close student of legislation and has assisted in the writing of important bills for that committee.

As he leaves the House now, voluntarily, I am sure the good wishes of his colleagues will go with him.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know the gentleman from Tennessee for many years before he became a Member of this House. I observed his activities as a civic leader and outstanding member of the bar of Chattanooga. I know of his high standing in the section of the South with which he has been identified. I appreciate his contribution to the solution of the great problems which have engaged us here. His splendid training as a lawyer, his studious disposition, his kind and generous treatment of those associated with him, and his qualities of progressive leadership have won the admiration of his colleagues and the appreciation of a multitude of American citizens.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that ESTES KEFAUVER is leaving us. He is a man of outstanding ability and has been a pleasant, understanding gentleman to work with. His loss will be deeply felt by every Member of the House.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the people of ESTES KEFAUVER's district and of the State of Tennessee are losing a most capable, hard-working, and intelligent Representative. During the years we have served here together I have gotten to know ESTES KEFAUVER well. He has come before the Appropriations Committee many times. He always presents his case clearly and forcibly and he knows the facts of his case. I consider him one of the top-notch Members of this body. He is the type of man we need in public service, and I hope he may continue in the upper body.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to serve with my colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER] on numerous unofficial committees. I regret that he is leaving the Congress, for he is a man of high ideals in the best American tradition. In times like these we need able men like Mr. KEFAUVER—men with fearless courage willing to grasp the complex issues before us and grapple with them until they are solved.

ESTES KEFAUVER has earned the high reputation he enjoys among us here by his hard work, sound judgment, and kindly consideration he has always had for the views and problems confronting his fellow colleagues. I wish him the utmost success in the future and want him to know that he will always carry my sincere best wishes with him.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest regret that I say farewell to my friend and colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER. He is a sincere, hard-working American and it has been a great pleasure to be associated with him in Congress. ESTES has established one of the finest records of any man here and has been a real credit to his district, his State, and his country. I hope I have the pleasure of working with him for many years to come.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many other Members share in my regreat that so valuable a Member of Congress as my colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER, is leaving us. His work here has earned the respect of all of us. He is a man of clear judgment and outstanding ability. I have enjoyed working with him here in Congress and I look forward to his continued success in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in voicing my sincere regret that he is leaving the House of Representatives after having served so faithfully and ably not only his own district and State, but also the Nation.

He is a man of great ability and is highly regarded not only by the members of his own party, but also by the members of the majority party. He has contributed much in constructive legislation while in Congress.

A year ago it was my privilege to be his guest in Tennessee and to view the great Tennessee Valley Authority projects, for which he had worked so energetically ad capably. He has, as a Member of the House, consistently worked for and with the people of his district and State for legislation beneficial to his people. He has been in Congress a recognized leader of his party, an outstanding Member of the House.

We will miss him, not only as an outstanding legislator, but also as a sincere and lovable friend.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, may I join with the many other Members of the House in expressing my regrets that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, has decided to leave us and seek the select and rarefied air of that great deliberative body on the other side of this building. Not only will we miss his warm and attractive personality, but the House of Representatives will lose one of its finest minds, its most energetic workers and one of its true and inspirational leaders. The gentleman from Tennessee has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues here in the House, and by his accomplishments he has earned the right to represent the people of Tennessee in the United States Senate.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us will miss the ready smile and hearty handshake of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. In leaving us he takes with him the best wishes of the membership. He has well represented his district, State, and Nation. Good luck, Estes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, during my 6 years in Congress I have learned to love and admire the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. His ability, his sincerity, and his willingness to work early and late, and his genial disposition, endeared him to his colleagues. We will all miss him in the House, but we look forward to his well-merited promotion in the Congress by service in the Senate of the United States. I am happy to count him as one of my closest friends in the Congress.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy to encourage my friends to seek the goal that will bring them the utmost satisfaction and that will provide an opportunity for the personal growth.

In this instance I am glad to know of Representative KEFAUVER's ambition to enter the Senate of the United States, and I do wish for him success in this effort. However, his fine record in the House is something of which he should be very proud. His devotion to the work of the House has earned for him the respect and confidence of every Member. We shall all feel his absence keenly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many Members who have the highest praise for the invaluable service which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has rendered during his years in the House. His diligence, great ability and excellent judgment has gained him the confidence and respect of all of us, including Democrats and Republicans alike. In addition, his unfailing courtesy has always been refreshing. All wish him good luck and success.

MR. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state that it has been a great pleasure and a source of inspiration to have had the opportunity to serve with my colleague and associate on the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER of the great State of Tennessee. His devotion to duty, his fair and impartial approach to all bills before our committee are all to his great credit. ESTES has been kind, sympathetic, and understanding upon every occasion that I have sought his friendship, consideration, and support. His ability as an attorney, his judicial mind, and his leadership shall be sorely missed when he voluntarily retires from the House of Representatives.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of genuine regret to me that Mr. KEFAUVER is retiring from the House. It so happens that he and I have been interested in some of our congressional problems and have cooperated one with the other. I have found him to be an earnest, intelligent and sincere legislator—the kind we all appreciate and admire. I hope he will continue in the service of his country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is an uncommon privilege to serve in this House but a more rare privilege to work with a Member who measures up to the high caliber and is possessed of the sterling character and productive ability of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I remember when first he came to Congress for he made his impression early and well. Never to my knowledge has he failed to devote his intellectual attainments and his inexhaustible energies to the welfare of his constituents and his country. I shall miss him and his sound reasoning. His departure from this Chamber I trust precedes his graduation to the Senate where the Senatorial toga to drape his broad shoulders awaits him. He will contribute to that august body at the other end of the Capitol the same sound reasoning, help and virility that he so unselfishly and generously gave to the House. May the good people of Tennessee and of his district reward him for his patriotic service by promotion to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend and fellow Member, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Estes, as we affectionately know him, leaves this great body voluntarily. We are going to miss him. We will miss his sound counsel and advice.

But, while we grieve at his leaving the House we rejoice in the thought that he is waging a forceful campaign for election to the other branch of this Congress, and we wish him success in his race.

The gentleman from Tennessee has contributed much to the Government of our great country and it is my hope that, in or out of Congress, he will continue his fine service to his fellowman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say that, among all the outstanding men I have met in this House, none has impressed me more with his sincerity, his ability, his interest in mankind, and his loyalty to his country, his State, and his constituents than the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. We on this side of the aisle are losing a great colleague, a loyal Democrat. The House is losing a faithful servant. He has made a great record here. We have confidence that the high level of public service which he has rendered here will characterize his activities in his new undertakings.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am one of many Members of this House who are genuinely sorry to know that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] will no longer be with us.

All during my tenure of office in this body I have appreciated and admired the distinguished gentleman's ability, and statesmanship. He brought to this body an intelligence and integrity that contributed greatly to the deliberations of this body. It is such men as he that has enabled this body to carry on through the most difficult and critical times in the history of our Nation. His attributes are rare and shared by few. For this reason, I have held him in the highest esteem.

My earnest wish is that he will soon grace the other body, thus bringing to that body the high character and great qualities that he gave to this body.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to learn that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER, will not be a Member of this body next year. He has made an enviable record and no man in the House is regarded more highly by this body.

We wish him great success in all his endeavors, and should he become a Member of the other body I am sure the people of Tennessee will be well represented.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, when Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER leaves the House of Representatives we lose one of the most able and outstanding Members of this body. He has been a forward-looking Representative of his people in every instance where their welfare might be in jeopardy. Our good wishes go with him as he leaves our midst.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I hear my friend and colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] state that he will not be with us in the House next Congress. It will be a distinct loss to this body to have him leave it. I regard my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] as one of the strongest Members here during my membership.

I have never seen or visited the physical plant of the great Tennessee Valley

Authority, but I have gained a favorable impression of it. A large part of my knowledge of TVA and the good impression I have of it has been gained through the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. He has been a great friend and stanch defender of this highly important and controversial development. I know he will continue to support and foster this and every other significant and worthy cause for his State and Nation.

Mr. LANHAM of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was not until the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] spoke his few brief words of farewell to the House a few moments ago that the realization was brought to me that he would not be a Member of the House during the next session of Congress.

Before I came to Washington as a Member of the Eightieth Congress I did not know ESTES KEFAUVER personally although I had heard much of the splendid record he had made in the Congress. Since coming to Washington I have learned to love, admire, and respect him very much.

Mr. KEFAUVER is recognized by his colleagues as one of the ablest and most progressive Members of Congress; and when I say he is progressive in his thinking and approach to public questions I mean that he is progressive in the true sense of the word and in no sense a radical.

Mr. KEFAUVER is one of a group of the younger and more forward looking Members of Congress who have done a wonderful job in reorganizing and streamlining the Congress. I have read with interest and I trust with profit, his book entitled "Twentieth Century Congress." In that book, which should be read by every Member of Congress, as well as every person in America interested in seeing the Congress work more effectively and speedily in the public interest, Mr. KEFAUVER makes many recommendations and suggestions to speed up the democratic process. I am of the opinion that most, if not all of the things suggested by Mr. KEFAUVER in his book could well be adopted by the Congress in the interest of a more vital and effective functioning of our great democracy.

I have felt especially close to Mr. KEFAUVER because of the fact that he represents a district in the State of Tennessee which adjoins the great Seventh Congressional District of Georgia which I have the honor and privilege of representing. I have been proud to call him my neighbor and friend.

I can say without disparaging in any way the distinguished junior Senator who now represents the State of Tennessee and without passing upon the merit of the other candidate for the Senate from that great State that ESTES KEFAUVER would be a most worthy and able representative of his State in the United States Senate.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important committees in the House of Representatives is the great and dignified Committee on the Judiciary, to which are referred more bills on more varied subjects than any other committee.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress I was assigned to that committee along with the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, of the Third Tennessee District. His keen mind, lofty character, and fine ability were instantly recognized by our chairman, and to him were assigned many of our most arduous and difficult tasks.

He is one of the best-educated lawyers in the House. Progressive in his views on modern problems, yet he is a stickler for the fundamentals and the recognized principles of law and government.

He is stalwart, both mentally and physically, and his 10 years' service to his people and to our country has been magnificent.

His retirement from the House of Representatives will be a distinct loss to his committee and to the whole House. We will miss him greatly.

It is my hope that the people of his great State recognize his meritorious services, and I join his many friends in wishing him happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I know I voice the sentiments of the House of Representatives when I say that we shall miss the long and valued services of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER. However, I am sure that this loss will only be a temporary one because the people of Tennessee will select him to represent them in the United States Senate.

No one has been a more consistent champion of the development of the great resources of the Tennessee Valley than ESTES KEFAUVER. The people of Tennessee are fortunate, indeed, in having such an able advocate in the Congress of the United States.

During his long service on the Judiciary Committee he has gained a reputation as one of the outstanding constitutional authorities in the Congress. He has always fought for and supported those measures which were in the public interest. It was my particular good fortune to have served with him during the past 7 years as a member of the House Small Business Committee. He has been a zealous guardian of the interest of the small-business men in America. He rendered an outstanding service to the country as chairman of the Subcommittee on Business Monopoly in the last Congress. The small-business men of America will not forget his tireless efforts in their behalf.

All of us join in wishing him many more years of public service in behalf of his country.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the other colleagues of ESTES KEFAUVER in paying tribute to this outstanding statesman. Here in Congress, we might be listed as Democrats or Republicans or of any other political faith, but among ourselves we have other standards, such as: Does he fight for what he thinks is right, has he ability, is he fair and honest, and does he respect the beliefs of others? My association with ESTES has convinced me that he qualifies in every respect.

I also must state that TVA is losing in the House one of its great champions.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my other colleagues in expressing my deep regret in saying farewell to my good friend and coworker, the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman KEFAUVER.

I have, through these past 9 years that I have served with him, learned to have a deep respect for his ability, personality, understanding of governmental problems.

His help was tremendous in our effort to reorganize the Congress. The great contributions he made to bring about a better legislative branch will be long remembered. He is a genuine student of legislative government and his understanding has, and I hope will, continue to aid the Congress in improving its machinery and its procedures.

I have followed his voting record closely over these years and have admired and largely concurred with his carefully arrived at and courageous decisions.

The loss of Representative KEFAUVER from this body is a deep blow—one which I hope will be compensated, however, by his service on the other side of the Capitol. We can ill afford to lose such an able Member when the Nation faces such grave problems as it does today.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the proudest term I know is the single word, "American." That word stands for many things in the eyes of the world—for courage, for kindness, for tolerance, for religious liberty, and political freedom.

Among the colleagues with whom I have had the honor of serving in this House who particularly deserve the highest praise for their genuine Americanism is the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

When it would have been easy for him to follow along with blind hysteria, he has stood firm for the American way. He has proved by his votes, even though he knew that they might cost him shortsighted support, that to him it was more important to be right than to seize a temporary advantage.

ESTES KEFAUVER has supported good legislation consistently courageously, and militantly.

He has applied the same qualities in opposing bad legislation.

His voting record in Congress could be taken as a guide for wise representation of his constituency. All of us might do well to measure our own records against his.

He will be missed in this House.

ESTES KEFAUVER is a man, and a Congressman, of whom Thomas Jefferson would have approved.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, during the terms I have served in this House, many Members have come and gone. We have lost valuable Members through death—the whims of politics—and those who have left to follow other pursuits.

I have listened to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, say farewell to those with whom he has so ably served.

Tennessee has contributed many statesmen to our great democracy, and I know of none who gives more promise of emulating the greatest of these than the gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER.

Though he does not return as a Member of the House of Representatives, yet he will still be with us in spirit, and the contributions he has made to this body, will long be gratefully remembered.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, as one who has served 10 years in the Congress and who has come to know the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER well, I wish to join with others in paying high tribute to him.

During this session of the Congress it has been my pleasure to serve on the Judiciary Committee of the House along with Mr. KEFAUVER. About one-third of all the bills introduced in the Congress in this session have been referred to the Judiciary Committee. Perhaps more useful and constructive legislation has come from this committee than any other. Mr. KEFAUVER is recognized as one of the most able members of this distinguished committee.

On a purely selfish basis we regret his seeking promotion to the Senate. However, for patriotic reasons we wish him much success in his current campaign. He would make a United States Senator of which all Tennessee could justly be proud.

At this time, however, I wish to refer to only one of the outstanding contributions Mr. KEFAUVER has made to the Congress. I wish to acknowledge with gratitude his sponsorship of electoral reform. Mr. KEFAUVER was one of the first and most effective advocates of a constitutional amendment to change the method by which we elect Presidents. House Joint Resolution 9, reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House without a dissenting vote, and Senate Joint Resolution 200, reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate with but one dissenting vote, currently known as the Gossett-Lodge resolution, was in large part the handiwork of ESTES KEFAUVER. Through effective and able advocacy he has been able to create much support for this proposed amendment in the Congress. In the opinion of many of us, this reform is essential if American democracy is to survive. As a Member of the United States Senate, Mr. KEFAUVER can and will continue his able espousal of this cause. He can and will contribute materially to its early enactment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, like all other Members of the House, I deeply regret the retirement from this body of the able and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. During his service here he has commanded the respect and high regard of the House. Capable, aggressive, conscientious and forward-looking, he has consistently been a vigorous and able advocate of every principle or measure that he sponsored and a worthy representative of his district. Of gracious and amiable manner he very naturally enjoys many warm friendships among us who will miss his presence in this body.

It is not surprising, therefore, that he has answered the summons of a higher responsibility, the quest for a greater public duty in perhaps a wider field of service. Our very best wishes attend him as he proceeds to achieve his aspirations and I am honored and happy to add my testimony to that of my colleagues in expressing regret upon the departure of such a distinguished Member and conveying to him my own sentiments that good will, good fortune, and success in the future may be his lot. May he enjoy higher flights and happier landings.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I join those who contemplate with regret the departure from Congress of the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER. He has made a great record; a record which is symbolic of the devotion to ideals, the perseverance, and the splendid ability he has shown. His place here will not easily be filled.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to publicly acknowledge my deep appreciation for the privilege of having sat side by side on the House Judiciary Committee with Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. My assignment to the Judiciary Committee followed closely the assignment of Mr. KEFAUVER.

As revealed from the history of the Judiciary Committee of the House, as prepared by our colleague and fellow committeeman the Honorable LOUIS E. GRAHAM, of Pennsylvania, many outstanding men have served there. Mr. KEFAUVER came to us with a splendid educational and practical background, well qualified for the many duties incident to his assignment. Strong of body, alert of mind, eager for work; no other member of our committee has done a better job.

The voluntary retirement of ESTES from the House leaves a vacancy which will be difficult to fill. By reason of his many sterling qualities, a strong bond of friendship prevails throughout the committee's entire membership regardless as to party lines.

I am sure that this humble expression of appreciation and loss by the retirement of Mr. KEFAUVER is shared in by our entire committee. May the Lord add strength and length to his already fruitful life.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, voluntarily retires at the end of the Eightieth Congress he will leave behind a most distinguished record of service. He was elected first to the Sixty-ninth and each succeeding Congress by the people of his district by overwhelming majorities.

This decade of service to the people of Tennessee as well as the Nation is a record of painstaking, diligent, and unselfish work.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Tennessee will continue to seek the opportunity to use the service of our sincere, honest, and faithful colleague.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard with regret of the voluntary retirement of Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, from the House of Representatives. During his long tenure he has demonstrated marked ability and has won the respect of his colleagues by his fine service to his people. He has consistently supported the progressive legislation advocated by the Democratic Party during his service. His departure will be a real loss to the House and to the Nation.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that our colleague, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, is offering his services to the State of Tennessee by reason of being a candidate to the United States Senate.

I have observed Mr. KEFAUVER's work in the House of Representatives for the past 6 years, and in my judgment he is one of the most effective Members of this body. He has been most diligent in carrying out the trust imposed on him by the people in his district in Tennessee, and I am confident if he is successful in his quest for a seat in the Senate, he will serve the people of Tennessee with honor and distinction.

I do not believe there is a Member of the House who is more admired and respected by his colleagues than is ESTES KEFAUVER, or one who has a better record of service to his country and to his State and district.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of genuine regret to Members on both sides of the aisle that our distinguished colleague the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER is retiring from the House. Industry, integrity, and ability have marked his record of service. I have learned to know him well in the decade we have served together in this Chamber, and I entertain for him affectionate regard. May good fortune and happiness attend him all the days of his life.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress we are turning our thoughts toward returning home and leaving our tasks here in Washington and at the same time parting with those whom we have been associated with in our committee work and in the Congress. At this time I want to express my regrets that we are not going to have with us on the Committee of the Judiciary one of our very good members who has served in the Congress for the past 9 years.

Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER has been one of our hard-working Members. He was highly respected by the entire membership of the House and his opinions and judgment were eagerly sought on the many intricate problems which came before our committee. He has contributed a great deal toward the fine record made by that outstanding committee. He acted as chairman of the committee investigating the conduct of one Judge Johnson, who as a Federal judge was accused of misconduct. He applied himself very diligently to the work and as a result of the investigation which the committee undertook, the judge resigned from the bench. He was determined to see to it that if there was any malfeasance in office it should be uncovered and the guilty ones exposed. His work has been praised by the entire committee. He has spared no effort to see that justice be done. He is not seeking reelection to the House of Representatives but is a candidate for United States Senator. I wish him well. He has earned any ambition he may seek as a public servant. He has been tested and not found wanting. If elected to the Senate he will give the people of the State of Tennessee excellent representation. His experience

in the House qualifies him for the office and Tennessee will have a very fine and outstanding Senator. I wish him well and hope that he will enjoy good health and many, many years of success and happiness.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for some time it has been my privilege to serve with ESTES KEFAUVER on the Judiciary Committee of the House. We have worked together on such important matters as the Administrative Procedure Act, the Contract Settlement Act, and many others. Several years ago I was a member of a special committee, of which he was chairman, to consider impeachment proceedings against certain district judges in Pennsylvania.

As a result of this close association I have come to know ESTES very well. In my judgment, he is one of the most able Members of the House. He has an excellent legal mind, which enables him to go at once to the root of any problem. He is one of the hard working Members of the Congress, and possesses executive ability to an unusual degree. He has been very mindful of his obligations to his constituents and to his country.

I shall remember ESTES as a worthy Member of Congress, a sturdy American, and a true friend.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which should have been presented to the Congress long ago. Air parcel post is badly needed in this country. I do not believe that anyone will insist that air parcel-post service should not be inaugurated at this time. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] will agree with that statement. Their opposition to this bill stems out of the fact that the measure provides that air parcel post shall be carried by air-mail carriers. They contend that certain noncertificated cargo carriers should have an opportunity to carry this air parcel post. In my opinion, air parcel post can be carried effectively and efficiently only by regularly scheduled air-mail carriers. I have an interest in these noncertificated cargo carriers. They have appeared before our committee. I have met many of them personally. I appreciate the great fight that they are making in the development of air cargo transportation. They now have an application with the Civil Aeronautics Board for a certificate. The application will be acted upon. If they are given a certificate, then they will be eligible to receive an air-mail contract and can then carry air parcel post.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. The nonscheduled air cargo carriers, the veterans, have had their applications for certificates in for three years, and not one veteran air line has been given a certificate. That is why they want a regular route. The veterans can carry this mail 40 cents cheaper per ton mile than the other carriers.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that an application for a certificate is now pending before the CAB.

Mr. KENNEDY. It has been pending for three years.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Hearings have been held upon it. I understand that action will be taken at an early date. I appeal to you to pass this bill. It provides for the carriage of air parcel post by zone rates just like the zone rate for surface transportation. However, the rates are so high that they cannot be in competition with surface transportation, by train, for example. The railroads do not oppose it. The Railway Express Company does not oppose it. It is a service that is urgently needed for the shipment of perishables and medicine, for parts and other articles from one coast to another, and to all sections of the United States.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. The statement was made before that the present certificated air mail carriers are receiving payment for space that is not used.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. KEOGH. And that they will be able to utilize that space for this parcel post.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. KEOGH. The utilization of that space for parcel post will in nowise decrease air-mail payments; will it?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Certainly not.

Mr. KEOGH. If the gentleman will excuse me, did he answer that it will not? Therefore, in fact, they will be paid twice for the same space.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No, no. Let me tell the gentleman from New York this: At the present time, under the decisions of the CAB, the Post Office Department is paying for 20,000,000 tons that are not being used. Now, if those 20,000,000 tons are used for this new air parcel post, then it will not cost the Post Office Department one single penny for the carriage of the mail for this unused space. Let me tell you furthermore that on all small trunk lines the CAB has fixed a minimum load of 300 pounds. That is what the Post Office Department has to pay for; yet none of these lines carry over an average of 75 to 100 pounds of that 300 pounds. The balance of around 200 pounds can be utilized in the carriage of air parcel post, and it will not cost the Post Office Department one penny to use that space.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I wish the gentleman would permit me to finish first. I have already yielded to the gentleman and cannot yield at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the present bill if enacted into law will provide for the carriage of air parcel post to 400 cities. Two hundred other cities are now waiting for air service. They will also soon receive air parcel post if this bill becomes law. I ask my friends: How can noncertificated, nonscheduled carriers carry air parcel post? Air parcel post should go the same as any other kind of air mail.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question as to how they can carry it?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. It has to be carried on regular schedules, the same as any other mail. I trust the Members will vote for this bill.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to reply to those who have been defending the independent carriers.

I will say that our committee did give consideration to the problem they have discussed this afternoon. We gave it very careful consideration. As far as the chairman of this committee is concerned, he feels that the CAB has not probably been as fair as it might have been with respect to its treatment of the independent air freight carriers, but what we are discussing this afternoon is the question of the use of a great deal of space, some $10,000,000 worth of space, that is not being presently used. We feel it should be used.

I will say to the gentleman that consideration will be given to their problem. We expect to hold hearings in regard to it and try as far as we can to help them work out their problem. We are in sympathy with their contention, but we have had full hearings on this bill and recommended what we believe to be the best bill considering the circumstances.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The veterans did present a bill to your committee that would have taken care of these problems, and it was turned down completely.

Mr. REES. Well, they did submit their proposal and the committee did not recommend it.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. If the chairman expresses the thinking of his committee, has he not presented to the House the best argument for deferring action on this bill until that matter can be taken up?

Mr. REES. The chairman is speaking about his own thinking in regard to those people, but he does feel it is utterly improper for us to allow this $10,000,000 worth of space to go to waste. We think it ought to be used. I think the gentleman from New York agrees with me. We are not shutting anybody out. We are trying to use something that we have and have paid for and not presently using.

Mr. KEOGH. Anyone who knows the distinguished gentleman knows the standing he has with his committee.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his forthright statement in behalf of the veteran-operated cargo air lines. I know that he has made a detailed and careful

study of this situation, especially in regard to the apparent inequity that now exists. I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will look into this situation further at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds have voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2281, being an identical bill with the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of postage on mailable matter exceeding 8 ounces in weight, but not weighing more than 70 pounds nor measuring more than 100 inches in length and girth combined, when carried by air and including other transportation to and from air-mail routes, shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be determined on the basis of the 8 postal zones established for fourth-class matter, as follows:

(1) For delivery within the first or second zones, 55 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(2) For delivery within the third zone, 60 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 8 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(3) For delivery within the fourth zone, 65 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 14 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(4) For delivery within the 5th zone, 70 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 24 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(5) For delivery within the 6th zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of 8 ounces, plus 33 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(6) For delivery within the 7th zone, 75 cents for the first pound, or fraction of a pound in excess of eight ounces, plus 45 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(7) For delivery within the 8th zone, which, with respect to air parcel post, shall include all offices located in continental United States beyond the 7th zone, 80 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof over 8 ounces, plus 65 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

(8) For air parcels exchanged between offices in continental United States and offices in Territories and possessions of the United States, in either direction, and between offices within such Territories and possessions, the applicable zone rate shown in paragraphs (1) to (6) of this section shall apply to and including the seventh zone: *Provided*, That for offices falling in the eighth zone the rate of postage for air parcels weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be 80 cents for each pound or fraction thereof.

(9) Mailable matter of light weight in relation to size shall be subject to such surcharge as may be determined by the Postmaster General to be warranted by reason of the extra space and care required in handling and transporting such mail matter.

(10) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973), as amended, or any order, rule, or regulation made by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder, as may be necessary for the safe and expeditious transportation by air of mail matter weighing in excess of 8 ounces.

(11) The Postmaster General is further authorized and directed for the period of 2 years, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (9), inclusive, of this section, to adjust from time to time the weight limit, size, rate of postage, zone or zones or conditions, or either, in order to promote the service to the public and assure the receipt of revenue from such service adequate to pay the cost thereof.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in the disbursement of the appropriation for domestic air-mail service, to apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing suitable quarters at public airports for use in the handling and distribution of air mail at a reasonable rental to be paid quarterly or monthly, for a term not exceeding 20 years.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the act of August 14, 1946 (Public law 730, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), entitled "An act to fix the rate of postage on domestic air mail, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The rate of postage on domestic air mail weighing 8 ounces or less shall be 5 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That the rate of postage on air mail of the first class weighing in excess of 8 ounces shall be the rate provided for air parcels but in no case shall be less than 3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following the month of enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF., AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6633) to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "Secretary", insert "after receiving the written approval of the Attorney General as to the titles, leases, and other mutual conveyances connected therewith."

Page 6, line 9, strike out all after "Navy" down to and including "and" in line 21 and insert "and shall cease to be used for a period of 2 years by any branch of the armed services of the United States for military or naval purposes, then and in that event, the said lease shall terminate, be canceled and be of no further effect, and the city shall have the immediate right to reoccupy said lands.'; and."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. PHILLIPS of California, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, and Mr. THOMAS of Texas.

LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to bring to the attention of the House a radio broadcast by Mr. Martin Agronsky over the American Broadcasting System.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to bring to the attention of the House a radio broadcast by Mr. Martin Agronsky recently over the American Broadcasting Company's network from New York which is so replete with false charges and propaganda against Members of Congress that it cannot go unanswered in all justice to all good Americans both in and out of Congress.

After this broadcast was made, I requested a copy of Mr. Agronsky's broadcast, which I received several days later, and after the gentleman had made several changes in his charges, which I discovered in checking his exact spoken words against the altered copy he sent me. You will note as I read these charges that the gentleman from New York the Honorable JOHN TABER comes in for criticism, but the truth is that at no time has the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] taken part in the subcommittee hearings on this bill for the 1949 fiscal year appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, nor did he at any time make recommendations to the committee on language or on amounts in the bill, but simply gave his approval to the bill when it came before the full Appropriation Committee of the House, of which he is chairman. Consequently, to the members of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations, of which I have the honor of being chairman, must go the blame or credit for the bill as reported to the House of Representatives May 26 last.

I invite everybody in America to examine the action taken by the committee

and the Congress on this bill, a great part of which is for the orderly and more rapid development of our 17 Western States.

CHARGES

As the Presidential nominating convention draws near and the Eightieth Congress steps on the legislative gas to meet its June 19 adjournment deadline, it becomes increasingly difficult for the public to see through the obscuring clouds of political oratory exactly what's happening on the floor of the House and Senate to some of the most vital issues affecting our contemporary way of life.

This morning, because it's important that Americans, getting ready to elect a new President and a substantially new Congress, see clearly and very clearly just what that Congress is doing, I want to report in some detail on an obscure piece of legislation. This legislation consists of a series of amendments and riders attached by the House Appropriations Committee under the chairmanship of Republican Representative JOHN TABER to the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior.

ANSWERED

The purpose in his opening statements is to set the stage for an attack upon Republican handling of the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1949 in the House of Representatives. He refers to this bill and amendments as "an obscure piece of legislation" and to the debate upon the bill as "obscuring clouds of political oratory." He indicates that he, as a radio commentator reporting the news, will reveal the facts concerning Republican trickery in passing the bill.

"Obscure" means shaded, darkened, hidden, and remote from observation. Shadowy, mysterious, and unknown are synonyms. Interior Department appropriation bills are not "obscure" in any sense of the word. They are, each year, among the most important annual supply bills enacted by the Congress. During the last 2 years no legislation, including the Marshall plan, has received such exhaustive treatment and careful consideration.

The organization of the Congress under our two-party system prevents "obscure" legislation or "buried," "misleading" amendments from being enacted. The House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, for the newscaster's information, are composed of Republican and Democratic members; their committees and subcommittees are each composed of Republicans and Democrats. The Republicans being the majority party have a majority membership; the Democrats being the minority or opposition party have a minority membership. The House Appropriation Committee is composed of 25 Republicans and 18 Democrats, and the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee is composed of 4 Republicans and 3 Democrats. The Democratic members attend and are as familiar with the hearings and with the bill as written and reported as are the Republican members. Each member, Republican or Democrat, has equal rights and privileges on committees. All members are entitled to be present at all committee meetings and to be present when a report is accepted or rejected and when a bill is drafted. Nothing can be hidden; nothing can be buried; nothing can be obscured. The Democratic members, or the representatives of the opposition party, have the responsibility to inform their leadership and party members of the contents of any and all legislation. They were informed concerning all details of this bill. They knew what was in it.

CHARGES

These obscure amendments and riders buried under misleading titles and literally rammed through the House in one afternoon's inconclusive debate last week, threatened to destroy the American Government's whole vast system of power and irrigation projects. They're important. They come into effect by passing the Senate, the Reclamation Act of 1902 brought into being by President Theodore Roosevelt, will be completely nullified and the exponents of power and land monopolies throughout this country will reign supreme.

ANSWERED

Amendments to the bill referred to by the newscaster as "obscure amendments" were printed in the report exactly as they have been printed in reports for years. There has been no change in procedure. Every Member of the House of Representatives is familiar with the make-up of a House Appropriations Committee report. His reference to an amendment "buried under misleading titles" is misleading itself. No one who read the report or bill could have missed the provision to which he referred. They might have objected to it, but they could not have missed it. Anyone who even casually read pages 45 to 49 of the committee's report and the bill itself would not have been misled by a mere editing error. He appears to have been the only person misled, for Members of the House—as the debate reveals—were well familiar with all its contents, including the legislative limitation which he claims was buried. Nothing in the bill destroys or threatens to destroy Federal irrigation or power projects. Nothing in the bill "nullifies" any provision of the Reclamation Act of 1902, and the newscaster submits no evidence to bear out these charges. The report of the committee insisting upon a reemphasis of reclamation constitutes one of the foremost steps taken within recent years to assure that the spirit and the letter of the 1902 Reclamation Act is fulfilled.

CHARGES

Now, what the House of Representatives did in approving by a voice vote, with not more than 100 Members present, this obscure bit of legislation was nothing less than practically insuring that the extension of public power shall eventually be brought to a dead stop and that the famous 160-Acre Act, which is aimed at blocking the provision of irrigation water from Government dams to farms exceeding 160 acres in size, shall be nullified.

ANSWERED

He charges that the House action on the Interior Department bill will bring "the extension of public power * * * to a dead stop" but does not support the charges with facts. His comments were obviously written without reference to the House hearings, the committee report, or the House debate. This man suppressed the fact that the Department of the Interior will have more money next year than in any previous year. The House committee would provide the Interior Department with $375,692,591 for the fiscal year 1949. This compares with $262,801,000 in 1948 and $258,985,716 available in 1947. The same is true of the Bureau of Reclamation for which the House appropriated $226,794,897 for use in the fiscal year 1949. This compares with $136,644,738 available in 1948, the previous peak level—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 1, 1948, page 6751.

Of these huge sums, vast amounts were made available for projects in Western States which involve power as well as reclamation. The Bonneville Power Administration received $20,920,000 exclusively for power developments; the Anderson Ranch Dam in Idaho, which is an irrigation and power project, will have $5,100,000 available for all purposes in 1949; $19,495,000 will be available for the Davis Dam project; $41,396,000 for the Central Valley project; $19,750,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project; $8,100,000 for the Hungry Horse project; $3,192,000 for the Fort Peck project; and over $54,000,000 for Missouri River Basin projects. Of the money made available for the Missouri River Basin project, approximately $4,000,000 was earmarked for transmission lines and substations alone. Millions of dollars were made available for the extension of Federal power in Western States. These facts completely answer this commentator's falsification that the "extension of public power" has been brought "to a dead stop." If, after making millions of dollars available for power there is to be no progress, then this broadcaster should argue for a complete and full investigation of Federal power agencies rather than attack the activities and the motives of the House of Representatives.

Nothing in the 1949 Interior Department appropriation bill as it passed the House related to the 160-acre provision of the 1902 Reclamation Act. No recommendation of the Interior subcommittee or of the full Appropriations Committee and no action taken by the House of Representatives in its consideration of the bill blocks or was aimed at blocking the 160-acre limitation in the 1902 act. This reporter's statement to the contrary notwithstanding, it is still the law of the land.

CHARGES

That 160-acre provision of the Reclamation Act was written with Teddy Roosevelt as its champion to prevent the growth of the land monopoly in this country and to insure the protection and existence of small farms. Everyone knows the aims of the Government power project, the basic ones being, of course, that more Americans can get cheaper power and the national power shortage so dangerous to the national defense shall be overcome.

ANSWERED

At this point the newscaster falsely assumes that providing consumers with power is a basic function of the Federal Government. For this information, furnishing consumers with cheap power is not today and has never been a function of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government does not have the authority to build a power project the primary purpose of which is to furnish consumers with cheap electricity, any more than it can set up a grocery store to sell

food. Under the Constitution, as interpreted by the courts, the Federal Government can build reclamation, navigation, and flood-control projects, and, when economically feasible, can install power-generating facilities to produce power as a byproduct. With regards to Interior Department projects, the function of government is to provide reclamation and irrigation, and not power. Water users are interested in cheap water. Cheap power means that water will cost relatively more, for in the West power is supposed to help pay the cost of reclamation. He failed to report the policy statement of the House Appropriations Committee which appears on pages 20–21 of Report No. 2038 on H. R. 6705, Eightieth Congress, second session:

The committee desires to reemphasize its statement in former reports on the bill, that the reclaiming of arid lands by the construction of reclamation projects is and always has been the primary purpose of the reclamation laws. Development of hydroelectric power is incidental to irrigation and is made as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings. This policy should not be departed from without specific legislation by the Congress.

The Bureau of Reclamation should not use its power and authority or funds entrusted to its care to construct power facilities that are not essential to carrying out the purpose of the reclamation laws. It is unsound and against the principles of our form of government to appropriate Government funds for the construction of transmission lines, switchyards, substations, and incidental facilities where private capital is prepared to provide them.

At a time when it is so essential for the Government to stimulate the creation of taxable property, it is the opinion of this committee that private enterprise should be encouraged. Investment of private capital in tax-paying properties is greatly to the advantage of the Government. Public funds should be invested only where necessary to furnish adequate services or facilities that private enterprise cannot provide. Not only in regard to the production and distribution of electric energy, but also in small or big business enterprise, agriculture, professional services, and banking.

CHARGES

Well, what happened? The story starts with the descent on Congress of one of the most able, active, and influential group of lobbyists on Capitol Hill. These are the lobbyists of the private power companies. These gentlemen, the most prominent of whom is Purcell Smith, who makes $65,000 a year for his efforts and earns it—these gentlemen did yoeman work in the House of Representatives and earned their salaries to a fare-thee-well. Their approach, which the House vote indicates won the approval of the House majority, was to concentrate on legislation by appropriation, since they rightly feared the public outcry that would come if they attempted to change in the open the basic laws affecting power- and public-land policy in our country.

ANSWERED

The shopworn technique of using the so-called power trusts as a convenient political whipping boy with the implication that its lobby was able to unduly influence men of sincerity and integrity to vote against their consciences has lost its blackmailing sting by its repetitive use. In fact it has become a political "roar-back" because it will be interpreted by every right-thinking Member of Congress as a reflection upon himself personally and upon the constituents who placed their trust in his integrity.

During the debate on the floor of the House on this bill, I said:

We hear a great deal of talk about some of us being stooges for this or that organization for private utilities, and for other private interests. As I have said many times before, this committee, not a single member of it, Democrat or Republican, is stooging for anybody but the American people, the taxpayers of America—the good people of America. I resent any such accusation to the very limit of my feeling. I know every member of this committee feels the same way. I am sure there is not a member of the committee on either side of the aisle who has any other purpose than to do a good job for the American people and help develop the West in an orderly, businesslike manner. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6598.)

Representative ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and a minority member of the committee had this to say during the House debate concerning the charge of utility influence and pressure:

I do not charge anyone with being improperly influenced. Indeed I have strong confidence that such has not happened. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6009.)

In the same breath this commentator also charges House leadership with passing legislation in an appropriation bill. This, for a change, was a correct statement. He fails to explain, however, why there was legislation in this bill. I explained the reason:

The reason we found ourselves compelled to put some language in this bill, to which the chairman of the Public Lands Committee has objected, is because of the fact that he, as chairman of that committtee, has refused to act and to do something about bringing out the legislation that would correct those abuses. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6596.)

In other words, this was the only way to obtain legislative action to correct administrative abuses and malpractices within the Department of the Interior, abuses revealed as a result of extensive hearings not only this year but in previous years. Corrective action was in the interest of good administration and efficient government.

CHARGES

To start with, they were immensely aided by the House subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, headed by Republican Representative JENSEN, of Iowa. This committee, in defiance, by the way, of the congressional reorganization act, decided to hold all of its meetings on Interior appropriations in executive session. That means in secret with no members of the press and the executive departments allowed to be present.

ANSWERED

There was no defiance of the Legislative Reorganization Act, an act which the broadcaster obviously did not bother to read. Section 133 (f) of that act—Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946—provides:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

Thus it is left to the standing committee whether or not its sessions will be open or executive. The full House Appropriations Committee duly considered the problem and voted to hold executive sessions, not only on this bill but on all appropriation bills, just as it has always done. In reaching this decision the full committee considered only how its task could best be accomplished. The newscaster overlooks the fact that while the hearings were in executive session, members of the minority or opposition party were present at all times and were completely informed as to the detailed contents of the bill and in a position to make their criticisms known at the time the bill was reported. In fact, minority members have the privilege of filing a minority report if they desire, but none was filed.

CHARGES

Attempts by Bureau of Reclamation and Interior officials to get a hearing before this committee were all rejected. Attempts by Mr. Purcell Smith and his fellows to get a hearing were more successful. And here's how that worked. The Congress has already approved a number of appropriations for the Interior Department to increase its transmission lines and substations in various Government power projects in order to widen the access to the public in the various areas to cheap Government power and electricity. A Mr. James Black, the president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., one of the most powerful private utilities in northern California, appeared before one of the Jensen committees executive session—that's secret session—and demanded that this planned extension of Government power in northern California be stopped. The committee, without hearing a word of rebuttal from the responsible interial—interior—officials of the area, or from pro-Government power, farmers and citizens of the area, took Mr. Black's suggestion and approved it, writing into the appropriations bill as a rider that killed the extension of public power in northern California.

ANSWERED

This is irresponsible reporting. All told, there were 183 appearances by witnesses favoring the Interior Department's budget estimate. There were 21 appearances by utility witnesses. No utility witness testified against reclamation. They opposed Federal spending to build duplicating, or uneconomic transmission lines and related facilities.

The printed record of the hearing comprised 4,684 pages, the largest hearing in the history of the Appropriations Committee. The hearing lasted for approximately 12 weeks. Out of this total accumulated record of 4,684 pages, 2,147 pages related to testimony in support of the Department's power and reclamation program. There was in contrast 223 pages of testimony by utility witnesses.

As for the reference to Mr. James Black, president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the committee records show that he appeared and testified on April 7. There is nothing secret as to who appears and who does not appear. Prior to that date the committee heard testimony from the following Department officials:

Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

Kenneth Markwell, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

Wesley R. Nelson, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

A. R. Golzé, Director of Programs and Finance.

A. O. Babb, Chief, Division of Program Operation.

Walker Young, chief engineer.

H. F. McPhail, Director, Branch of Power Utilization.

J. W. Nixon, Director, Branch of Project Planning.

R. J. Newell, regional director, Region I.

Harold Nelson, assistant regional director, Region I.

G. W. Lineweaver, Director, Branch of Operations and Maintenance.

C. W. Hamilton, chief engineer, Division of Power.

Following April 7, when Mr. Black appeared, the committee heard testimony from the following Department officials:

Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

Kenneth Markwell, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

G. W. Lineweaver, Director, Branch of Operations and Maintenance.

H. F. McPhail, Director, Branch of Power Utilization.

Wesley R. Nelson, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation.

Richard Boke, regional director, Region II.

Ben Creim, power manager, region II.

J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior.

Oscar Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior.

William A. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CHARGES

Another specific example of the same exact kind is provided by the case of Mr. J. E. Corette, Jr., who is the vice president of the Montana Power Co. That's the most powerful private monopoly in that State. Mr. Corette told the committee, again in secret session, that he was against the Government's plan to extend the powerful facilities in his State by adding more transmission lines and substations to existing Government facilities, though in this case, too, Congress had already approved this plan and appropriated money for it, the project was also written out of the Interior bill by an obscure amendment. Again no—no witnesses who might disagree with the private power point of view were called.

ANSWERED

Mr. J. E. Corette, Jr., is revealed in the committee's records as having testified on April 6. Consequently the same department officials testified both before and after his appearance as before and after Mr. Black. Department witnesses had ample opportunity to state and restate their position with regard to any and all items.

CHARGES

The same kind of wrecking action was repeated by the committee, usually after hearing testimony from private power representatives only in regard to Government power extension projects already approved by the Congress for every one of the 17 Western States. That's one way the powerful Committee of Appropriations operated through its equally powerful subcommittee.

ANSWERED

Secretary of the Interior, Julius Krug; Under Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman; Assistant Secretary, Girard Davidson; and other top department witnesses were heard last at the suggestion of the committee, a suggestion which met with the Department's full approval. Concerning this, Interior Secretary Krug stated in his appearance before the committee:

I am particularly appreciative of this chance to appear last rather than first, as you suggested at the outset of these hearings. Appearing at the close of the hearings assures that if you have questions of policy or otherwise that I can answer such questions directly. Also, I would like to know before this record is closed that you have all the facts that you want. (House hearings, Interior Department appropriation bill for 1949, 80th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, p. 1053.)

Thus, Department officials had the last word.

CHARGES

Here's another way they worked. On the House floor, with Democratic Congressman AL ELLIOTT, of California, as the sponsor, the Appropriations Committee floor spokesman rammed through what amounts to an unconstitutional bill of attainder, which requires that Bureau of Reclamation top officials must have 10 years engineering experience. That would force the dismissal of the Bureau's two top officials, Michael Straus, the Commissioner, and the regional director, Mr. Boke. Their crime has been that they have faithfully implemented the provisions of the 160-Acre Act on irrigation in California despite the outraged screams of the great land holding companies in that State.

ANSWERED

The amendment requiring that Bureau of Reclamation top officials must have 10 years' engineering experience was not sponsored by the committee. Although I was in charge of the bill for the committee as chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I did not speak on the measure one way or another except to ask that debate be limited. Again this subject came up as an amendment to the bill, and consequently was subject to a point of order. Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, the minority whip in the House, raised the point of order that this was legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair ruled that the amendment was a limitation; that it referred to a part of the appropriation bill, and therefore ruled against the point of order.

Reference to the debate indicated that the House acted as it did because certain top employees of the Bureau were not qualified engineers in jobs requiring vast engineering experience, but operated as publicity agents and propagandists in keeping with their backgrounds.

This story teller implies that it is unconstitutional for Congress to establish qualifications to be met by persons holding responsible positions in the Government. Since it was Congress which created the whole reclamation program by passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902, it is both constitutional and proper for the Congress to set up the qualifications of those persons appointed to carry out this program if it desires. By requiring engineering qualifications for certain positions, Congress is giving legal effect to a personnel custom that had been practiced over a long period and proven highly successful. These two men were the first in a long and brilliant professional history of the Bureau of Reclamation to have held such positions without the qualifications prescribed in this amendment.

CHARGES

The committee operated in yet a third way. They inserted into the appropriation legislation a clause which they buried under the completely misleading title of "Alaskan Investigation." That clause provides that the 3-percent interest collected by the Government on its power and municipal-water projects in any profits made on these projects could no longer be used to extend Government irrigation and cheap electricity to consumers. That money must be returned, instead, to the Treasury immediately. What this means is that automatically the cost of Government power and irrigation would be forced up to and even beyond the prices charged by private companies. Thus the whole key power and water basis of Government water projects would be killed. Interior Department officials told me this provision alone would cause a power-rate increase to consumers nationally ranging from 15 to 38 percent.

ANSWERED

Nothing in the bill was buried. The provision to which he objects here was outlined in the committee report. The fact that the provision was in the bill was well known to the minority members of the committee and therefore minority Members of the House were on notice. The public power grave diggers certainly exhumed the body if this provision was buried, inasmuch as it was a major point of discussion.

It is ironical for this broadcaster to argue that if Federal power projects in the West paid 3-percent interest on their money into the reclamation fund with the stipulation that it not be allocated, that this would force the price of Federal power up beyond prices charged by private companies. If this is true—if Federal power is so inefficient and depends so completely upon subsidies—then the Government had better get completely out of the power business and stay out.

CHARGES

There are many more of these obscure amendments written into the Interior appropriations bill. It's worth noting again that all of the hearings during which these amendments were written were held in secret. The committee only released them for scrutiny by the press and Government officials on the morning of the day that it agreed with the House Rules Committee to bring the whole bill on to the House floor for debate.

ANSWERED

The Elliott amendment was not written into the bill in committee but was incorporated into the bill by an amendment offered from the floor. The other legislative limitations and provisions to which the broadcaster objects were made a part of the bill when it was marked up. This was in executive session, and under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, it is required that such action always be taken in executive session regardless of whether the hearings are open or closed. Section 133 (f) of the

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provides as follows:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee, by majority vote, orders an executive session.

CHARGES

Since the hearings covered thousands of pages, it was obviously impossible for those Members of the House who would have fought these wrecking amendments to spot the destructive features. Just to make sure, apparently, that nothing could be done about it anyway, even if they were spotted, the committee rammed through the House on the day of debate a gag rule that forbids points of order being taken and thus killed off any extended opposition debate. They did quite a job.

ANSWERED

Again let it be noted that minority Members were present during all hearings on the bill and at the time the report was presented for reading, and at the time the bill was marked up. They were completely informed at all times concerning its provisions. The House was put on notice to the subject of every provision to which the broadcaster objects.

The bill was debated in the House under a rule forbidding points of order being made against items in the bill as reported. Without this rule one individual out of 435 Members by raising a point of order could thwart the will of the majority and could have prevented long-standing abuses from being corrected. The rule under which the bill was debated did not prohibit amendments being offered. Any objectionable feature of the bill could have been struck out by an amendment and certain features that the House found objectionable were stricken from the bill. It is further to be noted that the amendment to which he takes most violent objection was offered from the floor and was subject to a point of order that was overruled. Further, the rule under which this limitation as to points of order was adopted was submitted to full and complete debate on the floor.

CHARGES

The Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations handled the matter differently and decently. They permitted opponents to testify in open hearing. That brought before that Senate committee a dozen Congressmen, men who had been unable to make their voices heard in their own House and brought denunciations from Republican Governor Warren of California and also from Republican Gov. Sam Ford of Montana.

ANSWERED

The House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee held hearings covering a period of 3 months. At the close of the House hearings Secretary Krug himself stated, "Our people do appreciate the fair and thorough hearings that your committee has conducted during the past 11 weeks. Without exception they have reported that they have had both courteous and attentive consideration and a complete unbridled opportunity to lay the facts before the committee." (House hearings, Interior Department appropriation bill, pt. 1, p. 1053.) Irrespective of what the newscaster reports, not a single Congressman who wanted to be heard in the House was denied that opportunity. Governor Warren of California and Governor Ford of Montana could have appeared had they so desired. Since they did not request time, it is obvious that they did not wish to testify. Contrasted with the opportunity given to any and all witnesses to appear during the House hearings, the Senate Appropriations Committee, in order to accomplish its task and to expedite the enactment of this annual supply bill, found it necessary to limit witnesses, other than department witnesses, to 5 minutes each, and the hearings in the Senate covered 4½ days, compared to 11 and 12 weeks' time in the House.

CHARGES

Now the whole business has such a rotten look to it and the Senate hearings so effectively exposed the rottenness for anyone who cared to listen, that there is some hope that this most successful of all the special interest raids against constructive Government projects will fail. But it needs a lot of publicity still.

ANSWERED

This slur against the processes of the Congress of the United States cannot go unchallenged. It is apparent that this broadcaster has never realized that Government agencies can constitute a special interest group fully capable of raiding the United States Treasury and sticking its hands deep into the pockets of the United States taxpayers. It is hardly rotten for House committees and the House to take every action within its power to protect the interests of the American taxpayers and the solvency of the United States Government and the Nation's credit.

This bill as it passed the House made $375,692,000 available for the fiscal year 1949. This means that the House pared the budget estimate $84,293,000 and prevented a special interest raid of that amount. But, even so, the bill makes $112,876,000 more available for use in 1949 than was provided in last year's bill, an amount which compares with $172,000,000 made available in the fiscal year 1940, the last full fiscal year before the beginning of the national defense program.

CHARGES

The minority whip, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, said of this legislation and these are his words, "It gives off a strange odor. It's the odor of the power lobby." To the general public the whole rotten business can be summed up in three words for even those with the least sensitive olfactory equipment. And those three words are "It smells bad." And I could sum it up in two words but I have to keep decency in mind.

ANSWERED

Instead of quoting the Democratic minority whip, the broadcaster might have quoted Democrats who are definitely pro-Interior. For example, Representative MURDOCK, Democrat, of Arizona, said:

I want to say to the gentleman how earnestly this subcommittee has worked. I recall coming before this committee late one day and having to wait 2 hours until a dozen other witnesses were heard. But the gentleman and his committee remained long after hours to hear my constituents, for which I want to express my appreciation. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6600.)

Representative KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, and a member of the subcommittee, said:

I * * * want to congratulate the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and the majority members of that committee. They were very gracious and granted the minority members all the time they wanted to interrogate any witness who appeared before the committee. I am very appreciative of their courtesy. Generally speaking, I think this is a good bill. There are some things in it with which I do not agree and to which I shall call attention. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6602.)

Representative GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and also a member of the subcommittee, said:

The distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has labored long and diligently. For many, many weeks we have been sitting long, long hours daily studying the many problems affected by this bill. The distinguished gentleman has been thoroughly fair and considerate of the minority members as well as his colleagues on the majority. * * * We members of the minority have served as a backstop. Our opinions, though they have not prevailed in some of the fundamentals of the bill, have, I think, been taken into consideration. Upon most points in the bill, though in some cases reluctantly, we find ourselves in agreement. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6609.)

Representative JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, said:

It was my pleasure to have the privilege of serving temporarily with the subcommittee in connection with the marking up of a portion of the bill under consideration today. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], painstakingly considered all items of the bill, as did other members of the committee. I know that the chairman did his utmost to give fair and equitable consideration to all matters before the committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1948, p. 6616.)

Interior Department appropriation bill, 1949

Amount of budget estimates including supplementals	$474,773,835
Amount of bill as agreed to by conferees	[1] 407,836,497
Bill is under budget estimates	66,936,861
Amount of budget estimates considered by House	$459,970,835
Amount of bill as passed House	375,692,591
House bill under budget estimates	84,278,244
Amount of budget estimates considered by Senate	474,773,835
Amount of bill as passed Senate	422,179,098
Senate bill under budget estimates	52,594,737

[1] And, in addition, contract authorizations totaling $48,947,500.

Total number of witnesses on bill, 424.

Total number of pages of printed hearings, 4,707.

Eleven successive weeks were consumed in hearings, 5 days each week from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m. each day, after which the committee sat in executive session to determine the amounts allowed for the thousands of items in the budget

request for the whole Department of Interior functions.

Data in connection with hearings on reclamation.

There were 33 hearings with representatives of the Department covering a period of 17 days.

A total of 44 departmental witnesses were heard, including 27 from the field.

Other witnesses heard in connection with reclamation matters are as follows:

Senators and Members of the House	42
Outside groups	82
Total	124
Total number of witnesses, including departmental representatives	168
Pages of hearings:	
With department	1,149
With Members and outside groups	729
Total number of pages	1,878

Of all the persons appearing before the committee in connection with reclamation matters not a single witness expressed opposition to reclamation in the Western States as such, and I am sure I am correct in stating that of the 42 Members of Congress who appeared, not one appeared in opposition to any project.

A number of REA officials appeared and representatives of municipalities and people from every walk of life who were interested in more funds for reclamation, power, irrigation, and other activities located mainly in the western part of the country. Not a single person was denied a hearing or unduly limited as to time. Many persons were heard on several different subjects and one departmental witness, Mr. Wright, the Southwestern Power Administrator, was heard on three separate occasions.

APRIL 23, 1948, PART 3

Mr. JENSEN. All right; is there anything else?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for letting me appear before you again, and I appreciate your cooperation.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, Mr. Wright, you realize that we have extended a privilege to you that is not customary, by permitting you to come back before the committee the second time. However, because of the complexity of this controversy, the committee felt that you should have an opportunity to discuss the things which you had discussed before the committee on your first appearance, and I want to thank you for coming before the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. I certainly appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

MAY 14, 1948, PART 3

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. SCHWABE, do you have any questions?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes. Mr. Wright, of course, we appreciate your being here. This is the third time you have been before the committee in this series of hearings, and this committee, I say without fear of successful contradiction, has given you more consideration and extended you more courtesy than has been extended any other Bureau or group that appeared before us.

Mr. WRIGHT. I appreciate that.

Mr. SCHWABE. This hearing today was due to the fact that you apparently wanted to furnish the committee with information which, I think you utterly failed to furnish at former hearings.

I think that we all know that you are here because you were advised that the committee was not satisfied, that you had made a showing that would justify this committee in appropriating the amount you requested.

We are glad you are here. I personally was the first member of this committee to suggest that you be given this opportunity, and I am glad of it, and happy to have you here.

I want to say, however, that there are some things in this telegram that you sent in that we were not able to understand, and do not understand yet.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to clear them up.

Mr. SCHWABE. That is the reason we have extended this unusual privilege and opportunity to you of being here today.

Mr. STRAUS. We are now drawing to the close of an outstanding hearing. I have been sitting here keeping statistics during this hearing, and I see that this is the end of the thirty-third session on reclamation alone. Reclamation said, as this hearing opened, it looked forward confidently to a helpful hearing, and that the more thorough the hearing was the greater would be the benefit to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the United States. Expectations have been more than fulfilled by this hearing. I say that now, and I want to say it on the record. I do not want it to inhibit the committee from remembering that we are also asking for money when they go to mark up the bill.

This is the first time that we have brought in such a group of field officials. I want the record to show that I consulted with the chairman of the committee, and that we were glad to bring these officials to Washington. We feel it was very worth while from the point of view of the Bureau of Reclamation as well as from the point of view of the committee and the Congress to have those officials come to Washington. You may be interested in knowing that for the purposes of this hearing 27 field officials came to Washington from the reclamation areas, including regional directors, assistant regional directors, and others. Perhaps 16 or 17 people were here from the Washington office. I am only citing Bureau of Reclamation witnesses at this hearing.

The able clerk, who has educated more Reclamation Commissioners than he has before him at the present time, tells me that during these hearings far larger numbers of witnesses who are not members of the Bureau of Reclamation appeared than appeared on this hearing, which is a hearing on the largest budget that has ever been submitted.

The Bureau of Reclamation alone, the out-of-town regional and field officials, traveled a total of 135,000 miles to make an appearance here. They were glad to do so, and the Bureau of Reclamation was glad to have them do so. I would also like to mention that approximately 1,500 square feet of maps were drawn for this hearing. For the Reclamation Bureau witnesses alone the transcript numbered over half a million words, and I think we had some 700 man-days of time of Bureau employees used in connection with these hearings alone, all of which is considerable. Whatever the cost, the Bureau of Reclamation feels that it is a very good investment and it was glad to make that investment. I think that more information has been submitted to this committee at this hearing than any other hearing that I am familiar with in my 16 years of attending hearings. I think that this has been a better hearing than any hearing that I have attended for perhaps 16 years. This is not a task or a burden only for the Bureau of Reclamation, but the Bureau wants to recognize fully that it is an equally heavy task and a burden on the members of this committee and the Members of Congress that have sat patiently through these long sessions and treated us with such courtesy and understanding and sympathy, and also with an increased knowledge of our problems gained not only during these hearings but during the trip that was made last summer.

In conclusion, I want to say that I would like to thank you on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation for the way in which these hearings were conducted, and to state that in our opinion these hearings were fine, full, and fair, and we were delighted to participate in them. We look forward to the result of these hearings, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Straus.

In response to that very glowing and interesting analysis of the hearings and the things that go with it, I have only this to say: The three members of the committee, Mr. SCHWABE, Mr. FENTON, and myself, who made the extended trip to the Western States last year said on every occasion where we made stops—we made little talks numbering a little over 100—the purpose of our trip was for one thing, and one thing alone. That purpose was to see with our own eyes and to hear with our own ears the things that were important to the development of the work. We had but one purpose in mind, and when the time came to consider an appropriation for the many and varied projects, not only the Bureau of Reclamation but every branch of the Interior Department, we would give full and careful consideration to the requests of the Department for every branch of that Department, and for every project.

We also stated that we would go into the matters pertaining to each case thoroughly and completely in an attempt to acquaint ourselves and get full information from the officials of the departments and from such other people as would be interested in any matters pertaining to the duties of the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States.

We also stated that we felt that up to that time we had done everything we could, and we will continue to do and carry out the promises made to those people.

When we mark up this bill we will stand by our word. Of course, it is customary to mark up this bill in about 3 days, but I can readily see where we will spend not only 3 days but a week, or possibly longer, in going through each one of these items and talking it over among ourselves in executive session, trying as best as we can to determine what is the right and proper figure, as near as humanly possible, to allow for each item.

Gentlemen, I again assure you that we will carry through and that we recognize the responsibility that rests on the shoulders of the members of this committee. I know that you recognize the responsibility that rests on our shoulders in asking for the American people insofar as the expenditures of money is concerned, as it pertains to this committee. Without a doubt, we will reduce some items, and possibly raise a few even over and above the budget requests. After all, we feel that it is the duty of this committee to use its own judgment to some degree, regardless of what the Budget has sent up as a requested appropriation. However, we do not expect to deviate very far from those requests in raising items to any great degree from what the Bureau of the Budget has requested.

I am sure that I speak for all members of the committee, who act pretty much in unison, in the final analysis, when we get into executive session. Of course, we have some pretty hot arguments about certain items in the bill, but we always have. I suppose that we will have those arguments this time. That is merely a difference of opinion, and we try our best to have a meeting of the minds so that when we bring this bill to the floor of the House it will be in such form that the committee will be in as complete accord as possible on each item.

Gentlemen, I want to say that I am very appreciative, and I know that I speak for the other members of the committee when I say that. I believe we are all appreciative of the manner in which you have presented your requests to this committee, and the desires

that you have shown to give us the information that we requested. We shall now live in hopes that some of the things we had been critical of, rightly or wrongly, will be corrected. If we have been wrong, it has been a mistake of the mind, and not of the heart, because we have no ax to grind other than to do a good job for the American people. I am inclined to feel that that is your purpose. While there are certain individuals that would like to take a broadside at the Members of Congress on occasions, after all, we are all human and must live as best we can in peace and harmony so long as we treat each other as friends and neighbors, and we will get along in this great America of ours.

That is all I have. Thank you, gentlemen.

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF NATURAL FIBERS

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2376) to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed in the aggregate outstanding at any time $150,000,000. Each such note shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the note. Payment of the purchase price of such notes and repayments thereof by the Secretary of the Army shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The proceeds of these notes shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, or his duly authorized representatives, as a revolving fund for the purpose of (a) purchasing natural fibers (including cotton waste) produced in the United States, and such other materials, including starch, dyestuff, roller leather, and card clothing as may be used in processing and finishing such fibers; (b) transporting such fibers and other materials to occupied areas, making them available for processing, and having such fibers processed in such areas; (c) insuring such fibers and materials and the products obtained from such processing; and (d) selling products obtained from such processing. In the case of wool, mohair, or flax fiber, only those types and grades shall be purchased hereunder as the Secretary of Agriculture, in the light of supplies on hand in the United States, designates as available for export; and stocks held by Commodity Credit Corporation of the types and grades so designated shall be purchased before other purchases are made of such types and grades. For the purpose of this act an occupied area shall be considered as any liberated or occupied area, which is at the time, occupied by United States forces or such an area occupied jointly with another power or powers when it is considered by the Secretary of the Army to be necessary or desirable to include such an area, in order to carry out United States objectives: *Provided,* That a treaty of peace shall not have been ratified and confirmed for such an area.

SEC. 2. Neither the Secretary, nor any duly authorized representative, shall use the fund created by this act for the purchase of any commodity unless, on the date of purchase of such commodity, it appears in his best judgment that within 15 months after such date—

(a) such commodity will be processed, or used in processing operations, in an occupied area; and

(b) So much of the products obtained from such processing will be sold under such terms and for such currencies as will be necessary to cover, in United States dollars, (1) all amounts expended from the fund in connection with such commodity plus (2) an appropriate portion of the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act.

SEC. 3. The proceeds from the sale of products of commodities purchased with moneys from the fund, to the extent of the amounts specified in section 2, shall be returned to the fund.

SEC. 4. Annually after the date of enactment of this act the Secretary of the Army shall make a complete report to the Congress with respect to the status of the fund. At such time as there shall no longer be any occupied area within the meaning of this act, or at such earlier time as the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution shall determine that the fund is no longer required for the purposes of this act, the unobligated balance of the fund shall be repaid to the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Secretary of the Army, as expeditiously as possible consistent with orderly liquidation, (a) shall cause to be sold so much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund and products thereof which are then on hand as may be necessary to obtain the amount of any balance then remaining owing to the Secretary of the Treasury on account of loans made pursuant to this act, and (b) shall repay such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 5. Fibers and other materials purchased for processing in any particular occupied area may, if a treaty of peace is ratified and confirmed with respect to such area prior to the processing of such commodities, be processed and sold, or sold, in such manner as the Secretary of the Army may deem to be in the best interest of the United States. If, after purchasing any such commodity with moneys from the fund, it shall appear to the Secretary of the Army that the product of such commodity cannot be sold for as much as the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act the Secretary of the Army may sell such product for a lesser amount; but, insofar as may be possible, no commodities shall be sold for less than the amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. So much of the commodities purchased with moneys from the fund for processing in any occupied area and so much of the products thereof as are not required to be sold, and so much of the proceeds obtained from the sale of any such commodities or products as is not required to be returned to the fund shall be used and disposed of by the Secretary of the Army, in such manner as he deems fit, for the benefit of the economy of such occupied area.

SEC. 7. In providing for the performance of any of the functions described in section 1 the Secretary of the Army shall to the maximum extent feasible utilize private channels of trade and is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations for the efficient implementation of the provisions of this act.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Georgia for 20 minutes.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is offered for the purpose of setting up a revolving fund to aid the textile industries, mostly wool and cotton, in Japan and Germany, countries we now occupy, to aid in their rehabilitation effort.

It is costing the taxpayers of this country today approximately $400,000,000 to help support these people. The purpose of this bill is to establish a revolving fund which may be used from time to time to purchase raw materials for shipment to those countries, under control of the Army and other Government agencies, to be converted into fabrics by the Japanese and German people who work in the mills. This would give employment to people in an industry which represents about 60 percent of their economy.

Before the war Japan furnished a large market for our surplus cotton. That is another purpose of the bill, to help reestablish that market. We have today in this country under control of the Commodity Credit Corporation a large stock of raw wool for which there is apparently no use in this country because it is a kind that our own manufacturers do not use. The bill requires that before any material can be purchased in the open market in this country that CCC stocks will have to be used. That would convert that stock pile into cash and return that money to the Treasury. The bill is meritorious in that respect and has the unanimous support of the Committee on the Armed Services of the House. It was passed in the Senate without a dissenting voice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words about this bill because it is a very important bill. It is important not only from the standpoint of the industrial rehabilitation of the occupied areas but it also directly affects the pocketbook of every American taxpayer.

What this bill does is to set up a revolving fund under the control of the Secretary of the Army. This fund will be used to finance the purchase of natural fibers produced in the United States—cotton, wool, mohair, and flax fibers. These fibers can then be shipped to Japan, Germany, and other occupied areas where they will be processed by the textile industries of those countries. The finished goods may then be sold either in those countries themselves or exported to other nations. The money borrowed from the revolving fund will then be returned to the fund out of the proceeds of these sales. In this way the textile industries of occupied areas will be provided with working capital which they do not now have and which they need very badly.

I want to make it clear at the outset that this bill does not mean that we are going to give away $150,000,000. This is

a business proposition, and we expect that every cent will be repaid to the fund. We expect, moreover, that a substantial profit will accrue from the proceeds of sales over and above what is necessary to repay the fund. These profits may be used by the Secretary of the Army in any manner he sees fit for the benefit of the occupied areas from which they are derived.

Now, let us see why this bill is important to the taxpayers of the United States.

At the present time, we are appropriating approximately $400,000,000 a year to cover the cost of relief shipments of food and other necessities of life to Japan. We have to do this because Japan today cannot feed herself. Japan has always been a deficiency nation. She has never been able to produce more than 80 percent of her total food requirements. Therefore, in order to feed her people, it has always been necessary for Japan to engage in foreign trade in order that she may buy from other nations the foodstuffs to make up her own deficiencies at home. This was true before the war and is still true today. But in order to engage in foreign trade she must produce commodities for which there is a demand in other countries, so that she may have something to offer in exchange in foreign markets for the food she needs at home. Because every inch of Japanese soil is devoted to the cultivation of foodstuffs for home consumption, Japan cannot hope to produce agricultural commodities in large volumes for export. And so, quite naturally, Japan turned many years ago to the development of her manufacturing industries. She had to do this in order to provide herself with purchasing power in international trade; she also had to do this to provide employment for her own people because there is just not enough land in Japan to keep all the Japanese people occupied in agricultural pursuits.

Before the war the cotton and woolen textile industries were the leading manufacturing industries of Japan. Manufactured cotton goods were Japan's principal export products. Japan was the most important customer of the American cotton farmer, and raw cotton and wool were her leading imports. With the textile commodities which she produced, she was able to buy from other nations the foods which she required at home, and also the raw materials to keep these industries operating so that she could produce these manufactured goods for export.

The importance of the textile industry to Japan cannot be overestimated. It accounts today for over 60 percent of the industrial capacity of the entire nation. Yet today, Japan has only 2,000,000 cotton textile spindles operating as against 12,000,000 in 1937. Today there are 203,000 laborers employed in her cotton textile industry. By a process of simple arithmetic it is easy to see that with 12,000,000 spindles—the capacity of the cotton textile industry in 1937—about six times as many people could be employed, or about 1,200,000.

The industrial rehabilitation of Japan is and has been a primary concern of the occupation authorities. Until self-sufficiency is obtained, Japan and other occupied areas will continue to represent a financial burden which must be sustained by the taxpayers of the United States. Under our international obligation to prevent disease and unrest, we must furnish food and other relief supplies to keep the Japanese people alive. These relief costs, which run to nearly $400,000,000 a year, must be met in addition to the purely military costs of occupation. Consequently, we must face squarely the problem of assisting the Japanese people to become self-supporting. Otherwise we will have to continue relief shipments indefinitely.

One of the principal handicaps which has been faced by occupation authorities in their attempts to bring about economic recovery in occupied areas is the lack of a supply of working capital. This bill will provide the means of obtaining that working capital, and I might say that it has been estimated that savings of $300,000,000 in appropriations for Japanese relief could have been brought about in the past if we had had a revolving fund of this type in operation beginning on VJ-day.

The main reason why this working capital is so important is because Japan and the other occupied countries now have no means of financing purchases of raw materials. These countries are bankrupt; their production is virtually at a standstill; they do not have the purchasing power in the form of exportable commodities with which they can enter foreign markets to buy these raw materials. In Japan, in particular, the textile industry will have to shut down unless working stocks of raw cotton and wool are made available immediately. This will mean more unemployment, more relief shipments, and ultimately more money out of the American taxpayer's pocket.

Considerable progress has been made since the occupation began in the rehabilitation of the Japanese textile industry. This progress has been possible because surplus stocks of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation have been made available. This cotton has been furnished on a credit basis with payment being made from the proceeds of sale of finished goods, in very much the same manner as will be done under the revolving fund. These shipments of cotton provided an interim solution to the problem of obtaining working stocks of raw material—a solution, incidentally, which circumvented for a time the difficulties resulting from the absence of working capital. By now these surplus stocks have been exhausted, and a new method of financing must be provided to finance raw material purchases.

Experience under the CCC program has demonstrated that the Japanese textile industry can and will operate at a profit. Under that program, its average net profits per month have been $10,000,000, and there is every indication that these profits will continue if the textile mills can be assured of working stocks.

Some of the Members may ask if there is not a danger that the textiles produced by the mills of Japan will find their way back to compete with our own textile industry. This fear is absolutely without foundation. Testimony was received from representatives of the cotton textile industry who told the committee that they too had formerly shared this fear. But they went on to say that after careful study of the problem they had come to realize that no question of competition was involved, but rather, the question of survival of the Japanese industry. They pointed out that the products of Japanese mills are of a cheaper quality for which there is no demand in the United States, but for which there is a crying need in India, China, the Philippines, and other countries of the Far East. These were the countries in which Japan sold the bulk of her textile exports before the war. These are the countries from which Japan can obtain copra, rice, and other raw materials vital to her recovery. She can also barter these textiles for rubber and tin which we need in this country, and which can in turn be sold to American purchasers in exchange for dollars with which to repay withdrawals from the revolving fund. I might add that the bill provides that this fund can be terminated at any time by the President or by the Congress, by concurrent resolution. Thus, if Japanese industry ever develops to a point where competition becomes a threat, we can call a halt to this program immediately.

I want to say also that there is no danger that purchases of cotton, wool, mohair, or flax under this fund will raise the domestic prices of these fibers. The quantities of these shipments will be insignificant in comparison with those to be made under the comprehensive foreign-aid programs. Moreover, the fibers to be shipped will be those for which there is no demand in this country—short-staple cotton and cotton waste, wools of coarser grades which now lie unused in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and surplus mohair, of which there are vast stocks still in the hands of domestic producers.

This is a very important bill. It is important from the broad standpoint of our foreign policy. It is important from the standpoint of our taxpayers. It will help materially to put the Japanese economy on a sound basis by restoring her production and by putting her back into normal channels of foreign trade. It is vital from the international political standpoint for the same reason that the foreign-aid programs are so vital. As we all know, there is no better safeguard than prosperity to stem the menacing tide of communism.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I have had some persons question whether or not this program might set up a plan which would compete with the textile industry in this country unfairly. Can the gentleman state whether or not it would do that?

Mr. VINSON. That question was raised when the committee was having

its hearings. We have absolute assurance there will be no importations of textiles which will in any way interfere with American production.

The type of goods manufactured by the Japanese does not come in competition with American production. It will be sold out in the Malays, in China, and in that section of the world.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWE. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the House whether or not the cotton and woolen producers as well as the converters in this country favor or disapprove this measure?

Mr. VINSON. The textile people had their representative before the committee. The wool industry had its representative. The type of wool that is used is not a kind that can be used in our looms here and the type of cotton that will be used is the low-grade cotton. So there is no competition and it is urged by the textile industry. They support this bill to aid the industry in Japan to get on its feet, if you please.

This bill will begin to save us money, it will put people back to work and help them rehabilitate themselves, which is the proper thing to do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say that I have given considerable attention to this matter and I am convinced that in the interest of our country as well as the Japanese it ought to be enacted into law.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to ask members of the committee how this particular program works in connection with Government relief in occupied areas. Does it supplement it, is it in competition with it, or what?

Mr. VINSON. I may say that as the occupied area of Japan is under the jurisdiction of the Army, the administration of this will be by General MacArthur's headquarters.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We are doing just exactly that with some of these millions of dollars we are sending to Germany and Japan. We are using part of it for that purpose.

Mr. VINSON. This will have the effect of reducing that because they will not have to use any of that money for subsistence of the unemployed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Nearly all of this stuff we are sending over there is being sold to those people. There is rolling around somewhere from seven to nine hundred million dollars in a revolving fund to do this very thing the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. VINSON. It is not for this purpose. It may be for some other purpose. It is not for textile purposes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman feels if this program is carried out as now suggested, by this time next year this Congress should be called upon to appropriate less money for these occupied areas?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. If that could have happened immediately after VJ-day we would have saved a great deal of money.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PROMOTION OF THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2554) to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In enacting this act, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive and continuous program for the future safety and for the defense of the United States by providing adequate measures whereby an essential nucleus of Government-owned industrial plants and a national reserve of machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment may be assured for immediate use to supply the needs of the armed forces in time of national emergency or in anticipation thereof; it is further the intent of the Congress that such Government-owned plants and such reserve shall not exceed in number or kind the minimum requirements for immediate use in time of national emergency, and that any such items which shall become surplus to such requirements shall be disposed of as expeditiously as possible.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) The term "national industrial reserve", as used herein, means that excess industrial property which has been or may hereafter be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of by the United States, subject to a national security clause, and that excess industrial property of the United States which not having been sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of, subject to a national security clause, shall be transferred to the Federal Works Agency under section 5 hereof.

(b) The term "excess industrial property," as used herein, means any machine tool, any industrial manufacturing equipment and any industrial plant (including structures on land owned by or leased to the United States, substantially equipped with machinery, tools, and equipment) which is capable of economic operation as a separate and independent industrial unit and which is not an integral part of an installation of a private contractor, which machine tools, industrial manufacturing equipment, and industrial plants are under the control of any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any wholly owned Government corporation and which are not required for its immediate needs and responsibilities as determined by the head thereof.

(c) The term "national security clause," as used herein, means those terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations, heretofore formulated or as may be formulated under section 4 (2) hereof for insertion in instruments of sale or lease of property, determined in accordance with section 4 (1) to be a part of the national industrial reserve, which will guarantee the availability of such property for the purposes of national defense at any time when availability thereof for such purposes is deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 4. To effectuate the policy set forth in section 2 of this act the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to—

(1) determine which excess industrial properties should become a part of the national industrial reserve under the provisions of this act;

(2) formulate a national security clause, as defined in section 3 (c) hereof and vary or modify the same from time to time in such manner as best to attain the objectives of this act, having due regard to securing advantageous terms to the Government in the disposal of excess industrial property;

(3) consent to the relinquishment or waiver of all or any part of any national security clause in specific cases when necessary to permit the disposition of particular excess industrial property when it is determined that the retention of the productive capacity of any such excess industrial property is no longer essential to the national security or that the retention of a lesser interest than that originally required will adequately fulfill the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection (3) shall require the modification or waiver of any part of any such national security clause when such clause is deemed necessary by the Secretary of Defense to effectuate the purposes of this act; and

(4) designate what excess industrial property shall be disposed of subject to the provisions of the national security clause.

SEC. 5. (a) In the event that any agency charged with the disposal of excess industrial property, after making every practicable effort so to do, is unable to dispose of any excess industrial plant because of the national security clause it shall notify the Secretary of Defense, indicating such modifications in the national security clause, if any, which in its judgment would make possible disposal of the plant. The Secretary of Defense shall consider and agree to any and all such proposed modifications as in his judgment would be consistent with the purposes of this act. If, however, such clause is not modified or the requirements thereof waived pursuant to section 4 (3), or if modified, such plant cannot then be disposed of under such modified clause, the Secretary of Defense shall direct that such plant be transferred to the Federal Works Agency, and such transfer shall be without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any agency charged with the disposal of excess machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment shall transfer custody of such machine tools and equipment as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 4 hereof to the Federal Works Agency, without reimbursement, for storage and maintenance.

SEC. 6. Subject to provisions of section 7 hereof, the Federal Works Agency is hereby

authorized and directed to accept the transfer to it of such excess industrial property as is directed to be transferred to it under section 4 hereof and, as and when directed or authorized by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 7 hereof, to utilize, maintain, protect, repair, restore, renovate, lease, or dispose of such property. Notwithstanding section 321 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412; U. S. C., title 40, sec. 303 (b)), any lease may provide for the renovation, maintenance, protection, repair, and restoration by the lessee, of the property leased, or of the entire unit or installation when a substantial part thereof is leased, as part or all of the consideration for the lease of such property.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Defense, with respect to property in the national industrial reserve, is authorized when he deems such action to be in the interest of national security—

(1) to establish general policies for the care, maintenance, utilization, recording, and security of such property transferred to the Federal Works Agency pursuant to section 5 hereof; and

(2) to direct the transfer without reimbursement by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property to other Government agencies with the consent of such agencies; and

(3) to direct the leasing by the Federal Works Agency of any of such property to designated lessees; and

(4) to authorize the disposition by the Federal Works Agency of any such property by sale or otherwise when in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense such property may be disposed of subject to or free of the national security clause provided for in section 5 hereof; and

(5) to authorize and regulate the lending of any such property by the Federal Works Agency to any nonprofit educational institution or training school when (a) the Secretary shall determine that the program proposed by such institution or school for the use of such property will contribute materially to national defense, and (b) such institution or school shall by agreement make such provision as the Secretary shall deem satisfactory for the proper maintenance of such property and for its return to the Federal Works Agency without expense to the Government.

SEC. 8. As and when directed or authorized by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to the provisions of section 7 hereof, the Federal Works Agency shall after the date upon which transfer is directed pursuant to section 5 hereof provide for the transportation, handling, care, storage, protection, maintenance, utilization, repair, restoration, renovation, leasing, and disposition of excess industrial property.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of any property for the national industrial reserve except from excess or surplus Government-owned property.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of Defense shall appoint a National Industrial Reserve Review Committee, which shall consist of not exceeding 15 persons to be appointed from civilian life who are by training and experience familiar with various fields of American industry, including shipbuilding, aircraft manufacture, machine tools, and arms and armament production. The members of such committee shall serve for such term or terms as the Secretary of Defense may specify and shall meet at such times as may be specified by the Secretary of Defense to consult with and advise the National Military Establishment. Each member of such committee shall be entitled to compensation in the amount of $50 for each day, or part of day, he shall be in attendance at any regular called meeting of the committee, together with reimbursement for all travel expenses incident to such attendance: *Provided*, That nothing contained in sections 41, 109, and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, and 203); in Revised Statutes, section 190 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99); in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (Public Law 395, Seventy-eighth Congress); or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to such persons solely by reason of their appointment to and membership on such committee.

SEC. 11. It shall be the duty of the committee appointed under section 10 hereof to review not less often than once each year the justification for the retention of property in the national industrial reserve established hereunder and (i) to recommend to the Secretary of Defense the disposition of any such property which in the opinion of the committee would no longer be of sufficient strategic value to warrant its further retention for the production of war material in the event of a national emergency; (ii) to recommend to the Secretary of Defense standards of maintenance for the property held in the national industrial reserve; (iii) to review and recommend to the Secretary of Defense the disposal of that property which in the opinion of the committee could and should be devoted to commercial use in the civilian economy; and (iv) to advise the Secretary of Defense with respect to such activities under this Act as he may request.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress on April 1 of each year a report detailing the action taken by it hereunder and containing such other pertinent information on the status of the national industrial reserve as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

SEC. 13. Section 5 of the act approved August 5, 1947 (ch. 493, 61 Stat. 774), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense and to the Federal Works Administration, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress may, from time to time, determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary of Defense and the Federal Works Agency to carry out their respective functions under the act.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, S. 2554 is a bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity. It is almost identical to a House bill, H. R. 6098, which has been unanimously reported to the House by the Armed Services Committee.

This is one of the most important defense measures to be presented to the Congress in this session. This bill, if passed, will preserve an essential nucleus of industrial plants and manufacturing equipment so necessary to the Nation in the event of an emergency.

The primary purpose of this bill is to establish a method of maintaining plants which cannot be disposed of subject to a national-security clause. This bill provides that after a disposal agency finds that it cannot dispose of any excess industrial plant with the national-security clause, then the Secretary of Defense may direct that such plant be transferred to the Federal Works Agency without reimbursement. Thereafter the Federal Works Agency, subject to the policy and standards established by the Secretary of Defense, shall maintain the plants and equipment in adequate standby condition so as to insure their readiness for use in the event of an emergency. It is contemplated that the Federal Works Agency would be authorized to utilize such facilities for storage purposes or other Government use, which would not affect the basic functions of the plant. Continuing efforts will be made to sell or lease these plants with appropriate security clauses imposed.

Under the provisions of Public Law 364, approximately 100,000 machine tools have been earmarked for the industrial reserve or transferred to the custody of the armed services. The proposed legislation permits the further selection of machine tools and industrial equipment excess to the needs of any Government department to be placed in the industrial reserve. It is estimated that the total industrial reserve of machine tools and equipment may eventually approximate 150,000 to 200,000 items.

It is anticipated that under the proposed legislation, the Federal Works Agency will be called upon to maintain about 60 industrial plants. These plants originally cost about $550,000,000. It will cost about 5 percent of original cost to place these plants in adequate stand-by condition, and thereafter about 1 percent per year for maintenance.

The entire cost of the project for fiscal 1949 will probably be about $36,000,000, and thereafter about $6,000,000 to $7,000,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this legislation from a national defense viewpoint. In effect, all we are doing is keeping what we have so that if we are ever called upon to produce war material, we will not have to spend billions for rebuilding or repurchasing that which we already have.

This bill does not in any way impair the operations of private industry or the national economy, and I sincerely hope it will be accepted by the House.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6098) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6813. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1691. An act for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; and

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) entitled "An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCKELLAR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6428 An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6501) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in the interest of national security the Federal Government should promote the employment in air commerce in as large numbers as possible of more efficient transport and cargo aircraft; and, to this end, sponsor the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototype transport and cargo aircraft, intended primarily for commercial use, but adaptable also for auxiliary military service.

SEC. 2. The Civil Transport Aircraft Evaluation and Development Board (referred to hereinafter as "the Board") hereinafter provided for, is authorized and directed—

(a) to survey the national requirements for aircraft types designed primarily for commercial transport and cargo service, but adaptable also as auxiliary military transport for one or more of the departments of the National Military Establishment;

(b) to prepare and recommend, from time to time, the operating and utility characteristics and specifications of such aircraft: *Provided*, That such characteristics and specifications shall be consistent with the requirements of the civil air regulations promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

(c) to advise the Secretary of the Air Force (referred to hereinafter as "the Secretary") of the Board's findings and recommendations under this section, and to recommend the allotment by the Secretary, from funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, of appropriate sums for design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type of aircraft.

SEC. 3. (a) The Board shall be composed of one representative designated by each of the following agencies: The United States Air Force, the United States Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and such other agencies of the Federal Government, concerned with aeronautics, as the Board may, from time to time, determine.

(b) To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, it is authorized to establish an industrial advisory committee composed of not less than six members appointed by the Board with the approval of the Secretary. Each member of such committee shall serve for a term of 2 years, except that (1) the terms of three of the members first taking office after the enactment of this act shall expire at the end of 1 year, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. No member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than one term unless in the opinion of the Board his reappointment is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. Members of such committee may be designated without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall receive such compensation, not in excess of $50 for each day or part of a day actually devoted to the performance of the duties of such committee, as the Board shall determine. Each member of such committee shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence when engaged in the performance of the duties of such committee at any place other than his permanent residence or place of business. Nothing contained in sections 41, 109, 112, or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, 202, and 203), section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119), or any other provision of law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to any such person solely by reason of membership on such committee: *Provided*, That the provisions of the act of July 12, 1870 (R. S. 3679; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 665), as amended, shall not apply to the acceptance of voluntary service by any member of any such committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Board shall be designated by the Secretary from among the members thereof and the Board shall act in accordance with such regulations and rules of procedure as it may, from time to time, prescribe. The Board is authorized and directed to consult with manufacturers of aircraft, and with United States operators of transport aircraft. Members of the Board shall serve as such without additional compensation, but each member of the Board shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem, in lieu of subsistence, when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board at any place other than his permanent station.

(d) The Board and the Secretary are authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but without regard to any provision of law limiting the number of civilian personnel which may be employed by the Department of the Air Force, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be deemed necessary to assist the Board and the Secretary in carrying out their respective functions under this act: *Provided*, That to the extent possible, consistent with other duties and assignments, the personnel and facilities of the member agencies of the Board shall be used to carry out the duties of the Board.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board referred to in section 2 of this act, to provide, out of funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, for the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type

of aircraft, by contract or otherwise. Any such contract entered into by the Government shall contain a provision that—

(1) sales of aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be made at a price allowing a reasonable profit, not exceeding such profit as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and

(2) in determining the fair selling price of such aircraft, except to the extent required by the Secretary, there shall not be included in the cost thereof any development, engineering, tooling, or other costs which have been reimbursed to the manufacturer by the Secretary; and

(3) aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be sold only to purchasers who, by contract with the Secretary, have undertaken (a) unless required by the civil air regulations to make no changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary; and (b) to make, for an agreed sum payable by the Secretary, such changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft, not inconsistent with the civil air regulations, as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of this act, may enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, with or without legal consideration, with or without performance or other bonds, and, in carrying out such contracts, arrangements, or modifications thereof, may make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Each contract, arrangement, or modification thereof, executed pursuant to this act, shall contain such provisions, consistent with the laws affecting the issuance or use of patents, governing the disposition and use of inventions made thereunder as are appropriate, in the judgment of the Secretary, to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract, arrangement, or modification thereof is executed.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to procure and test prototype aircraft from any manufacturer whose design meets the operating and utility characteristics and specifications recommended by the Board: *Provided*, That, in the event such manufacturer is not in a position to produce promptly the prototype aircraft desired, then the Secretary may procure such prototype aircraft from any other qualified manufacturer.

SEC. 7. Aircraft manufactured from design specifications pursuant to this act shall not be sold directly or by resale to either foreign governments or other foreign users without the approval of the Secretary: *Provided*, That in approving any such sale the Secretary may waive such of the requirements of section 3 hereof as he may deem proper.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board with respect thereto, by appropriate contractual conditions or otherwise, to recover, in whole or in part, as deemed to be practicable and expedient, the costs incurred by the United States pursuant to this act. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress within a period of 1 year following the passage of this act a report setting forth the means and methods which he intends to utilize in effecting such recovery.

SEC. 9. In the event the Board shall recommend the development of a seaplane commercial transport or cargo aircraft and the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force concur, the Secretary of the Navy shall be authorized to perform all of the functions with respect to such aircraft as are vested in the Secretary of the Air Force by this act, and the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy such funds appropriated under this act as may be necessary for the performance of such functions.

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) The term "aircraft" shall include engines, propellers, instruments, accessories, and standard equipment for such aircraft.

(b) The term "standard equipment" means all operational features of such aircraft, including, without limitation, standard cockpit arrangement, communications, facilities, and provisions for such items, but excluding commercial equipment.

(c) The term "commercial equipment" means removable furnishings and fittings, not part of the primary structure or the mechanical apparatus of such aircraft, and which is generally installed for the accommodation of passengers, baggage, or cargo.

(d) The term "prototype aircraft" means the initial models of each type, built primarily for static tests, flight performance, and service test.

SEC. 11. The Secretary and the Board shall transmit to the Congress, on the 1st day of January in each year, a report on (1) the progress made in the accomplishment of the purposes of this act and (2) the amounts of the expenditures made or obligated pursuant thereto.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Air Force such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, this bill has received the unanimous approval of all Members of the Committee on Armed Services who were present and who took part in the consideration of it, as well as of those to whose attention it has been brought. It sets forth the policy of the United States that in the interest of national security the Federal Government should promote the employment in air commerce of as large numbers as possible of more efficient transport and cargo aircraft. The purpose of the bill, which has the approval of the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Civil Aeronautics Board is to see to it that the latest possible transport designs are available for air-commercial people. At the outbreak of the present war the Government was fortunate and so was the military in having DC-3 planes available in large numbers. The cargo companies are not in a position to develop the new planes, and that being so it is believed that the Air Forces, under the direction of the Secretary and Board, should determine the best type of transport plane for both the military and the commercial people and to see, if possible, if they cannot agree to use that plane in their operations. That, I think, is a sufficient explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO submitted conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

CONVEYING SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLASON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 3735:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, subject to the limitations and conditions hereinafter enumerated and such others as he may prescribe, to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all or any part of that portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, extending one mile east from Brooks Bridge on United States Highway 98 near the town of Fort Walton, Florida, except for a strip of land six hundred feet wide (three hundred feet east and three hundred feet west from center line of road leading to radar site 'Dick'), extending from Highway 98 to the mean low water level of the Gulf of Mexico, and two miles west from said bridge, and to all or any part of that portion of said Santa Rosa Island which lies east of the new channel at East Pass (consisting of two small islands), said property being under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. Such conveyance shall be made upon payment by said county of a sum which shall be 50 per centum of the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale regardless of its former character or use, as determined by the Secretary, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said island, prior to its conveyance to the United States, as the Secretary shall determine to be fair and equitable."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES R. CLASON,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of

the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3735) entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit the Secretary of the Army to convey a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to Okaloosa County, Fla., subject to restrictions, without consideration, for public recreational purposes. The Senate disagreed with the provisions authorizing a gratuitous conveyance of the property in question and amended the bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall be permitted to convey the property to Okaloosa County, Fla., but that the consideration for such conveyance should be equal to the fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale without regard to its former character or use, less such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said land, prior to its conveyance to the United States. The conferees have agreed to an amendment to the Senate amendment wherein the conveyance is authorized upon the payment of 50 percent of the fair market value of the property by Okaloosa County, Fla., to the United States.

Senate amendment No. 2 is merely a clarifying amendment which clearly defines the responsibility, as between Okaloosa County and the Department of the Army, for the maintenance of certain fences which are to be erected pursuant to the provisions of the proposed legislation. Senate amendments Nos. 3 and 4 are only technical amendments which are made necessary by the fact that the Secretary of War has been superseded by the Secretary of the Army.

CHARLES R. CLASON,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 654) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 318 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, continued by House Resolution 153 of the Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000 additional, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 213) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,500 copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee during current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 676) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 293, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $5,000 additional, including the expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, special counsel, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 674) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the studies and investigations conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 404, Eightieth Congress, not to exceed $10,000 additional, including the expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 655) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the fifteenth report of the Commission of Fine Arts, transmitted by the President to the Congress of the United States on May 27, 1948, be printed as a House document with illustrations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 675) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the Joint Committee on Housing (established by H. Con. Res. 104, Eightieth Congress), for the purpose of concluding its business not to exceed $5,000 including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants since May 15, 1948, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the former chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS OFFERED BY THE CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 646) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 2,500 copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, Chaplain of the House, at the opening of the daily sessions of the House, during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, including the current session, be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

After the comma on page 1, line 3, insert the following: "and any acting Chaplain of the House,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 595) to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. BUCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation of this resolution?

Mr. RIZLEY. This resolution came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It gives that committee authority to look into the fuel situation during this summer. It was reported by that committee unanimously

and was reported out of the Committee on Rules unanimously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it appears that current and anticipated shortages of petroleum products threaten the present and future economy and security of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such shortages must be considered in the light of the availability of other fuels and energy resources; and

Whereas in order to deal effectively with the problem of making petroleum and other fuels available in quantities adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, it is necessary to formulate sound national policies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to formulate and recommend a national fuel policy adequate to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war, including recommendations for a national petroleum policy and the integration of such policy with policies relating to other fuels and energy resources except atomic energy; and for such purposes the committee shall study the current and future fuel supply and demand of the United States and shall study methods of encouraging needed developments to assure the availability of fuels adequate for an expanding economy and the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a report not later than the close of the present Congress. Such report may be made to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof—

(1) is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has adjourned, or has recessed, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member;

(2) may utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies;

(3) may seek information from such sources and conduct its studies and investigations in such manner as it deems advisable in the interest of a full and correct ascertainment of the facts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 600) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of carrying out the provisions of House Resolution 595, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $35,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, assistants, and other employees, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out "$35,000" and insert "$20,000" in lieu thereof.

Line 11, following the word "subcommittee," add the words "and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have no way of objecting to these appropriations, of course, since they come from the Committee on House Administration as privileged matters. But just the other day, before several resolutions similar to this passed, I looked up the record with reference to such appropriations. I find that this Congress has already appropriated $1,733,741.52 for investigating committees. I think that that is probably a larger amount than I have ever known to be appropriated in any 10-year period for investigating committees.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course, the gentleman knows that a considerable part of that money has not yet been expended. For example, the resolution just read was reduced from $35,000 to $20,000, in accordance with the resolution which was just passed a moment ago.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understand that, but by the time we get through with this session of the Congress, we will probably have appropriated much more than $2,000,000 to pay the expenses of investigating committees. Nearly half of the amount that has been appropriated, the gentleman understands, has not been expended.

I do not say that all this money has been expended, but it has been appropriated.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I do not have the figures with me as to amount that is unexpended. But some of the committees, for example, have already turned back money.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that all this money has been expended. I am just saying that this session of the Congress has appropriated $1,733,741.52 for investigating committees.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to remind the gentleman from Texas that under the Reorganization Act, the responsibility was placed on the regular standing committees of the Congress to conduct continuing surveillance of the operations coming within their jurisdiction. Much of the money has been spent in that way. I might suggest also that my view is that probably the money that has been spent that way is the best money that this Congress has ever spent.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF ISLAND POSSESSIONS IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 129) providing for a joint committee composed of Members of the Senate and the House Public Lands Committee to make an investigation of our island possessions in the Pacific and trust territories, and report back recommendations for legislation providing for civil government, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 11, after "advisable.", insert: "The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words."

Page 4, line 12, after "committee", insert: ", which shall not exceed $50,000,".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that for the trip down to the Hawaiian Islands to investigate whether that Territory is ready for statehood?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No. This bill passed the House and has already passed the Senate. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. This in no way refers to the Hawaiian Islands statehood proposition.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of curiosity, we passed the Hawaiian Islands statehood bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unfortunately, it was not passed in the other body.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suppose under this resolution the joint committee will keep alive the hope to the people of Hawaii that sometime in the future both branches will act favorably.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman making those remarks, but this resolution has to do with a trusteed area which has been taken over under the United Nations by the United States, and we must necessarily adopt some kind of civil form of government.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not opposed to the resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. I make the observation that certainly this body did everything it could in connection with Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. HOBBS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the distinguished gentleman from Michigan if he is a member of that committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You mean the committee that is to be appointed?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and Territories, I may be on the committee, but the Speaker has not yet appointed a committee.

Mr. HOBBS. But you are chairman of the committee which is bringing in this request?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. HOBBS. And, in your opinion, it is all right?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. HOBBS. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to promote the general welfare of the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands of the United States through the economic development of the Virgin Islands of the United States there is hereby created, within the Department of the Interior, a body corporate to be known as the Virgin Islands Corporation hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation."

SEC. 2. The Corporation shall have principal offices in the Virgin Islands and in the District of Columbia and shall be deemed, for purposes of venue in civil actions to be an inhabitant of each of these jurisdictions. The Corporation may establish offices in such other place or places as it may deem necessary or appropriate in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 3. The Corporation shall have, and may exercise, the following general powers, in addition to those elsewhere conferred in this act:

(a) To have succession until dissolved by act of Congress.

(b) To adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) To adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its general business, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

(d) To sue and to be sued in its corporate name.

(e) To determine through its directors the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to laws applicable generally to Government corporations.

(f) To execute all instruments necessary or appropriate in the exercise of any of its powers.

(g) Whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of the Corporation, to acquire, in any lawful manner, any property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible; to hold, maintain, use, and operate the same; and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of the same.

(h) When consistent with the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, to enter into contracts, leases, agreements, or other transactions—

(1) with any person, firm, association, or corporation; and

(2) with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, Territory, or possession, or with any political subdivision thereof, on a break-even basis, except that such basis shall not apply with respect to the sale of products manufactured or produced by the Corporation: *Provided*, That in no case shall the Corporation contract to undertake an activity for any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State, Territory, or possession, or with any political subdivision thereof, unless the latter is authorized by law to undertake such activity and has funds available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall not undertake any program or activity tending to duplicate concurrently the programs or activities of any other Government agency within the Virgin Islands or extend such program or activity beyond limitations already imposed on such other governmental agencies.

(i) To obtain funds from the Treasury of the United States, for use in the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law, not to exceed a total of $7,775,000 outstanding at any time. For this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to advance to the Corporation out of funds appropriated in advance to the Treasury for this purpose, amounts not exceeding a total of $7,775,000 when requested by the Board of Directors of the Corporation. Appropriations for this purpose are hereby authorized to be made.

(j) To appoint such officers, agents, and employees; to vest them with such powers and duties; to fix and pay such compensation to them for their services as the Corporation may determine, without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and to require bonds for the faithful performance of their duties, the premiums on such bonds to be paid by the Corporation: *Provided*, That persons employed by the Corporation whose compensation is paid on any basis other than a per annum basis shall not be included in making computations pursuant to the provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall give due consideration to residents of the Virgin Islands in the hiring of its employees and officers.

(k) To use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(l) To have, in the payment of debts out of bankruptcy estates, the priority of the United States.

(m) To accept gifts or donations of services, or of property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes herein authorized.

(n) To take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers herein or hereafter specifically conferred upon it.

SEC. 4. In fulfillment of its objects, the Corporation, in accordance with annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to applicable provisions of law, is authorized to use its general powers—

(a) to examine, investigate, and conduct research and experimentation in the marketing, distributing, advertising, and exporting of products or resources of the Virgin Islands, and to make known the results of such activities;

(b) to encourage and to promote the investment of private capital in industrial, agricultural, commercial, or related enterprises or activities in the Virgin Islands. Insofar as may be possible without jeopardizing the maximum development of industrial, agricultural, commercial, and related resources for the public good, the Corporation shall formulate its policies so as to encourage and promote the investment of capital owned by residents of the Virgin Islands;

(c) to engage in land-use planning to the end that the most economic and socially beneficial use may be made of the soil of the Virgin Islands, and to encourage and assist private persons and organizations to act in accordance with the results of such planning;

(d) to encourage and engage in the business of providing, whenever adequate facilities are not otherwise available, transportation for persons and property to and from the Virgin Islands, and from place to place in the Virgin Islands;

(e) to encourage, promote, and develop, and to assist in the encouragement, promotion, and development of tourist trade in the Virgin Islands;

(f) to encourage the establishment and development of small farms and small farm communities in the Virgin Islands, and, for that purpose, to construct, equip, improve, administer, operate, and supervise such small farms or communities and to make loans and give other assistance to them;

(g) to make loans to any person for the establishment, maintenance, operation, construction, reconstruction, repair, improvement, or enlargement of any industrial, commercial, agricultural, or related enterprise, undertaking, or activity in the Virgin Islands whenever such loans are not available from private sources: *Provided*, That the total amount of outstanding loans made under authority of this paragraph shall not at any time exceed $5,221,880: *Provided further*, That each person applying for a loan shall be required to furnish adequate security and that the interest on such loans shall not exceed 6 percent per annum; shall be the general policy of the Corporation to establish interest rates on loans that, in the judgment of the Board of Directors, will at least cover the interest cost of funds to the United States Treasury, the operating expenses of the lending division of the corporation, and a risk factor which, over all, should provide for losses that may be expected to materialize on loans;

(h) for any of the purposes or objects herein authorized, and for the further purpose of developing the industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, livestock, fishery, and forestry resources of the Virgin Islands, to establish, maintain, operate, and engage in, upon its own account, any appropriate enterprise, undertaking, or activity:

Provided, That the Corporation shall not undertake any activity not specifically set forth in the annual budget programs: *Provided further*, That in the event an emergency is declared to exist by the Board of Directors during a period when the Congress is not in session, appropriate action in effectuation of the policies or purposes of the Corporation recommended by the Board to meet such emergency may be taken upon the advance authorization of the President of the United States. Such emergency action shall be reported to the Congress upon its reconvening for its approval, and, subject to the appropriation of funds therefore, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to reimburse the Corporation for any losses incurred as a result of such action.

SEC. 5. (a) The Corporation shall issue a receipt as of July 1, 1948, to the Secretary

of the Treasury for the value of the property and assets transferred, less the liabilities assumed, under section 9 hereof. Such receipt shall be evidence of the ownership of the Corporation by the United States of America. The amount of the receipt shall be increased or decreased by any subsequent changes in the investment of the United States Government. Any property and assets, the ownership of which hereafter may be transferred to the Corporation without cost, or for consideration clearly not commensurate with the value received, shall be included in the investment of the United States Government at net values approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Any income earned by the Corporation shall be included in the investment and any losses incurred shall reduce the investment. The amount of the receipt shall not include, and interest shall not be paid to the Treasury on funds advanced by or payable to other agencies of the United States Government.

(b) The Corporation shall pay interest on the advances from the Treasury and on that part of the Government's investment represented by assets transferred to the Corporation, but shall not pay interest on accumulated net income or on funds received through appropriations by the Congress to cover losses. The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the interest rate annually in advance; such rate to be calculated to reimburse the Treasury for its cost.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury sums to cover net losses estimated in advance in the Corporation's budgets submitted in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597) and approved by the Congress, to be paid over to the Corporation from time to time as needed.

SEC. 6. The Corporation is hereby authorized to use all its funds and other assets, and all funds and other assets which may hereafter be paid, transferred, or allocated to, or otherwise acquired by it in the exercise of its corporate powers and functions: *Provided*, That no Government funds may be turned over to or administered by the Corporation other than as authorized by this act or the annual Government Corporations Appropriation Acts. The Corporation shall reimburse the civil-service retirement and disability fund for Government contributions to the fund applicable to the Corporation's employees, and the employees' compensation fund, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, for the benefit payments made to the Corporation's employees, and shall also reimburse other Government agencies for payments of a similar nature made on behalf of the Corporation.

SEC. 7. The Corporation shall pay into the Treasury of the United States the amount of its funds, from whatever source derived, in excess of the current requirements of the Corporation. Such payments shall be applied, first to reduce the balance of the receipt evidencing ownership attributable to advances outstanding under section 3 (1) hereof, after which any payments shall be applied to the remainder of the receipt. The investment of the United States Government in no event shall be reduced to less than $1.

SEC. 8. The property and business of the Corporation shall be managed by a board of nine directors to consist of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Secretary of the Interior or his nominee, the president of the Corporation, the remaining members to be appointed by the President of the United States. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. Not more than five directors shall be of any one political party. The directors shall designate one of their members as chairman of the Board, subject to the approval of the President of the United States. The Board of Directors shall report upon the affairs and activities of the Corporation to the President of the United States through the Secretary of the Interior. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as possible each year. The Board shall meet at least quarterly: *Provided*, That at least two of the meetings in each year shall be held in the Virgin Islands. Directors who are otherwise employed full time by the Corporation, by the Government of the Virgin Islands, by the municipalities of St. Thomas and St. John or St. Croix, or by the United States Government shall not receive additional compensation for their services as directors. All other directors shall receive a fee of $50 a day for each day in attendance at directors' meetings, including travel time. All directors shall receive necessary travel expenses in connection with their attendance at directors' meetings. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. Qualifications for Board membership shall consist of demonstrated ability, attachment to the public interest, impartiality, and diversified experience among the members. The Board shall confine itself to over-all policy-making, directive, and supervisory functions with administrative functions centered in a staff of executive officers (including a controller) headed by a chief executive, responsible for the execution of programs and policies adopted by the Board.

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby transferred to the Corporation the following property:

(1) All property—real, personal, and mixed—now operated by the Virgin Islands Company, on behalf of the United States, except that property now operated by the company for the Department of the Interior conveyed to that Department by revocable permit from the Navy Department under agreement dated January 1, 1948. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at the depreciated cost as of June 30, 1947, shown in schedule 1 of the Comptroller General's report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, adjusted for all changes from that date to the date of transfer, including depreciation at rates set forth in said schedule 1.

(2) All the assets and property—real, personal, and mixed, tangible and intangible—of the Virgin Islands Company. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at the value shown on the books of the Virgin Islands Company at the date of transfer, subject to any adjustment deemed necessary as a result of the audit required to be made by the Comptroller General under section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945.

(3) All of the United States Government's interest in the property known as Bluebeard Castle Hotel situated in the Island of St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands of the United States. The value of the property so transferred shall be fixed at a value approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(b) The Corporation shall assume and discharge all of the liabilities of the Virgin Islands Company: *Provided*, That the liabilities shall not include the balances of relief grants held by the Virgin Islands Company, which balances are invested in the assets and property embraced by section 9 (a) (2) hereof, and which shall become part of the Government's investment in the Corporation.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, who are the stockholders of the Virgin Islands Company, a corporation created by ordinance of the Colonial Council for St. Thomas and St. John, Virgin Islands of the United States, are hereby authorized and directed to take such steps as may be appropriate to dissolve the said Virgin Islands Company.

SEC. 11. In lieu of taxes, the Corporation is authorized to make the annual payments into the municipal treasuries of the Virgin Islands directed by section 5 of the act of May 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1372; 48 U. S. C. 1401d), to be made by the Virgin Islands Company: *Provided*, That any valuation for tax purposes made by the Secretary of the Interior shall not be reviewable by any court: *Provided further*, That the annual payments shall not include payments in lieu of income taxes, capital stock taxes, or franchise taxes.

SEC. 12. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 is amended by striking out "The Virgin Islands Company" appearing therein and substituting "the Virgin Islands Corporation."

SEC. 13. This act shall become effective June 30, 1948.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Virgin Islands Corporation Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, some 14 years ago, as the result of a terrific and chaotic economic condition in the Virgin Islands, the Government of the United States went into that Territory and established what has been known for the past 14 years as the Virgin Islands Company. Private citizens of that area had practically been thrown into bankruptcy and were forced to discontinue operation of their plantations and their sugar mills because of the terrific losses that had been incurred in the period 1929 to 1933. The Government of the United States outside of the Virgin Islands Company and through the Department of the Interior, Public Works Division, acquired a very substantial acreage where sugarcane and other crops had previously been grown. They purchased two sugar mills and a rum factory which had been owned and operated by private individuals. The Virgin Islands Company, having received grants-in-aid from the Treasury of the United States, leased from the Department of the Interior, Public Works Division, lands and mills which the Department of the Interior had acquired.

During the past 14 years the Virgin Islands Company has been operating those properties under lease. The Virgin Islands Company is the largest employer of direct employees, and, indirectly, through purchasing the products grown by farmers on the island of St. Croix, which is the largest agricultural area of the islands, and thereby becomes the largest employer of people in the Virgin Islands. Its operations primarily constitute the backbone of the economic structure of the Virgin Islands.

Some months ago, as you know, the Congress of the United States adopted the Federal Corporations Act which forces all of these Federal corporations to become organized under the Corporations Act. It is therefore necessary now to reincorporate the Virgin Islands Company before the 30th of June of this year under the new Federal Corporations Act or the Virgin Islands Company must go out of business not later than June 30 of this year.

If the Virgin Islands Company does go out of business on June 30 of this year it forces a tremendous relief program to be initiated by the Government of the United States in order to provide relief for the people of the Virgin Islands because the principal industrial operation of the Virgin Islands will cease to operate.

The best information which I can obtain, and it is certainly reliable, from the Department of the Interior, the Governor and the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. Croix, is that this will call for an immediate job for the Red Cross and cost millions of dollars from the Federal Treasury putting these people on direct relief if these operations, agricultural and industrial, are discontinued. This is a straight proposition without any vacillation whatsoever to refinance the Virgin Islands Company, extend it under the New Federal Corporations Act and let it go along as a direct employer maintaining the principal economic structure of the Virgin Islands.

We are now at the point where we must make a decision whether or not we shall resort to direct relief in place of agricultural and industrial operations or go ahead with the refinancing and reconstruction of the Virgin Islands Company under the new Corporations Act.

If any Member desires to ask questions, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell us what the over-all cost involved in this bill will be?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This bill calls for only $7,750,000 for the combined purpose. Now, let me make this very emphatic: It will take something like $900,000 to refinance the Company and rebuild the mills so that they can operate efficiently, and put in new machinery—new presses for the sugarcane which the farmers grow.

This bill carries, roughly, $4,000,000 as part of the $7,750,000 for the Company to use in making loans to people in the Virgin Islands who are without bank facilities in that the one bank located there which holds the position of a virtual monopoly will not extend commercial loans to the people and let them adventure in their own way. This is necessary if the people of the Virgin Islands are to have money with which to operate or a source from which to get funds so that they can enter into private industry of their own. They must have recourse to the RFC, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or some other Government credit agency, in the absence of the existence of the Virgin Islands Company.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know what action the other body took on this?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand, the other body has passed a bill which provides only $500,000 to continue the operation of this Company along with loans that it will have to obtain from the Treasury of the United States for 1 year.

That bring up this question: Just 1 year ago in the closing hours of the session, as a matter of fact, almost at midnight, as the result of our not having acted prior to that time, the Appropriations Committees of the two bodies in conjunction with my efforts and the efforts of other gentlemen of the Congress, mushed through in the last minutes a life rope, you might say, and pulled the Company through, but with the promises that before this time this whole matter would be cleaned up. Now we face the situation where the other body offers to extend it on a shoestring basis for another 6 months until the Congress meets in January, action which will call for an amendment to the Federal Corporations Act exempting this corporation from that act so that it may continue beyond June 30. That is as frank and blunt as I can state with reference to what the other body has done.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel the action of the other body is probably better than this bill?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think so. I feel that the responsibility of the Virgin Islands is upon the leadership of these two bodies and that we have not treated those people fairly. It is time for us to give them some answer as to their social and economic condition while we are doing all these things for people scattered all over the world.

This is a bill that I strongly urge and strongly advocate for the favorable consideration of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell the House whether the Virgin Islands Company has done anything in the way of rehabilitating those people?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Virgin Islands Company has maintained the social and economic structure of these people during the past 14 years and it has charged up against that a loss of only about $60,000 in direct losses plus depreciation on the agricultural implements and the factory owned by the Department of the Interior during that period.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress ought to be informed as to what is going on in the Virgin Islands. Senator BUTLER and myself made a trip to the Virgin Islands during the Christmas holidays. We spent 2 weeks in these islands. A report was made to Congress. It is amazing the amount of waste of the taxpayers' money that is going on in the islands.

You must remember the Seventy-eighth Congress appropriated $10,000,000 for a rehabilitation program, a public-works program, in the Virgin Islands. We have already spent more than $4,000,000 on public works.

Mr. Speaker, I was down there and saw some of those public works. In two of the towns on St. Croix Island, Christiansted and Fredriksted, they had built 3 miles of sewers and have 18 private houses connected with those sewers.

They are wasting the taxpayers' money in a way I am sure you would not approve.

As to the Virgin Islands Company, we looked into that very, very carefully. The present manager I think is a good man. His name is Olsen. He wants to get out of the business of growing sugarcane by those people. He has the earmarks of a good manager. Now, we propose to appropriate over $7,000,000 to continue this Company. Between four and five hundred people are employed by the Virgin Islands Company for a period of about 5 months in the year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman knows very well that the pay roll of the Virgin Islands Company to which the gentleman refers does not include the very small farmer who operates a small piece of land and sells the products of his labor to the mills operated by the Virgin Islands Company and the gentleman further knows that the $10,000,000 referred to by him has nothing whatever to do with the Virgin Islands Company.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It was a work-relief project. I know there are a few small farmers around there who raise cane and send it to the mills. The sugarcane industry cannot be justified.

The Government is also in the rum business. You have to sort of give it away with the other liquor that people drink. They have to buy some of this Government rum in order to get liquor. Now, that molasses is brought over from Puerto Rico.

I admit that the Virgin Islands is our problem. The people have not been very well treated. But I am also here to tell you that the people in the Virgin Islands will not work. They do not work. They like relief. We have carried them on a relief program and as long as they are carried on such a program they will not work. We are establishing an economy and standard of living they cannot support.

Senator BUTLER, myself, and two clerks went over to the island of Tortola, which is about the same size as the island of St. John. It is under England's control. Now, we have more people employed by the Government on the island of St. John than there are in private industries. The biggest employment there is Government employment, with padded pay rolls all the way down the line. I believe the records show that

there are 1,100 people on the Government pay roll in the Virgin Islands.

There is an Englishman in charge at the island of Tortola. An Englishman runs that island containing about the same number of people as the island of St. Thomas; he has all of those farmers working making a living, self-supporting, bringing their goods by little boats to the island of St. Thomas and he is running his island with 75 people. That is what the English are able to do.

The Interior Department under Tugwell and other New Dealers have planted a philosophy in these Virgin Islands that the United States must take care of them. These islanders could support themselves just as they do on the English-controlled island of Tortola if we gave them proper management. The Dutch had no trouble when they owned the islands.

I say to my colleagues that the program that we are adopting in the Virgin Islands is absolutely wrong. It is said there are more Virgin Islanders in the United States than there are down in the Virgin Islands. The average age of the worker in the Virgin Islands, according to statistics, is 54. I looked at their school-lunch program. They can raise everything in the Virgin Islands that they need. They can raise potatoes and vegetables, but the food that was used in the school-lunch program did not come from the Virgin Islands. Every bit of it was imported from this country. They had 160 pounds of potatoes for 120 youngsters. The meat, the butter, the vegetables, and the things that they could raise in the Virgin Islands were not raised there. They were imported, because we give it to them. As long as we continue with that program they will never become self-sustaining or self-supporting.

I am in favor of adopting the bill passed by the Senate. The Senate bill will start liquidation of the Company. There is a bona fide offer to buy the Virgin Islands Company for $1,500,000. It ought to be cleaned up. It would be far cheaper for us to put these people under the Red Cross if they insist on being treated as wards, but the program we are now adopting in the Virgin Islands is absolutely wrong. I am certain that these good people of the Virgin Islands want to be respected self-supporting folks. They cannot do it under the present program.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. After being down there did the gentleman think that there was as much agriculture in the Virgin Islands as there is in a good county in Iowa or Nebraska, or even a good township hardly?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, there is not much good land. They could be self-supporting if they went out and worked under proper encouragement from this country.

Mr. LECOMPTE. One good county in the Middle West could produce more than they are producing down there.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, yes. I prefer the Senate bill. We can then in the Eighty-first Congress help to put these people back on a self-supporting basis. We should not continue the Tugwell program of the thirties.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the argument of my good friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] defeats itself. This $7,000,000 for the Virgin Islands is largely to put the people in industry and largely to start a public works program which is sadly needed. If there are any on relief, that will take them off relief. So, his argument really defeats itself.

I understand from reliable sources that in those islands the water is so bad that it is almost dangerous for anybody to drink it. We owe a duty to the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands. They are our wards. Why force those people to continue drinking this unsanitary water? I understand also that for the past several years there have not been any hospitals built and there have not been any roads built, and conditions down there are deplorable in every respect. When you talk about the pay of these workers on these public works and in private enterprise, they only get about $2 or $3 a day.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, it will be more expensive to deny these Virgin Islanders this $7,000,000 because the entire economy of the country would probably collapse and we would have practically everybody on relief. This is a humanitarian measure. It is not only humanitarian; it is our duty to take care of this situation in the Virgin Islands. The whole world will point to this example how the United States treats its wards down in the Virgin Islands.

I hope that the membership will realize that we ought to pass this measure with an overwhelming vote.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me reemphasize that the $7,700,000 which is carried in this bill is not to be used unless the people of the Virgin Islands to the extent of approximately $4,000,000 of that total apply to this Company for loans in order to go into business and enterprise themselves. This bill is designed for the specific purpose of enabling those people to establish essential industries and get out from under the wing of the Federal Treasury. It is the very purpose that the gentleman from Nebraska advocates, and it does away with the past program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, it encourages private enterprise and encourages the establishment of small business, and keep these workers working and under more satisfactory conditions. I hope the House will see the justice of this thing and see what our duty is and pass the bill overwhelmingly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with this situation because it happens that most of the Virgin Islanders that are in America live in my district. I do not want to differ too radically with the gentleman from Nebraska, but there are only about 13,000 Virgin Islanders in America and there are 34,000 in the Virgin Islands. Eight thousand of the Virgin Islanders of America live in my district.

Our friend from Nebraska certainly said some things that are true, but they just do not happen to be related. This is not a relief bill. Granted that the $10,000,000 that was appropriated before went down there for relief and was not used correctly, granted that that may be true, this is still not a relief bill. This is to do just what the gentleman from Nebraska wants done. If you read the bill carefully you will find it states:

> For the further purpose of developing the industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, livestock, fishery, and forestry resources of the Virgin Islands, to establish, maintain, operate, and engage in, upon its own account, any appropriate enterprise, undertaking, or activity.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This Company has been engaged in that business. They were chartered for it, but they have not accomplished a single thing. There is no reason to think they will accomplish anything in the future.

Mr. POWELL. This Company has accomplished everything. If it were not for this Company we would still have to spend money down there for the relief and the feeding of the people. This is their livelihood.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Danes had the islands for over 100 years and they had no trouble. They were quite self-supporting.

Mr. POWELL. Yes; that may be true. Also, if we could get this Company on its feet they would be self-supporting, but we have never put this Company on its feet correctly. If we get this Company on its feet, then they will be able to be self-supporting. You cannot tell people to go out and work and support themselves unless you give them something to do it with; is not that true? In Nebraska you have great farmers, but they have to have something in their hands to farm with.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is really a relief program, if that is what you want it to be.

Mr. POWELL. No; this is not a relief program at all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has been all along.

Mr. POWELL. This is to develop in the people the character the gentleman has been talking about, so they will be able to take care of themselves.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I go to the bank and borrow $500 in order to start a peanut store and a popcorn popper and put

myself in business, the gentleman from Nebraska would call that a relief program. That is exactly what it is not.

Mr. POWELL. If the gentleman did not, it would be all right, but if they did it he would call it relief.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is the soundest type of industrial operation on the face of God's green earth. That is what built this country. The gentleman from Nebraska knows this as well as anyone else.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is a relief program when the money is not paid back and you have to put in more and more money to keep the machine going.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, if it does not come back.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is what is going to happen in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What we have been doing in the Virgin Islands is what this bill is designed to take us out of, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. POWELL. We have been spending money in relief. With this, there is no relief. We are giving the people an opportunity. I call for passage without a record vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 132, noes 9.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 10, 1948:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the poultry industry in the United States;

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Turners Society in the United States;

H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 5155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., and to report to the Congress upon the advisability and practicability of constructing thereon a parkway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5283. An act to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.; and

H. R. 5816. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes.

On June 12, 1948:

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of powers of appointment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2359. An act to authorize the payment of a lump sum, in the amount of $85,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4721. An act to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy;

H. R. 4954. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennwick division of the Yakima project, Washington;

H. R. 5151. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5553. An act to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5587. An act to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6056. An act to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.;

H. R. 6078. An act to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; and

H. R. 6091. An act to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii.

On June 14, 1948:

H. R. 669. An act to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 3680. An act to amend sections 207, 213, 215, 216, 220, and 225, of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 5728. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5770. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6500. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On June 16, 1948:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of William Allen White, whose literary genius made such a great contribution in the field of American literature;

H. R. 6407. An act to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2389. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

H. R. 5134. An act to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational-rehabilitation purposes; and

H. R. 6730. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

On June 17, 1948:

H. R. 2634. An act for the relief of the Tampa Chapter, No. 113, United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 3628. An act to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; and

H. R. 4032. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT, OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

REPORT ON JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 725)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court during the fiscal year 1946–47.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

LABOR DISPUTE AT OAK RIDGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 726)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, it is my duty to report to the Congress concerning the labor dispute which recently existed at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The important facts concerning the dispute may be summarized as follows:

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory is Government-owned. Some 2,350 persons are there engaged in important atomic-energy research, but not directly in production of fissionable materials or weapons.

The dispute was between the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. and the Atomic Trades and Labor Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The corporation operates the

laboratory under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract with the Atomic Energy Commission. The corporation also operates two other important plants of the atomic-energy installation at Oak Ridge. The council represents some 900 employees who perform maintenance, operating, and service functions at the laboratory.

The recent dispute resulted from the failure of negotiations concerning both wages and working conditions. These negotiations were begun with the predecessor contractor in the latter part of November 1947 and continued with Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. beginning February 9, 1948.

It is clear that there was a difference in objectives sought by the council and the corporation. On the one hand, the council desired to preserve differentials over the two nearby atomic-energy plants as to wage rates and conditions of employment—differentials which have been in existence in the laboratory since its beginning. On the other hand, the corporation desired uniformity of wage rates and conditions of employment and the elimination of the laboratory differentials.

In a union meeting held Sunday, February 29, the employees voted to strike unless settlement were made by Friday midnight, March 5, and this intention was reaffirmed by another meeting on the night of March 3. Accordingly, on March 5, I issued Executive Order 9934, creating a Board of Inquiry pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act. At my request, both parties agreed to maintain the status quo until March 19.

On March 15 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its first report. It found the existence of a labor dispute at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and it advised me of the facts of that dispute. It further found that grave danger to the national safety would result if the operations of the laboratory were interrupted.

Thereupon, at my request, the Attorney General on March 19 instituted an action and obtained an injunction in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. This order enjoined both the corporation and the council, and all persons in active participation with them, from engaging in any strike or lock-out or from interfering with normal continuance of work, or from making any change in terms or conditions of employment other than by mutual agreement.

On March 24 I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. Negotiations between the parties continued, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On May 18 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its second report, stating that the position of the parties remained unaltered and the dispute unsettled.

On June 1 and 2 the National Labor Relations Board conducted a secret ballot of the employees to ascertain whether they wished to accept the final offer of settlement as stated and made by the employer. The employees, by a vote of 771 to 26, rejected the employer's last offer. On June 7 the National Labor Relations Board certified to the Attorney General the results of this election. On June 8 the employees at a union meeting took action looking to a possible stoppage if the injunction were lifted and if the employer unilaterally placed in effect the terms proposed in its final offer.

On June 10, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Attorney General moved the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 11.

During this period, the parties continued negotiations, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On June 15 the parties reached agreement on the terms of a new contract.

All parties to this dispute and the Government agencies concerned complied with all legal and procedural requirements of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

A number of additional facts concerning this dispute are set forth in the first and second reports of the Board of Inquiry. Copies of these reports are transmitted to the Congress with this message.

Both parties are to be commended for achieving settlement of this dispute without an interruption of work.

The dispute at Oak Ridge has raised some question, nevertheless, as to the sufficiency of present collective-bargaining methods in atomic-energy installations.

This question is somewhat different from others which have arisen in the past. On the one hand, it is clear that the national security and the development of the beneficial arts and sciences are bound up with the progress of our atomic-energy program. Thus, every dispute which threatens to seriously impair that program imperils the national health and safety.

On the other hand, it is equally clear that the progress of our atomic-energy program requires the support and drive of broad sectors of the American economy. In order to encourage such support, the Atomic Energy Commission has lodged in its contractors a large measure of responsibility and authority. The progress of the program is equally dependent upon the full and willing support of the men and women who work in atomic-energy plants and laboratories.

Under these circumstances, it is imperative that the most successful techniques of the collective-bargaining process should be adopted for the atomic-energy program.

The objective should be twofold: The parties should continue to enjoy the maximum of voluntary action and freedom of choice; secondly, the public interest must be protected at all times.

I believe that special study should be given to the problem of peaceful and orderly settlement of labor disputes in Government-owned, privately operated atomic-energy installations, such as those at Richland, Wash.; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Los Alamos, N. Mex.; the Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago, Ill.; and others.

I propose, therefore, to establish a commission, composed of men having expert knowledge in the field of labor relations, to study this problem and to make such recommendations as they may find necessary. The commission should explore the question whether any special legislation should be enacted to protect the national interest without depriving management or labor organizations of the initiative and freedom necessary for the progress of our atomic-energy program. The commission should study ways and means of adapting to the atomic-energy program the best of our experience in the complex field of labor relations. The commission should concern itself also with special aspects of the problem, such as questions of bargaining representation, uniformity of working conditions and wages, and procedures for grievance handling.

The commission should concern itself, in short, with the broad code of conduct which should be observed by management and labor in their relations with each other in this vital program.

In appointing this commission I shall request the advice of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy both as to the membership of the commission and the specific questions to be studied.

I believe that the report of this commission, which should be submitted as soon as possible, will be of great value in guiding contractors, labor organizations, and the Government in this new and vital field. I am confident that this is the best avenue to follow to achieve and maintain that proper balance between freedom and responsibility which is the tradition in all our economic relations, including those between management and labor.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

TO AMEND RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) (2) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, be further amended by striking therefrom the following words and figures: "Section 4 (a) (1), (2), and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sections 4 (a) (1) and (2)"; and that section 4 (c) thereof be amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000,000."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out $25,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof $35,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry," approved June 28, 1947, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1949," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1954."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 1, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1954," and insert "June 30, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago I placed in the RECORD a report of the investigation staff of the Appropriations Committee referring to certain matters relating to the administration of unemployment compensation and the employment services in the State of Tennessee. The State director of these services published a reply in most of the newspapers of that State. My answer follows:

My attention has been called to an article entitled "Hake's Reply to Charges," appearing in various Tennessee newspapers. Because the gentleman—under pressure—has attempted to brush aside plain facts and truth with falsehoods and innuendoes, I deem it my duty to give the people of Tennessee the facts.

W. O. Hake is the State employment security commissioner for the State of Tennessee. As such he has under his direction State employees who are paid entirely out of funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States. The Unemployment Compensation Division and the Employment Service are both financed out of funds raised by virtue of a tax imposed by Federal law on covered pay rolls. It thus is important that the Federal Government know how these funds are being expended by the States. The Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of this particular appropriation directed that an investigation be made in the field in various States to determine the necessity for the large appropriation requested. Mr. Hake appeared before my subcommittee, along with a number of other State administrators, on April 2, 1948. His testimony is found in the printed record of the committee hearings. While he was on the witness stand, I made this statement, which appears on page 239 of the hearings:

I would like to say to you that that is one of the things that the investigating staff of the Appropriations Committee is going to make a thorough study of, and they are trained men in the field of investigation. I expect they will come up with some real information to this committee, so that we can get a picture of the situation which we have heretofore had.

Mr. Hake's response was:

I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for inaugurating that policy. The State men will unanimously welcome it.

Thereafter the Appropriations Committee sent investigators into a number of States, including Tennessee. Their preliminary report indicated serious violations of the Hatch Act. The committee decided to have a further investigation made and sent the chief of the investigating staff, Mr. Lee, to conduct the investigation. I may say that everyone in Washington knows that Mr. Lee is one of the most courageous and outstanding investigators in the Federal service, and the attempt of Mr. Hake to "smear" him is the usual artifice adopted by one who is cornered and caught and who is seeking to distract attention from the real facts.

When Mr. Lee's report came to the committee, I was instructed by the committee to lay it before the Congress and to present the preliminary facts disclosed by the Attorney General of the United States and to the United States Civil Service Commission with a demand that a full and complete investigation be made by the FBI and the Civil Service Commission, and with the further demand that such steps be taken in accordance with law as the facts might indicate to be necessary.

Mr. Hake in his statement in no way denies the facts but resorts to the old trick of the accused when confronted with unassailable documentary evidence by calling me names. Among other things, he states in reference to me:

He is well known as having a fixed hatred of any progressive legislation enacted by the Democratic administrations of the last 16 years. The social-security program appears to be one of his pet hates, and especially the Employment Service.

He further says that the action taken by the subcommittee and the Congress would have emasculated the employment security program and that he, along with other State administrators, testified before my committee against this unwarranted position. I categorically state that such statement can only be properly designated as an unmitigated falsehood. The facts are clear. Judge Hake, in company with other leading State administrators, came before my committee and urged that the Congress adopt the program which I was advocating. His testimony appears on pages 234 to 240 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I need only to quote this to demonstrate the falsity of Judge Hake's statement. He made this statement to the committee:

As I review it, Congress has done two outstanding things up to the moment: No. 1, last week when it determined that these two programs (unemployment compensation and employment services) should not be separated when they defeated the reorganization plan; and No. 2, this year they did another outstanding job when they decided that the program would not go over to the Labor Department. Then, by inference certainly, they would decide by these two actions that the program should be administered in the Federal Security Agency. I appeared before both committees along that line, and I think now the question is, Congress needs to do something to carry out what they have most decidedly said they want and which is apparently not going to happen from the executive branch of the Government. I think the State administrators are unanimous in their thinking now that the reorganization should be effected yesterday. I mean by that without delay.

In statement after statement appearing in this record, Judge Hake firmly supported me in the very program which he so viciously assails and condemns in his so-called reply. For 3 years now he has appeared before my committee and urged the very thing which has now been accomplished and written into the law. He now says that this action on the part of the Congress would destroy the social-security program. He of all people knows that there is not a single word of truth in such a statement. The full Appropriations Committee accepted with practically no dissent the recommendations which I offered to consolidate in the Federal Security Agency, the unemployment compensation and the employment service activities. The House of Representatives with only 29 dissenting votes approved that program. It then went to the Senate, and the Senate took a contrary view, largely because of the opposition of Mr. Truman. In the conference between the House and Senate, an agreement was reached fully sustaining the reorganization program which I had proposed, and the Senate completely receded from its position. Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, was a member of that conference committee and signed the conference report.

It is interesting to note that the conference report was overwhelmingly adopted by both the House and the Senate, and the bill went to the President. The President vetoed the bill and thereafter on June 16 the House by a vote of 288–113 overrode the Presidential veto. It is also interesting to note that Representatives GORE, MURRAY, PHILLIPS, JENNINGS, COOPER, and DAVIS of Tennessee all supported the position of the writer and voted to override the Presidential veto. Only Representatives PRIEST, COURTNEY, and EVINS voted to sustain the President.

It is also interesting to note that the Senate by a vote of 72–17 voted to override the veto of the President and thus by an overwhelming vote placed its seal of approval upon the action proposed by the writer. It is also interesting to note that both Senator MCKELLAR and Senator STEWART of Tennessee voted to override

the President and voted to support the position taken by the writer.

Thus when Judge Hake attempts to indicate in his alleged reply that "Congressman KEEFE's political prestige had thus reached an all-time low and something had to be done to restore it," he is again making a statement which he knows is not in accord with the facts.

It is also interesting to note that while the conference between the House and the Senate was going on, W. O. Hake, Commissioner, sent the following telegram to me and to every member of the Tennessee House delegation:

H. R. 6355 as passed by the House contains a reorganization rider which has been rejected by the Senate. The issue now goes to conference. As administrator of the employment security program in Tennessee, I strongly endorse the position which has been taken by the House. My attitude is shared by the vast majority of State administrators of this program. Reorganization and integration of the Federal level similar to operations now maintained in all States would be most helpful to our State part of the program. Present dual set-up on Federal level leads to irritation, inefficiency, time and money wasted both on the Federal and State level, and should not be tolerated by Congress. I strongly urge that you lend your support to the conference committee in sustaining the House's former action.

Does this telegram and the testimony of Judge Hake before my committee indicate that he opposed the position which I had taken? I repeat that Mr. Hake has evaded the facts and has resorted to abuse and vilification in an attempt to becloud the issue.

He further attempts, in his alleged reply, to stir up political emotions by his intolerant and hate-inspiring references to Mr. Lee and to myself. I happen to know that in making this statement he was doing so under orders from higher-ups in Tennessee, and if he is the man that I have always thought he was, he will let the people of Tennessee know the truth and repudiate his statement.

He attempts to inject into the picture the fact that I am a Republican from Wisconsin and that my political fortunes are "low" and that I have lost caste with my colleagues, and so forth, and so forth. The record of the congressional action and the overwhelming support given me by the Congressmen and Senators clearly demonstrates the falsity of this statement. His own telegram, above quoted, ought to cause him to hang his head in shame for daring to write such a reply, even though he was under pressure from political superiors to do so.

The real truth is that the employees of State government in Tennessee themselves know whether they have been subject to a political shake-down by which 10 percent of 1 month's salary has been taken from them for political purposes. It will not do for Judge Hake to say that these contributions were voluntary. I have many letters in my file that clearly demonstrate the contrary, written by State employees who were forced to contribute against their will because of fear of loss of jobs.

As a Republican from Wisconsin, I am interested in seeing that these two great programs throughout the Nation are conducted in the public interest and that the employees, paid for 100 percent by Federal funds, carry on their jobs in the interests of the people and not be subjected to the political dictation of any political machine. I have served notice that these investigations will continue, and no amount of personal abuse will stop them. This is Federal money that is being used, and to that extent the Congress of the United States has an interest in seeing that Federal law is not violated.

I can assure Judge Hake that so far as it lies within my power I shall see to it that he has his day in court and that all of the facts are presented. I know nothing of the political situation in Tennessee and have no intention of injecting myself into the politics of Tennessee. I believe the good people of Tennessee, however, are no different from the good people of Wisconsin or any other State in the Union and that they will resent efforts to cover up plain facts with a campaign of smear, abuse and vilification.

I have every right to assume that the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission of the United States Government will follow through on this investigation and that in due time Mr. Hake and his political associates will have ample opportunity to try to explain away the mass of fully documented evidence that has been gathered by the investigators of the House Appropriations Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two radio addresses by Father Saloway. I do not know whether this will exceed the limit allowed, but, if so, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR TO LEASE PROPERTY AT 811 VERMONT AVENUE NW.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2706) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in a building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., in Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to lease for commercial purposes for periods not exceeding 10 years and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, such space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building, as was leased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for commercial purposes on July 30, 1947, the date title to such building was transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the United States of America by section 306, title III, Public Law 268, Eightieth Congress. The rentals received pursuant to this act may be deposited into a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 303b), shall be available to pay the cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair of the space so leased and for the establishment of necessary reserves therefor: *Provided*, That except for such necessary reserves, the unobligated balances of rentals so deposited into the Treasury shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO HEAR AND DETERMINE CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIERS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1260) to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created and established a Motor Carrier Claims Commission, hereafter referred to as the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Commission shall hear and determine, according to law, existing claims against the United States arising out of the taking by the United States of possession or control of any of the motor-carrier transportation systems described in Executive Order No. 9462, dated August 11, 1944 (C. F. R., 1944 supp., p. 70). The settlement of any claim prior to the enactment of this act shall not prevent the Commission from hearing and determining such claim if it determines that the principles of equity as administered by the courts require that such settlement be set aside and that such claim be heard and determined.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall consist of a Chairman and two other members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall each receive a salary of $15,000 per year. At least two of such members shall be learned in the law. Each member shall take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and to discharge faithfully the duties of his office. The members shall hold office until the dissolution of the Commission as hereinafter provided. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments. Two members shall constitute a quorum, and the agreement of two members shall be necessary to any and all determinations for the transaction of the business of the Commission, and if there be a quorum, no vacancy shall impair or affect the business of the Commission, or its determinations.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall appoint a clerk and such other employees as shall be requisite to conduct the business of the Commission. All such employees shall take oath for the faithful discharge of their duties and shall be under the direction of the Commission in the performance thereof.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall meet at such times and places as it may prescribe, shall keep a full written record of all its hearings and proceedings which shall be open to public inspection, and shall have power to establish its rules of procedure.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall receive claims for a period of 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, and not thereafter. The jurisdiction of the Commission over claims presented to it as provided in section 2 of this act shall be exclusive; but nothing in this act shall prevent any person who does not elect to present his claim to the Commission from pursuing any other remedy available to him. The Attorney General or his assistants shall represent the United States in all claims presented to the Commission.

SEC. 7. Any member of the Commission or any employee of the Commission, designated in writing for the purpose by the chairman, may administer oaths and examine witnesses. Any member of the Commission may require by subpena (1) the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of all necessary books, papers, documents, correspondence, and other evidence, from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing; or (2) the taking of depositions before any designated individual competent to administer oaths under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory. In the case of a deposition, the testimony shall be reduced to writing by the individual taking the deposition or under his direction and shall be subscribed by the deponent. In taking oral testimony, opportunity shall be given for cross-examination, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe. Witnesses subpenaed to testify or whose depositions are taken pursuant to this act, and the officers or persons taking the same, shall severally be entitled to the same fees and mileage as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

SEC. 8. The final determination of the Commission shall be in writing, shall be filed with its clerk, and shall include (1) its findings of the facts upon which its conclusions are based; (2) a statement (a) whether there are any just grounds for relief of the claimant and, if so, the amount thereof; (b) whether there are any allowable offsets, counterclaims, or other deductions, and, if so, the amount thereof; and (3) a statement of its reasons for its findings and conclusions.

SEC. 9. (a) When the final determination of the Commission has been filed with the clerk of said Commission the clerk shall give notice of the filing of such determination to the parties to the proceeding in manner and form as directed by the Commission. Such determination shall be subject to review in the same manner as is provided for cases in the Court of Claims upon application to the Supreme Court within 3 months from the date of the filing of such determination with the clerk.

SEC. 10. In each claim, after the proceedings have been finally concluded, the Commission shall promptly submit its report to Congress.

The report to Congress shall contain (1) the final determination of the Commission; (2) a transcript of the proceedings or judgment upon review, if any, with the instructions of the Supreme Court; and (3) a statement of how each Commissioner voted upon the final determination of the claim.

SEC. 11. (a) When the report of the Commission determining any claimant to be entitled to recover has been filed with Congress, such report shall have the effect of, and be paid in the same manner as is provided for, a final judgment of the Court of Claims.

The payment of any claim, after its determination in accordance with this act, shall be a full discharge of the United States of all claims and demands touching any of the matters involved in the controversy.

(b) A final determination against a claimant made and reported in accordance with this act shall forever bar any further claim or demand against the United States arising out of the matter involved in the controversy.

SEC. 12. The Commission shall determine all claims presented to it as expeditiously as possible, and shall make a report to Congress of its progress not later than the fifteenth of April of each year until its dissolution.

SEC. 13. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of 2 years after the first meeting of the Commission or at such earlier time after the expiration of the 6 months' period of limitation set forth in section 6 hereof as the Commission shall have made its final report to Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALTER. No; I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to demand the second.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin for 20 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a few minutes to explain this bill which is a very simple one. During the war some 103 trucking companies operating in the Midwest, principally west and south of Chicago, found themselves in difficulty because of strikes. Finding that the strikes could not be settled the Government issued an order taking over the truck lines. Due notice of that seizure was posted and the ODT sent their representatives to St. Paul and thereafter proceeded to operate the 103 lines.

The first thing done by the manager in behalf of the Government was to insist that the trucking companies pay the wages which had been in dispute and which had not been settled between the operators and the truck drivers. Thereafter, the representatives of the Government continued to manage and operate these truck lines and exercise control over them, differing in degree naturally, in the various lines.

It is the claim of the operators of the truck lines which were taken over by the Government that they were damaged by this action, by the seizure of their property, and they make demand on the Government under the due-process clause of the Constitution for the payment of damages.

This bill would simply set up a commission of three members to be appointed by the President to hear and determine the claim of the operators of these truck lines.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. Does not the bill carry a House committee amendment reading "to determine such claims, if any there be"?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I may say to the gentleman that some amendments were suggested in the House committee including the one to which the gentleman refers.

The present motion is to pass the bill as it passed the Senate. I would have no objection to the amendment. My only thought in making the motion as I did was to pass a bill which had passed the Senate and avoid the necessity of going to conference. I believe the amendments that were made by the House committee would not substantially affect the bill one way or the other. I would be perfectly agreeable if they could be accepted by the Senate but I fear that if we go to conference the bill will not be passed.

This bill has been the subject of extended hearings in the Senate, and hearings were held by the House committee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I judge then the gentleman's objection to any amendment is in order to facilitate passage?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct. I am moving that the bill be passed by the House as it was passed in the Senate to avoid the necessity of a conference. As I said before, I personally would have no objection to the House amendments.

Bear in mind that these truck operators will be required to submit their claims to this Commission within 6 months after the law becomes effective, that no person will be entitled to recover a dime unless he proves he was damaged and unless he proves he was damaged in accordance with the rules and decisions made many times under the due-process clause.

I think this is a very just bill and a very simple and easy way to get these claims adjudicated.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, the procedure set up in this bill is a substitute for procedure in the Court of Claims, which is cumbersome and the only remedy available to these people right now.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. The effect of this bill is to substitute the Commission for a hearing of the case by the Court of Claims.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct. It is in the interest of economy both for the claimants and for the Government. It follows a policy that was adopted by this Congress and has been used on many occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Members of the House can agree that during the

last few days we have been going at a merry clip. I suppose if somebody at some time could devise a means of eliminating the last week of a congressional session or any legislative session, the country would erect a statue to him, and it really should.

I do not criticize the leadership here for the necessity of bringing a lot of these bills up with very little time for consideration. I realize the situation with which they are faced.

But here, Mr. Speaker, is a bill that we should not, if we are going to act in good conscience, consider in this manner. What we are doing in effect is passing an appropriation bill involving at least eight or nine million dollars and the possibility of an amount even in excess of that, with no check on the facts, simply on the basis of turning over to a commission of three men this matter and saying: "You decide what these people are to get, you give it to them by certifying it to the Congress, and the Congress will have no further check."

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Of course the Government can appeal any decision just like in the Court of Claims.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Government may appeal, that is true; but as far as this Congress is concerned, what it is doing is passing a claims bill in an amount of over eight or nine million dollars. We are doing it here in a hurry without a full discussion of the contentions and the facts in the case.

What does the bill do? I am somewhat in doubt as to what the committee actually desires in view of the fact that the committee some time ago reported a Senate bill with amendments. Now, today, in order to hurry it up and get it through and spend this money, they are saying, "Well, we are going to forget about the precautions that the committee wanted to put in this legislation, we are going to take it from the Senate just as it came to us even though when we were thinking a little slower and probably using better judgment we wanted to have amendments on the bill, we wanted to make some corrections in it."

That is the evidence, Mr. Speaker, of how fast we are trying to move. The bill provides for three commissioners at a salary of $15,000 a year each, and the bill says they shall complete their functions within the next 2 years. In other words, that will be their term of office. But you and I know if they have not determined all of the issues involved in that time, it is going be another 2 or 3 years that these commissioners will continue in their jobs, and draw their salaries, with their staff, plus their expenses.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Is there any indication here that these claimants cannot have recourse to the courts of the United States?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The evidence is that the Court of Claims has ample jurisdiction, has complete jurisdiction over this matter. The proponents of the legislation were not willing to have an ordinary bill which would confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims passed, because they admit—at least some of them do to whom I have talked—that the Court of Claims has jurisdiction. That is not an issue at all as far as being a reason why a commission has to be formed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my position that that certainly is the way this should be handled. We have a court already set up to handle just such cases as this. But here we come in and bypass that court and say that we are going to create some jobs and spend more money. Why? I think the primary reason is the feeling that probably the commissioners will be a little more lenient in the rule of damage that might apply or the amount of proof required.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Will the gentleman inform the House who are the beneficiaries of this legislation?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. There are some 103 carriers, I believe it is, who, during the war, refused to comply with a directive of the War Labor Board increasing the wages of employees. In order to avert a strike the Government took over some of these carriers. There is a question of law even now as to whether the Government did come in and operate and take over all the carriers who are now making claim. I believe it is connected in the case of at least eight of them that they were taken over and operated, but may I also call the attention of the House to the fact that because the Government operated a business and that business did not make money is, in my judgment, no reason for a substantial claim against the Government in that regard. I remember sitting on the War Claims Committee when an order of the Government closed up some gold mines out West by virtue of which severe damage was done. But those people did not have a special commission set up to assess their damages. I believe that those who have a just claim are entitled to be recompensed, and I am not arguing against that at all. But they should go to the duly established courts of this country which we authorized them to do, and there prove their claims and prove their damages and obtain their awards.

I do not believe in the advisability, particularly at this time in the rush of adjournment, of pushing through and ramming through a bill involving as much money as this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that during World War I it was necessary for the Government to seize the railroads of this country and to operate them during the entire course of the war. Immediately after the war the Congress set up a Claims Commission to hear the claims of those railroads against the Government. During World War II it was necessary for the Government to seize another segment of the great transportation system of the country; 103 over-the-road truck lines principally situated in the upper Mississippi Valley. They serve an area covering 15 States, and in most instances are the only means of transportation from town to town, especially the smaller towns. Those truck lines were seized in August 1944, under exactly the same statute that the railroads were seized during World War I.

Now, the Constitution of the United States is clear that this Government of ours cannot seize private property without providing just compensation, and that is what this bill seeks to do. It seeks to set up a Claims Commission so that that Commission may determine if any of these carriers are entitled to compensation and, if so, how much compensation.

I think I know of the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] in this controversy. The fact of the matter is that there are some truck lines in the United States which the Government did not seize. As you all know, the trucking business in the United States is a young, growing, vigorous business and very competitive. I dare say that there are some truck lines in the State of Wisconsin that were not seized during the war. From that you may well conclude what the interest of the Members of the House who object to this bill really is.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVITT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Of course, the gentleman knows that extensive hearings were held on this bill in the Senate and before the House committee. Does the gentleman know whether or not the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] appeared before those committees and made known his views at that time?

Mr. DEVITT. The gentleman from Wisconsin did not appear before any of those committees. This bill passed the Senate unanimously after extensive hearings. It was unanimously reported out by the House Committee on the Judiciary. It is a fair, just, and reasonable measure.

As I understood the arguments of the gentleman from Wisconsin, they were two in number. No. 1, he said this bill makes a huge appropriation of some $8,000,000. The fact of the matter is, it does not do any such thing. If he and all of us will read the bill on page 5, section 11, we will find that the payment of these claims, if any are adjudicated by the Claims Commission, is handled in exactly the same way as claims from the Court of Claims.

The No. 2 objection he made to the bill is, why do not these 103 motor carriers go to the United States Court of Claims? I will be very happy to answer that question for the gentleman. Three years ago three of these motor carriers decided to try their cases in the Court of Claims. So they started a lawsuit in the Court of Claims, and that lawsuit has not been

decided even today. The hearing examiner has just finished taking testimony. A motion was made in the course of the hearings on one of these claims asking the court if they would not consolidate all pending cases so that they could all be heard together. The court denied that motion. So the object of setting up this commission is to avoid a multiplicity of suits.

Is it going to be necessary for these loyal Americans who had their trucking lines taken from them during the war to wait for 10, 12, or 15 years before they can have a determination in the United States Court of Claims, which is already overcrowded?

I will tell you another reason why the Court of Claims is an inadequate tribunal to hear these suits. It is because under the statute the Court of Claims has jurisdiction only over claims against the Government that sound in contract or implied contract. Many of the claims of these trucking companies are tort claims, accident claims, and the like.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. I think most of us agree that we have been concerned in these years following the war with taking care of many claims under the Contract Settlement Act, among other things, where patriotic citizens came to the fore when an appeal was made to them. I think we should not neglect these honest, patriotic truck owners. The action of the Government in taking over these truck lines was a very precipitous proposition. They had a labor dispute in this 15-State area, and the President of the United States issued an order to the Office of Defense Transportation in which he ordered them to take over these truck lines. A Federal manager was appointed. He seized the truck lines. He operated them. He controlled their activities. He controlled their rate-making. He told them how much they had to pay their employees. These truck owners have legitimate claims against the Government as a result of that operation.

This resolution seeks to set up a commission to hear and determine these claims. It is not expedient to go to the Court of Claims. It seems to me it is a reasonable request of the Congress.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVITT. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us why a commission can review these cases and determine the damages any more expeditiously than the Court of Claims can do it, since the Court of Claims has said that each case is to be considered on its individual merits, its individual facts, which I believe is the contention of the proponents. Does not the Commission have to do the same thing?

Mr. DEVITT. No. 1 is that the docket of the Court of Claims is years behind. No. 2, that the procedure in the Court of Claims, if the gentleman is acquainted with it, is for hearing commissioners or examiners to go out all over the country and take testimony. They come in and present their findings. Those findings have to stand in line until the other business of the court is disposed of. The third reason is that the Court of Claims has no jurisdiction over tort matters.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman complains that there are certain phases of this matter that are not within the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims.

Mr. DEVITT. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yet the proponents of the legislation refuse to accept an amendment which would confer jurisdiction on the court over those phases which they do not have jurisdiction over.

Mr. DEVITT. That may be true. I have no knowledge of any amendments to the bill. I know that extensive hearings were had and that matter did not come up, although careful consideration was given.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the principal objection to this bill made by my distinguished young friend from Wisconsin is in the fact that a commission of three people is to be appointed. Let us for a moment examine the procedure in the Court of Claims. In the Court of Claims, in actions ex contractu, a hearing is fixed by a hearing examiner. He hears all of the facts. The hearing is in Washington or anywhere that witnesses are available so that they may testify. After he prepares the facts and the findings thereon, the record is submitted to the Court of Claims. Our Court of Claims has a docket which would take them 3 years to become current, even if no additional cases were added to it. In order for these people to stay in business, it is necessary that they get relief more quickly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder, then, if it would not be more advisable for the Committee on the Judiciary to recommend the creation of another branch of the Court of Claims to clear off not only the truck cases but the other cases that you are complaining about which are pending.

Mr. WALTER. May I say to the gentleman that the Committee on the Judiciary has reported many bills for the establishment of new judgeships throughout the Unted States, and for some reason or another, probably because this is 1948, favorable action has not been taken on those bills.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The fact is that Congress adopted this policy years ago, and we can not make over the Court of Claims just to suit somebody's whim.

Mr. WALTER. Of course not.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. We provide in the bill that the Attorney General is authorized to hear these claims which cannot be heard in other places, is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. That is entirely correct. It seems to me in the long run, the Government is going to save money because after all you must bear in mind the fact that whatever claim is paid is going to be paid with interest, and if claimants must wait for years, which I am sure will elapse before the claims are finally disposed of, we are going to pay a very large sum of money in interest.

Now, there is one thing you must bear in mind: There is no intention on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a finding of liability. The question of whether or not the United States is liable in each of these cases is a question of law and of fact, but there is no finding. Therefore, this cannot possibly be construed as a large claims bill, because there must first be a finding that there was a tort, an illegal taking, and after that fact has been determined, then there is the question of whether or not the taking resulted in damage.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have had a great deal of experience in condemnation cases of lands for reservoirs, dams, and so forth. Is there any difference in principle in what you propose than you have in the ordinary court, where the land owner is entitled to a speedy trial and a quick determination of the issues, and interest on the judgment?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, no. It is a well-known method of disposing of matters of this sort, and I think that in simple justice we should approve the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I do this merely to get an official declaration from the gentleman who is now presenting the bill that there is no intention on the part of the Judiciary Committee of the House to admit an illegal taking in any case.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question that the bill contains no legislative finding. It is my own judgment, after hearing the testimony, that what was done by the Government amounted to a taking. However, I see nothing in the bill that passed the Senate which would foreclose adjudication of that question by the commissioners and by the courts.

Mr. HOBBS. And nothing that would foreclose the necessity of proving an illegal taking on the part of the Government.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. In my judgment, the gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to say that I am not opposed to this bill. However, I feel it is my duty to say a word or two about the amendments which were adopted by the

subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which heard this bill, and which will not be in the bill if the motion which has been made by the gentleman from Iowa is finally agreed to. It was felt by some of the members of this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that the language of the Senate bill might amount to a legislative finding of a taking. I want the RECORD to unmistakably show that it was the unanimous desire of the subcommittee that heard this bill that there be no legislative finding that there was a taking, either legal or illegal. The claims might finally result, notwithstanding what has been said before, even if the taking were legal, because the alleged taking was under the war powers, and of course that taking could be legal.

In the Senate bill, after the word "taking," the committee has written into the bill the phrase "if any."

I repeat, I wish the record to unmistakably show that there has been no legislative finding that there was a "taking," either legal or illegal by the Government.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Under the bill as it is now before us, however, which is the bill as it came from the Senate, there is some question as to whether there has been such a legislative finding, in view of the fact that the amendment that the committee wanted to put in is not presently in the bill.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes; there was some question in the mind of the subcommittee, but I am pleased to note that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] has said that the sponsors of the bill do not consider the language to be a legislative finding that there was a taking, either legal or illegal.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full 5 minutes, but I think the best argument against the adoption of this bill that has come to us from the Senate came from someone who said he did not oppose this bill at all—from a member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], who pointed out to you that after the House Committee on the Judiciary had held its deliberations on this bill, a majority recommended some amendments that you are not given a chance to vote on here on the floor of the House today. In their haste to get this thing through, the deliberations of the House Judiciary Committee are being disregarded. I have not heard anything said by the three gentlemen who spoke in favor of this bill here in this late evening that dissuades me from the opinion that the creation of this commission for the settling of these claims is utterly wrong in principle. Here we have a great variety of circumstances among a large number of trucking companies who have a variety of claims to present, and the only argument I have heard is this: Now we have got all these claims; the way to settle them is by a commission, so we will get it done quickly.

Every one of these cases is not going to have to be pursued in the courts. Under the usual procedure, the claimants set out to establish one or two claims, then usually the rest can be quickly disposed of.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. I wonder if the gentleman was in the Chamber when I made the statement that this procedure is exactly the same procedure that was used following World War I in the case of the railroads.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I was here and heard the gentleman make that statement. Even if that were true you cannot make one right by the duplication of a wrong; and here you have admitted that the men sent out to investigate this by the Court of Claims have now completed their work; they have filed their reports. Now you are asking this House hastily to set up a procedure that will call for a duplication of the same work.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No. The statement was that several trucking companies had begun suit and that there was a proceeding in a few cases. They have not concluded them.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But have there not been investigations completed and reports filed in some of those cases?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. No; the cases are still being tried.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota to say that some reports had been completed.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is correct.

I wish the gentleman to understand the situation. Each one of these would be a separate suit and several have been begun. Many months have elapsed, a great deal of testimony has been taken, and nothing has been concluded.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is it not true that each of these cases is going to have to be dealt with separately even if you do set up this high-salaried commission to hear those claims?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Very true, but the whole situation is this: That you require these people to litigate 103 cases in the Court of Claims that they must wait years for their cases to be reached on the docket, just exactly like the railroads would have had to wait, just like these Japanese claimants would have waited. So as a matter of simple justice and following a policy which was adopted years ago we have created a special commission which will have nothing to do but work on these claims until they get them disposed of, and not longer than a 2-year-limitation period.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does the chairman of the subcommittee approve of a policy where some of these cases have been partially heard and are now pending before the court, to now set up a separate administrative agency to do the same work in those cases over again?

Mr. GYWNNE of Iowa. No, no; the bill specifically provides that any claimant may come before this Commission or he may go before the Court of Claims and file his case there if he so desires.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. What is the attitude of the administrative agency which had this job to do during the war with respect to the setting up of this Commission? Is it not true that the ODT and the Department of Justice have opposed this proposition?

Mr. DEVITT. May I say to the gentleman that at the time the Government took over these truck lines it told the truckers they were going to be compensated. Now there are some technical objections on the part of the Department of Justice as to whether they were taken over. That is why it has been emphasized by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH]. This bill does not determine the question whether or not they have been taken over. That is something that lies within the province of this Commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin), there were—ayes 90, noes 28.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTS-IN-AID TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES IN PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE AND TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2861), as amended, to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman tell us something about this bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from New York that extensive hearings have been had not only by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, but also in the Senate. This is to provide hospitalization for those Filipino veterans who served in the Army of the United States during the war with Japan, those who were not only taken in by order of the President of the United States, but those guerrillas who later became a part of our armed forces under orders of the commander in chief, General MacArthur. At the present time in the three hospitals in the Philippines there are approximately 3,000 disabled Filipino veterans.

Mr. BUCK. What is the annual cost of the bill?

Mr. KEARNEY. The total cost of the bill is about $25,000,000 for the three hospitals.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman says the total cost is $25,000,000?

Mr. KEARNEY. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Why should we pay these costs for the Filipinos? They were fighting for their own independence. Why should we bear this burden?

Mr. KEARNEY. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that these veterans were duly enlisted in the Army of the United States. It is my humble opinion that we not only have a moral obligation but a legal responsibility to those veterans for the reason that they are in the same category as the veterans in our own hospitals in this country. They were soldiers of the United States armed forces, wearing our uniforms and fighting alongside our own men. They are the men of Bataan and Corregidor.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Were they a part of our own Army?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I may say that the former Governor General of the Philippines, also a former distinguished Member of this body, appeared before our committee and testified on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is correct and the gentleman gave our committee a true and complete picture of the situation at present existing in the Philippines with particular reference to the hospital Victoria Luna. We are grateful to him for the complete and true picture as it exists today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assist the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for veterans, as defined in section 2 of this act, who are in need of hospitalization for disabilities, determined by the Veterans' Administration under laws which it administers to be connected with the service described in such section, the President is authorized, subject to the provisions of this act, to furnish aid in the form of grants to the Republic of the Philippines (a) for the construction and equipping of hospitals in the Philippines to be used exclusively for such medical care and treatment and (b) for expenses incident to such medical care and treatment in either the hospitals so constructed and equipped or other hospitals in the Philippines.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of section 1 of this act, the term "veterans" means persons who served in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the Commander in Chief, Southwest Pacific Area, or other competent authority in the Army of the United States, and who were discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable.

SEC. 3. Any grant for the construction and equipping of a hospital may be made prior to or following its completion: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $22,500,000.

SEC. 4. Grants for expenses incident to hospitalization may be made for a period not to exceed 5 years to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for moneys expended for such hospitalization: *Provided*, That the total of such grants shall not exceed $3,285,000 for any fiscal year.

SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations and impose such conditions on the receipt of financial aid as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and he may delegate in whole or in part the authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or officers of the United States.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING LAND IN TENNESSEE TO THE CITY OF JOHNSON CITY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 7, page 3, and insert:

"SEC. 2. The tract of land authorized to be transferred by the first section of this act shall be used by the grantee for fair grounds and recreational purposes; and the deed of conveyance of such lands shall contain (1) the provision that all such property shall be used and maintained for the purposes for which it was conveyed for a period of not less than 20 years, and that in the event such property ceases to be used or maintained for such purposes during such period, or is alienated or an attempt is made to alienate such property during such period, all or any portion of such property shall in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and (2) such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States. The deed shall reserve to the United States the interests in fissionable material as provided in Executive Order 9908, dated December 5, 1947: *Provided*, That Johnson City shall pay 50 percent of appraised value of its property to be determined by the Veterans' Administration."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO PRESCRIBE RATES OF PAY FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT FIELD INSTALLATIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2794) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284), as amended (38 U. S. C. 693), is amended by adding at the end thereof a paragraph to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C. 661 and the following), or any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to prescribe the rates of pay for the following positions at Veterans' Administration installations in the field: (1) Hospital attendant, (2) dental mechanic, (3) orthopedic mechanic, and (4) positions classified in the crafts, protective, and custodial service pursuant to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That in no case shall the range of rates prescribed for the position be lower than the range of rates prescribed for the same position by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES NAVAL TRAINING STATION, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6958) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act, 1944, as amended, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to transfer to the Navy Department without exchange of funds all of the lands at the naval training station, Great Lakes, Ill., which the Navy Department now occupies under revocable permit from the Veterans' Administration, except the portion thereof which lies between the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad and Morrow Avenue, together with all improvements thereon; the specific area hereby authorized to be transferred comprising a parcel lying between the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad and Sheridan Road and a parcel lying north of Morrow Avenue.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING LANDS TO THE CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5734) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affais to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amend-

ment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not find myself in agreement with this measure, but under the conditions existing at the present time in regard to the confirmation of this Commission, I feel it is in the best interest of the country to adopt this measure at this time. When the Commissioners took over this project from the War Department in 1946 under the present Atomic Energy Act the primary objective was from a military standpoint. The Commission has met this obligation in its entirety. The recent tests at Eniwetok have proven that this weapon is more powerful and much cheaper than heretofore produced. The research work which has been carried on under the direction of the present Commission for the benefit of humanity is too numerous and much more extensive then I can explain to the Members of this body in the few minutes allotted to me. I have had the opportunity of visiting this operation which today is much larger than the United States Steel Corp. of America and feel that since the Commission has taken over this project that they have done an excellent job. By virtue of the imminent relationship between science and technology the problem is one of great importance to the national welfare. The future development of the physical and biological sciences will be, I hope, in the years to come for the benefit of mankind. In the meantime we must face the fact that we live in a world in which not much progress has yet been made toward achieving stable international relationship. This Commission which has been carrying on this project, in my opinion, carries a heavy responsibility to the American people and their appointments should be carried out under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. American scientists of which this Commission is composed have shown themselves to be conscientious and discreet in the case of the atomic bomb. I most emphatically say that it has been our good fortune thus far to have had such men to carry out the functions of this important operation. I maintain that the original act should be carried out in regard to these appointments to fulfill the objectives of the 1946 Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have the same feeling on this bill as expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. I have a further feeling that it is politically motivated, but I am constrained to go along for the same reason as outlined by my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, may I submit that those who support this bill owe the American people a straight answer to one question:

Have the members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission done a good job?

That is what matters here.

If these men have not done a good job, this House would be faithless to its trust if we voted to continue their tenure for 1 minute.

If these men have done a good job—have safeguarded the leadership in the development of this new force for man's benefit—if they have brought these things to pass, then they are not only fit to serve for the two additional years provided for in this bill, they are fit to serve the terms of variable length which the Congress in accordance with sound policy decreed should be installed in 1948. If these men have done a good job, vote down this bill, so that the wise provisions on tenure of Commissioners in the original Atomic Energy Act may apply.

I say Messrs. Lilienthal, Pike, Strauss, Waymack, and Bacher have done a good job, Mr. Speaker.

I say this out of personal knowledge gained through work as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Armed Services Committee of this House.

Let me enumerate some of the accomplishments recorded by this group of able and devoted men in the 17 months since they assumed charge of this Nation's atomic-energy program.

When they took over the project the most important element in it—the technicians and scientists whose work makes production and new discovery of principles possible—was in disrepair. Men were leaving this service; those remaining were confused and uncertain. On the testimony of the scientists themselves, oft-repeated in recent months, these Commissioners have remedied these conditions. Morale is good and growing better. The technical staff is coming up to strength.

They have set in motion a whole series of programs designed to train more technical men and more skillful technical men for future research and production work.

They have nurtured a current research program which is yielding new knowledge of great importance such as the recent first artificial production of mesons in the large cyclotron at the Radiation Laboratory in Berkeley. They have maintained and enhanced the security of physical facilities and of technical information and have disseminated unrestricted technical information to advance science and industry, as directed in the Atomic Energy Act.

They have guided an unremitting—and successful—drive to step up output of fissionable material. As a matter of fact, in furtherance of this operation there is now under way at Hanford in the State of Washington one of the largest peacetime construction programs ever undertaken by this Nation.

With complete fidelity to their charge to hold paramount the common defense and security, they have provided the means and the encouragement which have resulted in the signal advances in atomic weapons development proved out at the recent tests at Eniwetok Atoll. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I was present at one stage of these tests. In addition I have received from the Commission in executive session of the joint committee, a detailed account of the test result. I know whereof I speak.

Mr. Speaker, in this sphere of weapons development and cooperations with the military services, there are a few additional comments to be made. I have an especial interest here because of my membership on two of the committees most intimately concerned and because of my own experience in the armed forces in the last world war.

This interest of mine has led me to observe these phases of atomic energy operations very closely. I can state categorically that all the evidence is that the Commission and the military services have worked closely together with satisfactory results.

It will be recalled that section 2 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act establishes a Military Liaison Committee and provides that the Commission shall keep this committee fully informed of all matters regarding atomic energy and that the committee shall have authority to take an appeal to the Secretaries of War and Navy and finally to the President if at any time it concludes that any proposed action or failure to act on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission is "adverse to the responsibilities" of the armed services. Let me emphasize that the relationship between the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services have been so amicable and satisfactory that not a single appeal to the President has been necessary under this provision of the act.

The attitude of the armed services is well represented by the statement of Secretary of the Army Royall when he was asked to comment on the bill introduced by Senator WHERRY to turn the atomic energy program back to the military. In this connection, it should also be noted that there have been several bills introduced from time to time to accomplish this result and that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has never seen fit to take any action on them.

My observations at Eniwetok of the field working relationships between the civilian scientists of the Commission and the men of the three services combined into Joint Task Force 7 for the conduct of the weapons tests provided the final proof that there is complete cooperation—and most fruitful cooperation—between the Commission and the military. This was evidenced further by the statements of General Hull, Captain Russell, and Dr. Froman issued at Honolulu May 18. Note the words of these men:

Lt. Gen. John E. Hull, commander, Joint Task Force 7:

It is a tribute to the scientists who were members of the task force that the operation was successful. * * * All of us have been equally impressed with the scientific competence, the technical skill, and the sound judgment of the civilian scientists and technicians assembled for these tests. Our close association has been valuable in many respects and paves the way for continuing and increasing cooperative effort to insure the common defense and security of the people of the United States.

Capt. James S. Russell, United States Navy, test director, Joint Task Force 7:

The support given to the AEC group was complete and without the assistance of military personnel in the technical phases of the operations the test program could not have been carried out.

Dr. Darol K. Froman, scientific director, Joint Task Force 7:

The spirit of cooperation which existed between the military and civilian personnel resulted in the smoothest possible operation. Throughout the whole operation there has not been a single incident which impeded any test or measurement.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nation stand in the debt of the men comprising the Commission whose leadership has provided such striking results in so many new and strange phases of endeavor. They deserve from this Republic a better reward than is here vouchsafed in this politically motivated bill. The Nation deserves of us much better than the disservice that we would render by enacting this bill which will impede progress in atomic-energy development. Let us rise above partisan considerations; let us take the course of true service to America and speed the progress of this important work by rejecting this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee. The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office prior to June 30, 1950, shall expire at midnight on June 30, 1950. The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office after June 30, 1950, shall be 5 years, except that (A) the terms of office of the members first taking office after June 30, 1950, shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 5 years, after June 30, 1950; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy, occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each member, except the chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 679 was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF FREE PASSES TO TIME INSPECTORS OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2192) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (7) of section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "its officers, surgeons, physicians, and attorneys at law," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "its officers, time inspectors, surgeons, physicians, and attorneys at law."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAINING OF FILIPINOS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely perfects the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 with respect to the training of selected Filipinos—some in public health, some in engineering and highway construction, some in fisheries, coastal survey, and in other fields. The original bill authorized the training of a designated number of Filipinos ranging from 10 to 100 in each of these fields. Most of them were to be brought to this country and trained before July 1, 1948. It proved impossible to do it in so short a time. Therefore, this bill extends the time under which it can be done to July 1, 1950. It does not increase the authorization of appropriations in the original act. It allows us to spread the training over a longer period instead of being so hurried and concentrated as to prevent a good job.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. JUDD. There is no appropriation at all in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. JUDD. That was authorized under title III of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. I would have to look up the hearings to get the exact amount in each category, but this does not increase them.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The Philippine Rehabilitation appropriation was in the bill which makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, from the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. I assure the gentleman there is no increase in the appropriation. I cannot tell him the entire amount now because I do not have the information before me, but it does not change the situation as far as money is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman has no idea of what the cost is?

Mr. STEFAN. The money has already been appropriated.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I know; but what is the amount?

Mr. STEFAN. The cost has already been included in the funds that have been appropriated by the House and the Senate for the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the gentleman does not know the amount?

Mr. STEFAN. I cannot tell the gentleman what the amount is. It just increases the number of students that are coming and going.

Mr. JUDD. May I say to the gentleman it does not increase the number; it extends the date from July 1, 1948, to July 1, 1950, so a smaller number can be trained each year, approximately 25 a year for 4 years, instead of 50 a year for 2 years. That is the essence of it. It does not increase the total number by a single person.

Mr. STEFAN. And not a cent of money more is required than has already been appropriated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows: "The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public-health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and supplementary field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and administration, through field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos, to be so designated."

SEC. 2. Section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended by adding thereto a subsection numbered (f) and reading as follows:

"(f) Any Filipino who has commenced training or instruction prior to June 30, 1950, as provided in this act, shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, be entitled, insofar as facilities are available, to receive the full course of training or instruction as prescribed by the head of the bureau or agency concerned, and funds appropriated under the authority of this act shall be available for such training or instruction. The number of trainees to be trained each year, as prescribed by the several sections of this act, refers to the number of trainees who may be designated each year by the President of the Philippines and not to the total number of trainees receiving training or instruction in any 1 year."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause on page 1 and on page 2 through line 11 and insert the following:

"That section 302 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to provide training for not to exceed 10 Filipino engineers, to be designated by the President of the Philippines from the regularly employed staff of the Philippine Public Works Department and the engineer officers of the armed forces of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in the construction, maintenance, and highway traffic engineering and control necessary for the continued maintenance and for the efficient and safe operation of highway transport facilities.'

"SEC. 2. Section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) To accomplish such purposes the Public Health Service shall at the earliest practicable time survey the health situation in the Philippines, and is authorized to replace, expand, or install such health services and facilities in the Philippines as are deemed essential to preservation of health, and may assist in the rehabilitation and development of a Philippine quarantine service for prevention of introduction of disease from abroad or from one island to another. The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and supplementary field work and observation of public health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and adminstration, through field work and observation of public health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos, to be so designated. It may replace equipment and supply reasonably necessary additional equipment, utilizing for this purpose, so far as possible, surplus property, and may recommend to the Commission the repair or construction under the provisions of section 304, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, of buildings deemed essential to the rehabilitation of public health and quarantine functions.'

"SEC. 3. Section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTE INDIANS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2743) providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians or any tribe or band thereof may have against the United States, and for other purposes, approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), as amended July 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 593), June 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 160), June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 255), and August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), is hereby amended by adding to section 3 thereof the following: "The court shall, upon a determination of the material issues or upon consent of the parties, enter a separate final judgment for any value of the surface and a subsequent separate final judgment for any value of the subsurface of the land which the court may determine to be the subject matter of case No. 45585 in the United States Court of Claims entitled "Confederated Bands of Ute Indians versus United States of America." Each of the judgments shall be subject to review in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 13, 1929 (ch. 229, 43 Stat. 939), as amended by the act approved May 22, 1939 (ch. 140, 53 Stat. 752; 28 U. S. C. 288). Any value subsequently allowed by the court for the subsurface, when added to any value previously allowed by the court for the surface, shall not exceed the court's determination of the value, if any, of the land, surface, and subsurface, valued as a whole. The parties may compromise or settle in whole or part claims for any of the surface or subsurface values involved, and any settlement or compromise shall be reduced to a separate judgment. The services rendered by the attorney or attorneys in obtaining any judgment shall constitute a separate employment and undertaking involving a single set of services and the court shall award separate compensation for the services rendered in obtaining each separate judgment. Nothing in this act shall be construed to reduce or increase fees payable to counsel in accordance with their duly approved and executed contracts or to preclude their continued representation in any case until paid; nor, with respect to any judgment hereunder, shall this amendment impair or limit any claim, right, defense, or offset otherwise applicable."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPORTED FERMENTED LIQUORS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6162) to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor, with a Senate amendment, thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out "also be subject to the war excise tax prescribed in section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code" and insert "during the continuance of the war-tax rate on fermented malt liquors prescribed in section 1650, be subject to tax at such rate in lieu of the rate hereinbefore prescribed."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6800) to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide a permit and bond system for users of nonbeverage alcohol. It does not make any change in the net rate of tax paid by these users of nonbeverage alcohol upon withdrawal. It has the unanimous support of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3108 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended—

(a) By amending the heading thereof to read as follows: "Withdrawal of Alcohol Tax-free or at Reduced Rate."

(b) By relettering subsection (d) as "(e)" and by inserting after "tax-free" in such subsection the following: "or as provided in subsection (d)."

(c) By relettering subsection (e) as "(f)."

(d) By inserting in said section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) For use in production of medicines or medicinal preparations for internal use, food products, flavors, and flavoring extracts: Alcohol may be withdrawn, under regulations and upon payment of tax at the rate of $3 per proof gallon, from any industrial plant or bonded warehouse for the manufacture or production of medicines or medicinal preparations, intended for internal use, food products, flavors, or flavoring extracts, which are unfit and not intended for intoxicating beverage purposes."

SEC. 2. That section 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(m) Same: Withdrawal under permit: Any person withdrawing alcohol under the provisions of section 3108 (d) shall pay special tax as follows: $25 for such withdrawals not exceeding 25 proof gallons a year, $50 for such withdrawals not exceeding 50 proof gallons a year, and $100 for such withdrawals exceeding 50 proof gallons a year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LEON NIKOLAIVICH VOLKOV

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 703) for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to suspend the deportation of Leon Likolaivich Volkov for a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA SCHWARTZ AND BESSIE SCHWARTZ

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5716) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz, who arrived at the port of New York on May 9, 1947, and that they shall, for all purposes under the immigration laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as immigrants for permanent residence, upon the payment of the visa fee and head tax. The Secretary of State is authorized to instruct the proper control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year in which such quota is available."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 77 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6657, to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (b) and (f) of section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 11, sec. 205 (b)), be, and are hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(b) A plan of reorganization within the meaning of this section (1) shall include provisions modifying or altering the rights of creditors generally, or of any class of them, secured or unsecured, either through the issuance of new securities of any character or otherwise; (2) may include provisions modifying or altering the rights of stockholders generally, or of any class of them, either through the issuance of new securities of any character, or otherwise; (3) may include, for the purpose of preserving such interests of creditors and stockholders as are not otherwise provided for, provisions for the issuance to any such creditor or stockholder of options or warrants to receive, or to subscribe for, securities of the reorganized company in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as may be set forth in the plan; (4) shall provide for fixed charges (including fixed interest on funded debt, interest on unfunded debt, amortization of discount on funded debt, and rent for leased railroads) in such an amount that, after due consideration of the probable prospective earnings of the property in light of its earnings experience and all other relevant facts, there shall be adequate coverage of such fixed charges by the probable earnings available for the payment thereof; (5) shall provide adequate means for the execution of the plan, which may include the transfer of any interest in or control of all or any part of the property of the debtor to another corporation or corporations, the merger or consolidation of the debtor with another corporation or corporations, the retention of all or any part of the property by the debtor, the sale of all or any part of the property of the debtor either subject to or free from any lien at not less than a fair upset price, the distribution of all or any assets, or the proceeds derived from the sale thereof, among those having an interest therein, the satisfaction or modification of any liens, indentures, or other similar interests, the curing or waiver of defaults, the extension of maturity dates of outstanding securities, the reduction in principal and/or rate of interest and alteration of other terms of such securities, the amendment of the charter of the debtor, and/or the issuance of securities of either the debtor or any such other corporation or corporations for cash, or in exchange for existing securities, or in satisfaction of claims or rights or for other appropriate purposes; and may deal with all or any part of the property of the debtor; may reject contracts of the debtor which are executory in whole or in part, including unexpired leases; and may include any other appropriate provisions not inconsistent with this section.

"The adoption of an executory contract or unexpired lease by the trustee or trustees of a debtor shall not preclude a rejection of such contract or lease in a plan of reorganization approved hereunder, and any claim resulting from such rejection shall not have priority over any other claims against the debtor because such contract or lease had been previously adopted. The term 'securities' shall include evidences of indebtedness either secured or unsecured, bonds, stock, certificates of beneficial interest therein, certificates of beneficial interest in property, options, and warrants to receive, or to subscribe for, securities. The term 'stockholders' shall include the holders of voting-trust certificates. The term 'creditors' shall include, for all purposes of this section, all holders of claims of whatever character against the debtor or its property, whether or not such claims would otherwise constitute provable claims under this act, including the holder of a claim under a contract executory in whole or in part including an unexpired lease.

"The term 'claims' includes debts, whether liquidated or unliquidated, securities (other than stock and option warrants to subscribe to stock), liens, or other interests of whatever character. For all purposes of this section unsecured claims, which would have been entitled to priority if a receiver in equity of the property of the debtor had been appointed by a Federal court on the day of the approval of the petition, shall be entitled to such priority and the holders of such claims shall be treated as a separate class or classes of creditors. In case an executory contract or unexpired lease of property shall be rejected, or shall not have been adopted by a trustee appointed under this section, or shall have been rejected by a receiver in equity in a proceeding pending prior to the institution of a proceeding under this section, or shall be rejected by any plan, any person injured by such nonadoption or rejection shall for all purposes of this section be deemed to be a creditor of the debtor to the extent of the actual damage or injury determined in accordance with principles obtaining in equity proceedings. The provisions of section 60 of this Act shall apply to a proceeding under this section. For all purposes of this section any creditor or stockholder may act in person or by an attorney at law or by a duly authorized agent or committee subject to the provisions of subsection (p) hereof. The running of all statutes of limitation shall be suspended during the pendency of a proceeding under this section: *Provided, however*, That such plan of reorganization shall not affect the existing authority of any State or State regulatory agency relating to service, operations or rates. This proviso shall not be construed as restricting any of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act."

"(f) Upon confirmation by the judge, the provisions of the plan and of the order of confirmation shall, subject to the right of judicial review, be binding upon the debtor, all stockholders thereof, including those who have not, as well as those who have, accepted it, and all creditors secured or unsecured, whether or not adversely affected by the plan, and whether or not their claims shall have been filed, and, if filed, whether or not approved, including creditors who have not, as well as those who have, accepted it. Upon confirmation of the plan, the debtor and any other corporation or corporations organized or to be organized for the purpose of carrying out the plan, shall have full power and authority to, and shall put into effect and carry out the plan and the orders of the judge relative thereto, under and subject to the supervision and the control of the judge, the laws of any State or the decision or order of any State authority to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided, however*, That such plan of reorganization shall not affect the existing authority of any State or State regulatory agency relating to service, operations or rates. This proviso shall not be construed as restricting any of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act. The property dealt with by the plan, when transferred and conveyed to the debtor or to the

other corporation or corporations provided for by the plan, or when retained by the debtor pursuant to the plan, shall be free and clear of all claims of the debtor, its stockholders and creditors, and the debtor shall be discharged from its debts and liabilities, except such as may consistently with the provisions of the plan be reserved in the order confirming the plan or directing such transfer and conveyance or retention, and the judge may require the trustee or trustees appointed hereunder, the debtor, any mortgagee, the trustee of any obligation of the debtor, and all other proper and necessary parties, to make any such transfer or conveyance, and may require the debtor to join in any such transfer or conveyance made by the trustee or trustees. Upon the termination of the proceedings a final decree shall be entered discharging the trustee or trustees, and making such provisions as may be equitable, by way of injunction or otherwise, and closing the case. Upon confirmation of a plan the Commission shall, without further proceedings, grant authority for the issue of any securities, assumption of obligations, transfer of any property, sale, consolidation or merger of the debtor's property, or pooling of traffic, to the extent contemplated by the plan and not inconsistent with the provisions and purposes of the Interstate Commerce Act as now or hereafter amended. The provisions of title I and of section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to the issuance, sale, or exchange of any of the following securities, which securities and transactions therein shall, for the purposes of said Securities Act, be treated as if they were specifically mentioned in sections 3 and 4 of the said Securities Act, respectively: (1) All securities issued pursuant to any plan of reorganization confirmed by the judge in accordance with the provisions of this section; (2) all securities issued pursuant to such plan for the purpose of raising money for working capital and other purposes of such plan; (3) all securities issued by the debtor or by the trustee or trustees pursuant to subdivision (c), clause (3) of this section; (4) all certificates of deposit representing securities of, or claims against, the debtor, with the exception of such certificates of deposit as are issued by committees not subject to subsection (p) hereof. The provisions of subdivision (a) of section (14) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 shall not be applicable with respect to any action or matter which is within the provisions of subsection (p) hereof."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF $50 EACH TO MEMBERS OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5355) authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States arising from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, according to the provisions of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 137), to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to make therefrom a per capita payment or distribution of $50 to each of the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of the State of Minnesota, living at the date of the passage of this act, immediately payable upon the passage of this act, under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That the money paid to the Indians as authorized herein shall not be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other parties: *Provided further*, That before any payment is made hereunder, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify the provisions of this act and accept same.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF LAWS RELATING TO NAVIGATION

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2186) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes", approved May 28, 1908, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 104), is amended (1) by striking out the words "yachts belonging to any regularly organized yacht club of the United States", and inserting in lieu thereof "yachts used and employed exclusively as pleasure vessels and belonging to any resident of the United States", and (2) by striking out the words "belonging to any regularly organized yacht club thereof", and inserting in lieu thereof "used and employed exclusively as pleasure vessels."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2621) authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to the extent and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., the provisions of the act of May 27, 1930 (ch. 340, 46 Stat. 391; 18 U. S. C. 744a–h); the act of June 23, 1934 (ch. 736, 48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744i–n); and Executive Order 6917 dated December 11, 1934, shall apply to the industrial employment and training of prisoners convicted by general courts martial and confined in any institution under the jurisdiction of any department or agency comprising the National Military Establishment.

SEC. 2. Transfer by any department or agency comprising the National Military Establishment to Federal Prison Industries, Inc., without exchange of funds is authorized of any property or equipment suitable for use in carrying out the functions and performing the duties covered by any agreement entered into under section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. In addition to the members of the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., authorized by section 2 of the act of June 23, 1934 (ch. 736, 48 Stat. 1211; 18 U. S. C. 744j), the President shall appoint an additional member of the Board as a representative of the Secretary of Defense. Such additional member shall serve at the will of the President and without compensation.

SEC. 4. For its own use in the industrial employment and training of prisoners and not for transfer or disposition, transfers of surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 may be made to Federal Prison Industries, Inc., without reimbursement or transfer of funds.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING INTEREST OF FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT IN IDAHO

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5416) entitled "An act to promote the interest of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That those provisions of the order of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 6, 1948, which are based on certain recommendations contained in the Report on Conditions Found to Exist on the Fort Hall Irrigation Project and the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho, dated February 26, 1941, and which are described in the said order as made pursuant to the authority contained in the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), are hereby approved pursuant to the provisions of such Act.

"SEC. 2. During such periods as water for the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project may be available in excess of the present duty

of three acre-feet per acre per annum, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the delivery of such excess water equally to the project lands in an amount not to exceed five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum, in addition to the present duty of three acre-feet per acre per annum: *Provided, however,* That any surplus water temporarily available in addition to the three and five-tenths acre-feet per acre per annum may be furnished for use on project lands on terms, conditions, and rates to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. The Little Indian Unit containing one thousand one hundred eighty-six and thirty-three one-hundredths acres of irrigable land in townships 2 and 3 south, ranges 36 and 37 east, Boise meridian, within the boundaries of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, is hereby made a part of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and the lands therein shall have the benefit of, and be subject to, all existing legislation applicable to said project to the same extent as other lands of like ownership and character within the project. The Indian-owned irrigable land in the unit shall be charged with its proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $5.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act. The non-Indian-owned irrigable land of the unit shall be entitled to receive only natural-flow water until a full project water right is acquired for said land through the execution by the owner of a contract, or contracts, providing for the repayment to the United States of like per-acre costs as are charged against the Indian-owned land in the unit. Said charges, as to Indian and non-Indian lands, shall be a first lien against the lands, under the Act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210).

"SEC. 4. The net irrigable area of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project is hereby established as forty-seven thousand and forty-four and sixty-three one-hundredths acres of land, more or less. This area includes the forty-six thousand eight hundred and three and seventy-two one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, shown as the irrigable area of the project by the maps and plats in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, and the two hundred and forty and ninety-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, included in eight additional tracts of land described as follows: (a) An irregular shaped area in the northeast corner of the east half southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 36, township 5 south, range 33 east, Boise meridian, containing one and seventy one-hundredths acres; (b) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the west half of section 35, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty-eight and seventeen one-hundredths acres; (c) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Fort Hall Main Canal in the south half of section 14, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing forty acres; (d) a portion of the northwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing thirty-three and forty-two one-hundredths acres; (e) Fairview Park in the east half southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter and west half southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres; (f) the east half northeast quarter northwest quarter of section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing twenty acres; (g) an irregular shaped area lying along the east side of the Pocatello lateral in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, containing ninety-seven and sixty-two one-hundredths acres; and (h) the southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24, township 6 south, range 34, east, Boise meridian, containing ten acres. The above-described tracts of land, together with such lands in the portion of the village of Alameda, lying between the Pocatello lateral and the Oregon Short Line Railroad right-of-way in section 23, township 6 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, as (notwithstanding their inclusion in the irrigable acreage shown by the maps and plats hereinabove mentioned) have no water right at present, shall be entitled to receive, or to continue to receive, water through pumping operations or by gravity flow, provided the respective owners thereof, within five years from the date of the enactment of this Act, enter into contracts whereby they agree (1) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project construction costs of $18.12 per acre, as these costs are defined in the report referred to in section 1 of this Act, for such of their lands as do not now have a project water right, (2) to pay their proper proportionate share of the project rehabilitation and improvement costs of $15.10 and not to exceed $7.50 per acre, respectively, for such of their lands as are not now covered by contracts for the repayment of such costs, and (3) to install, maintain, and operate, at their own expense, pumping machinery to lift the water from the project canals or laterals for the irrigation of such of their lands as cannot be supplied by gravity flow. The non-inclusion of the Fort Hall town site within the net irrigable area of the project as hereby established shall not prevent the obtaining of water rights therefor in accordance with the Act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1025).

"SEC. 5. There is excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by the designation of the project area in section 4 of this Act the nine thousand six hundred and seventy acres of tribal, allotted, and non-Indian-owned lands located between Fort Hall and Gibson, Idaho, heretofore authorized to be included in the project by the Act of March 3, 1927 (Ch. 371, 44 Stat. 1398). The construction costs apportioned to the tribal lands so excluded are hereby canceled and the water rights are made available for project use. The water rights for the lands of the several allottees and non-Indian owners within the area so excluded shall not be impaired or affected by reason of such exclusion, but water shall be delivered only at the head of the laterals serving these lands. The respective owners of such lands may make their water rights available for project use, whereupon the construction costs assessed or assessable against their lands with respect to the water rights thus made available shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior. Allottees of lands within the excluded area, or their heirs or devisees, may donate or sell their lands to the tribe or may exchange their lands for assignments of tribal lands within the project area. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, $8,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior, in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, of one hundred and eighty acres of non-Indian-owned land, with water rights and improvements appurtenant thereto, described as the north half southeast quarter southwest quarter section 13, township 4 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, and south half northeast quarter and north half southeast quarter section 7, township 4 south, range 35 east, Boise meridian, located within the area excluded from the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project by section 4 of this Act.

"SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,995 to compensate the following-named landowners, or their heirs, for work accomplished or for future work necessary in filling, leveling, and otherwise preparing for irrigation the abandoned portion of the old Fort Hall Main Canal within their holdings, in not to exceed the following amounts: Frank E. DeKay, $401; Henry Jensen, $633; Theodore H. Gathe, $654; A. E. Albert, $106; Ezra D. Wilson, $127; J. M. Bistline, $378; Ambrose H. McGuire, $424; Ellen Griffith, $412; C. M. Allen, $116; Olive A. Granden, $184; William Webster, $28; Hiram Faulkner, $114; Williamette Blakeslee, $298; Frank Parker, $99; and Henrietta C. Blakeslee, $21.

"SEC. 7. Pending the construction of a siphon to provide gravity flow water to ninety-six and six-tenths acres of irrigable lands in the southwest quarter section 27, and east half section 28, township 5 south, range 34 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, which lands have been irrigated by pumping operations over a period of years, the Secretary of the Interior may accept the conveyance by the landowners of the pumping equipment for use of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project and may operate such equipment as a part of said project in order to provide water for the irrigation of such lands; the acceptance of such conveyance being subject to the owners of the lands executing releases to the United States of any and all claims whatsoever due to the pumping operations carried on by such landowners.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to revise and reform, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be fair and equitable in all the circumstances affectng the interests of the United States and the contractors, existing contracts between the United States and the Idaho Irrigation District, the Progressive Irrigation District, and the Snake River Valley Irrigation District in Idaho, which contracts provide for certain payments by the districts to the United States for the benefit of works of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project.

"SEC. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for refunds to Indians, or their heirs, the sum of $1,419.55, representing irrigation assessments of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project erroneously made and collected, as follows: Andrew F. Cutler, $153.80; Alice Sorrell Johns, $168.95; Nettie Stinson LaVatta, $146.62; Earl Edmund Cutler, $159.20; Charles Faulkner, $145.25; Josephine LaVatta Rumas, $155.20; May Phyllis LaVatta Brower, $29.90; Leonard I. Cutler, $135.85; Effie Diggle Houtz, $122.75; Lucy Yandell Spencer, $25; Charles Gerard Cutler, $121.53; and Hattie Sorrell Siler Tillotson, $55.50.

"SEC. 10. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the relocating, rehabilitating, cleaning, and extending of irrigation systems serving the lands irrigated from Ross Fork, Bannock, and Lincoln Creeks, which lands are outside of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, including the construction of a storage reservoir on Bannock Creek. The costs of any work benefiting Indian lands performed pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned on a per acre basis and collected under laws applicable to Indian irrigable lands on the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project. Operation and maintenance charges against such lands shall likewise be subject to the same laws, rules, and regulations as apply to Indian lands on the Fort Hall project. Any unpaid charges against such lands shall be subject to a first lien as provided in the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 200, 210). No expenditure shall be made under this authorization which will benefit lands in non-Indian

ownership unless the owners thereof execute contracts providing for the repayment of their proportionate per acre share of the costs of the work assessable against their lands.

"SEC. 11. In order to prevent the accumulation of delinquent project assessments or other charges against the non-Indian-owned lands of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause liquidation of all delinquent assessments or charges by taking such action as may be necessary, including the foreclosure of the Government's lien covering any such delinquent charges or by initiating such other procedure as may be legally available, which action may be taken by him at any time when in his judgment the best interests of the project would be served thereby.

"SEC. 12. All Act or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN SANBORN,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5416) to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The text of the Senate amendment was designed to accomplish the same results as the provisions of the bill as it passed the House, hence the conferees adopted the language of the bill as it passed the House. It was agreed that the text of the House bill sets forth more clearly what was intended than what was contained in the Senate amendment.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN SANBORN,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROLL OF THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) entitled "An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided therein," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HUGH BUTLER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
J. E. MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2878) entitled "An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided for therein," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Senate conferees in receding from its amendment restore to the bill the language which it contained when it passed the House.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
J. HARDIN PETERSON,
JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Rudd entitled "Education for the New Social Order," notwithstanding the fact that it is two and one-quarter pages over the regular allowance in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. REGAN (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, June 17, 18, and 19, on account of illness.

THE DRAFT BILL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express the sincere hope that when the conferees bring back the draft bill that the Members of this body will be as brave as the men we expect to draft under it.

ANCHOR DAM, OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to clear up a matter in connection with the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill.

On the subject of transfer of the Owl Creek unit, Wyoming, Missouri Basin project, from phase B to phase A in the tabulation of the conference committee report, Interior Department appropriation bill, H. R. 6705, on page 8788, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, the Owl Creek unit appears under phase B, units being prepared for construction, with the amount of $200,000 approved by the conferees. It is understood that when the amount of $200,000 was inserted by the House appropriations subcommittee, the intention was to start construction of this development through initiation of work on Anchor Dam. The hearings before the House and Senate committees show that the Bureau of Reclamation has completed preliminary or preconstruction work on Anchor Dam, the major feature of the Owl Creek unit, and the $200,000, if allowed, would be used to initiate construction.

In order that the Bureau of Reclamation may have guidance with respect to the intention of the Congress in connection with the Owl Creek unit, the record should show that it is the understanding of the House that the item "Owl Creek, Wyo., $200,000—amount approved by conferees" on page 8845 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17 should appear under "Phase A, units selected for construction" rather than under "Phase B, units being prepared for construction." I feel sure that this was an oversight on the part of the efficient assistants of the conferees in making up the report and the question is raised at this time so that there may be no misunderstanding of the place this unit has in the Missouri Basin program. Inadvertently, this was not brought to the attention of the committee of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is chairman, and I therefore desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa what position he and his committee take on this matter.

Mr. JENSEN. Since this matter has been brought to my attention, I can assure the gentleman from Wyoming that the committee will be happy to concur in the Bureau of Reclamation request to bring this project into phase A construction.

A HUNDRED THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT COMMUNISM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to call to the attention of the Members of the House the answer to the question which I have been asked frequently in the past 48 hours; that is, whether or not you can secure extra copies of this new publication of the House Committee on Un-American Activities,

entitled "A Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism."

I am pleased to announce we are making arrangements to have printed 500,000 extra copies of this factual document. They will be distributed to the public through the House document room in the normal manner, which will mean that about 1,000 copies will be available to each of you. If you do not care to distribute those copies in your own districts, perhaps you can make them available to your senatorial colleagues or to Members from other States, where these handbooks are in great demand.

This handbook on communism grows out of 10 years of research by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its able staff and gives the specific, direct answers to 100 important questions about communism, how it operates in the United States of America and what its purposes are in this Republic.

MONTANA PUMPING UNIT, MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of transfer of the Montana pumping unit, Missouri Basin project, from phase B to phase A in the tabulation of the conference committee report, Interior Department appropriation bill, H. R. 6705, on page 8845, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, the Montana pumping unit is included under phase B, units being prepared for construction. This appears to be an error and this unit should be included under phase A. The basis for this inquiry is the statement made on page 6637 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27 in a colloquy between Mr. D'EWART of Montana and Chairman JENSEN of the House Appropriations Subcommittee. In that colloquy Chairman JENSEN stated "When we marked up the bill we meant to bring a certain portion of this money which we had approached in phase B for the Montana pumping item and also for the Lower Marias, to bring it out of phase B up into phase A, which is construction." The chairman stated then that he had conferred with other members of the committee and "we now recommend that such part of the amount allowed for these projects as may be necessary shall be available for phase A, or, in other words, construction." Since it is the understanding that the Bureau of Reclamation will follow the break-down by projects of the amounts approved by the conferees under the Missouri Basin item, it is suggested that the record should be clarified so as to transfer the item: "Montana pumping, Montana, $210,000—amount approved by conferees" from phase B to phase A.

The first subunit under the Missouri Basin pumping unit will be the N-Bar-N ranch development which will be an important pilot irrigation undertaking in this area. It is hoped that the Bureau of Reclamation will press the construction of this subunit which will have an important bearing on guiding future developments in the Missouri River Basin.

The conferees on the part of the House are to be congratulated on the excellence of their work in maintaining the major part of the results of their able and earnest efforts to advance reclamation along sound lines.

Mr. JENSEN. It is the intention of the committee that that project be advanced from phase B to phase A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by the Honorable W. Calvin Wells to the Mississippi State Bar Convention.

I am advised by the Public Printer that this exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and that the cost is $301.75. Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

TOM LINDER, J. E. MacDONALD, AND BOB HARRIS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange indeed that the Department of Justice has overlooked so many Power Trust lobbyists, railroad lobbyists, and other big interest lobbyists that have infested this Capitol for the last 6 months, and indicted Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia; J. E. MacDonald, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Texas; and Robert M. Harris, a cotton farmer and merchant, for their efforts to boost the price of cotton, which the farmers sold for about 50 or 60 percent of its normal value last year.

Mr. Harris is a Louisiana planter who is also engaged in the cotton business. He is a cotton merchant; but he seems to be always on the bull side of the market; that is, he is in favor of raising the price of cotton instead of holding it down.

Now, if the time has come with a commissioner of agriculture of a southern State cannot exert his efforts to keep the buyers from beating down the price of cotton and plundering the farmers of the South of untold millions of dollars, I say we have reached a poor pass.

Why not indict some of these lobbyists who are here trying to wreck this country, or trying to ram through legislation that they know is detrimental to welfare of the American people.

Tom Linder and J. E. MacDonald are two outstanding men of the South as far as the cotton farmers of this country are concerned.

They have exerted every effort to see that the southern farmers received a fair price for their cotton, and I cannot see the justice of prosecuting them for such efforts, especially since they have been elected by the people of their respective States for that purpose.

TOM LINDER

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in what the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has just said about the indictment of Tom Linder in Georgia. We in South Carolina across the river from Georgia admire the great stand of Tom Linder, of Georgia, in behalf of the cotton farmers and, indeed, of the farmers of every State of the 48 States of this Union. Possibly I am wrong but it appears to me the Attorney General could find plenty of people who should be indicted without bringing charges against a man who is obligated by virtue of his election as commissioner of agriculture to fight for the rights of his people before committees of this Congress and elsewhere. I do not believe Mr. Linder has made this fight for personal gain. I believe the courts will prove this.

Tom Linder has done a good job for the farmers of the South. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that if they are going to indict anyone, why not indict some of these big monopolies, these big trusts, lobbyists for displaced persons and foreign loans here in Washington and not come down into the sovereign State of Georgia and indict the commissioner of agriculture of a great and sovereign State.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include, first, an article entitled "American Taxpayers Finance Communist Students," second, an article entitled "More on State Department Act," and, third, an article from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Banking and Currency Committee.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes following any previous special orders for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish again to remind the House that there is pending before the Rules Committee an extremely fine veterans' housing bill, H. R. 4488, the only bill that will really give housing to the veteran. The bill passed today does not take care of the veterans; it is not a veterans' housing bill. It is a general housing bill. They have to take their chance with everybody else. There is no priority for veterans, as I understand the bill.

In all of our discussions on the question of housing legislation there is one fundamental fact which too many of us overlook. We tend to forget the fact that the housing problem is primarily a veterans' housing problem. We are forgetting the pledges we made to our demobilized veterans that we would do something about their housing problem. The suffering caused by the present housing shortage is not equally distributed—our former GI's are bearing the brunt of it.

There is ample evidence that the average veteran family is already priced far out of the market for new homes. The high rate of home building is an excellent achievement, but let us not delude ourselves that these homes are going to our veteran constituents. They simply cannot afford them.

The general housing legislation we are considering will not improve this situation. Except for the public-housing provisions, which will conceivably prove helpful to only a small segment of veterans in the metropolitan centers, the general housing bill will merely continue a status quo in which the veteran has no real preference.

It is time for us to live up to our pledges and to pass a housing bill which will really help our veterans. I am convinced that H. R. 4488, the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, is that bill. The veterans' homestead bill has the sponsorship of the American Legion and was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is the only legislation I know of which will really give the veteran a break in the housing market.

It will give them homes at much lower cost. Through FWA grants and other features, the bill will reduce housing costs to veterans by as much as 20 percent. Unlike the general housing bill, which would give aid to the bottom 10 percent of our income groups through public housing, and to the top 10 percent through its other provisions, the veterans homestead bill is aimed squarely at the home-seeking veterans in the middle 80 percent.

It will give veterans the tools to master their housing problem through their own initiative. Through homestead associations chartered by the Veterans' Administration, veterans can go ahead in their own communities and build their homes without having to rely on the efforts of others.

It assures veterans of the necessary financing. Through loans from the Veterans' Administration and through provisions which assure the availability of an adequate supply of capital for GI loans, home-seeking veterans can be certain of low-cost financing.

It will solve the rental-housing problem which is plaguing our veterans in urban centers. Homestead associations can begin immediately to build apartment houses which will feature greatly reduced monthly rentals.

It provides the very necessary aid to GI's who need farms. By making low-cost credit available to veterans through the Federal land banks and the Farmers Home Administration, the bill will answer a crying need in our farm communities where veterans are now unable to get the necessary financing to buy a farm.

These are the compelling advantages offered to veterans by the homestead bill. Now as to legislative cost. I have heard opponents of the bill say, "The bill is all well and good, but won't its cost to the taxpayers be prohibitive?" The answer is an emphatic "No."

The great bulk of the funds made available under the Homestead bill will not be expenditures at all, but will be self-liquidating loans which will be repaid to the Government with interest. The only direct cost involved is the $200,000,000 for FWA grants for land development and public utilities, and even this cost will be spread over a number of years. I think that all of us who have helped to develop the Homestead bill can well be proud that it will accomplish so much at so little cost. It certainly seems the least we can do to help our deserving veterans solve their housing problem.

A broken pledge is a terrible thing. Let us keep faith with our veterans and give them this Homestead bill. It is the only way we can make amends for our shameful neglect of the veterans' housing problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include as a part of my remarks an editorial taken from this morning's Washington Times-Herald, which is as follows:

GOOD LUCK, CONGRESS! SEE YOU NEXT JANUARY

As this was written it was pretty nearly in the cards, that Congress will leave here in another 48 hours not to return until January 1949, so here is a sort of vital-statistics round-up on the job it has done.

A FINE RECORD

To begin with, this is the Eightieth Congress since the founding of the Republic. It came into being with the elections of November 1946, and took office on January 3, 1947, for its first session. On July 27, 1947, it recessed and went home to check with the public, returning November 17. This present session convened January 6, 1948, and closes June 19, 1948.

The Eightieth Congress has done an outstanding job, all things considered, and the taxpayers have got more than their money's worth out of it.

So this Congress has a right to its present cocky, cheerful confidence that the taxpayers will call on the Eighty-first Congress for more of the same from just about the same representation in House and Senate when it convenes here on January next.

Looking over the record in detail, we figure the main weaknesses of the Eightieth Congress about as follows:

It leaves the country without universal military training and regardless of whatever so-called draft it turns out in these last hours, this was a terrible mistake.

WEAK SIDE

We live in an age of wars and in such an age there is no substitute for a trained military manpower. A draft, as such, is only a stopgap until UMT can really polish up our fighting Reserves for instant service when needed. The Eightieth Congress laid down on that job, largely because it was intimidated by mothers, college professors, and professional pacifists. To do so was an invitation to national disaster.

The Eightieth also made a boner, we think, in not passing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Senator TAFT was able to get this long-range project through the Senate but the House flopped. Here's hoping the Eighty-first Congress puts it into law, and for that matter all the rest of Senator TAFT's lay-out of improvements in social security, education, and public medicine.

Taken all together, these are a program of national self-improvement that the United States of America could use and nobody we know of equals TAFT as a master at designing the laws to carry out such a program.

On the good side, the Eightieth has a really stellar record. First, as to national defense, it has put up the necessary cash by the billions for research and improvements of weapons—lands, sea, and air.

GOOD SIDE

It has forced the Army, Navy, and Air Force to work on a long overdue internal reorganization that will undoubtedly be valuable both to economy and efficiency. It has kept its head about the atom bomb, in spite of many tensions and some real mistakes, such as last year's senatorial confirmation of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Eightieth has also faithfully reorganized its own system of doing business along the lines drawn up by the Seventy-ninth Congress and has started a high-powered Commission to studying the executive branch for reorganization as well. The Commission will report to the Eighty-first Congress next January, and great hopes are held for better government at less cost.

On taxes, the Eightieth has done about as good a job as anybody had a right to expect, having got through some cut-backs of a modest sort over the Presidential veto, as at least a token of intention, if not as a real return of the people's money to the people.

On labor, there is the Taft-Hartley law working smoothly after all and helping the unions keep out of trouble.

On foreign affairs, the Eightieth yielded to the pressure for the multibillioned ERP gamble, but at least has had the wit to form up a team of its own specialists to watchdog the Executive. Thanks for that, anyhow.

On veterans' needs it has done such a good job that it has won high praise from even Commander Ty Krum, the Times-Herald's editor of veterans' affairs, who has put in many hours of work with Speaker JOE MARTIN.

But, as of this writing, the House was past due on one piece of veterans' legislation that passed the Senate a year ago and that is the bill to provide cars for combat-disabled men of World War II so they can get out and make a decent living. There is still time for the bill to go into law and it should.

POLITICAL PROSPECTS

Considering the record, what is the political outlook for the Members of the Eightieth Congress? How is the country likely to feel about reelecting them?

Well, first it has to be noted that the Eightieth Congress has been a Republican Congress, working upstream against the stubborn, often frantic disruptions of a tail-end Democratic regime headed up by a man who was never elected to the Presidency.

Congress has done its work wonderfully well against the sniping of Mr. Truman's team and has not only won most of its battles but has kept its dignity and prestige.

Of course we could be wrong, but right now it looks like a sure thing to say that the Eighty-first Congress, like the Eightieth, will be organized by the Republican majority

and will also have the satisfaction of working with a Republican President.

Good-bye, Congress. Good luck. Hope most of you come back next January.

Mr. Speaker, if the so-called veterans' amputee car bill that has already passed the Senate does not pass the House, I shall feel that everything that is being said in the House about caring for our disabled veterans is a hollow mockery. These veterans are the combat disabled, the blind and the amputees, among the worst disabled of all of our veterans. It costs very little. The Senate in its wisdom and kindness passed it last year. There is no excuse for not passing this legislation. We have just passed a bill which I myself introduced to build a hospital in the Philippines. We have a legal and a moral obligation to do that. But I remind the House that countless billions have been sent to foreign countries, millions of dollars of automobiles have been sent to foreign countries. This bill costs only a pittance. These veterans are the boys we sent to war. There are a few Members who have been disabled as these boys have been. They know what an automobile can do as a rehabilitation measure.

Mr. Speaker, I feel so strongly about the matter that if by any chance it should not pass, I plan to tour the entire country to see that in the next session it does pass. It cannot fail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

REDUCING THE COST OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress approaches a close, I wish to say a few words with respect to the work of the Congress in the matter of reducing the cost of government.

Inasmuch as the House has acted on all the appropriation bills, except for a final deficiency bill, I recognize that what I might say at this time will have little, if any, influence on the final record of the Congress in achieving economy. Nonetheless, I feel justified in taking this time in order that the record may be clear, at least insofar as I am personally concerned as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, on what has been accomplished and what we have failed to accomplish.

At the moment no one knows what the final figures will show as to the actual savings realized by this Congress in the various operations of the Federal Government. Indeed, a major question yet to be decided is the amount to be appropriated for the foreign-aid program. I am most hopeful that the views of the House, reducing the amount to be appropriated, will prevail over the views of the Senate, which is insisting upon the full amount.

As is true in every election, there are many factors that prompted the American people to elect this Republican Congress. One of the reasons, and I think a very compelling reason with the majority of the American people, was the fact that the Republicans gave promise of reducing the cost of Government, of eliminating the waste and the extravagance, and of placing our economy on a sound fiscal basis.

This Congress did not break that pledge. As a rough estimate, the Congress has saved approximately $6,000,000,000 in these 2 years of its existence. When one considers the difficulties that have been involved in accomplishing this saving, the determined opposition we faced from the administration, it represents a very substantial achievement. It is because of this saving that we have been able to give our people much-needed tax relief.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I fully appreciate how hard it has been to realize economy. We have had absolutely no cooperation from the executive branch of the Government. And, as has been demonstrated time and again here on the floor of the House, we have had consistent opposition by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle.

It should be borne in mind that the President did not present to the Congress his major budget requests when the Congress opened. It was not until May 26 that our committee received the final budget estimates for the Army and the Air Force, and it was not until June 1 that we received the estimates for the Navy.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have been proceeding under great handicaps in trying to accomplish a thorough job of realizing economy. I appreciate that fact. I know what our committee has been up against. While I do not for a moment detract from what has been accomplished, I wish to say that for myself I believe much more could have been accomplished.

I rise at this time to utter a word of warning, Mr. Speaker. We are rapidly approaching a crisis in Federal expenditures. As I have said on several occasions on this floor, when the various appropriation bills were before us, it is always easier to spend than to save; every proposed expenditure has a political appeal. It is perfectly evident to me, and I believe to the vast majority of the American people, that the only way to cut Government spending is to cut it. It takes political courage, but that is the kind of courage we must have if we are to maintain financial stability.

Let me emphasize this fact: if the fiscal system of the United States weakens, the whole civilized world will follow. The weakening of our financial foundation, upon which our system of free competitive enterprise rests, will do more to serve the enemies of our way of life than any weapon that could be devised. The liberty-loving people of the world are dependent upon our strength. For my part, I do not believe that we can remain strong when the Government, Federal, State, and local, eats up about 30 percent of the incomes of all Americans.

One of the major achievements of this Congress was the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. For approximately a year that Commission has been engaged in a thorough, over-all survey of all the operations of the Government. It will probably make its report when the new Congress assembles. It is a nonpartisan Commission, and it has proceeded in a nonpartisan manner.

The fact that this Commission exists and that it is composed of such outstanding men gives me some hope. It gives me hope that when the new Congress meets we will be in a position to do the kind of a job that should be done toward bringing order out of chaos in Federal operations and expenditures.

Former President Herbert Hoover is serving as Chairman of this Commission. That he and his colleagues recognize the absolute necessity of dealing realistically and thoroughly with this problem of Government expenditures and the need for complete reorganization is evidenced from the following paragraph in a letter he wrote last month concerning the work of his Commission:

> That it is imperative is obvious when we consider that the number of persons at 3 years after the First World War who were receiving regular payments from the Federal Government was about 2,200,000, and 3 years after the Second World War it is about 13,400,000. The budget 3 years after the First World War was about $4,000,000,000 per annum, whereas 3 years after the Second World War it is $40,000,000,000. There are insufficient savings left in the hands of the people to repair, maintain, and improve the tools of production and distribution upon which our standard of living depends. These figures obviously indicate the necessity for important structural changes in the Government to secure the maximum efficiency and economy.

But however thorough a study this Commission may make of the subject, however sound its final report may prove to be, it will all be meaningless unless we have in Congress men and women who are determined to carry through an economy program. As I said before, we have accomplished much during this Congress; but speaking for myself, I do not believe we accomplished nearly enough.

It is my conviction that the American people earnestly desire to see our Government on a sound fiscal basis, that they earnestly desire to see the cost of government reduced, that they earnestly desire to be relieved of the burdensome taxes that have been destroying initiative and eating up our productive substance. I hope—I sincerely hope—that when the people go to the polls this November they will elect a truly economy-minded Congress and an economy-minded President.

We greatly need, both in the White House and in Congress, men and women who do not simply talk economy, then vote for an increase in this appropriation and that because it may be politically wise or expedient. We need a determined, courageous economy program. Without such a program, I fear for our national solvency.

We have made a beginning, but it is only a beginning toward restoring sanity and order in Government. I am sure the people will wholeheartedly support an all-out economy program. To such a program I stand committed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4071. An act to amend section 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 19, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1660. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 18, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Manistique Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 19, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 721); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1661. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 10, 1948, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Oswego Harbor, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 722); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1662. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 1, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., in the vicinity of Fairfield, N. C., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 28, 1944, and also in partial response to resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on April 20, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 723); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1663. A letter from Charles E. Bohlen, counselor, for the Secretary of State, transmitting lists indicating the dismantling and shipping status of all plants listed for reparation in the French zone and, for all plants other than war plants for which estimates are feasible, their character and capacity, as requested under the second and third questions of House Resolution 365; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1664. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year ending December 31, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

1665. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to settle and extinguish land claims to the public domain in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1666. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, and the Annual Report of the City of New York covering operations of foreign-trade zone No. 1 during the calendar year 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 678. Resolution authorizing the printing of the volume entitled "The Democratic Way and the Totalitarian Way" as a House document; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Union Calendar.

Mr. BENDER: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 686. Resolution providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to procurement and buildings authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 684. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of part No. 2 of the final majority report of the Joint Committee on Housing entitled "Statistics of Housing"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2404). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 672. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 403; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 199. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (H. Rept. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence; with amendments (Rept. No. 2406). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on relation of new functions and activities of departments and agencies; to increased civilian employment in the executive branch; without amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 580. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. 2413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 691. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organizations, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. 2415). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2416. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2417. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 654. Resolution to provide additional funds for the conduct of the investigation continued by House Resolution 153; without amendment (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 213. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee, current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law; without amendment (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 676. Resolution to provide further expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 298, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 674. Resolution providing for the further expenses of the studies and investigations conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 404, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 655. Resolution authorizing the printing of the fifteenth report of the Commission on Fine Arts as a House document with illustrations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 675. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the Joint Committee on Housing for the purpose of concluding its business; without

amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 646. Resolution to print the prayers offered by the Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses, 1945–48; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2426). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 600. Resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Resolution 595; with amendments (Rept. No. 2427). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 677. Resolution for the relief of Evelyn Richardson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2407). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 692. Resolution relative to the contested election case of Wilson versus Granger, First Congressional District of Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 6981. A bill to improve methods of wine production, to correct inequities in the revenue law with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6982. A bill to provide for the calling of a governors' conference by the President of the Senate; for certain changes in the rules of the Senate and House of Representatives; to authorize certain expenditures consequent thereon; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6983. A bill to amend section 719 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to borrowed invested capital; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 6984. A bill extending the time to file claims for refund of income taxes paid on certain compensation received for military or naval service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POTTER (by request):

H. R. 6985. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative decisions declaring forfeit veterans' benefits; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6986. A bill to provide that certain mortages and loans shall not be eligible for insurance or guaranty under the National Housing Act or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 unless a warranty is provided against structural and other defects in construction of the dwelling involved; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 6987. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 6988. A bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6989. A bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6990. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 432. Joint resolution providing for an investigation of the effect of certain conventions and treaties between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and the Dominion of Canada relating to the protection and preservation of certain species of migratory birds, waterfowl, and game mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution to suspend the operation of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. Res. 691. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 693. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6958; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 694. Resolution providing for the further expenses for conducting the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 120 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6991. A bill for the relief of Hampton Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 6992. A bill for the relief of the estate of James J. Barnett, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6993. A bill for the relief of Leonid Zankowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6994. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6995. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6996. A bill for the relief of the Montana Engineering & Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 6997. A bill for the relief of Ferd Owen, Berdie Owen, Gilbert Good, Lela Owen Good, Audie Owen, Wayne Owen, Art Owen, Has Owen, Marvin Owen, and Gene Owen, doing business as Owen Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6998. A bill for the relief of Janos and Marianne Mero Somogyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2112. By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of the City Council of the City of Chicago, memorializing Congress to provide appropriations for the operation of air-traffic control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in cities throughout the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2113. By the SPEAKER: Petition of New York Teachers Chapter, American Veterans Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2114. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of Dr. and Mrs. Frank E. Becker, containing 1,215 signatures, including those of 223 residents of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the appropriation by the Congress of sufficient funds for the education and general rehabilitation of the Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1948

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 15, 1948)

(Continuation of Senate proceedings of Friday, June 18, 1948, from 1:45 a. m. on Saturday, June 19, 1948.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some months ago, while I was absent because of illness in my family, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] took occasion not only to attack me personally at that time but also to attack the conduct of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Tonight I hold in my hand a statement made last evening during the temporary absence of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, in 1933, when the Democrats came into office, the record shows they did not confirm one single postmaster. The record shows further that President Hoover made a personal appeal to President Roosevelt for the single purpose of getting even Walter Newton, his former secretary——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to make the point that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please be seated so we can hear the speech by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Even the desperate personal appeal of former President Hoover merely to have one single Democrat, Walter Newton, confirmed as judge was denied.

Mr. President, in contrast, I want to show the fine and splendid cooperative attitude of the Republican Party. I have here in my hand the nominations that were on the calendar for June 15. Postmasters were confirmed for the States of Connecticut, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jer-

sey, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia. In addition to that, two were confirmed in Iowa.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wanted to ask the Senator about the State of Washington.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest the Senator from North Dakota retain the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Likewise, on the next day, the 16th day of June, postmasters were reported and confirmed in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is doing the best he can. This is a very important speech.

Mr. LANGER. The postmasters were also reported and confirmed in the States of Minnesota, Mississippi, Vermont, and Virginia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Again, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I reluctantly make the point of order that the Senate is not in order. We should have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois suggest that the galleries be cleared?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; I do not suggest that. The people are here to see a good show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the point of order is not well taken, because the show cannot go on if the Senate is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from North Dakota has enumerated every State in the Union except the State of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is coming to that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so long as I am in this chair as acting majority leader, I shall insist that the rules of the Senate be enforced. I know that the Chair is seeking to enforce them. There are other rules which we can put into effect if we do not have order on the floor of the Senate. Simply because we may not agree with the tactics being used, we should not be ourselves guilty of violating the rules of the Senate. I shall cooperate with the Chair in maintaining order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Dakota yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He can yield only for a question, under the rules. We must follow the rules. However, the Chair will continue to recognize the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield for anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will entertain no more parliamentary inquiries. The Senator will proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during my absence from the Chamber yesterday the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] made what I consider to be an attack upon the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. Upon that occasion he introduced various resolutions to discharge the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from the consideration of various post office nominations. In order that it may be clear in the minds of the Senators upon the floor, I wish to read what transpired:

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question respecting a number of postmaster nominations, in view of the fact that many postmasters have been confirmed tonight. It is my understanding that some 38 or 40 postmaster nominations in Illinois have been approved by the Civil Service Committee, and I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is present and can tell me why those postmasters do not appear on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from North Dakota is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that my colleague from Illinois has objected to these postmasters, and he is present. I should like to know whether that is true or not.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I may say to my colleague that I know nothing about the nominations of postmasters that are not on the calendar. I was asked if I approved them and I said I did not know who they were. I do not know who they are and to that extent I have not approved them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to submit resolutions respecting each and every one of these postmasters. The purpose of the resolution is to discharge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from further consideration of the nominations of the postmasters to whom I refer. The first one is Monroe A. Lawson of Clay City, Ill. Mr. Lawson is a disabled marine veteran of World War II, having been wounded on Saipan.

He was the only applicant for the office and the only eligible certified by the Civil Service Commission from an open competitive examination.

He has served as acting postmaster since October 1946, and is unanimously endorsed by the Clay City Chamber of Commerce, and was recommended by the Republican Congressman from that district.

Personally, the Senator from Illinois does not know whether this gentleman is a Democrat or a Republican, and it would not make any difference, because he is a veteran, and is No. 1 on the eligible list, and the only one on the list.

"He is a veteran." I want my distinguished colleagues to remember those words of the Senator from Illinois—"He is a veteran."

Mr. President, why that individual cannot be confirmed by the Senate of the United States at this session will be a little difficult for me to understand, and it will be a little difficult for many people in Illinois to understand—people who will know more about it as time goes by.

I submit the resolution, and ask that it lie over for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be filed and will lie over for the day.

Mr. LUCAS. The second nomination is that of Charles H. McGough, to be postmaster at Secor, Ill. Mr. McGough was the first man on the eligible register established by the Civil Service Commission as the result of an open competitive examination.

He is a disabled veteran of World War II, and is now serving as acting postmaster.

Some other individual is serving as acting postmaster while this disabled veteran of World War II, who was the first man on the eligible list, waits for his commission because of someone here in the United States Senate who refuses to approve him or who refuses to report out his nomination.

I may say to every Senator upon the floor that every nomination that has been approved by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been reported with the exception of a man from Wyoming and one from the State of Illinois. To the others there was some objection by some Senator. In accordance with the rule laid down by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, if any Senator objects, the nomination is not reported. Four from the State of Wyoming were objected to by the distinguished Senator from that State [Mr. ROBERTSON], on grounds that were satisfactory to himself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The Senator from Illinois continued:

Mr. President, to me this is indefensible and it is unbelievable that an Illinois boy who went out to fight for his country, and is disabled, and is No. 1 on the list, should not be confirmed.

I want Senators to remember that statement also.

There is nothing that anyone can do about it under the law. He must be ultimately accepted, whether anyone likes it or not, because under the law no one can be chosen over him. I do not know what his politics are, but I know that he is a disabled veteran, and I know that he is waiting for this job, and that he cannot get it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Chair's pardon.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Nebraska wants to ask me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. How does the Senator know that the nomination in question will not be reported from the committee?

Mr. LUCAS. I hope it will.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the Senator really begging the question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not begging the question very much because unless the nomination is reported from the committee within 48 hours he will not be confirmed. There would not be any action in this matter if it were not for the fact that the Senator from Illinois has taken the floor and proceeded to take the action he is now taking.

Mr. WHERRY. The chairman of the committee is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. I have asked the chairman about this.

Mr. WHERRY. The chairman has done quite well in the matter of reporting nominations,

and the Senate has confirmed every nomination which has been placed on the Executive Calendar, with the exception of one, during the executive session today

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is something of a record. Only one nomination on the calendar has been put over today. I have taken the position that when the Senate acted on the Executive Calendar all nominations on the calendar should be confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. I have tried to get these nominations on the Executive Calendar. Obviously they cannot be confirmed until that is done.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied that if the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were present he could give the Senator satisfactory answers respecting these postmasters.

Mr. LUCAS. He cannot give me satisfactory answers respecting the individuals I have mentioned, because there is nothing that can be done about these postmasters except confirm them or turn them down.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I cannot answer the Senator respecting the postmasters in question, but I will say there is a meeting of the committee scheduled for tomorrow morning, when nominations for postmasters will be considered, and I hope these nominations may be reported then.

Mr. LUCAS. Recently I called the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], a member of the committee, on the phone and he told me that some 33 nominations for postmasters had been reported favorably by the committee, that there was no objection to them, and since that time nominations from one State after another have been placed on the Executive Calendar, but the Illinois postmasters are not on the calendar, and time is running out in this Congress. Action must be taken quickly if the nominations are to be confirmed before the session is ended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There are three nominations of postmasters from Illinois on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; there are three from Illinois. This is somewhat of an anomaly. I went before the committee and appealed to the committee to have the three postmasters from Illinois placed on the calendar, and the committee voted practically unanimously to place them on the calendar while I was there; and, lo and behold, they are now on the Executive Calendar. The reason I appeared was because some slight objection had been raised to these three. Lo and behold, they are on the calendar. But these other postmasters, to whom there is no objection, have not been placed on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps if the Senator went before the committee again he would succeed in having them placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought they would be placed on the calendar in view of the favorable report by the Committee on Civil Service. I had every reason to believe they would be on the Executive Calendar as a result of favorable action by that committee.

Then all these pending nominations were named in the RECORD, the nomination and the name of the town. I refer to the fact that the distinguished Senator from Illinois referred to his colleague and blamed him because these nominations were not upon the calendar. I wish to take exclusive, total blame, as chairman of the committee, because these nominations have not been reported to the Senate.

A resolution passed by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service provides that where both Senators from a State agree, unless there is some objection on the part of someone, either in the files or otherwise, a nomination must be reported.

Mr. President, as I said before, all the other nominations from every other State except Wyoming and these from Illinois were reported, and I want the RECORD to be clear, I want it to be indelibly clear, as to why they were not reported.

Some months ago the Senate passed a resolution directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make a full and complete investigation of the entire matter as to how the civil-service law relating to postmasters had been carried out and was being carried out at the time. I made that investigation, and the report is practically ready.

During the course of the investigation being made by my staff, I for a time was absent. Lately I have been going over the report. My going over the report is why I did not report these Illinois nominations.

When the civil-service law was passed the distinguished Senator from Wyoming gave the most eloquent speech upon this floor. He said that the civil-service law was passed to take post offices out of politics, that that was the prime reason for passing it.

I do not think the distinguished Senator from Illinois will deny that his brother is a postmaster. I do not think he will deny that his brother's brother-in-law is a postmaster. So, Mr. President, in this investigation, I wanted to find out whether there was dirty politics in the State of Illinois in the matter of these post offices or whether there was not.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is making my family——

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator spoke in my absence last night.

Mr. LUCAS. I am going to speak some more, too, when the time comes.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield now.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will yield sooner or later.

Mr. LANGER. I am giving the record.

Mr. LUCAS. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will have every chance in the world when I finish, to answer this record, answer the cold-blooded record if he can, show how veterans were discriminated against in the State of Illinois by the——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator ought to talk about the cold-blooded record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senators will be in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, here it is. Here is the cold, cold, cold record. I do not blame the distinguished Senator for getting excited. I do not blame him at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. First of all I want to say that in this entire investigation——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for anything.

Mr. LUCAS. Cannot a Senator raise a question of personal privilege?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield for anything at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to stand here and have my family and the State of Illinois defamed by innuendo and not be allowed to answer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sentors will suspend for a moment while the Chair discusses the matter with the Parliamentarian. [After a brief interval.] There is no rule in the Senate rules or in the precedents of the Senate that would permit the Senator from North Dakota to be taken off his feet on the basis of a question of personal privilege. The only reason for a Senator being taken off his feet is that he has, in violation of the rules of the Senate, referred offensively to a State or to a Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. LANGER. That I have not done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Or impugned the motives of a Senator.

Mr. LANGER. That I have not done.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's ruling is that the Senator has not transgressed those two narrow rules of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; if the Senator refuses to yield——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I will answer at the proper time.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield further. I have the floor, and I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said a parliamentary inquiry. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not in order at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To make a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is not in order to make a point of order without the yielding by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Chair rule that the Senator from Washington is not in order to make a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. What have we come to if a Senator cannot make a point of order

in the Senate of the United States? Can a Senator go on and on and a point of order cannot be made regardless of what happens in the Senate? That is the strangest ruling I have ever heard of.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To make the RECORD clear, I make a point of order, and I want the Chair to rule in declining to entertain the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is not in order. The latest precedent on the subject in the Senate, when the matter was fully discussed and the precedent was handed down, which was in line with other precedents of the Senate, was on the 27th day of July 1947.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and make a point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling on the 27th of July 1947 was based on rule XIX of the Senate headed "Debate," reading as follows——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on what page does that rule appear?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On page 23 of the Standing Rules of the Senate Manual.

1. When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not procede until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer; and no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

Based on that rule and the precedents of the Senate the decision of the Presiding Officer of the Senate on the 27th of July 1947 was that interruption could not be made for a point of order. That was the ruling of the Chair based on the rules of the Senate and the precedents of the Senate.

Of course the ruling of the Chair is subject to an appeal, if the Senator desires to take an appeal, and when the Senator from North Dakota has surrendered the floor the question would again be subject to discussion and appeal could be taken perhaps at that time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I rose to a point of order. I rose in all sincerity because I thought by the ruling of the Chair made just prior to my rising that the Chair suggested that a point of order might lie when any Senator might in some way, by innuendo or otherwise, cast reflection upon a State or upon a Senator. I thought the Senator from North Dakota did cast a reflection upon the State of Illinois and the senior Senator from Illinois. I rose to a point of order. I should like to discuss that matter, but if the Chair will not allow me to make my point of order I must reluctantly, although I do not like to do so, appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is endeavoring impartially to preside over the Senate at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's ruling is based on the rules of the Senate, on the advice of the Parliamentarian, and on the precedents of the Senate. The Chair is not endeavoring to cut off any Senator from any right he has under the rules of the Senate, but whoever the occupant of the chair is, it is his obligation, at least as the present occupant of the chair sees it, to enforce the rules of the Senate as they are, and as the precedents have determined them to be.

The Chair refers to rule XIX again, which provides as follows:

2. No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

3. No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

4. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

The last paragraph refers to the two preceding paragraphs relating to imputing to another Senator any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator, or referring offensively to any State of the Union and it is on that basis that the Presiding Officer has made his ruling.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, do I have a right to propound a parliamentary question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that the Senator does not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Chair rule that I have no right to propound a parliamentary inquiry at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled, based on the rules of the Senate and the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that until the Senator from North Dakota has yielded the floor, or unless the Senator from North Dakota gives permission by yielding, a point of order cannot be made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, then the Chair rules that a point of order is not in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order is not in order, and the Senator is out of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for me to read Rule XX of the United States Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield to anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield, and the Chair respectfully suggests that we proceed in order, and permit the Senator from North Dakota to proceed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what I am trying to do—proceed in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield for any purpose in any way, shape, form, or manner.

Mr. President, during the course of investigating these Illinois post offices, and there is a very large number of them in Illinois—I was very often in communication with the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. In view of what was said upon the floor last evening by the senior Senator from Illinois it is going to take me a little time to make my statement. I want to make it unmistakably clear not only to the people of the State of Illinois, but to the people of the entire United States of America, that from no other Senator in this body, so far as veterans are concerned, and particularly disabled veterans, has the Senator from North Dakota received more cooperation and finer help than from the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois. Time and time and time again the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois has asked me to be certain that no veteran, particularly a disabled war veteran, should in any manner whatsoever be discriminated against. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois warned me, Mr. President, because of the fact that the debate had some months ago showed that in connection with a postoffice in another State there were three candidates, one of whom was a civilian, and two were disabled war veterans. Examination for postmaster was not called for for a long while, although both of the disabled war veterans wanted to take an examination. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois said to me, "I want you to be certain that that sort of thing does not transpire, not only in my own State of Illinois, but anywhere in the entire country."

So, Mr. President, with the help of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, I as chairman of the committee have taken exceptional care, and I instructed the entire staff of the committee to be certain that no veteran should possibly be discriminated against.

I believe I can readily understand why the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] was so solicitous with respect to even the most humble veteran in the State of Illinois. It is because the junior Senator from Illinois himself is one of the most distinguished and outstanding veterans of World War I. The brother of the distinguished Senator was killed in the service. He himself was wounded time and again, and decorated with almost every medal and every ribbon that this great country could give him in that war. I can understand his solicitude, because he had been across the water. He had seen the boys over there making sacrifices and undergoing suffering. He saw them in hunger, and in time of want. He saw them offering up their very lives for the United States of America. I say that the distinguished Senator from Illinois can be proud, as I believe every Senator, and the citizens of the great, fine State of Illinois, can be proud, of the record

that this distinguished Senator made upon the fields of battle.

I have here every single one of the nominations which I myself held up, and for which I myself take full and complete responsibility. Every single one of these, as anyone can see who cares to look at them, was approved. They were not held up, but were approved by the junior Senator from Illinois. I said to him then, "After making an investigation I may not report them right away." His answer was, "If you, as chairman of the committee, have any objection to a single one of those nominees as a result of your investigation, I want you to know that the people of Illinois do not want a postmaster in any town in the United States who does not meet the qualifications set up by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service." That is the fine cooperation which I have had, Mr. President.

What did the examination in Illinois show? Let us take the town of Cullom, Ill. It is because of what I found in this examination, and the examination in another town which I shall name in just a moment, that on my own responsibility I held up these nominations until I could make a fuller investigation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what does the examination at Cullom, Ill., show? An examination for third-class postmaster at Cullom, Ill., was held on February 15, 1941, and produced the following eligibles: Jerome W. Kiley, 80.63; Henry E. Altig, 76.25. Then came the veteran we heard so much about last evening. The record shows that he was preferred. He had 75. Under the civil-service rules, when a veteran is within a point and a half, the Civil Service Commission looks into the case very carefully. What took place here? The Post Office Department, for some reason—I will let Senators judge what that reason was—wanted to appoint Henry E. Altig.

The experience of the nominee, Henry E. Altig is as follows: Education, eighth grade graduate. Business experience: 1904 to 1914, odd jobs and farm laborer; 1914 to 1916, store clerk and post-office clerk; 1916 to 1921, farming; from the 22d day of June to the 23d day of April next, oil truck driver; from 1927 to 1933 he operated his own dray line. Senators can imagine what a great businessman he was and how competent he was, when they find in the report that the dray line consisted of one horse and one wagon. From 1933 to 1941 he was maintenance patrolman. On the 19th day of June he was a laborer in the county on AAA.

Now we come to the rating. I want Senators to remember that under the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Illinois last night he wants the committee discharged from further consideration of the nomination. What does the report show? The rating officer and reviewing officer concurred in a rating of 75 on experience, but later graded 80 on a new experience and fitness report, with a notation "See memo by L. A. Moyer August 5, 1941, R. M. R."

Mr. President, a very significant thing happened. Our committee wanted to get those files, and we could not get them. They refused to give them to us. We sent for them, sent a man to get the files for the committee, but we could not get them.

Then what happened? The record shows further that Mr. Altig received a rating of 72.5 on a written examination, giving him an average rating of 73.75, a 5-point upgrading, which changed his average rating to 76.25. I have here the original sheets.

But it was not enough to grade up Mr. Altig. I state the simple fact that he is a brother-in-law of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. He was rated up 5 points, and a veteran was rated down 10 points. That is the record; here it is.

I want to find out whether among the 38 nominations in Illinois there are cases of other veterans who were marked down and other persons who were marked up—persons who possibly had a little influence.

Mr. President, I may not be chairman of this committee very long; but so long as I am chairman of the committee, it is going to be honestly run, let the chips fall where they may, let me make enemies where I may. The committee is going to be honestly run, and run in an open and aboveboard fashion. When we find the Department refusing to give the record to a properly constituted committee of the Senate of United States, the question arises, whom are they trying to protect? Why were they covering up?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from North Dakota——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose whatsoever.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise again to a question of personal privilege. The Senator from North Dakota asked whom were they trying to cover up or protect; and the Senator cannot refer to anyone except the Senator from Illinois in that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot stand here and take these innuendoes much longer. If I do not get some protection from someone, I shall take the matter in my own hands.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is perfectly welcome to do so any time he wishes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have the floor, and I wish to proceed quietly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will suspend while the Chair makes a statement.

In the opinion of the Chair, the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota was not a transgression on either of the two rules which heretofore have been mentioned, for violation of which a Senator can be taken off the floor.

The remark as to who might be responsible for the matter referred to could obviously apply to someone in the Post Office Department or anywhere else in the Government.

For that reason, it is the opinion of the Chair that the remark made by the Senator from North Dakota does not violate either of the two rules referred to.

The Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I come now to another post office. I repeat, that in order to take care of Mr. Altig, after the examination had been taken and after the papers had been marked, Mr. Altig was marked up five points, and a veteran was marked down 10 points; and that action was based—it was the only thing on which they could base it—on business experience. After the veteran was first ranked up, he was later lowered 10 points.

Now we come to another post office. This is the post office in the town of Abingdon, Ill. The postmaster is J. Wilcy Lucas, I believe his name is.

Mr. LUCAS. His name is J. Wiley Lucas.

Mr. LANGER. Very well; J. Wiley Lucas.

In this case an examination for postmaster, second-class office, was held in December 1944. There being no eligible, a second examination was held in March 1946. Only one eligible was secured, the acting postmaster, with a rating of 81.70, including 10 points for being a veteran's widow. She was appointed in that town—which was not Abingdon; but in Abingdon an examination for postmaster, second-class office, was held in August 1945. That examination produced one eligible. The candidate, Mr. J. Wiley Lucas, made a grade of 51.25 on the written test, and he was originally rated 85.21 on experience and suitability, which gave him an average of 68.23—not enough for eligibility. He was later rerated upward by reviewing officers to 89.2 percent on experience and suitability, thus making him eligible with an average of 70.23. Of course, 70 was required to pass.

He was then nominated, and subsequently was confirmed by the Senate. You see, Mr. President, when one eligible failed, no examination was called, although the rules and regulations provide that in such case an examination shall be called. This man failed. But instead of calling a new examination, they rated him upward, so that they could qualify him. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that that was in 1945, about the time when the veterans were coming home.

I have another case in Illinois. This is from the town of Sutter, Ill. On the 3d day of March, at Sutter, Mr. Melvin W. Shrader received from the Post Office Department a letter signed by Mr. J. M. Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General, and now the Postmaster General. The letter is as follows:

MARCH 3, 1947.

DEAR MR. SHRADER: Your name has been certified as eligible for appointment as postmaster, and your appointment is now under consideration. Before any further action can be taken, it will be necessary that the inclosed medical certificate, Form 2413, be executed by any doctor of medicine who is

duly licensed to practice under the laws of the several States, the District of Columbia, or the Territories or possessions of the United States. When completed, it should be returned to this Bureau for submission to the Civil Service Commission.

Please give this matter your prompt attention and see that the necessary form is properly executed and returned to this Bureau at the earliest practicable date. Further consideration cannot be given your appointment until your medical certificate is approved.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON.

On March 26, 1947, he received another letter, from the office of the Postmaster General, as follows:

Mr. MELVIN W. SHRADER,
Sutter, Ill.

DEAR MR. SHRADER: It is a pleasure to notify you of your appointment as postmaster of the above-named fourth-class office. You are without authority to enter upon your new duties until your commission has been issued. This will be done when you have had the enclosed bond and oath of office properly executed and returned to the First Assistant Postmaster General. The enclosed Form 905, oath of office, must be executed by the person you appoint your assistant, after you receive your commission. This form should be carefully filed in your office.

I congratulate you—

Mr. President, this letter was from the Postmaster General, Robert Hannegan, to Mr. Shrader—

upon your appointment. It of course carries with it not only an opportunity for public service, but an obligation to adhere strictly and faithfully to the postal laws and regulations of the Department.

ROBERT HANNEGAN,
Postmaster General.

On March 20 he received another letter. This is from J. L. Bridwell, superintendent of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Government Service Bureau, 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. It reads:

DEAR MR. SHRADER: Your appointment as postmaster has come to our attention and we take this opportunity to congratulate you and wish you a long and a successful career.

On April 29, 1947, he received another letter. This is from Mr. Donaldson, then First Assistant Postmaster General:

Please disregard this Bureau's letter of April 26, 1947, informing you that you had been appointed postmaster at Sutter, as the Department wishes to make a selection from a more complete register of eligibles. The Civil Service Commission has been requested to hold another open competitive examination for postmaster.

You see, Mr. President, Mr. Shrader was a Republican. After he had been appointed, after he had been congratulated by the Post Office Department, and after he had been wished a long term of service at Sutter, Ill., this Republican could not take office. They fired him even before he could qualify. Of course, he took the matter up with his Congressman.

I hold in my hand a letter which I am going to read. Why is it important? I call attention to the time J. Wiley Lucas was raised from 68 and a fraction up to 70.23 so he could qualify. There was no talk then of having an examination so there would be three eligibles. What do we find here, when a Republican had been appointed, where a bond had been sent him for execution, and where he had been congratulated by the Post Office Department? The letter is from the Congressman:

This is in reply to your letter of recent date regarding the shoddy treatment of Mr. Melvin W. Shrader. I took this matter up immediately with members of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee—that is, the Republican members—and they informed me it would not hurt, neither would it help, for me to go down and make a fight on this case.

It would not help him any.

However, I did go down to the Post Office Department yesterday afternoon and spent some time with Mr. Uttley, who is executive assistant to Mr. J. M. Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General.

Parenthetically, I may say Mr. Donaldson at present is Postmaster General.

The answer given me was, under the law—

I refer your mind back, Mr. President, to Mr. Uttley, now.

The answer given me was that under the law appointments may be made from any of the first three certified by the Civil Service Commission, that in event there are not three qualified, the Postmaster General may name the appointee even though there be but one or two that qualified, unless someone raises the point and demands that there must be three certified. Mr. Shrader, stood first, Mrs. Lemons, second, in this case. Then an unusual thing happened. My recommendation of Mr. Shrader had been received. Someone in the office failed to check my recommendation for party affiliation.

But, Mr. President, in 1938 we were told if Congress would only pass the Civil Service Act——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from North Dakota would grant unanimous consent to permit the naming of conferees, with the understanding that he would not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I regret I cannot do that. I am sorry.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is, would the Senator yield on the condition that he might proceed immediately thereafter? It would only take one sentence to name the conferees. The Senator could then proceed.

Mr. LANGER. I very, very much regret that I cannot yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we can not hear. If the Senators would speak a little louder, we would appreciate it. We are interested in the proceedings of the Senate as well as Members on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator declines to grant the consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declined to grant the consent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I was saying a moment ago, when the civil service law involving postmasters was passed, the most eloquent speech, according to the RECORD at least—I was not here at that time—certainly the most eloquent speech according to the RECORD was delivered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. O'MAHONEY). The Senator, before becoming United States Senator from Wyoming, had been First Assistant Postmaster General. At that time it was promised us, or rather promised to the people of the country, that if the Congress would pass the civil service law and place postmasters under it, it would take the postmasters out of politics.

Mr. President, if you read the speech by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming you will observe that he covered paragraph after paragraph in his statement to show what it would mean to the Post Office Department if only postmasters were taken out of politics, and if the Post Office, the largest business in the world, were only taken out of politics. In 1938 the civil service law was passed. Yet we have States today where the investigation shows that not a single Republican was appointed. I can cite a town where three men were high on the list, so certified by the Civil Service Commission. They were all three Republicans. Not one of the three was appointed. Another examination was called for. The three high men again were Republicans. No one of the three was appointed.

Finally, among the three eligibles there was one Democrat. That Democrat was appointed.

As I say, Mr. President, I speak only from the record. I want to make it clear that when the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] moved to discharge the committee last evening, making the statements which he did, saying by innuendo that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was discriminating against veterans, there were some other Illinois post offices to which I wanted to refer. But I shall not discuss them tonight. I may discuss them later, because I gather from what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said tonight that he might have something to say when I have concluded. So I shall save those post offices until later.

I want to take up the matter of the draft law. I wonder whether the Members of the Senate really comprehend the feeling of the people of the United States with regard to the measure which we are discussing.

I have here, out of thousands of letters I have received, certain ones from my home State of North Dakota. I want to show the Senate how church after church has written me protesting the passage of the bill. Here is a letter from the Northern District Conference of the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America, dated June 9, 1947. That was only a week ago, plus a year. Mr. President, during all this time the attitude of the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America has not changed. The letter is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: At the recent session of the Northern District Conference of Mennonites, comprising the more than 5,000 members of some 30 churches in South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Montana, it was unanimously resolved to make known to the congressional delegations from these respective States that we are definitely opposed to the plan of peacetime military conscription as recommended by the President's special commission on this subject.

It seems to us that this is so utterly foreign to what we in this country have always

felt was our greatest weapon, namely a righteous course in international affairs. It would seem now that we will leave this glorious heritage and substitute for it a policy which will be based on might of arms. Countries which have rested largely on force to maintain themselves in the family of nations have usually fallen while we have prospered. It is our feeling that if our country follows a basically Christian course in the family of nations with emphasis upon fair play, equal opportunity, and righteousness, it will not be necessary to follow in the footsteps of the nations that we so recently destroyed because they followed a course based on selfishness and force.

We trust that you may do what you can to keep our country from this threat to real freedom.

Very sincerely,

WILLARD K. CLASSEN,
President of the Conference.
HENRY M. HARDER,
Secretary of the Conference.

Mr. President, I have some other letters here. Here is one from a Methodist church. It was written on May 20, 1947, on the letterhead of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, Chicago, Ill. The letter says:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The universal training proposals must not pass. I am convinced that the American people are opposed to the adoption of peace-time compulsory military training, even when labeled "universal training." We find a deepening conviction that universal military training legislation should not be adopted.

The Methodist Church officially is solidly opposed to the adoption of any form of peacetime compulsory military training, as evidenced by the official actions of various Methodist bodies. The Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church—

Just listen to this, Mr. President—

The Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, with only one abstaining vote among the 33 active bishops—

Thirty-two to one, Mr. President—

adopted a strong and impressive statement in opposition to any form of such universal training. The commission on world peace reaffirmed its opposition at its last meeting. The annual conferences have become most outspoken in opposition. Quite recently the board of education of the Methodist Church, embracing the university and college division, and also the Division of Religious Education, took an incisive and forceful stand in opposition to any form of universal military training. The National Conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship took action at its last meeting, reaffirming its former opposition, as did the Woman's Division of Christian Service.

All of the above agencies are officially elected by the church, and contain a cross section of all viewpoints.

Let us see who the members of this commission are and whence they come. I will not give the names—well, I might as well read them, to show the outstanding character of these persons.

The members of the commission are: Rev. Earle A. Baker, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Bishop Robert N. Brooks, New Orleans, La.; Rev. Lawrence C. Campbell, Meade, Kans.; Rev. George W. Carter, New Orleans, La.; Rev. Mark Depp, Winston-Salem, N. C.; Miss Georgia Harkness, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. John W. Haywood, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. Edmund Heinsohn, Austin, Tex.; Mr. Harry N. Holmes, Jackson Heights, N. Y.; Mr. Tracey K. Jones, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. G. Ray Jordan, Atlanta, Ga.; Bishop William C. Martin, Topeka, Kans.; Mrs. James McGiffin, San Francisco, Calif.; Isaac Morris, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. William F. Quillian, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. George S. Register, Bismarck, N. Dak.; Mr. Frank D. Slutz, Dayton, Ohio; Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Willard E. Stanton, Moscow, Idaho; Mr. Robert C. Tatum, Beaumont, Tex.; Rev. Ernest F. Tittle, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Paul Worley, Johnson City, Tenn.; and Mrs. Frank L. Wright, Webster Grove, Mo. There are 33 of them, most of them Methodist Bishops, and the vote against the bill was 32 to 1.

The last sentence of the letter is:

Universal military training proposals should be decisively defeated. Assuring you of our full support in every effort to defeat universal military training proposals, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. BOSS, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. President, military training might be justifiable in certain cases. I wish to call the attention of all the Members of the Senate—there are so many of them sitting here before me [laughter]—to some of the votes they cast on the amendments proposed to the bill.

Before I do that I wish to make one statement. If there be any Senator who in the very, very, very back part of his cerebellum believes that the rule should be changed which permits even one Senator to give his viewpoint, I call to that Senator's attention the fact, if he wishes to change the rules of the Senate, about which we have heard much tonight, to think of our projecting ourselves 50 years from tonight, and if we then had here in the Senate a reverse condition, where an equal number of Senators wanted to pass a law such as is the law in Sweden today, providing that, in addition to taxes, there should be capital levy of 10 percent, every last Senator disagreeing with the capital levy of 10 percent would be exercising the privilege, under the rules, I am exercising tonight. They would not be in any hurry to adjourn, they would not be criticising the rule. They would be here trying to keep the majority of the Senate from passing a law to levy a capital tax to take 10 percent of what a man has, as is done in Sweden today.

So, Mr. President, I am not at all concerned when some Senators tonight say, "We have a lot of business to do. We are in a hurry to get it done", because what does the La Follette-Monroney Act say, the law which this body adopted only a year and a half ago? Does that say anything about adjourning on the 19th day of June? No, Mr. President, we could run on for over a month yet and still be acting in accord with the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act.

If there be any criticism because some of us may choose to talk, I very respectfully and humbly say that the criticism is not to be directed against any of us who may care to talk, but rather to the leadership which says we are going to quit on the 19th day of June. Mr. President, If you hired a man and paid him to work for you and paid him $15,000 a year, how long would you keep it up if the man quit work on the 19th day of June? [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries must maintain order. Under the rules of the Senate no demonstrations of approval or disapproval are in order. Unless the occupants of the galleries maintain order, the Chair will have to have the galleries cleared.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I go back to the amendments which were proposed to the bill. I offered an amendment, first, providing that in the case of contracts with our Government, the men who made the contracts should not make a greater profit than 10 percent on the capital invested. Is not 10 percent enough? At the time I offered that amendment I showed that in the manufacture of boilers and some other articles the war profiteers made a profit of 2,491 percent. For every dollar they made before the war, during the war they made $2,491.

When I tried to limit the profit to 10 percent, I said, "Oh, well, $249 is enough for every dollar that is invested," but I could not even get a yea-and-nay vote.

The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] offered an amendment to this very bill—and this time we got a record vote, and I am going to take great satisfaction in reading that vote upon the floor of the Senate as the years go by, when some Senator very piously rises and says that somebody is making too much money in war profits. Eleven Senators—I remember the number—voted to tax war profits 100 percent, 11 Senators voted for the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas. Senators are perfectly willing to draft the last drop of blood out of the body of a young boy 19 or 20 or 21 years old, but, oh, we must not tax profits. Let them go ahead and make 2,491 percent. In the list I read, Mr. President, time after time it appeared that there were profits of as much as 500 percent, 600 percent, 700 percent, and there were some profits of over 1,000 percent. Yet, Mr. President, that amendment was defeated. I think every taxpayer in the United States has the right to know that that amendment was defeated, and who voted for it and who voted against it.

One of the great things we treasure in this democratic country of ours is that what we do here is an open book. For example, a few years ago, when the Senate confirmed a nominee or failed to confirm a nominee, action was taken on the nominee in executive session. That practice was changed because the people wanted to know which Senators voted for confirmation and which Senators voted against confirmation.

Mr. President, I want to speak of churches, church organizations, and the very fine men who are at the head of them, bishops, clergymen, who are opposed to the bill almost unanimously. I have in my hand a letter from Rev. J. F. Simpson, President, Dakota Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, which comprises the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming. His letter to me is dated April 6, 1948, and is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We appreciate the great task which is yours in bringing before

Congress proper recommendations concerning the Selective Draft during this time of world peril.

Am sure you will agree with me when I say that our Nation has a great moral and spiritual problem and unless it is solved we will not be able to successfully wage another war.

The ranks of the Ministry have been depleted for years to come because of the loss of our young men during the recent war.

Our church had a conference of all its general and Conference leaders last week in Marion, Ind., and considered the above question seriously and took official action requesting our Congressmen to give serious consideration for the exemption of young men from Military service who are preparing for the Ministry, also unordained ministers.

Our church and other churches were loyal in releasing key men for the work of chaplains during the recent war. This has caused a serious shortage of pastors.

We will appreciate your influence and efforts to be used in securing proper exemptions for theological students, so that the Church and Nation can continue to have spiritual leadership.

Yet, Mr. President, when in the House the effort was made to exempt doctors and dentists, a terrible fight resulted. I have received letters from such men as the head of one of the leading clinics of North Dakota, with headquarters at Grand Forks, N. Dak., protesting the inclusion in the original draft bill of doctors. I also have received letters on the subject from some of the leading dentists in our State. I have letters from other churchmen.

I have one from Mr. Gordon W. Hewes of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the University of North Dakota, located at Grand Forks. I will say that the University of North Dakota, located at Grand Forks, is one of the great institutions of the country. Seventy-two miles south of it is the State College of North Dakota, formerly known as the Agricultural College. Those two institutions, Mr. President, have done a marvelous job not only for the United States but for the entire world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I would rather not yield at this time. I might do so a little later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I prefer not to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator prefers not to yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the State college there is a man named E. F. Ladd, who is connected with the Pure Food Commission. That man found, for example, that if one bought a can of stuff there was no way of knowing what was inside of it. For example, in a can of apricots there might be found some fluid which was entirely foreign to apricots. So Mr. Ladd obtained the passage in our State of a law requiring the labeling of all cans containing food and other products so that the purchaser could tell to the tiniest fraction all the components of whatever was contained in the can. Those who opposed the law took the case all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States, claiming the law was unconstitutional. Mr. Ladd made so fine a record in the development of paint that if a man in Michigan now buys paint, he will find on the outside of the can of paint a label giving the exact description of the contents. That is due to the efforts of E. F. Ladd.

Mr. President, he was such a distinguished man in his field that when the League of Nations met, officials of the League insisted that Mr. Ladd, of that school at Fargo, N. Dak., be one of the technical advisers, and later they selected him to draw up all the pure food regulations which they were going to place in effect in all the countries which belonged to the League of Nations.

What kind of men has the University of North Dakota, located at Grand Forks, of which Mr. Hewes is head of the department of sociology and anthropology, sent out to help America? In World War I when there was a scandal in the buying of millions of dollars worth of material for the Navy, President Wilson looked all over the United States and finally picked John Hancock, from a little town called Amarado, which perhaps at the outside at that time had 150 inhabitants, and he placed Mr. Hancock in charge of the buying of $2,000,000,000 worth of property for the Navy. He did such a good job that the Army also appointed him to do the same work, and he did buying for the Army. He is one of the few men who today holds rank in both the Army and the Navy of the United States. Today he is a partner of Lehman Bros. of New York, and one of the great advisers of Barney Baruch, the man who acted as adviser to those engaged in the development of atomic energy. Mr. Hancock is a graduate of the University of North Dakota.

President Roosevelt closed the banks and declared a bank holiday, and overnight every single bank in the country was closed except the Bank of North Dakota. I wonder why that bank remained open, of all the other banks in the United States. It was at that time decided that a man was needed who could take care of the closed banks without a scandal arising in connection with his work. So Mr. J. F. T. O'Conner of Grand Forks, where the State university is located, was chosen by President Roosevelt to be comptroller of the currency. I well remember when I was in Detroit talking to some of the officials of the Ford organization. They said they had $164,000,000 in one bank that was closed, and they said that Mr. O'Conner had operated that bank so well that there was not even the slightest claim of any wrong or fraud or corruption in connection with it. He is a graduate of the University of North Dakota.

Mr. President, if today one of the Members of this body should become ill and go to Rochester, Minn., to the Mayo Brothers Clinic, and if after he had been there for weeks and no one knew what was wrong with him, the final, ultimate decision, would rest with a doctor born on a farm in North Dakota, a graduate of the University of North Dakota.

Certainly people who live in Chicago have heard of the Murphy Hospital. A young farm boy born 7 miles east of Casselton, at a town called Mapleton, went to Chicago. After going to the university he became a doctor. He performed the first operation for appendicitis, and is the inventor of the Murphy button, which doctors use all over the country when they perform operations for appendicitis. It has been responsible for saving thousands of lives.

What does the head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology have to say? His letter is dated March 29, 1948, and reads as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Grand Forks, March 29, 1948.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been told that you have already more or less gone on record against UMT and revival of selective service. This is merely to help you hold fast to this position in the face of the overwhelming force of war hysteria and jingoism that now seems to engulf the country. Frankly, before coming to North Dakota, I had been frequently puzzled by the vague political reports I had heard about this State and its curious progressive-conservative approach to many problems—local, national, and international. Having lived here for 2 years, and having worked and traveled about in various parts of the State, I am beginning to understand the reasons for the political behavior of this State, and of your actions in representing it.

When I lived in California, and when I lived in Washington, D. C., and in Philadelphia, I had assumed that the reason for the so-called isolationism of North Dakota (along with certain other predominantly rural midwestern States) stemmed from what I assumed to be rural ignorance and inability of people in this remote area to perceive the relationships between national and international affairs which more favorably situated urban populations (on the Atlantic coast, e. g.) realized. I now know that the relative immunity of these people to hysterical propaganda is based on intelligence and a kind of realism which is often lacking in urban, industrial areas. Perhaps it simply comes from an occupation which permits the individual to think something out, reasonably and quietly, free from the incessant bombardment of headlines, slogans, and appeals to the emotions.

I was very impressed recently, here in Grand Forks, by two large meetings, one at which several ministers and a physicist (Dr. D. Q. Posin of Fargo), spoke on the menace of a future war to all civilization, and the other a meeting on this campus, to debate UMT-selective service. The questions from the floor were so reasonable, the interchange of opinion so sane, compared to the ranting of the radio commentators and so-called analysts, who predict war in 24 hours every night.

I am also very distressed by the way in which religion has somehow intruded in a big way into discussions of our foreign policy and international problems. If we must fight the Soviet Union because their state is not Christian, why not, just as reasonably, advocate war against the Arab nations, which are certainly, and have been for some 1,400 years, far more diligently anti-Christian than the Russians. To inject religion into a political, economic, and possibly military issue seems to me to place international relations back 400 or more years, when the nations of Europe were engaged in almost incessant wars, in the name of Christian faith.

Finally, you might be amused to learn that the Catechetical Guild of St. Paul, Minn., in a recently published comic-book presentation entitled "Is This Tomorrow" (or some

such title), purporting to show the way in which the Communists would take over America, contains an unflattering reference to the State of North Dakota. The booklet, distributed widely on newsstands, selling for 10 cents, uses the simplified, appeal-to-the-emotions-of-a-child approach, showing communist troopers (wearing United States Army uniforms) at work, etc. In one strip, civilians are shown being herded pell-mell into a line of cattle cars by United States Army troops (somehow taken over by the Reds). One victim says, as he is manhandled into a cattle car:

"They're taking us to North Dakota."

"Yes, to work on a dam for 5 years," says another.

This childish form of propaganda has had a wide distribution. I suppose it is necessary to make North Dakota the equivalent of Yakutsk or Kamchatka, in telling Americans what is in store for us if we do not go right down the line with the Administration's anticommunist drive.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON W. HEWES,
Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

Mr. President, I want to take up some other letters which I have received from North Dakota, so that the Senate may judge just exactly what kind of people are opposed to universal military training. Here is a letter from the president of a State college in North Dakota, the State Normal and Industrial College at Ellendale, N. Dak., which is only a short distance north of the State of South Dakota. The letter is written by J. C. McMillan, president of the college. He says:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We at the State Normal and Industrial College note with no little concern the continued insistence of the President and some military pressure groups, that compulsory military training legislation be enacted at this session of Congress. What arguments they have presented have been shown to be faulty, irrelevant, inaccurate, or downright misrepresentations, yet they are continually on the radio and in the press.

Dr. McMillan, who signed this letter as president of the State Normal and Industrial College at Ellendale, N. Dak., at the time he wrote the letter, on March 11, 1948, did not realize that the Marshall Plan and universal military training went hand in hand. If he had known about it, if he had known that the New York Tribune, the New York Times, Fortune, News Week, Time Magazine, Life and some radio stations were going to get $10,000,000 out of the Marshall Plan, perhaps he would not have wondered, because he says, "Yet they are continually on the radio and in the press."

President McMillan continues:

The proponents of C. M. T., in other words, are making themselves heard. The opponents are not. That puts a lot of pressure on you men in Washington.

This letter is written you from the faculty council of the State Normal and Industrial College to assure you that the faculty of this college is 100 percent diametrically opposed to compulsory military training and just as strongly in favor of a powerful Army, Navy, and Air Force. We are vitally interested in C. M. T. and will be glad to assist you in any way we can to keep it off the statutes. Let's not surrender to the system our forefathers came to these shore to avoid.

Yours very truly,

J. C. MCMILLAN,
President, Chairman, Faculty Council.

Mr. President, it does not worry me to keep the Senate up at night. It will do Senators good.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield merely for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator decines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. The soldier boys who are going to be drafted if this bill becomes law, as their brothers did a few months ago, will spend days, weeks, and months away from home.

Mr. President, in some countries when a man is elected to be judge, he is put in jail before he is allowed to serve as judge; and sometimes he is kept in jail a week, or sometimes a month, so that he can actually experience what it means to be in jail, before he sentences someone to go there. A letter I read a short time ago suggests that it might be a good idea for the Senators who favor a draft law to draft themselves for a short time and have the actual experience.

Mr. President, it is only a few months ago that I received from the president of one of the North Dakota colleges a pamphlet, which had been sent to that college, stating that in Knoxville, Tenn., a universal military training college had been in operation for 18 months; and that pamphlet, which actually was sent to students at that college in North Dakota, contained statements trying to persuade the students of that North Dakota college to leave there and go to the universal military college at Knoxville, Tenn.

Mr. President, as perhaps you know, I believe in taking direct action; and because we have authority in our committee to investigate personnel, I subpenaed before our Civil Service Committee the men who were in charge of that school or college in Tennessee. Lo and behold, they not only appeared before the committee, but they admitted that they had sent out 5,000 of those pamphlets every week; and they were only similar to other pamphlets which were gotten out in other parts of the United States—pamphlets advocating universal military training.

They admitted that they had been doing that for 18 months. They admitted that the War Department had established this college; and they admitted that they had had one graduating class of 600, and that 6 months later they had had another graduating class of 600, and that in a few days after they were testifying they would have another graduating class of 600—or a total, Mr. President, of 1,800 graduates of a universal military training college, and yet here in the Senate we had not passed a law providing for such a college.

I tried to find out who was responsible. The answer was always the same: Dwight Eisenhower had issued an order directing that the college be established. Testimony to that effect was taken under oath, and transcripts of the testimony are in the files of our committee.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the Federated Church of Grand Forks, N. Dak. I shall read the third paragraph of the letter:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: * * *

I hope that you will maintain opposition to the move toward the restoring of Selective Service as well as continue your opposition to universal military training.

Cordially yours,

HUBERT N. DUKES.

He is a minister of the Gospel.

Mr. President, I wish to read other letters from churches.

I now hold in my hand a letter from the pastor of the Methodist Church at Forest River, N. Dak., the Rev. George G. Finlay. He writes the letter from 1030 Plum Ave., Grand Forks, N. Dak. His letter reads in part as follows:

MARCH 24, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR: We have been considerably perturbed here by a press release of last evening in the Grand Forks Herald concerning a meeting of Senator GURNEY'S committee on the armed services. It was indicated that the committee is presently overwhelmingly in favor of a "limited" draft and of universal military training. Such action seems to me a complete reversal of a traditional American policy, which has been cherished as a safeguard of a democratic attitude and way of life. To reverse a policy so well grounded in reason and history is not a matter of light moment nor for the counsel of hysteria. Can the Senate not provide full and open hearings on this matter before taking decisive action?

Later in the letter he says:

The Farmer's Union and the Grange have both strongly opposed universal military training. My own church, the Methodist Church, has opposed it. Several Roman Catholic bishops have registered their opposition.

Mr. President, I now hold in my hand a letter from the president of the North Dakota Farmer's Union. The letter, which is dated March 22, 1948, reads as follows:

March 22, 1948.

During my attendance at the annual stockholders meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange in St. Paul last week, I listened to the President's address delivered in person to the joint session of Congress. Since that time I have carefully analyzed the text of his address as it was carried in the press. To say that I was shocked at Mr. Truman's interpretation of national emergency and his proposals for action by the Congress is putting it mildly indeed.

We completely disapprove President Truman's interpretation of national emergency and oppose both proposals for universal military training and re-enactment of Selective Service. We are for both rehabilitation and emergency aid for Europe, but we are firmly persuaded that such aid as may be made available by the Congress should be administered through the United Nations and not by unilateral action.

I congratulate you upon your Senate vote on this question. Our blind stampede down the road toward world war III must, in some way, be halted. It is our judgment that the United Nations organization still provides the only basis of hope for world peace. Russia, through her intemperate use of the veto and the United States through by-passing UN with unilateral action, as witness the Greek-Turkish program and the proposed Marshall plan, and our reversal of positions already taken, as witness the question of Palestine partition, has already done much to scuttle the United Nations organization.

We urge you to take every possible opportunity to insist that our Nation use its

strength, resources and influence to lead the world towards a strong United Nations and universal disarmament.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
GLENN J. TALBOTT, *President.*

When a large fine farm organization like that is calling upon one of the two Senators of the State, saying "We urge you to do everything you practically can; when the churches of every denomination in the State state that they are opposed to the bill now under consideration in the Senate, and when, as I shall later read, veterans of World War II are opposed to universal military training, asking me as 1 of the 96 Senators to do everything I possibly can to prevent enactment of the bill, then of course I, as their representative here, naturally will comply with their request to present to every member of this body the fact that the churches of North Dakota and the large farm organization of that State want me to so inform each of the Senators on the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. I regret I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Naturally those groups want to have their views known to those sitting upon the floor of the Senate tonight.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from a man who was formerly one of the officers of the Farmers Union of South Dakota, the State president. I believe the Farmers Union of South Dakota perhaps has the second largest group of members in that section of the country, being second only to North Dakota.

Jerome H. Evanson, President of the Jamestown Farmers Union Federal Credit Union, a man who used to reside in South Dakota sent me on January 30, 1948, the following resolution:

At the annual members' meeting of the Jamestown Farmers Union Federal Credit Union, composed of 300 members, held January 30, 1948, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the military is becoming more and more influential in governmental affairs, thereby tending to dominate the civilian life of this country; and

"Whereas we feel that the adoption of peacetime military conscription, would extend that power, and endanger the basic rights of free American citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we vigorously oppose House Resolution 4278, and that we mail a copy of this resolution to our Congressmen, Senators, and chairman of the House and Senate Military Affairs Committee."

JEROME H. EVANSON,
President, Jamestown Farmers Union, Federal Credit Union.

Mr. President, when the head of an organization like that says he is opposed to the measure, and when he says that the 300 members of his organization are likewise opposed to it, I reserve the right to take the judgment of those 300 men against the judgment of two honest men who may be representing the interests of another State, who may yet be mistaken. I feel that a Senator ought to take into consideration the wishes, the feelings, the judgment of the people of the State he represents. Here we have the State president of the Farmers Union, the State president of the credit union making their position known. "Ah!" somebody may say, "they merely sat down at Jamestown and wrote some letters." But, Mr. President, I have here a telegram dated March 20, sent to me from Bowbells, N. Dak., away up in the northwest corner of the State, near Canada, reading as follows:

At a meeting of Farmers Union Local No. 815 sixty members last night voted unanimously to oppose universal military training.

WILLIAM BUTGEREIT,
Secretary.

Sixty farmers meet, 60 taxpayers, and they say to me as their Senator, "We are opposed to universal military training."

In my opinion not one person in a thousand recognizes and knows what the Marshall plan and all these other programs have cost their respective localities. I went to the Congressional Library and said, "I want you to estimate for me what the indebtedness will be for every county in my State." We have a county called Cass. My recollection now is that Cass County's share is $20,000,000. There are some counties that I have clearly in mind, and some cities like Towner, N. Dak., with a population of 1,500, whose share is over $436,000. Wabek's share, as I now recollect, is over $1,200,000.

Tomorrow, Mr. President, I shall put in the RECORD exactly what it has cost every county in my State, and what it will cost them, together with what it will cost some of the leading towns.

Here is a letter, Mr. President, from the Episcopal Church in North Dakota. It comes from St. Matthew's Church, Linton, N. Dak., and from Christ Church, Mandan, N. Dak. It is written jointly to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and myself. I read:

DEAR SIRS: Greetings! To Senator BILL, whom I know personally; and Senator YOUNG whose recent questionnaire to sample people's ideas on public questions I greatly admire.

Mr. President, what was that questionnaire which the junior Senator from North Dakota, prepared and sent out to approximatey 40,000 voters in our State? If there be any Senator upon the floor who thinks that the people are in favor of universal military training, they should see the reports which were returned by the farmers, the laboring men, the small-business men, and the lawyers of North Dakota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter from Eidred D. Murdoch, Vicar, 205 Sixth Avenue, Northwest, Mandan, N. Dak., printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINTON, N. DAK., *March 17, 1948.*

Senators LANGER and YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: Greetings! To Senator Bill, whom I know personally; and Senator YOUNG whose recent questionnaire to sample peoples' ideas on public questions, I greatly admire.

I write to urge you men to consider carefully the implications behind this proposed universal military training. I am simply appalled by it.

History teaches that every country that resorted to it has failed, gone down sooner or later into defeat, corruption, or lost.

Every country that has taken it on has done so to be prepared so as to have peace, yet it has always been the nation with zeal and no preparation that has vanquished the one with all the guns.

The instigators of this universal training program know that when Laddie is off in a camp pa and ma buy bonds, and get more patriotic and will then back a war. Without son in the camp no politician would dare vote war, but with ma and pa full of pride he would be doing his duty and what was expected of him.

Appropriate a million, since there is endless sums, and send a hundred thousand mothers to live in or near any Army camp in U. S. A.—have her there Saturday afternoon and evening. Have her knit in the waiting room of a prophylactic station and watch the beardless kids come in until time for her to go to church Sunday a. m. and she would change her mind about how necessary it was to have preparedness. Have her take cookies to the venereal disease wards of the hospitals, have her there at the officer's club to hear the stars—after the radio broadcast is shut off, and to count the empty fifth bottles on the hundred tables and watch the "trained" "invigorated" youth go to the officer's quarters. We could send dad to the Orient and have him see our boys in those places and see the liquor ships hove into port ahead of the milk ship, or even ammunition ship.

Before you vote on any such thing talk to the kids in the colleges, the boys that were there. Talk to the Greeks who have visited Greece since the war, talk to any missionary from China, investigate this thing.

Dr. Pozen of the American Council talked in Bismarck not long ago. He made us feel that all the armies in the world will be of little use comes the next war. It might be an idea to have him address a group of your colleagues. It was really something.

In closing let me say that this seems quite an upset letter, I am upset. I have admired both you men and been proud that neither of you has been led around by party bigwigs or by pressure groups. I know you are investigating this thing too, but I do want you to know that there are some who are terribly against universal military training * * * and this Marshall Plan (if it can be used as a dollar club to make Europeans do what we want them to do politically).

Sincerely,

ELDRED D. MURDOCK,
Vicar.

Mr. LANGER. So we have the Methodist Chuch, the Mennonite Church, the Baptist Church, and the Episcopal Church, who are opposed to universal military training. Now we shall see who else complains.

Mr. President, right across the river from North Dakota is Concordia College, a great Scandinavian school, located at Moorhead, Minn., across the river from Fargo, the largest town in our State. I shall read the first few sentences of the letter:

Peacetime military conscription is contrary to basic American tradition. Years ago Daniel Webster considered it a mockery to speak of conscription in a free country.

Oh, how times have changed! If Daniel Webster were here now he would be called a radical.

In view of this fact, the burden of proof clearly rests on those who would change this long-established tradition.

For your consideration, we respectfully raise the following points:

This letter is from W. E. Lillo, chairman, faculty committee on military conscription. Surely, Mr. President, the Senate will not take the judgment of the military men who make their living out of being in the Army, and say that all these church people of every denomination are wrong, that the members of the faculties of various colleges are mistaken, that the heads of the farm organizations are wrong. The other Senators upon the floor may do so if they want to, but the Senator from North Dakota will not follow them. In the long run, I have found in my experience that usually church people can be pretty much depended upon.

Mr. President, I was talking to the late President Roosevelt one day. I said to the President, "Who really formulated social security? Who really came to you and talked to you about the care of the blind, the physically handicapped, the deaf, the dumb, the crippled? Who helped to figure it out?" He told me that it was a Catholic priest in the city of Washington, Father O'Hara. He said, "He has been of great value in helping to formulate it." He said, "You can always depend upon churchmen. They are not looking for money, honors, or glory. They are out to help the common, ordinary man in the rank and file of this life."

Later on I had the pleasure of meeting Father O'Hara. To my surprise, I found he had been in every State in the United States. He has worked, after he became a priest, 7 weeks in the harvest fields of North Dakota. I found that he had gone West, out into the fruit country in Idaho, over at Wenatchee, picking apples in the State of Washington. He came back here after that trip and helped to write the social security laws of the United States. So when Concordia College, that fine Lutheran institution, joins the Episcopal Church, the Baptist Church, and the Methodist Church of my State, and I receive a letter from the chairman of the faculty committee on military conscription, of the leading Norwegian school in the Northwest, I pay attention to it, Mr. President, because I have found in my experience that you can rely upon such persons. They are not politicians looking for votes. They are not trying to make a lot of money. They are not trying to ingratiate themselves. They are men who are ministers of the gospel.

The letter refers to what was said years ago by Daniel Webster. Daniel Webster used to occupy this desk. He considered it a mockery to speak of conscription in a free country. I wish that Daniel Webster were here today.

The faculty of Concordia College says:

We respectfully raise the following points:

1. We believe that the American way—the voluntary way—of maintaining our armed forces has not been fully tried.

Mr. President, whether you and the other Senators believe it or not, that is the feeling of the average American wherever I have been, that the Army has not fully tried the voluntary system, and here the faculty of Concordia College say so. Be it true or false, the fact is that today that is what the average American believes, and that is what I believe. No one can go through the questions that have been asked of the average GI and come to any other conclusion.

This is what the faculty of the great Norwegian school of the Northwest says:

A. The Army deliberately lifted its passing grade from 70 to 80 in the Army general classification test. Yet, General Eisenhower testified that the grade could be lowered to 70. Why did the Army want to discourage enlistments if it is short of men?

Mr. President, these men are not halfwitted, these men are not foolish, these men demand that they be shown the same as any American taxpayer has the right to be shown whether or not a law is correct. So they say:

B. In 1945 and 1946 the Army accepted enlistments for 18 months and reenlistments for 1 year. There were more than 150,000 recruits. Today the Army insists on longer enlistment. Why is it doing this if it is short of men?

C. It has been asserted that the Army is definitely limiting the number of Negro recuits. If this position is true, why is the Army doing this if it is short of men?

D. In Europe are millions of splendid young men who would be glad of the opportunity to serve in the American Army of Occupation. Such a plan has been proposed by Senator Lodge. The Army has made no move to get behind such a proposal. Why this attitude if the Army is short of men?

E. Both the Navy and the Air Force have testified that they can get the men they need without conscription. Only the Army insists that it must use totalitarian methods in order to get men. Why not try American methods? If we want steel we pay the price that will produce steel. If we need oil we pay the price that will produce oil.

Mind you, this is from the faculty of this Norwegian college in the northwest, Concordia College, in the State of Minnesota. This faculty is not being fooled. They say:

If we need oil we pay the price that will produce oil. If we need men why not offer the incentives that will supply men? Is the Army hostile to the American way?

F. Common sense suggests that in tomorrow's war the Air Force would be the line of first defense; the Navy would be second; and huge land armies would be of least importance. Should we violate a basic American principle in order to bolster the least important part of our defense system?

2. We recommend that every young man who volunteers for military service be given the full benefit of the GI bill of rights. We urge that human beings be considered just as important as material goods; that so long as we do not find it necessary to resort to compulsion in order to get the steel and aluminum we need for defense we ought not to resort to compulsion in order to get the young men we need for defense.

Respectfully submitted,

W. E. LILLO,
Chairman, Faculty Committee on Military Conscription.
CONCORDIA COLLEGE, MOORHEAD, MINN.

Mr. President, we have the Episcopal Church of North Dakota, the Presbyterian Church, the Baptist Church, the Mennonite Church, and all the other churches I have enumerated, calling upon the Senator from North Dakota. We have the leading farm organization, the Farmer's Union, calling upon the Senator from North Dakota. We have the Credit Union calling upon the Senator from North Dakota. Somewhere I have also a letter from the Livestock Association of North Dakota calling upon the Senator from North Dakota to do everything he can to defeat this bill.

Mr. President, how I should like to accommodate some of the Senators so that they could pass some of the bills they want to pass and go home and go to bed, but apparently I cannot do it and at the same time do my duty to those churches, to those farm organizations, to the people of my State, who, as is shown by the letters I have already read, ask me to do everything possible to prevent the passage of this iniquitous, terrible, un-American measure.

I have here another letter dated the 19th day of March, 1948. This letter comes from the western part of North Dakota, adjoining Montana. Only the Yellowstone River lies between Montana and North Dakota. Every time I mention the Yellowstone River or think about it I think of the great sacrifice made by Gen. George Custer when he was sent out to fight the Indians because of the fact that he protested against graft in the Army at Fort Yates, N. Dak., a military post. The privilege of selling goods to Indians for just one year brought graft of $11,000, and because George Custer dared come to Washington and tell the truth, because he dared to come here and insist on the impeachment of the Secretary of War, Belknap, he was sent to his death.

He started out from Fort Lincoln in 1776, and went across the prairies. As he and his men rode away, the flags flying and the bands playing, his little woman, soon to be a widow, was left behind. One has only to read that great book "Boots and Saddles" to realize what a sacrifice the wives of those soldiers made in order that that territory might be opened to settlement. What good did it do? George Custer died. They shipped his body down the Yellowstone River.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. MYERS. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield was to say that it is now 4:10 o'clock in the morning, so that it would be known that I was present in the Senate at this time.

Mr. LANGER. I regret it, but I cannot yield.

George Custer's body was shipped down the Yellowstone River. He and his successors freed the great Northwest.

If there is anyone on the floor of the Senate who has not read the speech which Chief Seattle, the last Indian chief in this country, made when he lived in the State of Washington, he should read it. I quote some words from his speech. He said:

The white men know so much more than the Indians, or they pretend they do; yet

the Indians build up their herds of buffaloes to the millions, and the white man comes in and destroys them in a few months.

A few years ago the assessed valuation of North Dakota was $961,000,000. That included every horse, every cow, every sheep, every piece of land and every building. Congress a few days ago gave away under the Marshall plan, $6,000,000,000. Therefore, Mr. President, I am not so certain that the Senate realizes the great service that George Custer rendered.

I do not want to get away from the churches and the educators.

Mr. President, may I have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The Senator's point is well taken. The Senator is entitled to order.

Mr. LANGER. Just to show that not only church people are interested in the subject, I read a petition which was sent to me, as follows:

The Honorable WILLIAM E. LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We ask that you use your influence against UMT and selective service and in its stead that you redouble your efforts toward securing a workable system of world government.

The petition is dated Fargo, N. Dak., April 6, 1948, and is signed among others by D. Q. Posin, professor, North Dakota State College, and 15 other citizens, some of whom I know. I know Alfred S. Dale, who was State treasurer of my State. Mrs. Alfred Dale was, I believe, head of the women's Democratic organization of Cass County, the largest county, possibly, in the State of North Dakota. She is certainly a brilliant, well-educated, remarkable woman. She is opposed to universal military training and has said so. So, it is not only the church people, it is not only the leaders of the farm organizations but the rank and the file of the people are opposed to universal military training.

I have another petition sent to me by Mrs. Robert Sense, secretary of the Black Butte local, Bowman, N. Dak. I will read the part of the petition which pertains to universal training:

Whereas the United States of America was founded by people who despised the military system of the Old World, we the undersigned, go on record as opposing universal military training on the grounds that it has been thoroughly discredited in two world wars, and it is outmoded as a means of national defense in consideration of the realization that we are living in an atomic age. Further, it is a betrayal of the traditions of the United States.

We further resolve that this bill is a step toward complete conscripting of American life. Universal military training is the road to war, not peace; it will encourage an armaments race. Further, there can be no real security until war itself is abolished.

Further, this bill for universal military training is the exact opposite of education for democracy, as it is widely advertised by its proponents.

I am hard pressed for time, and do not have the time to read the whole of the petition. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of the petition printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the names of those who signed it. I want to have the names of these farmers, some of whom I know down near New England, N. Dak., some of them the outstanding farmers of that locality, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the petition and the names signed thereto were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would damage our young men and waste their lives. It would be a shameful betrayal of our youth.

Further, we oppose placing such a huge and unnecessary tax burden on the American people on the grounds that it would weaken our economy which is already weakened by inflation, and would take money that we so urgently need for hospitals, schools, housing, and living.

We further resolve that passage of this bill would destroy the confidence of the rest of the world which looks to us for hope, and at the same time destroy our last opportunity to prove to the rest of the world that we earnestly want peace.

Rather, we favor spending a small fraction of the amount this proposed program would cost, on a smaller number of continuously and highly trained men who know precisely what atomic and bacteriological warfare mean.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, those who signed the petition are taxpayers. I see on the petition the name of Julius Homling, of Amidon, N. Dak. I see also the name of Clara D. Brown, superintendent of public instruction of Slope County, N. Dak. Those are the types of people who send petitions relating to the draft to Congress. They have a right to be heard, and so long as I am a Member of this body, I shall see to it that no matter how humble the man or woman may be, no matter how poor they may be, if they write WILLIAM LANGER, a Senator from North Dakota, that they want him to oppose something they think is wrong, I shall at least present their petition to the other Members of this body.

I have here a letter from the president of Golden Lake Local, 791, Farmers Union, Mrs. Edwin Fleache, The letter is dated Finley, N. Dak., April 5, 1948. She writes as follows:

FINLEY, N. DAK., *April 5, 1948.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in regard to compulsory military training and the reinstatement of the selective-service law. I am opposed to both of these measures and I urge you to work for their defeat.

I don't think any real effort has been made to come to a mutual agreement with Russia. I believe the Congress and public have been kept ignorant of the real facts of diplomatic relations.

Compulsory military training would be the first step toward war. We fought two world wars to save democracy and we are farther from that goal than ever. If we fight a third world war it will be the end of the human race. Who then will be left to enjoy the freedoms of democracy?

I feel that the money spent for war preparation could be used for improving our schools, hospitals, and for raising the living standard of low-income people.

Your efforts to represent the common people are commendable and I hope you will keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. EDWIN FLESCHE,
President, Golden Lake Local 791, Farmers Union.

I am opposed to both of these measures and I urge you to work for their defeat. Compulsory military training would be the first step toward war.

Mr. President, this letter from Mrs. Edward Flesche, president of Golden Lake Local 791, of the Farmers Union, is one of the very finest I have received.

Mr. President, I have letters here from churches outside my State. I prefer to confine my consideration to churches inside my State. The population of the State used to be 641,000. Because of the drought it was considerably reduced. Church after church in my State protests this bill.

I now wish to read a letter from the general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association at Grand Forks, N. Dak. I want all the many Senators in the chamber to listen carefully.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. I am sorry.

This is what is expected of a North Dakota Senator. The general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association of the second largest town in North Dakota writes:

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all of your energies in opposition to military conscription.

I served as an enlisted man through five campaigns in Europe during the past war—

Here is a man who fought through five campaigns in the last war—

and feel capable and obligated to express an opinion opposing military conscription. I share identical views with Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR of Idaho as expressed in his radio address over CBS on Saturday, April 20.

I will be watching with interest for the views which you express in opposition to military conscription.

The general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association is saying to his Senator:

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all your energies in opposition to military conscription.

This man is a veteran who served through five campaigns in Europe. His name is Leonard H. Egstrom, and he is general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association of Grand Forks, N. Dak.

Mr. President, it is very easy to sit here and vote "yea," but it is very much harder to say "Nay." The people of my State sent me down here because they had confidence enough in me to know that when I felt in my conscience that it was time to say "No" I would say "No." If I did not say "No" when I believed that a "no" vote ought to be cast, I would have no business in the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose.

I have here a letter from Reverend and Mrs. C. A. Zook, of the Church of the Brethren. He is minister of the Church of the Brethren of Minot, N. Dak. The letter is dated June 22:

I am hoping you will do all you can to down peacetime conscription as I feel it is the wrong thing to do and not a Christian way.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES A. ZOOK.

I am a minister of the Church of the Brethren.

Here is the letter from his wife:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Will you please use your influence against peacetime conscription? We feel that it is wrong and not the Christian way to insure peace.

Thank you.

Mrs. C. A. ZOOK.

From the Church of the Brethren, Minot, N. Dak.

I believe that makes nine churches in my State from which I have received letters. I have some more. Mr. President, we have a very religious State. A few years ago the Saturday Evening Post stated that we were the most religious State in the Union, if churches are any indication of religion. In Trail County, North Dakota, there are a great many churches. The Saturday Evening Post showed pictures of 12 churches in three townships out in the country. There was nothing like it in the entire United States. Those churches were in sparsely settled communities, 12 of them in three townships. We have a very religious people. The record shows that the people of North Dakota are among the most patriotic people in the Union.

It will be remembered that in World War I William Gibbs McAdoo offered a prize. As Secretary of the Treasury he said, "I will give a banner to the county in the United States which will sell the most bonds in the third Liberty Loan war drive per capita. To show the kind of people we have in North Dakota, we have a county in my State named Trail County. At that time 95 percent of the people of that county were Scandinavians, born in Norway or Sweden. Practically every one of them was naturalized. They won that prize in competition with every other county in the United States.

Mr. President, more North Dakota boys were killed per capita in World War I than boys from any other State in the Union. In World War I and in the Spanish-American War more North Dakota men were decorated for bravery than men from any other State in the Union, population considered. In the last war three times North Dakota led in the buying of Liberty bonds per capita. Once Montana beat us by one point. We led in the scrap iron drive. We led in the paper drive.

After World War I, France sent to the United States a commission to pick out the typical American nurse. That commission went to every State in the Union. When they got all through, whom did they select? They selected a little 18-year-old North Dakota girl, Frances Lauder. Today if you go to Paris, there in the middle of the city you will see a life-size statue of that little 18-year-old girl, the daughter of a district judge—sweet, young, 18 years of age. Among all the nurses who went across the water in World War I, she was selected by France, after the war, as a typical American nurse.

Mr. President, on the 17th day of March, in the year when Hiram Johnson ran for the Presidency—and that was the day when he was running in the primary in North Dakota—there was a blizzard of unprecedented viciousness, with a wind of unprecedented velocity. It came up so suddenly that the girls who were teaching in the schools were unable to get the youngsters home. In Oliver County, 8 miles east of Center, a little girl 15 years of age, named Hazel Miner, started home from school with her little brother and little sister. The teacher dismissed the school early. That little girl had a horse-drawn sled. She started out with her little brother and sister in the sled with her. That blizzard was so desperately bad that the horse took the sled off the road, to follow the coulee. Those children never got home. Their folks were living about a mile and a half from the school.

The next day when the children were found, her folks found that that little North Dakota girl had taken off her overcoat and her overshoes and her cap and had placed them around her little sister. She had taken the robe and had placed it around her little brother. Then, without any covering at all except her dress, she lay down to die beside her little brother and sister. Mr. President, those are the kind of people that I am proud to represent here on the floor of the Senate. Those are the kind of people I am going to represent. I shall represent them honestly and fearlessly; I shall represent them no matter what the attitude of any Senator may be, much as I like to have Senators friendly. When the day comes that I cannot represent them, I am going to walk out of the door of this Chamber with my head up and my chest out, and I will walk out as a North Dakotan should walk out of this Chamber if he finds that he cannot do his duty.

When those church people whose letters I have read and the university people whose letters I have read and the heads and members of the great farm organizations whose letters I have read and the petitioners and farmers whose letters I have read, all join in asking me to do my best to keep this universal military training bill from passing, they know they can be sure of one thing—and that is that come what may, BILL LANGER will do his best.

Mr. President, I am not responsible for any other Senator upon this floor. I am only responsible to one person, and that is the man who looks at me when I look in the looking glass. When I go up to the mirror, if the man who gazes back at me has no respect for me, then, indeed, my life will have been a sad, sad failure.

Mr. President, I have here another letter from a minister in North Dakota—Mr. Sterling Wenzel, of Great Bend, N. Dak. As I recall, he is an Evangelical minister of the German Evangelical Church. I read his letter:

GREAT BEND, N. DAK., *May 21, 1946.*

WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate:

DEAR MR. LANGER: May I encourage you to fight against any legislation that will be in favor of peacetime military conscription.

As pastor I can assure you that the people of the church are not in favor of a continuation of the present draft law.

Sincerely,

STERLING WENZEL.

Mr. President, I have received letters from many other ministers in North Dakota and from many ministers in other States.

I now hold in my hand another very interesting letter. Mr. President, in my State of North Dakota, when the young folks are 13, 14, 15, 16, or 17 years of age, they do not loaf around. They keep busy and take care of themselves. When they do want recreation and go to the theater, it is a beautiful sight to see them as they come through the door. There is not a pimple on the face of one of them. Their cheeks are rosy, and they look strong and well, and they are educated.

At our State college at Fargo, a group of them have organized the North Dakota Agriculture College Farmers' Union Cooperative Association, a mutual aid association. I have received a letter from the chairman of the resolutions committee of that association, and I wish to read it to the Senate:

NDAC FARMERS UNION CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,

Fargo, N. Dak., February 7, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER: We wish to submit to you a resolution passed at the last meeting of the NDAC Farmers Union Co-operative Association.

Whereas our Nation has always sought to avoid military entanglements and has at all times fought against the antidemocratic principles of peacetime military conscription which is nothing more than an incentive towards future wars; and

Whereas the NDAC Farmers Union Co-operative Association is in full accord with this Nation's democratic ideals of freedom for the individual as opposed to peacetime military conscription; and

Whereas this group believes that a military force sufficient for our Nation's needs can be built and maintained by voluntary enlistments: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the NDAC Farmers Union Co-operative Association meeting February 3, 1947, in Fargo, S. Dak., that our United States Senators and Representatives be urged to take action to prevent peacetime military conscription and in its stead make service in the armed forces an attractive career which will insure a high quality volunteer Army and Navy.

ARNOLD BJORLIE,

Chairman, Resolutions Committee, NDAC Farmers Union Co-operative Association.

It is a great pleasure to receive a letter like that and to realize that many of the boys who sent it are of military age, 18, 19, some of them younger. They are interested in what is taking place here and want to help by giving some of us older men their advice.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Bruflat Lutheran Church. I shall come to the other one of which Senators apparently are thinking. I have received voluntary letters from all the North Dakota churches. This is from the Lutheran Church at Portland, N. Dak., a Trinity Lutheran Church, of which Rev. I. M. Rotto is pastor. I quote from his letter:

I should like to express to you my firm conviction in regard to the proposed universal training program as recommended by President Truman, and urge you to oppose every measure designed to make our free America a militaristic nation after the pattern of totalitarianism.

To me it seems clear as day that such a measure will defeat its own ends. Excessive energies devoted to military preparation weakens and does not strengthen a nation. I think both world wars have revealed that fact.

Consider also this: Compulsory military training (or by whatever better sounding name it might be called) is surely the first step in the direction which European nations took and which led to their eventual downfall.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Rev. I. M. Rotto, pastor of the Bruflat Lutheran Church, may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I reserve the right to object. The Senator propounded a unanimous-consent request, which I think carries with it the right to object.

Mr. LANGER. I would rather withdraw the request. I withdraw it. Hereafter, I shall simply read entire letters into the RECORD. I am sorry it is necessary to take more time. Let the RECORD show that unanimous consent was refused. It will therefore be necessary for me to take 3 or 4 hours longer than I had expected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose whatever.

Mr. HATCH. I have not objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. The RECORD will show the Senator objected, and we will leave it that way. We shall have to take 4 or 5 hours extra, Mr. President. I was rushing along as fast as I could. I was getting to every one of the churches protesting the pending bill, whose letters I desired to place in the RECORD.

I want to read what the Rotary Club at Grand Forks, N. Dak., wrote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. The letter is from Mr. C. L. Kjerstad. It is on Rotary Club stationery. I do not know whether he was authorized to speak for the Rotary Club, of which he is secretary-treasurer. He states:

Universal military training: Don't know what your attitude is but I have yet to see a workable plan that I would support.

1. The last two World Wars have been won by nations that did not have universal military training.

2. This is no time to arouse the suspicions of our neighbors.

3. I am a Legionnaire but cannot support their program.

a. Yes; I want preparedness.

b. Military training has little relation to preparedness.

c. Let our high-school graduates go on to school. Did not the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps send their draftees to school as the first step in preparation in this war? Why, we had them on every campus in this and other States?

Most sincerely,

C. L. KJERSTAD.

I very frankly say I do not know whether he had authority to bind the Rotary Club at Grand Forks or not.

Let us see some of the other letters sent to me from North Dakota. There are numerous letters from private individuals. Here is one from a State institution, the North Dakota School of Forestry, which is one of the very finest institutions in the country. It is located at Bottineau, N. Dak., near the Canadian border. It is only a few miles from the International Peace Garden, a great body of land between Canada and the United States. I may say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who I sometimes fear is not interested in peace as much as he ought to be, I want him to know that every day thousands of people from Canada and North Dakota gather in the Peace Garden, which is only a few miles from the North Dakota School of Forestry.

Apparently some of the students attending the school talked with its president. The president is Mr. C. M. Nelson. He wrote me on March 6. I am sorry that I cannot shorten this letter, because of the fact that objection was made to my request for unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I cannot yield. It becomes necessary for me to read the entire letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair point out that the Senator from New Mexico had not made an objection earlier; he had merely stated his desire to reserve the right to object. The Chair should like the RECORD to be clear on that point.

Mr. LANGER. Then I misunderstood him, Mr. President. That will enable me to put into the RECORD many letters which I had thought I should not be able to do, in the course of my speech. I am very grateful to my distinguished friend the Senator from New Mexico, whom I have always found——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry. I cannot yield. But I want the Senator to know that I cherish a great affection for him.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield so that the Senator from New Mexico can return some of the kind things which the Senator is saying?

Mr. LANGER. I cannot yield.

The letter says:

At the annual meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges the question of universal military training as it is being considered in Congress on H. R. 664 came in for considerable discussion. I came away from that meeting fully convinced that this bill must not pass.

This is the president of the North Dakota School of Forestry speaking. It is a school which receives thousands of dollars a year from the Federal Government. It plants millions of trees a year. This gentleman had charge of all the planting. He became so efficient that he was hired to take charge of the entire program.

I cannot see why the War Department feels that it is necessary to conscript 900,000 men each year, in addition to the standing Army, Navy, Marine Corps, National Guard, ROTC, and the Enlisted Reserve Corps as a peacetime policy. The War Department itself and numerous military men have publicly stated that volunteers are preferred to conscripts.

Is it impossible to provide the necessary inducements to secure sufficient volunteers for our peacetime armed services? If it is, then I doubt that conscription is the answer to War Department's manpower problem.

I am convinced that the adoption of universal military training will cause us to develop a Maginot-line philosophy which will be more dangerous to our security than most anything else we could do.

I have some more letters from North Dakota, Mr. President. All of these persons are very anxious to be heard. I have now a letter which I know some of my colleagues are waiting to hear. It is a letter from the Catholic War Veterans. It is a very interesting letter, dated January 28, 1947. I read:

HONORABLE SIR: We wish to advise you—

This is a letter from the Catholic War Veterans. I have read letters from the Episcopal Church, the Methodist Church, the Mennonite Church, and all the other churches which I have named, all opposing universal military training. Here we have the Catholic War Veterans opposing it—

We wish to advise you as to the policy of CWV on the matter of the proposed peacetime training legislation.

We favor complete exploration of the possibilities of the Martin resolution, calling upon all members of the United Nations to outlaw peacetime conscription.

I have here a letter from the northern synod, of the State of Minnesota. I see the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] here. He used to live at Moorhead, Minn., and attended Moorhead College. He also attended the agricultural college, and was one of the great football stars of that institution, playing for many years, and was known all over the State as one of the smoothest, one of the slickest, one of the best and finest quarterbacks in the entire United States. The only reason he did not make the all-American team was that he did not weigh enough. If he had weighed a trifle more, Walter Camp said he would have put him on. I am delighted to know that the Senator is here, because he knows the town of Faribault, and it is very likely that he knows Rev. Victor W. Grupe, secretary of the Northern Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. I suppose

the Senator knows him well and intimately and would vouch for what the distinguished man says in his letter. The letter was written on June 3, 1947. Listen to this:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The following resolutions are being sent to you in accordance with the instructions with the therein named group:

"The Northern Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, in annual conference assembled at Faribault, Minn., May 20–22, 1947, herewith respectfully submits to the earnest consideration of Senators and Members of the House of the National Congress from the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, and Iowa, the following resolutions:

"'We reiterate our unswerving opposition to compulsory universal military training at any time and in any guise. Holding that the home, the church, and the school are primarily responsible for the upbringing of our youth, and that the military institution by its very nature a system of dictatorship and agency of destruction is morally unfitted for that task, we unreservedly condemn the dragooning of American youth by indiscriminate compulsion into the Military Establishment as abhorrent to the democratic spirit and repugnant to the Christian conscience. A nation, like an individual, that cannot save itself except by losing its character, does not have very much character to lose.

"'We view with grave misgivings the unilateral action of our Government, dishonoring its commitments to the United Nations. We favor increased appropriations for the hungry wherever they may be, we abhor the denial of fundamental freedoms, to be Communist or Fascist dictatorship, but we believe the military bolstering of unrepresentative governments in a game of power politics is a policy of futility that can only lead to confusion and mistrust, fear and hatred, and down the road to war. Let us encourage and increase the establishment of genuine democracy both at home and abroad, let us honestly demonstrate by word and example that our faith is not in tanks and guns and globe-girdling air bases, but in pacific means of settling differences, and so raise up a standard to which honest men the world over may and will repair.'"

Very truly yours,

VICTOR W. GRUPE,
Secretary.

That I repeat, is from the Evangelical and Reformed Church. The Senators will notice that five States—North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, and Nebraska are included. They have all the ministers there together.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. I should like to yield, but I cannot; I am sorry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator would not relinquish the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would give the Senator a little rest.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry. I very much appreciate the Senator's offer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. LANGER. My friend is so solicitious about my welfare, I assure him that if I should grow tired a little he can spell me for 3 or 4 hours, and I shall be very grateful to him, and I know very well the Methodist Church people and the Catholic Church people will be grateful.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Lutheran church.

Mr. LANGER. And the Lutheran church people and all the churches I have named. I am sure the YMCA of Grand Forks, where the distinguished Senator used to go to use the swimming pool when he was a student in North Dakota there, and learned his boxing at the YMCA, at the University of North Dakota. I assure him that I am very grateful to him indeed and later I shall welcome his assistance.

I wish to show how universal this demand is that we do not let this bill pass. I read a letter from the YMCA a little while ago. Here is one from the WCTU, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Mr. President, I say unreservedly that I believe the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is on of the greatest organizations in America. I have been a member of that organization ever since 1917. When I wrote my biography which appears in the Congressional Directory I was delighted to place in it the fact that I was an honorary life member of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Let me say, Mr. President, that in North Dakota we have today, as the Saturday Evening Post said, the very finest capitol in the United States. We started to build that capitol in 1933, and one of the very finest ornaments in that beautiful building is a lovely painting of the lady who was president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State for some 35 years. She was a woman of such exceptional ability that even at a time when women did not have the vote she organized a campaign, and led it, that threw out of office in North Dakota a Governor who had only one term of office, because he had disgraced, she said, the State of North Dakota by becoming intoxicated and leading a parade down the streets of Winnipeg, Canada, at 1 o'clock in the morning. The people of North Dakota rallied to her and that was the first time in the history of North Dakota that a Democrat was ever elected Governor of the State. I say this is a powerful organization, not only in North Dakota, but all over the country, and I was privileged a few days ago to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Miss Alice Smart, the national legislative representative of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the United States of America. I do not know whether she is a registered lobbyist or not. I do know I meet her on the streets here once in a while, and it is always a pleasure to greet her, because I know that the organization she represents stands for everything that is fine in the lives of young boys and young girls.

I was tremendously impressed with a bill that was introduced, at the behest of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, during the war, which sought to keep young boys and young girls a certain distance from all forts and all canteens, whatever they call the places where they knew that liquor was being handed out or sold. In my State they have done a remarkable job.

I have here also a letter, in addition to those I have received from churches and universities, from the associate professor of religion and philosophy in Wesley College. That college is located at Grand Forks, N. Dak. It is one of the greatest Methodist institutions in the whole world. It is a fine college, and while the enrollment may not be so very large, it is made up of the very finest minds in the whole State.

I have always been interested in that school because it has been financed by a man by the name of Frank Lynch, who later moved out West to San Diego, Calif., who was so impressed with the college, although he was of a different religious faith, that he contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars toward it. This man used to reside at Castleton, N. Dak., and he helped organize this institution.

What does this associate professor of religion and philosophy of Wesley College say? I read his letter:

WESLEY COLLEGE,
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., February 15, 1947.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to let you know why I am opposed to universal military training. First, because it is no real but an illusory defense in an atomic age—real defense rests with the UN. Second, it is contrary to our democratic ideals and a long step toward fascism. Third, by arousing the suspicions of other nations it will provoke the very war which it seeks futilely to prevent. Fourth, our imperialists, the big-business interests, are behind it and want the flag to follow the dollar.

Whenever and wherever I get an opportunity I voice my opposition to this measure. Shall it be said of us that we conquered Hitler only to be conquered by Hitler?

A. W. MUNK,
Associate Professor of Religion and Philosophy, Wesley College.

A little while ago I presented to the Senate a number of petitions. I then said it was not only the church people, not only the educators, not only the farmers' unions and the leaders of the farmers' unions, not only the individual locals, whose letters I have already presented, but the individual farmers in North Dakota who are opposed to this measure. I have here a petition addressed:

To the honorable WILLIAM LANGER, WILLIAM LEMKE, MILTON YOUNG, and CHARLES ROBERTSON.

I might say that Mr. LEMKE and Mr. ROBERTSON are Representatives at large from the State of North Dakota.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to peacetime compulsory military training and respectfully petition you to use your influence against any legislation of that kind.

The first one to sign the petition is Walter Troxel, who for years has been a member of the State Senate of North Dakota. Mrs. J. M. Joiner also signed the petition. Her husband is dead. He was a member of the legislature of North Dakota, elected in 1918 and took office in 1919, one of the outstanding men of the State. He left North Dakota and went

to Minnesota and was placed in a very important position there by Gov. Floyd Olson, of Minnesota.

In speaking of Mr. Joiner going to Minnesota, I am led to wonder whether the average Senator today is aware of the fact that whenever other States need good men they come to North Dakota to get them. These men who have received fine Christian influences from the time they were little children are much sought after for important posts in other States besides their own State of North Dakota, one of whose daughters has a life-sized statue erected in her memory in Paris.

When Gov. Floyd Olson was elected Governor of Minnesota he wanted a private secretary. He wanted a man whom he could trust with his private correspondence, a man whom he could trust to open his mail. So he came to North Dakota and hired as his private secretary Vincent A. Day. A little later he had some trouble collecting gasoline taxes. He could not find anyone in all of Minnesota who apparently could devise a system which would put a stop to the bootlegging of gasoline and the escape from the payment of State and Federal taxes on bootlegged gasoline. He came to Burke County and there he hired George Griffith to leave North Dakota and come to Minnesota.

Gov. Floyd Olson wanted a tax commissioner, an individual who knew something about taxes, someone who was honest. He looked all over Minnesota but could not find anyone in Minnesota, so he came to North Dakota and hired George W. Wallace, and he was one of the tax commissioners of Minnesota for years.

Governor Olson's State owned considerable timberland around Bemidgi, millions of acres of timberland. He wanted to get someone who knew about the handling of timberland, so what did he do? He hired a North Dakota man to take care of those 3,000,000 acres of timberland.

There are four or five thousand banks in Minnesota. Governor Olson apparently could not find anyone in his State who knew much about banking so Governor Olson, of Minnesota, went to Carson, N. Dak., a town of about 1,100 population, and appointed Robert D. Barry, who ran a little bank in his town. He was appointed bank examiner of Minnesota.

The Governor of Minnesota wanted a chauffeur he could trust to drive his car without running it off into the ditch, a man who would keep sober, a man who would keep his car nice and shiny, a man who would keep his car in a good state of repair. Gov. Floyd Olson apparently felt he could not get that kind of man in Minnesota, so he went to Grand Forks, N. Dak., and hired a man who became a great friend of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], Mose Rosensweig, of Grand Forks, who later changed his name to Rose. He became a close personal friend of Governor Olson. He died and now lies buried within 15 or 20 feet of a very famous and distinguished late Governor of Minnesota.

Mr. President, I want to be very careful not to violate the Senate rules in any way. But I mention what occurred with respect to Minnesota, because it is true.

There lived in my State a man named Nolan, who was convicted of murder. He had killed a traveling man who came to his place. He buried the murdered man in a manure pile. Shortly thereafter his carcass was found there. The murderer was arrested and given a life sentence. This man who was convicted came from the little town of Hansboro, in Towner County. After a while he escaped from the penitentiary. Do Senators know where he was found? Three years later he was found in Arkansas. He was the public printer of the State of Arkansas. I do not know whether he was elected or was appointed by the Governor. I mention that purely to show that even citizens of North Dakota who might be considered of very poor character get into other States sometimes and are advanced to positions of trust and influence and the holding of State office.

So Senators can understand that representing that sort of people as I do in the Senate, I feel very proud indeed when I receive a petition from a large group of individuals such as I have here. The first signer of the petition is a State senator. The petition asks me to do all in my power and to use my influence against any legislation of the kind proposed in Congress.

I have other petitions from churches in other States, which show that it is not only in North Dakota that the churches are up in arms against this measure.

I have a letter from Broadway Tabernacle Church of New York City, address 211 West Fifty-sixth Street. That address shows that the church is right about in the center of the town. The letter is written by Allan Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle Church, and states:

> I was very much impressed with the enclosed leaflet on universal military training and wanted to call it to your attention.
>
> I enlisted as a boy of 18 in the First World War and had 10 months in the front lines in the trenches.
>
> As a veteran, I feel this gives me a basis of judgment about the Army's proposal for compulsory military training, and on another war that could easily come if we do not stop the militarization of our Nation.
>
> I would appreciate your comments on the leaflet and on universal military training if you have time.

He encloses a leaflet entitled "The Army Says."

I might add, in connection with universal military training, that when the Army got out a little pamphlet in Tennessee it was sent to the boys in our colleges. It was one of the most beautiful things I ever saw. I presume it was published at the expense of the taxpayers. It contained beautiful pictures of young boys walking down the avenue arm in arm, under beautiful trees. Apparently it was designed to look as attractive as possible.

While we are on the question of churches, I have a letter here from a church in Boston. This is from the secretary of the Universalist Church of America, with executive offices at 16 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass. I note that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has left the Chamber. If he were here I would ask him whether 16 Beacon Street is not a pretty good address. That is where the executive offices of the Universalist Church of America are located. The letter is signed by the secretary. It reads as follows:

> At the recent meeting of the general assembly of the Universalist Church of America, the following resolution was passed in connection with the subject of compulsory peacetime military training:
>
> "Whereas compulsory military training is a denial of the rights of the individual; and
>
> "Whereas it is detrimental to the Christian education of our youth; and
>
> "Whereas it is an historical fact that military conscription has never prevented war; we
>
> "*Resolved*, That the delegates to the general assembly of the Universalist Church of America go on record as being opposed to compulsory peacetime military training; be it further
>
> "*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican minority leader in the House, and to the leader of the opponents of this measure in the Senate."
>
> It is my understanding that you have been very active in opposition to compulsory peacetime military training, and I am, therefore, transmitting this resolution to you for your information.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ESTHER A. RICHARDSON,
> *Secretary.*

Now let us go to the Department of Higher Education. This time we shall not go to New York or Boston. We shall remain in Washington, D. C. The next letter is from the Department of Higher Education of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW. It is signed by Alonzo F. Myers, president. The letter reads as follows:

> The enclosed statement, Major Arguments Against Universal Military Training, was developed by a highly competent group on the basis of a thorough and up-to-the-minute study of the problem.
>
> I recommend the statement to you as a careful analysis in opposition to a policy of universal military training for the United States.

I am sorry that I do not have the time to read the analysis entitled "Major Arguments Against Universal Military Training." However, I shall read the headings:

> 1. Military training will not produce soldiers ready for combat.
>
> 2. UMT ignores the specialized nature of modern warfare.
>
> 3. Military training will not provide men competent to handle civilian defense.
>
> 4. Professional soldiers would be diverted from the regular armed forces to train recruits.
>
> 5. Rudimentary military training can be taught much faster than industry can convert to war production.
>
> 6. UMT will draw funds from other defense programs.
>
> 7. UMT of the Fort Knox Test Tube cannot be reproduced on a national scale.
>
> 8. Military training is a recognition of bankrupt diplomacy.
>
> 9. UMT will preclude civilian programs needed to strengthen the American people and economy.

10. Military training will mean a reduction in volume and quality of war production.

11. UMT will deplete natural resources at a more rapid rate.

12. UMT would obstruct American industrial efficiency.

13. Military training will alter the structure of society.

I am sorry that I have not the time to read the contents, but I have read the headings of the various chapters. I should like to read the entire analysis, but I must rush on, because I have so many other letters which I wish to bring to the attention of Members of the Senate.

The next letter is from Nebraska. It is signed by Mrs. R. L. Burge, president of the Women's League for Universal Peace. The letter is dated April 15, 1948. The writer of the letter has a very intriguing idea. There is a heading which says:

Congressmen and Senators who favor UMT or the draft should join it.

The letter reads in part as follows:

All Congressmen and Senators who advocate and vote for universal military training or Selective Service Act should, as an indication of their sincerity, accompany their ballot with their resignation and with an enlistment as a military private, and subsist on the rations of a private, plus a private's pay; and forfeit all their monetary income.

The human being is the only animal that ask their young to do their fighting, therefore they should be willing do do what they ask of the younger generation.

Mr. President, it is strange how one's memory goes back, when reading a letter. I do not think the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was a Member of this body at the time when the United Nations Charter was under consideration by the Senate. Some time ago I read in a Washington newspaper an article by a columnist who said that he believed the propaganda used in putting over the United Nations Charter was the best job he had ever seen done. I wish to say that I remember that in the 3 or 4 minutes time during which I spoke here in the Senate on the question of the adoption of the United Nations Charter, I quoted Robert La Follette, Sr., who had fought the League of Nations. He said, "If you adopt the League of Nations, it will lead up into perpetual war." So in my speech on the United Nations Charter, I used that expression—that if we adopted the United Nations Charter, it would lead us into perpetual war. I remember that afterwards four or five Senators scoffed at me. Well, Mr. President, we have had it ever since July 28, 1945, when the Senate approved it, and of course the President signed it almost instantaneously. Since that time we have had perpetual war in almost every country except Ireland, Canada, and a few others. Today the countries generally are in worse shape by far than they were at the time when the United Nations Charter was adopted.

When the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in his speech advocating the ratification of the United Nations Charter said, "It is similar to the organization of the United States of America by the Thirteen Colonies," I pointed out that when the Thirteen Colonies organized the United States, none of them had a veto power. Certainly the five largest of the Thirteen Colonies did not have a veto power over the other eight. Mr. President, do you think the other eight Colonies would ever have joined the United States of America if the five largest Colonies had had a veto power?

In connection with the Charter of the United Nations, who fought to retain the veto power? The fight to retain it was led by England and the United States of America.

So I say that my memory goes back to the day when I prophesied that the United Nations would lead us to perpetual war. Only the other day the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], in the course of the debate here listed all the countries that are at war today: India, China, Korea, and practically all the countries of Europe. It is startling to realize how many countries are at war, 3 years after the United Nations Charter was signed.

Mr. President, I have on my desk various other letters from churches. Before I read them, I wish to read another petition from some of the farmers of our State. This petition comes from Bucyrus, N. Dak. One petition which I have received came from near the Canadian line, and another petition came from McKenzie County, near the Yellowstone River in Montana. The petition I now hold in my hand comes from Bucyrus, which is 3 miles from the South Dakota line, and undoubtedly the Senator from South Dakota is acquainted with that town. The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned members of the Bucyrus Farmers Union Local, No. 7021, are opposed to universal military training during peacetime.

Therefore we request that you oppose all legislation which will favor such a proposal.

The petition is signed by a great many farmers in that vicinity.

Mr. President, I have also received a card from Mr. and Mrs. Paul Aman, of Richardton, N. Dak. They say:

We are against universal military training.

Mr. Aman is one of the outstanding men in that vicinity.

I have also received a card from Mr. and Mrs. Hunke, likewise of Richardton, N. Dak. They say:

We are opposed to military universal training, and want you to vote against it.

Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that although I am in a hurry to conclude as rapidly as I possibly can, yet I feel it my duty, under the instructions I have received from the churches of North Dakota and the largest farm organizations, headed by the Farmers Union, and from petitions carrying thousands of signatures, to do everything I can to bring to the attention of the Members of this body the attitude of the people of North Dakota on this question of peacetime conscription.

I read now a letter from Mrs. M. O. Peterson, of Carrington, N. Dak. On March 8, 1948, she wrote to me as follows:

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., *March 8, 1948.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: There has been a great deal of discussion in our community about universal military training. I have talked with many people and have found no one in favor of this bill. Surely the money that would have to be spent for UMT could be put to better use for the good of all. You know, Senator, that we could use a great deal of money in this State alone for the betterment of our schools, just to mention one need.

I sincerely hope that you will vote against this bill when it comes up, and do all in your power to get others to vote against it also.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. M. O. PETERSON.

So, Mr. President, I wish to appeal to the distinguished Senator from Alabama to become active in this fight. I wish to keep this peacetime conscription bill from becoming law.

Here is a letter from the Sutton Farmers Union Grain Co., dated March 10:

SUTTON FARMERS UNION GRAIN CO.,
Sutton, N. Dak., March 10, 1948.

Mr. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: According to today's news UMT is again beating its wings. I just thought I'd write again and restate my views. I believe that peacetime military training harms the boys, often seriously, depletes our resources unnecessarily, and puts too much power in the hands of the military. It will be a sad day for democracy if we get to the place where all of our male youth is trained to click its heels and obey blindly when the overstuffed "brass" sounds off.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR W. DAFOE.

Here is a letter from Hebron, N. Dak., signed by R. A. Ketterling, secretary of the Farmers Union Local. Hebron is a town 75 miles west of Bismarck in a very good farming and dairying section of the State. The letter, dated March 8, is a typical Farmers Union letter. I read:

HEBRON, N. DAK., *March 8, 1948.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At our last Farmers Union local meeting, which consists of 40 members, it was unanimously decided that the group was opposed to universal military training.

This universal military training provides no defense. All indications are that the next war will be one of atomic bombs and biological warfare. Carrying a gun will hasten trouble. It will provide no protection for there is no defense for atomic warfare. Neither England nor the United States of America has had peacetime conscription but they have won their wars. France, Germany, and Japan all had compulsory military training. Peacetime conscription will increase taxes and promote military control. We have reached the point where the military are directing instead of supporting this country's policy.

If universal military training becomes compulsory it will be the ruination of our country and the beginning of militarism.

Yours truly,

R. A. KETTERLING,
Secretary.

Mr. President, I have here another petition coming from Marion, near the home town of my distinguished colleague the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], Berlin, N. Dak. The town of Marion is located perhaps 18 miles from the Senator's home town. I quote:

We, the undersigned, are wholeheartedly opposed to the passage of the so-called universal military training bill; we believe it is a step toward a military government and a threat to peace.

That is signed by a group of citizens. I know most of them. Those signing the letter I know are very fine, distinguished taxpayers of that county.

Here is a letter from Agate, N. Dak.

AGATE, N. Dak., *March 19, 1948.*
The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: We, herewith, would like to ask you to exert your influence in opposing compulsory military training as well as a peace draft. We feel that President Truman is being used by the military men in our Government in an effort to plunge this Nation into war, against the majority wish and will of the American people. The money that would be spent arming America could be better used to feed the hungry and raise living standards immediately in the destitute regions of the world.

Very truly yours,
MRS. IVER M. SOLBERG.
IVER M. SOLBERG.

I know Mr. and Mrs. Solberg well. I do not know how they came to be writing from Agate; perhaps they live there. One of the Solbergs was formerly State senator for Williams County, N. Dak. I think this is another Solberg.

Here is a letter from Mrs. B. H. Eggers, of Dickinson, N. Dak.:

In regard to the universal military training, I am definitely against it. We need our boys on the farm.

Here is a letter from her husband:

I am against compulsory military training. Please vote against it. We need our boys on the farm.

Here is a letter from Park River, N. Dak., dated March 18, one of the very prosperous towns in the State:

PARK RIVER, N. DAK., *March 18, 1948.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am opposed to universal military training, even after President Truman's speech.

I believe the voluntary program could be improved and should be given a fair trial before our Nation is forced into a conscription program which is directly opposite to all American traditions.

I ask that you work against passage of a universal training bill.

Yours truly,
(Mrs.) ZELLA V. WIDME.

Mr. President, I want to make it crystal clear that 4 or 5 days ago I announced to the press I would take part in no filibuster of any kind or character. I do not propose now to participate in a filibuster. I have brought the attention of the Senate to letters from our churches in North Dakota, also letters from our farm organizations, together with petitions from various other groups. Some may say, "Oh, but you stop legislation." Mr. President, who is responsible for the stoppage of legislation? Every Senator on this floor remembers that at the beginning of the session we were in session only every other day for weeks and weeks. How would a farmer raising chickens like to hire a man by the month to feed his chickens, and have the man feed them only every other day?

How many days did we actually meet in January or February or March? There was not a time when we could not have passed the pay bill. It was not wanted on the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for any purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield, I think I can help him in his hazy thinking.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry. I decline to yield. I deeply regret it. I am very sorry. I regret that I cannot yield.

I have here the testimony regarding the salaries of Federal Government employees. When was that testimony taken? It was taken on January 15, 16, 17, 24, 26, and 28; February 9 and 10. Where was our Republican leadership then? Tonight they are in a great hurry to get through. At that time our Republican leadership controlled the House and the Senate. Where were those distinguished men who are now in such a hurry to get to Philadelphia?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at this point I can inform him that we would have passed the salary increases if he had not made such a spectacle of himself, as he is doing tonight.

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield. I might say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota that I suggest that he read a letter which I filed. I suggest that he fight for the people of Minnesota as I am trying to fight for the people of North Dakota, so that his conscience might be as clean as is mine. I yield to no man, Mr. President, when it comes to fighting for the common people of this country. The distinguished Senator knew he was violating a rule of the Senate when he made the remark which he made, because he must be familiar with the rules. It is typical, Mr. President. If they cannot control, they try to wreck anyone who dares to stand up. They ridicule him, make fun of him.

I did not make the rules that we have in the Senate. I have not done anything wrong. I have a right to debate. It is my judgment that if a bill were before us today which would wipe out the grain exchanges, other Senators would be standing here making a spectacle of themselves.

O Mr. President, it is easy to criticize. I want it known that I do not care any more tonight than I cared for years as to what any other man thinks of me. That is my business. Looking into the mirror I see the man staring out at me. Surely we could have finished the salary bill. But I did not notice some of the members of the committee tearing their shirts to be there to hear the testimony. WILLIAM LANGER sat there seven-eighths of the time alone. I was not out playing golf; I did not play one game. But I say, Mr. President, that practically nine-tenths of the Federal employees are not receiving enough money. Some of them are not receiving enough to keep body and soul together. That does not worry the Republican leadership. Let them starve! When the testimony showed that some of the families could not buy butter for 3 months, and some did not have meat for over a month, I did not see the Republican leadership worrying about it. When the testimony was undisputed that in order for one of those men to live decently his pay should be raised $1,160, I did not see the Republican leadership worrying about it. If a Senator protests against such a situation, he is accused of making a ridiculous spectacle of himself.

Let some of the Senators who say that go back to their States; let them go to Minneapolis and St. Paul and publicly say "Let the Republican Party carry on its duties."

According to the testimony, if one of the Government employees received an increase of $800 a year, and received it today, he would still be getting $2.10 a week less than he received in 1939, based on what money will now buy.

That is the testimony of the Department of Labor; it is the testimony of the Department of Agriculture.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the failure to pass the pay bill months ago is a disgrace to the Republican Party. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] over a year ago showed the desperate need of Government employees. I have here, Mr. President, a record of the distinguished Senators who are members of the committee and who attended the meetings. I suggest to the postal employees and to the other Federal employees that they find out about the deep, deep interest of some of the Senators who now criticize a Senator for getting up and daring to fight for the interests of these employees.

Two hundred and ninety-nine million dollars was appropriated the other day just for tobacco for foreigners, $200,000 just for coca-cola for foreigners, under the Marshall plan. These Government employees did not have a raise from 1925 to 1946, and when they got the raise of $300 which I secured for them, 2 weeks later the President abolished overtime, and the record shows they took home less in their envelopes after they got the $300 raise. That is a record that cannot be denied.

Mr. President, Senators are in a hurry all of a sudden. There is a convention about to meet, and I am curious to see the planks of some of the reactionary Republicans. Four years ago they pledged themselves to pass an anti-lynching law, and there it stopped, they are still pledging. I am not going into all the other matters I have discussed at various times, but if you find a party that defaults on one promise, it will default on another.

Four years ago, when they wanted the Negro vote, they promised the Negroes everything. I do not know what they are going to say this time; I am very curious to see. What some gentlemen on this floor do not seem to realize is that the Senator from North Dakota believes that if a party makes a campaign promise, the party should keep it, not come along and say we are going to have a tonnage tax on coal or iron or something and then not impose it, come along and say we are going to raise the income taxes and then not do it.

It is very strange that some of these Senators who are so very, very critical and who are such great Republicans, could not carry their own State for President 4 years ago, and could not carry it 8 years ago. We carried North Dakota, we carried it when Minnesota went Democratic. I carried every county in North Dakota and I did it in spite of the fact that the Governor of Minnesota came to Grand Forks, N. Dak., and was photographed with my opponent. I did it in spite of the fact that $40,000 was raised in the State of Minnesota to defeat me, and that every grain company except the Cargill Elevator Co. contributed. I did it in spite of the fact that Mr. Stassen did all he could to defeat me in North Dakota, and I took a little time out from my own campaign to beat Mr. Stassen in another State, and we did a good job of it.

Oh, no, Mr. President, I may be making a spectacle of myself tonight in the judgment of some Senators, especially from Minnesota, but I challenge them to come to North Dakota and meet me in debate. We will decide up there what the farmers in that locality think about it. He has not heard from the churches of North Dakota asking me to put up this fight. He has not heard from the Farmers' Union asking me to put up this fight. He has not heard from the Concordia College asking me to put up this fight, or from the other churches and people's organizations asking me to put up this fight. I did not have to do it. I could have gone and lain down some place and let somebody else talk. It is not pleasant for me to be here. It is so much easier not to do your duty, sometimes.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I shall not soon forget the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. I learned a long time ago the courtesy of this Chamber. I regret that coming from the Northwest we have a man who did not know the meaning of that courtesy. We have not many men like that who will come into this body from the great Northwest.

Out there, Mr. President, in the great Northwest, over 50 years ago my grandfather started the fight for the people, my father kept it up, and the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce almost wrecked them. But we finally won out.

When one goes through a 50-year fight, Mr. President, he does things that seem incomprehensible to fellows who have not gone through a fight of that character, who have not had to work their way up, who had some machine that picked them up, a machine that was backed by the railroads, the Steel Trust, and the Grain Trust, who just picked them up and said, "You are a nice little boy. You will obey orders. We will take you for United States Senator. We will send someone there to give you a rub-down each night and keep you in shape." The Senator from North Dakota never had that kind of treatment, but when the Senator from North Dakota showed up at a place, he could get some sleep at some fine farmer's home.

I learned one thing, and that was to be honest with the men and women who elected me, and when the hour was the darkest in North Dakota, in spite of all the Minneapolis and St. Paul newspapers—in which I was vilified—could do, in spite of it all, I got the biggest vote for Governor on the 27th day of June 1934 that any Governor ever received in the history of North Dakota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair.) Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For a question?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator would not rule my grandfather out from Fort Ransom, would he?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

In this session we have had January, February, March, April, May, and part of June, and last year we had 12 months in which we could have passed a pay-increase bill. Nobody worries about it. So far as the Senate is concerned, I guess, I, as chairman of the committee, did most of the worrying about it. Now it is proposed to hurry the pay-increase bill through Congress. Anyone who proposes to make an appropriate increase is accused of filibustering. A bill is brought in providing $300 increase instead of $700, and when a Senator objects he is accused of making a spectacle of himself on the Senate floor. A small clique of Republican reactionaries say the increase should be $300 or $400. But if a Senator says the increase should be more he is filibustering.

Mr. President, fortunately, when someone says something about me that he may think is very, very bad, his remarks are like water on a duck's back.

Mr. President, delay is indefensible in passing a pay bill. But suddenly it is said that a pay-increase bill is going to be passed. Of course, the bill will not provide much by way of increase, but those who urge the passage now will say, "A half a loaf is better than nothing." Whereas an increase of $1,000 should be given, it is proposed to give $350. The poor Federal worker is so far in debt that even two or three hundred dollars looks like manna from heaven to him when he cannot stall off the banker any longer.

Some of those who are going to be at the Republican National Convention should read the testimony given on the pay bill. Do those who will compose the resolutions committee at that convention believe there should be an adequate pay increase?

Some say that if I had not talked tonight the pay-increase bill would have been passed, the conference on it would have been over, and increases of $350 or $450 would have been made, whereas, according to the evidence, the increases should be $1,160.

Mr. President, I hope the time will come when the Hatch Act will be abolished so far as it pertains to the Federal Government workers. There is no reason why those men and women should not exercise all the rights of full citizenship. Everyone else is receiving a large increase in pay. That is shown from the figures of industrial pay increases. Such increases are much greater than the Government has given its own employees. But no one is worrying about that.

Mr. President, I again come back to the draft bill. Respecting that bill I bring to the Senate the demands of the people of North Dakota that I should put up this fight. I am sorry if the people of North Dakota are different from the people of Montana or the people of Minnesota or the people of South Dakota. But here are the letters from professors in the agricultural college and the university; letters from the school of forestry and the school at Ellendale; letters from Concordia College faculty.

Mr. President, it is a great satisfaction to one who realizes that God Almighty has given him the strength and the courage and the fortitude and the patience and the health so that he can properly represent the kind of people I have in my State.

Mr. President, I would not criticize the votes of any of my colleagues for the world, because I assume that every man who votes on a measure votes according to his conscience, but I noticed when the Committee on the Judiciary 4 or 5 years ago reported a bill which would get the insurance companies out from under the antitrust law after the Supreme Court rendered a decision against them, how quick some were to vote for such legislation. I noticed what happened when the railroads were indicted for fixing rates, how they sought to get around the law, and I have observed that no Attorney General, either a Republican or Democratic Attorney General, up to the time that Tom Clark became Attorney General, had ever put a man in jail for violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. There seems to be one law for the rich and another law for the poor. There is an antitrust law on the statute books and it has been there since 1890. When a GI came home and stole a loaf of bread he went to jail. If a grocer, during OPA raised the price of bread one penny, he went to jail. But, Mr. President, when the great big companies get together and organize a monopoly on bread and milk they do not go to jail. Those behind those big companies were made ambassadors to foreign countries, and there they are, because out of the money they have taken from poor people they were able to raise four or five or six hundred thousand dollars to pay for a campaign for someone to run for President.

Mr. President, I would rather cast my lot, and I have during all the years of my life, with the underdog, with the one who needs a friend.

Mr. President, I return to the question of universal training. I want to call attention in the RECORD to the votes cast

on the amendments. Some Senators from the Northwest who have been preaching so much against war profits, when they had an opportunity to reduce them to 10 percent refused to raise their hands and obtain a vote; and when the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] offered an amendment to tax war profits 100 percent, it received very few votes.

I am not criticizing any Democrats. The Democrats started 18 months ago to put the Republican Congress in a hole, and they have done a beautiful job. One cannot help but admire it when they do a fine, efficient job. I am proud of the Republican Party. I am a very insignificant part of it, but, by the Eternal, I am a very vocal part of it. I shall do a great deal of talking out in the Northwest.

We have a peculiar system in the Northwest. We learned the last time that just because one is on the Republican ticket that does not mean that he must support the Republican nominee for President. One can even go to the Republican convention and second the nomination of the man who is nominated for President, and go back to the great Northwest, and instead of being for the Republican nominee he can be for the Democratic nominee, as was so well proved 4 years ago.

I am going back home to support the Republican ticket in my State. I hope to do a good job of it. But I shall get a great deal further by telling the Republicans the truth about this Congress than by trying to salve it over and make excuses for it. I know that in some of the other States that does not make any difference. In some other States the corporations and trusts are strong enough to elect anyone. That cannot be done in North Dakota. The people of North Dakota are too well informed, too progressive. They read too many newspapers. They watch the candidates, and they watch the record. So even if a man wanted to fool them, he could not do so, as has been so ably demonstrated by the people of North Dakota time and again.

There was a time when Art McKenzie gathered a few men around him in a hotel in St. Paul, Minn., and there named the entire ticket for North Dakota. I do not blame some of the Minnesota politicians for being sore at North Dakota. But in 1915 we obtained a divorce, and we wiped the slate clean. North Dakota had grown up. We said that we no longer needed a nursemaid in the person of Minnesota. Up to that time the situation reminded one of a big cow, with her front feet in North Dakota eating grass, and her hind feet in Minneapolis and St. Paul. Those in St. Paul got all the cream. In 1915 we moved the cow into North Dakota—all of her, hind feet, tail, and everything else, and we have had her in North Dakota ever since.

All we get is ridicule. We are not doing so badly in North Dakota. We have managed to get along all right. We have no great amount of bonds or indebtedness. Last year we had the highest income of any group of farmers in the United States. We are getting along well. But we do not want our boys drafted. We have a right to say that we do not want them drafted. When I am asked by the people of my State, by the hundreds of people who have written me letters, by the churches, and by all the other institutions I have enumerated this evening, I will say that I did not propose to let the Senate adjourn without presenting to the Senate the letters which I have received.

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain once more that I have not taken a single moment of time for a filibuster. The letters and petitions which I have presented are from people who are opposed to universal military service. Almost without exception the writers ask me to present them to the Senate. This is the first opportunity I have had to present them to the Senate as a body. My job is done. My work in behalf of those people, so far as this bill is concerned, is completed.

So, Mr. President, confident in the knowledge that the farmers and the common people of my State will understand what I have said here, even if unfortunately some other Senators from the Northwest do not, I am willing to leave it to the judgment of the people who elected me as to whether I have given a faithful portrayal of the feelings of the farmers of the Northwest. Every Senator who cared to do so could have sat here and listened to me tell the attitude of one State of this Union, the great, fine patriotic State of North Dakota.

I thank Senators who remained and listened to me. I wish to make it unanswerably plain that I believe that if the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] knew that something was being voted for that the people of Virginia did not want, he would say so. The same thing is true of the majority of Senators.

With those words, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall take only a few moments of the time of the Senate at this particular part of the early morning.

We have had about 9 hours of discussion which has generally been advertised in the public press, at least, as being a filibuster. We have had relief given to the Senator who is trying to prevent action on this very important national defense legislation, the relief being given by the Senator from North Dakota. Now the Senator who originally spoke, and who was conducting the filibuster to prevent the Senate from acting, is back again on the floor of the Senate.

I think I can say without fear of contradiction that no person denies to the Senator from North Dakota the right to discuss, debate, and vote against this legislation if his conscience tells him to do so. But by the same token, even though the rules of the Senate are so loose that they permit it to be done, I do not believe that morally any Senator or small group of Senators in exercising their right of expression and their right to vote, have a right themselves to deny to 94 other Members of the Senate of the United States, representing 140,000,000 people, the right to vote on legislation which may mean the very safety of this Republic.

Not so long ago we had an Ambassador who wrote a well-known book, the title of which was "Mission to Moscow." Mr. President, I say with all the sincerity I possess that, at some time when perhaps a power might move in Europe to upset the peace of the world, and might endanger the very safety of this Republic, I certainly hope history will not record that this filibuster was in fact a mission for Moscow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was on my feet first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought both Senators were on their feet at the same time.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Stennis
Connally	Knowland	Stewart
Cooper	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota that a conference be requested and the conferees be appointed. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President! Mr. President! Mr. President!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, recently, a month or 6 weeks ago at least, there was an article in the paper about two American GI's in Germany who chased two Russian officers home, throwing rocks through the barracks windows. The boys were arrested or detained and action taken against them. I have forgotten what, but certain penalties were invoked anyhow. When asked why they did it, the boys stated they "just hated Russia." Well, it is not much wonder

they hate Russia. I quote from an Associated Press dispatch from Frankfurt, Germany, dated November 7, which said:

American soldiers in Germany will begin next week a study of Communist Russia as part of the United States Army's official troop information and education program.

Attendance is compulsory.

The bulletin soldiers will study describes itself as "the story of Mother Russia, of its great cruel history, of the hard men who seized power 30 years ago and have held it ever since."

Officials said the lessons are scheduled as a part of a series of studies entitled "Know Your Neighbor."

It is ironical to note that during the war, when the Russians were fighting actively as our allies, we had courses of study on things connected with Russia, as everybody knows wonderfully well. We all remember that in those days the headlines would refer to our Russian Allies as "the gallant Russians," "the brave Russians," and "the heroic Russians." Then the war came to an end. More particularly, a date that is more significant than the change in relations would be the death of President Roosevelt. The tone of dispatches began to change almost as soon as Roosevelt left us. By the time the war had ended the newspapers hardly ever referred at all to the Russians in favorable terms. It was always, from then on, the "heroes of Stalingrad" who became the "villains of the Kremlin," and they have been hard at it ever since. It is a wonder, Mr. President, we have been able to keep the peace to this date considering the propaganda that is put out by the press against Russia; the radio, to a lesser extent, though there are laws that make the radio give both sides of questions to a certain extent anyhow.

I should like to read into the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday, April 20, dealing with the Bogota Conference. We have been told by our State Department, those in authority, that the Bogota Conference was a great success. I think it might be well to examine those articles. For that reason, I would like to quote first the article of Walter Lippmann. Across the page is another article by Sumner Welles dealing with the Bogota Conference. I think they are both very significant. The first article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 20, in Walter Lippmann's column, Today and Tomorrow. The item is entitled "The Bogota Intelligence," in which he says:

After testifying in a secret session of a congressional committee, Admiral Hillenkoetter, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, allowed himself to be interviewed in order to show that he had warned the State Department of the Bogota uprising. This would not have been edifying even if the admiral had proved his case. But in fact his own evidence disproves his case.

You see Mr. President, when they had this Bogota Conference down there they had a sort of revolution right in the midst of it and some of our Congressmen and various other people were very much put out that our Secret Service agents had not informed them of what was taking place in Bogota. Within the last few days I have read in the papers that Bogota is overrun by foreign secret-service agents; they are just all over the place. The country can hardly be called its own there any more at all, there are so many foreign powers in there finagling for the oil they have. Mr. Lippmann goes on to say:

The key-intelligence dispatch, dated March 23, which he says—

That is, Admiral Hillenkoetter—

which he says was withheld from the State Department by a representative of the Department in Bogota said: "Have confirmed information that Communist-inspired agitators will attempt to humiliate the Secretary of State and other members of the United States delegation to the Pan-American Conference upon arrival in Bogota by manifestations and possible personal molestation." This was in no sense a warning of what happened in Bogota. No attempt was made to humiliate the Secretary of State; there were no manifestations against the Secretary of State upon his arrival in Bogota, and he has not been subjected to personal molestation.

This was in no sense, Mr. President, a warning of what happened in Bogota. No attempt was made to humiliate the Secretary of State. In fact, all the dispatches I read said he was treated very well at all times. There were no manifestations against the Secretary of State upon his arrival in Bogota, and he has not been subjected to personal molestation. The fact is that what Admiral Hillenkoetter predicted did not happen, and what did happen was not predicted by Admiral Hillenkoetter.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say:

A "warning" that Secretary Marshall was going to be molested can hardly be construed as a warning that there was going to be an uprising against the Colombian Government.

When we stop to think about that, it is not any great wonder that they had an uprising against the Colombian Government. I find, since the uprising down there, that the Government has decreed that industries must provide their workers with shoes. That is a great advance, a great concession. Evidently, up to this time there have been a great many of the Colombians who did not even have shoes to wear. I do not see how anyone can expect people to be very satisfied when they have such a low economic state that they do not even have shoes to wear. So at least out of their uprising they did get an order directing the mostly foreign-owned oil companies to buy shoes for their workers. They are somewhat better off.

The article continues:

It seems reasonably certain, not only from the uprising in Colombia, but from the condition of the conference, before it was interrupted, that the administration, though it had warning of trouble, had not made a successful diagnosis of the trouble. It seems to have fixed its attention on the Communist-inspired agitators, and not on the deep and violent popular unrest which was boiling up just under the surface.

The crucial and difficult part of intelligence work is not in spying and the collection of secret information. It is in the appraisal of the information, most of it not secret at all. The first installment of Mr. Churchill's memoirs in Life magazine is worth studying in this connection. There is a passage in which Mr. Churchill tells us how during the years 1931–34, when he was out of office, he managed nevertheless to appraise far more accurately than the government in office what was happening in Nazi Germany.

During those years he worked closely with three men. One was Prof. Frederick Lindemann, later Lord Cherwell, with Desmond Morton, who was in the British Intelligence, and with Ralph Wigram, "then the rising star of the Foreign Office and in the center of all its affairs." Mr. Churchill had access to the same information, scientific intelligence, and diplomatic, as the government. He did not know any more than did the Prime Minister and the government. Yet he understood what he knew and drew the right conclusions whereas they did not understand and drew the disastrously wrong conclusions.

The moral of this story is that while an intelligence agency can serve a government, it is not a device for relieving statesmen of the task of judging correctly and wisely the course of events.

Let me say, Mr. President, that that is the question involved here, whether the right decision has been made. I am firmly convinced that any decision to saddle peacetime conscription on our country is the beginning of the end of all our traditional freedoms. If I were not firmly convinced of that, certainly I should not be subjecting myself to what I am going through here.

It is a mistake to expect, and foolish of Admiral Hillenkoetter to talk as if we had a right to expect, the Central Intelligence Agency to appraise the situation in Colombia and South America. That was the business of the President and Admiral Leahy, of Secretary Marshall, and Mr. Armour, after they had studied Admiral Hillenkoetter's reports and the State Department's reports. To suppose that an intelligence agency can make these final judgments is in effect to say that the intelligence agency could be not only the eyes and the ears, but also the brains of the Government.

There never was, and there never will be, such an intelligence agency.

The aftermath of the Bogotá explosion shows that it could not have been easy to foresee it. For even by hindsight there is as yet no convincing and consistent story of what happened. That may be due in large measure to the censorship. But I suspect it may also be due to something else, something subtler and more misleading.

That something else is the very human propensity to insist on making the facts fit one's stereotyped preconceptions—in this case to treat a South American revolution as a phase of the Russian revolution, and then to suppose that all revolutionary conditions in the world begin and end in Moscow, that but for Moscow there would be no revolutions.

In an epoch which is as revolutionary as ours this can be a dangerous infatuation. For it concedes to Moscow exactly what Moscow claims and desires: That all the oppressed and discontented masses of mankind.

I think that is a significant statement, Mr. President, in view of what was said on the floor shortly before I started speaking today.

There was the insinuation, the piously expressed hope, that this was not a mission from Moscow. They blame everything on Moscow. If you do not like universal military training, if you do not like to see the American people enslaved to a military machine, if you want the American people to remain free, then you are a stooge of Moscow. That is all they know to say, Mr. President. They cannot argue the matter on its merits, so they insinuate. Anybody who speaks up for the preservation of our traditional

way of life is a stooge of Moscow. That has been the cry of Fascist sympathizers, I might say, all over the world wherever they hope to destroy freedom and set up a Fascist way of life.

I may say that, with the Senator from North Dakota, who spoke during the night, I want neither fascism nor communism. We want to preserve the American way of life free from military domination.

Across the page from the article by Walter Lippmann which I have just quoted is another by Sumner Welles. These two gentlemen are conceded to be our foremost experts on foreign affairs at least in the field of newspaper columnists. Mr. Welles' article has this heading:

Bogotá putsch obscured trend—Hemisphere unity is dissolving.

Of course, I have been contending that our good-neighbor policy was being scuttled. For almost 2 years now I have been warning the American people and the Congress that the good will which Roosevelt built up for us in South America was being dissipated by the greed and disregard of the welfare of our South American neighbors by our cartelists and monopolists, who are down there exploiting those people unmercifully, interfering in their internal affairs, telling them how to run their government, driving their government to take drastic action against workers and workers' movements of any kind.

This is the subhead: "Sumner Welles reports bitter feeling against United States before parley was halted; he denounces patronizing attitude toward the Latins." By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State. This is the body of the article:

Secretary Marshall was right in describing the uprising in Bogotá as an "occurrence that goes far beyond Colombia." But whether the revolt was Communist-inspired, or, what seems more likely, merely Communist-abetted, it has had a tragic impact upon the national life of one of the most truly democratic of the American Republics. It has undoubtedly dealt a blow to the international prestige of the American regional system.

In the long run, however, more harm will result from the fact that public opinion is now going to be so obsessed with a hemispheric Red scare that it will lose sight of the significance of what happened at the conference before the uprising.

The conference provided new evidence that the inter-American system is in real ranger of collapse.

In other words, all the good will that was built up through the good neighbor policy, conceived and put into operation by our great leader Franklin D. Roosevelt, has been dissipated. Mr. Welles says:

For this, Communist intrigues are not responsible. It is due chiefly to our own policies in recent years. The impression of the public here that all is well is being deliberately fostered in Washington.

In other words, when they tell us that we still have the friendship of the Latins they are kidding us. Deliberately fostered is a polite way of saying they are not telling us the truth. If they have told us falsehoods about our relations with South America, it is not the first time we have been deceived by the bipartisan coalition in charge of our foreign policy at the present time. In fact, the Wall Street publication "Financial Age" published an article a while back telling, I do not know for what reason, just to brag, I guess, and let their business clientele see how easy it is to fool the common folks, that our Government sent out two different groups of speakers to sell the Marshall plan. One group went to churches and clubs and told them the Marshall plan was to feed hungry people, especially poor little starving babies. They do not want to forget the babies. Of course, that played on the sympathy of the good church people and tender hearted women's clubs. But they got behind the Marshall plan. Another team of speakers went to businessmen's clubs, chambers of commerce, bankers' associations, manufacturers' associations, and this team of speakers, sent out by the State Department to sell the Marshall plan, told these business people, "Now, don't let anybody kid you fellows. Just don't get exicted by what we are telling these women's clubs and church groups about feeding hungry people. This Marshall plan is really designed to get us markets all over the world."

We might expect something like that of Chiang Kai-shek or some of the other governments we have thought of as being corrupt all over the world, but can anyone imagine our Government being so cynical as to send out these different groups of speakers to say different things to different people to try to sell the Marshall plan to them?

The lengths to which they went to sell the Marshall plan were beyond belief. Of course, the appropriation of $10,000,000 out of the taxpayers' money for certain newspapers for services they rendered in selling the Marshall plan is about the ultimate in unmoral governmental dealing.

Mr. Welles goes on to say:

A State Department spokesman has just declared that the inter-American system "is a stronger * * * system than it was at the end of the war."

Mr. Welles said:

Now such a flagrant misstatement of fact as this not only misleads public opinion but also causes this Government's good faith to be questioned in Latin America.

Of course, when the State Department boys said that our inter-American system is stronger than it was at the end of the war perhaps they did not mean in the strength of the ties of friendship that the South Americans may have for us. Perhaps what they meant was in the number of guns they have down there.

Oh, some few years ago there was agitation for the Congress to appropriate money to arm South America. To my knowledge, Mr. President, unless it was slipped through without debate while I was away from the session sometime, we never did act on that matter of appropriating money for South America for armaments, but to the best of my knowledge they got the guns anyhow. This Army of ours pays no attention to what goes on on Capitol Hill. They just send stuff around and arm people to suit themselves. If they cannot figure it out one way they do another. If they cannot buy the new material, guns, and what not, to give to their stooges and protégés, their Fascist henchmen all over the world, then they declare it surplus and just give it to them if they do not happen to have an appropriation.

The next paragraph of Mr. Welles' article has the subheading "A blessing in disguise?" Now let us see what this blessing in disguise is.

Mr. Welles said in his article:

On the very day of this statement—

That is when he said that our inter-American system is stronger than at the end of the war.

On the very day of this statement, one of the most widely respected statesmen of Latin America said to me, "Bad as it is, the revolt at Bogotá may prove to be a blessing in disguise. It will probably pull us together in taking effective defense measures. And it has at least postponed the open clash between the United States and the other republics which seemed inevitable before the rebellion occurred."

The feeling against this country at the Bogotá Conference was more bitter than at any inter-American meeting since the Habana Conference of 1928.

Is that not a sad thing, Mr. President, that a man of the reliability of Sumner Welles can say now that the feeling in South America is more bitter against us than at any time since 1928—that was before Roosevelt came in? All that good will has been dissipated. Mr. Welles said:

The United States has failed to show any comprehension of our neighbor's most vital problem. It has refused to admit that they have any right to expect the United States to cooperate in a long-range economic program which would relieve their pressing difficulties, and which, by increasing production and promoting industrialization, would help them to raise the living standards of many peoples now illiterate, undernourished, desperately poor, and without sanitation or decent housing.

Is not that a terrible picture to be able to paint of our next-door neighbors right down here, when we are shipping billions of dollars worth of stuff over to Europe? I just read to this Chamber last evening the report that Europe is allowing food to spoil in warehouses, and manufactured goods to accumulate, because they are unable to sell them in Europe, while our poor South American brothers are in such dire straits. But we refuse to help them. We take the more direct, blunt approach of supplying arms to their corrupt rulers to keep the people in subjugation so they cannot protest against their economic conditions. Just send the bosses guns instead of sending the workers some food.

Mr. Welles proceeds to say:

The worst of it is that the peoples of the other Americas are beginning to think that the United States only remembers them when, as after Pearl Harbor, this country urgently needs their help.

Our misconception of the underlying issue was recently illustrated by an editorial in one of this country's greatest newspapers. It complained that when Secretary Marshall had read to the conference the announcement of President Truman's recommendation that the capital of the Export-Import

Bank be increased by $500,000,000 for loans for Latin America the Latin-American delegates listened in stony silence. Their lack of enthusiasm was termed "the last straw."

When folks are starving, our South American neighbors do not appreciate it when we tell them we will loan them some money. When we tell them we will loan them some money and they do not appreciate it, our boys say, "That's the last straw":

This point of view is precisely that of Secretary Marshall and his Cabinet colleagues.

The other American republics had for 3 years been pleading with the United States to join with them in a program which would safeguard the democratic institutions and insure the future welfare of the hemisphere.

The next subheading is "Flatly turned down." Mr. Welles goes on to say:

They had been flatly turned down. Yet they were apparently supposed to jump to their feet with jubilation—like school children granted a holiday—upon hearing an announcement that was in no sense responsive to their needs, and the purport of which had been published a month before.

The economic program for which they ask would involve no excessive burdens. It would imply the obligation of this Government, when private capital is neither available nor desired, to assure its neighbors of the credits and facilities needed over a period of years to help in carrying out a constructive development plan upon which all the American republics would agree.

Such a program would insure economic stability in the new world. By helping to rebuild trade between Europe and Latin America, it would expedite the European recovery which is our major objective. By increasing purchasing power, it would expand the market for our own exports. The adoption of this program would be the surest means of halting communism, which only prospers in those parts of Latin America where living standards are pitifully low.

Of course, that is true most any place. Where people get a decent economic break, communism has very little appeal. Mr. Welles continues:

The Latin-American Republics want no hand-outs. They do consider themselves entitled to the same friendly cooperation in the solution of their vital problems as that which they gave us during the war.

If the people of the United States want to preserve the inter-American system they must wake up to realities. It is only going to survive if we show our neighbors that we have learned that the welfare of the other Americas is essential to the welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, we are in a Presidential election year. Both old parties have failed to take any action to assure that millions of our citizens will have the right to vote.

Here is an article from the Atlanta Journal. It is headed "One thousand eight hundred and thirty-three of Negro voters purged by Laurens County registrars. Talmadge supporters linked to new board which began work in October."

The article goes on to tell how registered voters have been purged from the rolls. They are getting ready down in Georgia to be sure that very few Negro people are allowed to vote. As I have said, the new party has a Negro candidate for the United States Senate down there, and they do not want too many Negroes voting.

This article is written by George Goodwin, Journal staff writer. It reads as follows:

DUBLIN, GA., May 8.—Some 1,833 qualified Negro voters have been purged from the Laurens County registration list. The action by the 3-man county board of registrars cut off more than 75 percent of the 2,477 Negroes who were entitled to vote in the last general election.

The list of those removed included landowners, church officers, and college graduates.

In the past they have been a little considerate. If a Negro was somebody, so to speak, if he had landholdings or something else, they might give him a little consideration; but they are becoming a little more desperate now.

The purge started last October, some 5 weeks after Superior Court Judge R. Earl Camp appointed a new board of registrars. The registrars are E. S. Baldwin, chairman; Marvin W. Watson, and Ancil Chavous.

The registrars continued the purge after both the January grand jury and county attorney had ruled that their actions were illegal.

It seems that the election registrars down in Georgia pay about as much attention to grand juries and county attorneys as the Army pays to the Congress. The Congress can make rulings, but the Army just goes ahead and does as it pleases.

Political control in Dublin and Laurens County centers in Representative W. Herschel Lovett, one of the strongest Talmadge supporters in Georgia and candidate for the State senate. His political followers include Judge Camp, members of the county Democratic committee, the county commissioners, and members of the board of registrars.

In the 1946 general election Laurens County had about 11,000 registered voters. About 2,477 were colored. Since the 1946 election the Negroes are opposed to Mr. Lovett, both in State and local political matters.

REVEALS PURGE DETAILS

Mr. Watson, who was an assistant registrar before his appointment to the three-man board, and Board Chairman Baldwin told the Journal details of the purge.

The board held its first meeting October 5 and decided to go over the entire registration list. They worked 18 days in October and then stopped the purge until January of this year.

They stopped when the county attorney ruled that, according to the State law on the duties of registrars, they could not meet before April 20, 1948. He advised the county commissioners not to pay the board members for any days worked before that time. Registrars are paid $6 per day each. However, the commissioners have paid the registrars for all of their time worked.

Judge Camp said he advised the board members they could not meet before January 1. He said that he considered they could meet legally any time after the first of the year.

CALLED EMERGENCY ACTION

He said he had been told that the old registration list had been lost and that, even if it were not lost, it was somewhat incorrect. He justified the registrars' actions after January 1 as an emergency.

"The registrars had a mammoth task," Judge Camp told the Journal.

Actually, the list had not been lost. It was in the possession of the clerk of the court and another copy was in the hands of the tax collector. Board members said they got the list from the tax collector early in October.

The purge got into full swing in January. Chairman Baldwin said the board worked one district's list at a time. They started with Dublin district, where 1,482 colored voters were registered.

The Georgia code states that the fact that a voter's name is on the registration list as furnished to the registrars by the tax collector is prima facie evidence of his right to vote.

Most of the Negroes stricken had been registered more than 3 years and had voted in 1946. All had been eligible to vote in November 1946.

Nevertheless, they were stricken from the rolls, and so, of course, were unable to vote.

Here is an interesting article which appeared in the Washington Daily News. It is datelined Birmingham, Ala., June 12. The heading is "Negro Girl Scout camp disbands after threat." The article reads as follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., June 12.—Authorities today promised to investigate a night raid on a nearby Girl Scout camp by a band of men wearing the white robes and hoods of the Klan.

Two white Girl Scout instructors conducting a leadership-training course for some 20 Negro girls reported that the masked men broke into their tent late Thursday night and gave them 24 hours to get out.

Scout officials said the camp was broken up yesterday to safeguard the lives of the students and instructors.

Deputy Solicitor H. A. Sullinger, of Bessemer, near which the camp is located, promised an investigation to determine if any State laws had been violated.

In New York, Scout officials said the FBI was checking the incident.

Scout officials identified the threatened white girls as Miss Katrine Nickel, of Birmingham, and Miss Elizabeth Ijams, of Knoxville, Tenn., instructors on the Girl Scouts' national staff.

The two girls reported to Scout headquarters that 8 or 10 men in white robes and hoods, who looked like Klansmen, entered their tent late Thursday night.

The girls said the men awakened them, questioned them about camp operations, and rifled their personal belongings, saying they were looking for cards with hammers and sickles on them.

Then the hooded raiders warned them to "get out by tomorrow night," the instructors said.

Miss Nickel and Miss Ijams were conducting the training course for Negro girls from five Southern States at Camp Bray Fletcher, a short distance south of Bessemer. They had separate eating and sleeping facilities, they said.

Scout officials said the purpose of the camp was to train Negro girls in Scout leadership so that they could conduct similar courses for other Negro girls. There are presently no Negro girls in the area to conduct such courses, they explained.

Some Senators become so excited that every speech a Senator makes seems to them to have been written in Moscow, or perhaps written right at home on paper with sickles and hammers on it.

The article states that the hooded raiders explained that they were looking for cards with hammers and sickles on them. Mr. President, what a deplorably sad commentary that is on the state of affairs which exists today in some parts of the United States. In that case the Girl Scouts were trying to train some colored Girl Scouts, so that they, in turn, could train other colored girls in scout-

ing; and hooded men appeared and told them to disband within 24 hours, and said they were looking for cards with hammers and sickles on them. Imagine the hysteria of grown men, presumably, rifling a Girl Scout camp and looking for cards with hammers and sickles on them. It is almost unbelievable.

Mr. President, recently I was in Alabama, and I was arrested for going through the wrong door, it was claimed—a door marked "colored"—into a meeting place. I had first-hand experience with conditions in the South. I was arrested and tried for that offense of going through the wrong door. Of course, I was charged with practically everything on the books—disturbing the peace, assault and battery, resisting an officer in the lawful pursuit of his duties, and one or two other charges. I did not resist anyone; I simply tried to enter the hall as gently as I could, and still be firm and get any place. But I was tried. At the trial, the Honorable Oliver B. Hall, recorder, was the judge of the proceedings. I was found guilty and fined $50 and given a 180-day suspended sentence.

I have before me at this time a copy of the statements made by the judge at the time of my sentencing. There is nothing new about those statements. I have heard the same statements before. Any time the question of dealing with Negroes comes up, almost any person from south of the Mason and Dixon's line can be heard making remarks, very similar to those contained in this speech, about how much they love the Negro.

The court had this to say:

There is one statement there that the counsel I have heard so much about for so long, and I have high respect for, made with reference to the publicity, and that the city of Birmingham, Ala., is on trial tonight before the 47 other States.

I think the trial is not shirked at all. We have our laws and we have our customs and we have our problems.

The way and manner in which we have been solving those problems, and the way we are trying still to solve them, is peculiar to our own State or our own section or our own city, and I think we have made admirable progress in solving those problems.

Here, for instance, a short time ago, in my lifetime, it wasn't anything unusual to hear of lynchings, of unlawful homicides, of executions without trial, etc.

Mr. President, I may say that I was told by the Negroes and others in Birmingham that lynchings were out of style.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I wish to call the Senator's attention——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I can yield only for a question, I must say. I would be happy to yield; but the rule is being enforced, and I must not yield except for a question.

Mr. President, they no longer have lynchings down South; that draws too much publicity. I am told that just every so often a Negro is shot, but nothing is said about it in the newspapers. That is supposed to be in the line of duty. It has the same effect of intimidating the Negroes, but it does not receive the adverse publicity around about the country.

But to resume with the statement of Recorder Hall:

It has been a long time since I have heard of that. I am proud those things are being wiped out.

There has been a great deal of progress made in the good relations between the races in Alabama and in Birmingham, and it is—progress is being made from time to time.

But we are constantly confronted with some outside influences sometimes that retard that development and retard that progress we have made in those things, and there are spokesmen from other sections of the country coming in here and, for some reason or other, trying to create a discontent among the colored people, and it reacts to their disgrace, reacts to their detriment, reacts to the detriment of society as a whole in trying to create peaceable solutions.

Our solutions have been brought about by men in, and not outside of Alabama, trying to live and let live. There is room in Alabama for two races.

As long as spokesmen from other sections fail to recognize that fact and try to create disruption among the races, they are setting that progress back for generations and doing a disservice to the colored people. They are the ones that suffer. Just last night we had a case in here where a colored man drew a knife on a police officer, and he stated if it hadn't been for the Taylor case, he didn't believe he would have done it.

That is too ridiculous for words.

I read further:

That is the thing that makes it so hard for us to solve our problems and makes it so hard for our relations to continue peacefully.

Now, I have seen numbers and numbers and numbers of cases here in Birmingham where there has been a clash between the colored people and the white, where just a few years ago, in your own memories, there wouldn't have been trials in those cases. There would have been lynchings. So, the progress we have made to eliminate lynchings has been our own progress and not the progress by outside spokesmen.

I want to say now to all parties interested, and to the spectators on this side—

I may say, Mr. President, that the court room was divided by an aisle down the center. There was no physical segregation. The colored people were on the left side as one faced the judge, or on the judge's right side. So he spoke to the colored people. The court room was full—half colored and half white.

Recorder Hall said, then:

I want to say now to all parties interested, and to the spectators on this side, I don't think there is anyone who can say I am not a friend of the colored people.

That is an old saw.

I read further:

I am regarded as such by those friends of mine among the colored people that I know and have discussed it with—

I have gone out and asked them, "Don't you think I am your friend?" And they said, "Yes, sir; yes, sir."

And as for the separation of the races, I have not yet seen a man I call a leader among the colored people that wants to break down the progress we have made—

That is the way they put it. Of course, nobody wants to break down progress. They put it that way, "no leader among the colored people wants to break down the progress we have made."

And they do not want that social equality so many people from the outside quarrel for.

Of course, a measure of social equality would be very helpful, Mr. President, so those people could go into a place to eat, go into any kind of place of business or hotel. What would be even better, and what they want more is economic equality, a chance to hold any kind of a job and be advanced according to their ability and not have the color of their skins enter into the proposition.

He says:

They do not want that social equality so many people from the outside quarrel for. They have told me that.

How silly. Of course they have told him that.

They have said: "We don't any more want to go into your homes and eat with you than you want to come into our homes and eat with us."

Well, Mr. President, I may say that I have gone into colored homes and eaten with those people quite often in the past few months, when I have been out over the country, especially in the South. This recorder, Mr. Hall, goes on to say:

They are proud of their race.

Why, sure.

They have got lots to be proud of and they have got lots yet to do. If we are going to have racial equality, it cannot—

Now listen to this, Mr. President—

If we are going to have racial equality, it cannot be done except by bringing the white man down to the level of the colored man.

He delivered that statement right in the face of half of a courtroom full of colored people—that the white man would have to be brought down to the level of the colored man.

The only way we can raise the standard of the colored man is to hold the standard of the white man high and let the colored man catch up.

First, this is the old argument they put up about socialism along the same line. The slickers who oppose socialism ask the farmer, "Do you want the city fellows to come out here? You will have to divide up your sheep and hogs and things with them. Of course, they know that is not true, but it is a good gag for people that do not think. This statement that you cannot bring a colored man up, the white man has to come down to the level of the colored man—no man is asking those things, or that anybody be put on anybody else's level at all. All they ask is that they be given the same opportunity to seek their natural level, Mr. President, which they do not have at the present time.

He says:

Now, if the people from the outside would let us alone and let the white people keep their pace of advancement, they can live side by side and in harmony in Alabama, and so long as outside spokesmen come in and try to create discontent and try to break down that progress that has been made, so long is the chasm between the races going to get wider and wider instead of closer and closer, and I am speaking this to try to create good relations. When those people

get to where they feel capable of taking on to themselves the civilization created by the white people all over the world, not only in Alabama, that will be realized.

Mr. President, such a statement as that by the white people all over the world creating civilization. There are many civilizations besides the white. In fact, the whites make up only a small fraction of the people on this earth.

Some of the greatest men in America, some of the greatest men in Alabama, have been from the colored people—

They never fail to pay lip service to them—

and in the future they can keep on producing great people if they keep that discontent and enmity out of their hearts.

It seems to me from the case at bar that the whole situation is a publicity play, and if I followed my inclination it would be never to try the case at all but to dismiss it. That is what I would like to see done—to rob it of publicity value, to keep it from reacting to the benefit of other people in some other quarters that have deliberately tried to create a situation where this type of publicity would come on.

The reason I think it was deliberately planned and accomplished, the defendant in this case, after the occurrence, immediately hied away to Washington to make a speech before the United States Senate, and then came on back to appear before the court, riding on an airplane to and from.

That is a serious offense, Mr. President, "riding on an airplane, to and from."

If that is not creating publicity, creating a situation for the publicity that might accrue to him, I cannot see any other reason.

I may say that the whole thing was quite unpremeditated. I went down to address the Southern Negro Youth Conference. I had told them in the beginning that I would not and could not address a segregated meeting. When I got down there the sessions were supposed to start on Friday. They did not get started until Saturday, because they could not find a place to hold their meetings. They would make arrangements for a Negro church. Mr. Bull Conner, the city manager, chief of police, or whatever he is, would call the Negro preacher down to headquarters and tell him that he did not want him letting this outfit meet in his church. Well, in each case the Negro minister would argue about it and say that he had a right to let them use the church. Mr. Conner would then say, "Well, we may not have any legal authority to stop the meeting, but there is always the Klan"—these gentlemen I read about a while ago, who broke up the Girl Scouts' meeting. They did not get their meetings started until Saturday. They started to hold a meeting, some of them sitting on opposite sides of the aisle. It was a little church with one aisle. However, on the platform the colored and white sat together.

The police broke into the meeting that afternoon and arrested several of them and said they were not physically segregated. Then they laid a door down across the aisle about 4 rows from the front of this little Negro church, and nailed it across the single aisle. In that way, to get into either the back section or the section nearest the front door, one had to enter at the front door; to get in the front section, he had to come in at a side door. With only one aisle in the place, they made the door at the front of the building the Negro entrance, and around on the side was the white entrance. When they told me the meeting was segregated, they did not tell me about the physical arrangements. They just told me it was segregated. I told them I would not address the meeting, it was against my principle and against the policies of the new party to address segregated meetings.

They said, "Well, just come down and say 'Hello' to the boys and girls and tell them why you cannot address them. Just put in an appearance, anyhow." I said, "All right." I went down to the meeting in a taxicab, and when I got out in front of the Negro church, some of the Negroes were out there to meet me, and they said, "Senator, this is the Negro entrance. You will have to go around to the side door."

If that had been the white entrance, I would have walked up, gone in, told them what I had to say, and that would have been the end of it. But I would not put myself out and walk around the side of the building to help the police to enforce their insulting segregation laws against the Negro people. So I walked up to the front door and was unceremoniously arrested. So it was not premeditated, Mr. President.

Recorder Hall goes on to say:

Now, we have a distinguished visitor. We are happy to have distinguished visitors wherever they might come from. The defendant is a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

And then a voice in the audience said "Idaho." The court corrected himself and said "Idaho." Then he said:

It is a great State and a great people. He has reached fame and notoriety all over the United States, as well as in his own State, but he comes to Alabama and attempts to obtain publicity by breaking our laws. I have before me a distinguished United States Senator, a member of the highest branch of the legislative department in the United States. For that I honor him and respect him, but I am not trying him on his honor or on his respect here tonight. I have got to try him on the facts. I would say there is no other police recorder in the State of Alabama, anyhow, that has had the distinction of trying a member of the highest legislative group in the land—

"Laughter" is interpolated here—

and it is not, Senator, an altogether pleasant undertaking.

I might say, Mr. President, that this Mr. Hall was a very pleasant gentleman.

It is embarrassing to us, that I know, but it is a duty, and I can't do otherwise, but it is embarrassing just the same.

I came into town Sunday afternoon from a long trip. This case happened before I got here and I found it was in my lap. Embarrassing situations have come up. I have tried cases I hated to try, and this is one of them, but I would like to remind the Senator from Idaho, being temporarily in Alabama, a casting rod is better publicity for a politician than breaking the law [laughter and some applause], and it seems sometimes it is a little more successful.

With those efforts of trying to ease the situation that has created tenseness in the crowd, tenseness on the part of the court, tenseness on the part of the Senator, I threw that in for good measure and I am glad you were able to laugh about it. I am not trying to be a comedian but I am glad we still have sense of humor. As long as we can keep that sense of humor there is no danger of our becoming involved in things that can't be eliminated. I am not rebuking you for that outburst. However, it isn't proper decorum.

Now, I am saying all that for this purpose: to say I believe the defendant is guilty as charged, and I am conscious, at the same time, that in doing that I am probably playing right into the hands of the publicity that was in my opinion deliberately started, but be that as it may I have got to do what I think is right. In doing that I am cunningly jockeyed into a position of thus creating publicity for somebody to use for the benefit of their own purposes.

A United States Senator is supposed to know more about the laws than anybody on earth because they make them. I think, as such, they are chargeable with more knowledge, with more duty to obey them.

We like distinguished visitors here. We have had a few, but very few of them to come equal to this defendant's station in life, but when they do come we are proud of them and welcome them, but when a guest comes in our midst and deliberately sets about to violate our laws, then I don't think it fitting or proper that such conduct should be treated in any light manner. I think the evidence shows a deliberate intent here to violate the law, and if there was that intent the violator necessarily did it premeditatedly.

I realize the case has been exaggerated out of all proportion to its importance, and I am going to go the limit of only justice in setting the penalty. I am not going to set it at the minimum. We have our laws, they may at some time be changed but until that time comes we must obey them.

I find the defendant guilty and set his fine at $50 and 180 days in the city jail.

I understand the Senator has complained about our jail. I am not going to require him to go over there just at the same time, and I am going to suspend the jail sentence, and by that time the campaign for which this publicity was created will be just about over, and if the probation of 6 months has been kept, and there has been no violation of our laws within the jurisdiction of this court, then there will be no invoking of the 180 days suspended sentence, but if, for any reason, any of the laws of this city are violated by the defendant while he is in this jurisdiction during the next 180 days then the suspended sentence will be revoked.

So, Mr. President, I was fined $50 and I drew a suspended sentence of 180 days.

I read a moment ago an article concerning a Klansman invading a Negro Girl Scouts' camp and breaking it up. Here is an article from the Chicago Sun-Times. It says:

Loyalty quiz rocks Oak Ridge scientists.

A loyalty quiz of the scientists down there is being conducted. They will wreck our entire atomic-energy program with their witch hunts. Scientists are not stupid people and they will not stand for having their loyalty questioned all the time, as has been done since the Red scare arose.

The article is dated at Oak Ridge, Tenn. It says:

The most important impression of the loyalty investigation now going on here, under which 2 men have already been suspended and as many as 35 may be hauled up, is that no one finds it anything but distasteful; not unnaturally, the scientists who have been hauled up and those who fear they may be

next to undergo the procedure find it hateful. John C. Franklin, Director of Oak Ridge for the Atomic Energy Commission, winces when the subject is broached, for he knows it may be the end of his great research institute. The board that hears the cases is composed of men who are sunk in gloom over their task. The best they can say is that the law directs that the job be done, and, therefore, they must go ahead and do it.

Is not that a sad situation, Mr. President? We have gone crazy in this country, going around investigating people, and even the investigators feel terrible about it. Their heart is not in it. A few Red-baiters are responsible for the whole business.

The worst of it seems to be that no person at Oak Ridge came to this reporter's attention who thought that any of the men are loyalty risks under any reasonable test that could be devised.

Even the remarks of the men who actually hear the cases indicated that they have not been impressed by the dossiers upon which they must base their search.

It is clear that in an organization as tightly integrated as Oak Ridge, where almost all the technical people live and work in close association, a man whose loyalty was suspect would soon be known to his fellows. The men and women here insist that no such person exists in Oak Ridge.

(The United Press reported from Oak Ridge that the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists and Engineers in a statement Wednesday said that technical personnel at the atomic plant are "seriously demoralized" by the accusations against their colleagues. The association said the charges were "mostly trivial," chiefly based on "unsubstantiated rumors," and some completely false.)

HOW IT'S DONE

At the hearings the suspected worker is furnished a list of charges against him. He may present witnesses and retain counsel, at his own expense, and he is given a transcript of the hearing.

That is better than most Government employees get.

But the men who have been heard believe that most of the charges could have been checked without any trouble before the charging procedure was invoked.

There is some more in this whole business of witch hunting and what not.

Mr. President, I should like to correct the Pathfinder magazine. This is an old publication. I understand it has now come under the domination of Mr. Pew, the famous Republican boss up in Philadelphia. He is using it simply as a campaign propaganda weapon, I guess, because it had a wide circulation all across this Nation. For many years people learned to respect the magazine, but now it is taken over by Mr. Pew, and the respect and confidence which the magazine had built up through the years is prostituted for political use.

In the page Under the Dome, which is printed to simulate a typewriter page—it seems most every magazine has one now, or a similar page, telling all the secret dope—the first item has this to say:

Unless interest in his third party revives, Henry Wallace may give up his crusade and withdraw as a Presidential candidate before the Democratic Convention in July. He thinks his opportunity even 4 years hence is lost, and TAYLOR, his running mate, is pressuring him to drop the fight.

Mr. President, to the best of my knowledge I am convinced that Mr. Wallace has no intention of withdrawing from the race. We have talked it over and can see no possibility of any nominee winning either nomination who would be acceptable. As for the last sentence, that "TAYLOR, his running mate, is pressuring him to drop the fight," that is an outright falsehood, with no basis in fact whatever. I never at any time even suggested to Mr. Wallace that we should give up the fight. So Pathfinder was just talking through its hat, without any reason to say such a thing.

Back in March there appeared an article in the New York Herald Tribune which said: "Purge of Greek leftists called gesture to United States."

We have read in the papers day in and day out about all the Greeks who were being murdered by the government in power, which we are supporting over there, and, as I said last evening, it got so bad that the British had to protest, the French protested, the Norwegians protested, and perhaps others did, too, whose protest I did not see. Anyway, they decided then that instead of shooting the prisoners in great bunches, sometimes hundreds of them at one time, they would bring them out and shoot them only 10 or 20 at a time, and it would not attract so much attention. They did not kill fewer, but they did not kill so many at one time.

This article appeared in March, and it said:

Ex-minister says Athens sees Truman doctrine requiring repressions.

In other words, the Greeks have decided that what we want is for them to kill off all the opposition, that there would be less trouble that way, no difficulty about fighting them, and one thing and another.

The article, which is by Homer Bigart, by wireless to the Herald Tribune, reads:

ATHENS, March 7.—Nicholas Kolyvas, former Minister of Justice, said today that the current wave of mass arrests, deportations and executions was the result of the Greek government's interpretation of the Truman doctrine. It believes, he said, that Washington desires ruthless suppression of the Left as an implementation of President Truman's "containment of Communism" theme.

Mr. President, we have been responsible, with this Truman doctrine, for more misery in Greece than has been visited on that sad people for many, many years, and that is saying a great deal. They have had many trials and tribulations. But we have certainly caused them more grief and misery in the last 2 years than they had had for many years previous to that.

We are ruthlessly, indiscriminately bombing the so-called rebel villages. It got so bad that they had to send their children to Yugoslavia, where they are being taken care of by the Yugoslavs. The Greek Government, the installed government we are supporting, the same government that Adolf Hitler supported, has said that these children were kidnaped, and are in Yugoslavia against their will. But last week there was a series of articles in the New York Herald Tribune, I believe by their Balkan correspondent who had gone to Yugoslavia. He said he saw no evidence that these displaced persons camps for Greeks on Yugoslav soil were military in any way, no military training or preparation was visible, and the people said they had no communication with their homeland at all. The Yugoslavs were just taking care of the children out of the goodness of their hearts.

The correspondent goes on to say:

Mr. Kolyvas, Justice Minister in the Plastiras government at the time of the Varkiza agreement of February 12, 1945, under which the ELAS Leftist resistance force was disbanded, said he say no moral justification for the recent execution of ELAS members for alleged crimes committed during the German occupation. After so long an imprisonment—several were first jailed in the weeks immediately after the Varkiza agreement—it scarcely was humane to march them out and shoot them, he said.

In other words, Mr. President, here we are faced with the sorry spectacle of a country controlled by the United States. They would not do these things if we told them positively not to do them, but here in Greece they take prisoners out of jails and prison camps, where they have been incarcerated since Hitler's occupation. The crimes were committed against Hitler's occupation authorities at our behest. We told them over the underground radio that if they would sabotage Hitler we would be there right away and save them. We got there. Some of them got caught, but we got there before they were shot, and I guess they thought they were going to be saved. But for some strange reason they did not get out of jail. They stayed in jail until just this spring, and then they were taken out of jail finally, but instead of giving them an annuity and a medal for their services to democracy, to the cause of the Allies in the recent world war, we lined these poor wretches up and shot them, Mr. President; killed them for crimes committed against Hitler's occupation.

Of course, no freedom-loving people are going to like an American occupation any better than a Hitler occupation, especially when it is no better, which ours is not, over there in Greece. We are supporting exactly the same people, and they are just as ruthless in suppressing their own people now as they were when they were working for Hitler.

"I suppose I'll be labeled a Communist and a traitor for saying this," Mr. Kolyvas said, "but I believe these convictions should have been reviewed. Remember, some of these crimes were committed in a period of extreme political upheaval, when murder often was regarded as patriotic. At that time, both British and American broadcasts were urging the EAM (National Liberation Front) to neutralize and repress all elements collaborating with the Germans.

"Undoubtedly, there were murders motivated by personal vengeance rather than patriotism, but in a period of anarchy such cases are difficult to clarify.

"For that reason," Mr. Kolyvas said, "the amnesty granted under the Varkiza agreements should have covered all crimes committed during the occupation. In any event," he said, "the present purge is dangerously crude and has already eclipsed most of the fundamental liberties guaranteed by the Greek constitution."

CALLS REGIME REPRESSIVE

In the matter of individual freedom, the coalition government of Liberals and Populists (Royalists)—created last September by Loy W. Henderson, State Department director of Near Eastern and African Affairs—has proved far more repressive than even the predominantly Rightist governments which preceded it, Mr. Kolyvas maintained.

In other words this former Greek officials says that the Government now under cur occupation is more severe, more repressive, than it was even under Hitler's occupation.

He said thousands of suspected leftists have been deported without trial, journalists arrested for criticizing the government and civil servants purged for disloyalty without benefit of the right of appeal.

Mr. Kolyvas believes a political formula can still be found for restoring peace. Two weeks ago, he visited his native island of Zante and, at the request of its residents, arbitrated an agreement whereby all political groups agreed to bury the hatchet, disband their armed organizations and live in peace.

Liberal deputies at Athens today denounced as unconstitutional a decree adopted Friday of a parliamentary committee giving to the military council power to drop 60 senior army officers. Most of the officers are liberals, and the liberal deputies hinted they were being discharged for political reasons by the predominantly royalist military council.

Mr. President, what I have been reading concerning what is occurring in Greece is very pertinent to what is happening here in America. We have just read how the government over there has discharged all officers of liberal political leanings. If the peacetime draft becomes the law of America I am confident that this weeding-out process, getting rid of all liberals, will be continued here in America, and eventually the Army will just be a tool of reaction and police organization to see that there is no industrial disturbance of any kind taking place. They refuse to try to evolve some plan whereby the workers of America can be paid enough to enable them to buy the great abundance which they can produce in the sweat of their brow. Labor will not stand for that always. Every time labor gets an increase, the prices increase about twice as much, and labor just gets further behind. Well, when they see that there is potential abundance, so much that we have to figure out a Marshall plan to dump it abroad, on people who already have overproduction of their own, so much that we have to figure some way to curtail production, about the best way they can figure is an armament economy, put great segments of our people to building useless articles, articles of destruction like tanks, airplanes, and guns, and that keeps things scarce so prices stay up. And in order to perpetuate such an unfair state of affairs and not let the workers enjoy the good things they can produce, they will have to have a great army thoroughly disciplined and reactionary in leadership.

I have appointed several boys to Annapolis and West Point, and I always try to select them from the families of workmen and farmers. I figure that the so-called upper classes have had plenty of representation at West Point and Annapolis. But always I have a talk with these boys before they go there, and I ask them to please remember the background from which they came, to remember that these Army officers, these West Point and Annapolis folks are wined and dined and feted, and that they tend to forget that there are any common people in the world at all. They live in a world apart. They lose touch with the common people. So the last word I always say to my nominees to West Point and Annapolis is to urge them to please remember and keep that spark of sympathy for the common people whence they came.

Here is another little article of interest. It is from Istanbul, March 7, an Associated Press dispatch. It is headed: "Turkey wants United States aid to take economic form."

I said last evening that we had sent Turkey so many guns they had had to ask us would we please mind stop sending more, and send them instead something to eat. Here is the article on which I based that statement last night. It says:

Turkish sources said tonight the government would like to change the military character of the American-aid program so that it would concentrate instead on Turkey's sagging economic structure.

Consequently, Turkey was expected to ask that a new American mission come here for an economic survey. It was presumed the Turks hoped such a mission would propose that any additional financial aid to bolster Turkey against possible Russian threats be not wholly military, as was the initial grant of $100,000,000.

Ankara sources who cannot be quoted said the military aid program was drawn up in haste. They said the general staff had no time to consider all the aspects of the program suggested by the first American mission.

At the time stories were going about that Turkey had not asked for aid, that we just went over and insisted that they take it. They insisted that they did not want it, and we had to threaten them to make them take our aid. But we got them to do it. We are too smart for those fellows.

A study during the last few months, these sources said, has convinced the general staff and Cabinet members that both American and Turkish funds could be better utilized if the program was aimed at restoring the country's economy.

Recently the world witnessed one of the most interesting incidents in all history when the President of the United States recognized Israel 10 minutes after the creation of the state was proclaimed. The reports from Lake Success are certainly humiliating to any American who has any pride in being an American—and I suppose that includes all of us. But it was embarrassing after the reports that Warren Austin would resign because he had been so insulted by not even being informed of the fact that we had recognized Israel that many people thought he would have to resign to save face.

Here is an article headed "Austin denies again he'll quit over Palestine. Sudden United States recognition of Israel revives reports; other delegates critical." The article is by Fendall Yerxa, and reads as follows:

LAKE SUCCESS, LONG ISLAND, May 15.—Warren R. Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, issued a flat denial today to widely published reports that he would resign his post because of the Government's Palestine policy.

"If you ask me whether I have resigned, I haven't. If you ask me whether I am going to resign, I am not." Mr. Austin told reporters here before he attended a hastily summoned meeting of the Security Council to discuss the Palestine war.

At the same time, there was silence from the American delegation and caustic criticism from foreign countries in reaction to President Truman's sudden de facto recognition of the new Jewish state of Israel. It was this action, committed without any tip-off to Mr. Austin and his staff, that led to a renewal of reports that Mr. Austin was considering quitting his post.

Of course there was absolutely no excuse for the President recognizing Israel without even informing our delegate to the United Nations. He made up his mind on the spur of the moment, no doubt, to try to get the Jewish vote back, but he could have picked up the telephone. It would have taken him only a minute to call Lake Success and say, "Listen, Warren, I have recognized Palestine." He could have hung up and let it go at that. But he did not even bother to do that, and it put our delegates in a most embarrassing position.

Announcement of United States recognition of the new Zionist state threw the American delegation into confusion when it burst upon the final meeting of the General Assembly special session at Flushing Meadow Park last night. Alternate delegate Francis B. Sayre had to take the podium in the Flushing meeting hall and confess that the Nation's official spokesmen before the world congress did not know what their Government was doing.

The delegation had regained some of its composure today. Reporters seeking an explanation of why the President and State Department apparently left their UN representatives in the dark were deftly parried.

But members of some of the foreign delegations were not so casual about it. Three delegates from one of the western European countries were sharply critical. One of them said he wondered how any country in the world could hereafter place its trust in American foreign policies or the pronouncements of American spokesmen in international parleys.

Mr. Austin, quickly surrounded by reporters when he entered the Lake Success delegates' lounge, was jovial in response to their queries on his reported resignation. He declared that he was puzzled by the reports, and added that they had been circulated recently on three occasions.

When his Government did not have enough confidence in him, presumably, even to notify him that it was recognizing Israel, no wonder there were rumors that he would resign. I suppose it was not a lack of confidence, but merely a lack of coordination.

Mr. President, if some Russian soldiers get into an argument with American soldiers, there is a great to do about it. An incident is stirred up. But just the other day we read in the newspapers that our bombing planes had bombed some Korean fishermen and killed about

14 or 16 of them. If the Russians came over and did that to our Mexican friends I am afraid there would be a terrible hubbub and hullabaloo about it.

Here is an interesting article. While we are sending billions of dollars' worth of goods over to Europe, the heading in this article in PM, dated June 4, is Freak Slump in Britain. It reads as follows:

LONDON, June 4.—High taxes and high prices appeared to be forcing Great Britain into a freak depression today, despite critical shortages of essential consumer goods.

While Commons was bemoaning a proposed 25-percent cut in Britain's slice of Marshall plan aid and its possible effect on the import program, informed sources in the financial district said a buyer's strike was developing in London.

"You can't sell a handbag these days," one store manager said. "People just won't buy. Radio sets are piling up and furniture no longer is in demand."

This easing off of consumer demand was in sharp contrast to the long period of indiscriminate public buying which followed the war. People still want things, apparently, but they just haven't got the money to buy them.

Even the recent relaxation of rationing regulations did little to improve things. Stocks still are piling up in stores all over the country. Informed quarters in the "City," Britain's Wall Street, said the reluctance to buy ranged from luxury items to vacuum cleaners.

COMMONS WORRIED

Despite this situation, however Commons sat all night last night debating the finance bill and worrying about how much money the United States of America is going to allot Britain under the European recovery program. Most of this money will go for imports and raw materials to keep British factories going.

That is a strange thing, Mr. President. We are sending them goods, and yet they find it necesary to have bargain sales to try to get rid of what they have over there.

Mr. President, in the issue of United States News and World Report of May 21, 1948, there is an article about various draft plans. The heading is: "Europe's peacetime draft; comparison with United States plan."

The reports for the article come from London, Paris, and Washington.

The article says:

Peacetime draft, now being debated in the United States, already is under way in all major countries. Service is from 4 months to 3 years.

British youths are called up at 18, Russians at 19, Frenchmen at 20. Most countries defer students, professional trainees, hardship cases. But most men go into reserves until middle age.

Then follows a comparison giving the highlights of the various draft systems in Europe. They are quite interesting.

It says:

If the United States revives the draft, it will be joining all the major nations of the world in building a peacetime conscript army.

Mr. President, if that is any consolation to us—that we are joining all the major nations of the world—I suppose we had better go ahead and pass this bill.

The article then says:

Investigation shows that no major power now depends on volunteers, except the United States. Of 54 countries with military establishments, 48 use some form of compulsory service.

United States plans, before Congress, are to draft nonveterans 19 to 25 for 2 years of service. Youths of 18 also may be called. This issue raises the question of how other countries recruit their armies.

European nations call their youths to the colors at ages generally ranging from 18 to 21. Length of service varies from 4 months to 3 years. Only countries with no draft at all are Germany and Austria, which have no armies, and Eire, which still uses volunteers.

Mr. President, it seems that we did the Germans and the Austrians a great favor when we whipped them. They used to have universal military training, and we did not. Then they got into a war, and we whipped them. Now they do not have any army, so they do not have universal military training; but we have taken on such responsibilities that we are told we must have universal military training. So we have traded places with those folks. They used to be kicked around by the army, but now we have traded with them on that, and we are going to let ourselves be kicked around and receive the same sort of treatment which brought them to such a sad end.

The article further says:

Great Britain calls her young men at the age of 18 for 22 months of service. Progressive reductions in terms of service are to be made for men drafted after June 1, so that those called up in December will serve only 18 months.

After January 1, however, new draftees will serve 12 months, followed by 6 years in the reserves. Not only 18-year-olds, but nonveterans up to the age of 26 will be liable for service. Temporary deferments may be granted to students, apprentices and hardship cases at the discretion of draft authorities.

Mr. President, these draft plans just cannot be worked out equitably. There is "pull" connected with them, no matter what kind of a scheme is adopted. Some boys have to go. Others, who have "ins," are able to escape service.

The article says:

Deferments also are to be granted to doctors and dentists undergoing technical training.

Perhaps that is necessary; but is it fair, Mr. President, simply because a boy is sent to college by his parents to study medicine or dentistry, that he shall be deferred, while some poor boy who did not have the opportunity to receive such an education in the first place has to serve?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question, as I understand the situation. So I am happy to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask the Senator if he can advise the Senate how long he intends to speak, so that we may know when the motion may be put to the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is my intention to speak as long as I can hold the floor, and only the Lord knows how long that will be.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator mean he intends to speak as long as he can stand up?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. President, I was giving a résumé of the draft plans in effect in Europe. I feel that if enactment of the proposed law can just be put off a little while, as soon as the Congress has time to go home and talk to the people at home—and the international situation is quieting down now, of course—I do not believe the Congress will enact this proposed draft legislation.

But, Mr. President, once a draft is fastened upon a country, it is almost impossible to get rid of it. It grows like a cancer. As Charles Beard said in the testimony which I read last night, once you get such a system fastened upon you, it strikes down all your liberties, and the country becomes a regimented state, and the people lose their liberties—just as was the case in Germany. Mr. Beard was very bitter against the draft proposal.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I feel compelled to do this; but since we are in the process of losing all our ancient liberties, if I can just postpone this matter a little while, this urge to emulate the countries of Europe, which in the past we have vanquished with our free country, I think the urge for the adoption of the proposed draft system will pass, and we shall regain our equilibrium and our sanity and will have no more of this business. But once we adopt it, of course, it is much harder to get rid of rather than to prevent in the first instance.

I read further from the article:

Deferments also are to be granted to doctors and dentists undergoing technical training. But they must serve their terms before they reach 30. Coal miners are exempt from service now. Agricultural workers may be let off next year.

France keeps conscripts in service only 12 months, but this may soon be raised to 15 or 18 months. Youths are called up at 20, then serve in the reserves until age 48.

Deferments are granted to students up to 3 years before starting their training. Some coal miners also are deferred temporarily now.

Russia drafts her young men into service mostly at the age of 19. Only enough youths are called to fill a quota set each year. These usually are the men who are most fit, physically and mentally.

Others are put into second-line reserves, subject to call within 5 years. Also in the second-line reserves, but subject only to wartime call, are youths with slight physical defects and those with two disabled parents, or a father over 60 and a mother over 55.

Conscripts serve from 2 to 5 years, depending on the branch of service. Infantrymen serve 2 years, navy men 5. Longer-term recruits usually are volunteers. Deferments generally are granted only for remediable physical defects and to permit completion of secondary-school education.

Belgium and Holland have military conscription. Mr. President, that strikes me as rather ridiculous. They have military conscription, but they are so small they cannot even retard the progress of an enemy of any consequence. In the last war the Germans simply ran over them roughshod. They might just as well—in fact, they would have been much better off if they had had no army, because they put up practically no resistance, anyhow, and were just slaughtered in the process. Yet here they are, right back at the old stand with their draft again, setting up the dinky little army, no good to anybody.

Belgium and Holland call up their youths at age 18. Belgian boys serve 1 year. No more than four sons are drafted from any one family, and deferments are granted liberally for completion of high school, college, and religious studies, as well as for some workers in vital trades. There is no enlisted reserve.

Dutch youths ordinarily serve 1 year, too. But because of the fighting in Indonesia, they now are held in service for almost 2 years. Conscripts get 3 months' training at home, then are sent to Indonesia. Upon release, they are enrolled in the reserves until 45.

Isn't that terrible, Mr. President, to draft those young men in Holland and ship them over to Indonesia, to browbeat and cow the people in Indonesia, who love their freedom just the same as the Dutchmen love their freedom? Recently the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said that the amount of aid we have given Holland under the Marshall plan approximates the amount of money they have spent in reconquering Indonesia. In other words, we are financing Holland's imperialism.

Sweden and Denmark require only 11 months' service. Danes register at 17, may volunteer at 18 or 19 and are drafted at 20. Only enough youths are called up to fill an annual quota. Selection is on a basis of physical and mental examinations. Students are deferred while studying. Conscientious objectors are given civilian tasks.

Swedish youths usually are called up in their 20th year. But training may be deferred until the 25th year for educational or other good reasons. Those physically unfit are assigned to noncombatant duties. Women are employed in training camps for service duties. Reserves are subject to call until age 47.

Norway calls up her youth at 19 for 1 year's service. Sailors and fishermen are assigned to the Navy, others to the Army or Air Force. Students are deferred until they graduate. Reserves are subject to call until age 49.

Here is the best plan of them all. This is Switzerland.

Switzerland trains its youth in a citizens' militia, instead of in the regular army. Most boys are called up when they finish secondary school, usually in their 19th year. Cavalrymen serve 130 days, others 116 days. But an additional 200 days of training is given all men during the next 20 years in 3-week refresher courses.

After completing basic training, the recruit takes home his rifle, uniform, and other equipment, including his horse or motorcycle, if a mounted soldier. This equipment is looked over at annual inspections until age 48, when it becomes the citizen's personal property.

Mr. President, I think that would be the most sensible thing, if we simply had to have some kind of program, to train everybody regardless of health, practically, unless they were just incapacitated; but to turn a man down because he has a punctured ear drum or because his sight is not exactly up to snuff strikes me as silly. We ought all to be trained. Then let us take our rifle and equipment home, and in case we get a blitz of atomic bombs—I do not know what you could do; you could not shoot the bombs, but at least everybody would be ready to go, and it would be more democratic, instead of getting into an army when you are pushed around and lose your initiative and get used to being ordered around.

Other European countries draft their youths at the age and for the terms of service listed below:

Country	Age	Service (months)
Italy	20-21	12
Turkey	20	36
Poland	21	18
Spain	20	24
Czechoslovakia	20	24
Greece	21	24
Portugal	21	15
Yugoslavia	21	24

Outside Europe, all countries except the United States, the Dominican Republic, and four British dominions—Australia, Canada, India, and New Zealand—practice conscription.

Thus, if the United States adopts peacetime selective service, it will be following a custom long practiced in most countries, with age and service requirements more scringent than under most systems in Europe, but more lenient than some.

That is a fact, Mr. President. If we have this we will doubtless be following customs long established in European countries where they have incessant wars, where the people have very few of the liberties we are accustomed to and enjoy in this country, and yet here we are on the point of following their very poor example.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Army's whole handling of the manpower situation suffers from the same kind of thinking. The Army always wants more men than it can use. That is what the generals are doing all the time, both in peace and in wartime. They are thinking about the future, how they can remain generals. They do not want peace, that is, firm peace; they want an uneasy, cold war. That is what they like. They are proposing to draft more doctors for the newly enlarged armed forces.

Mr. President, a few days ago I saw a story which stated that the whole civilian population is suffering from a bad and growing shortage of doctors that might prove disastrous. The shortage is greatest in the rural areas. I suppose the Army's prescription for the shortage is to take more young men out of the rural areas than they take from out of the cities, which will somewhat relieve the demand for doctors.

I should like to place these facts before the Senate, so it may judge for itself as to the wisdom of removing doctors from areas in which they are badly needed. There is no one part of the country that does not need doctors.

This little article is from the Gazette and Daily, of York, Pa. I happen to know the editor of the newspaper. It is one of the few really liberal newspapers in the United States. It is a remarkable publication. How it has kept going all through the years, when almost all liberal publications have gone to the wall, is somewhat of a mystery.

The title of the article is the Shortage of Doctors, by the Physicians Forum. Every week in medical journals throughout the country scores of rural communities plead for help. Yes, Mr. President, the small communities of this Nation have a terrible shortage of doctors. They need doctors; they are desperate for them.

It is no easy matter to see your wife or child in pain, with no doctor available inside of 50 or 100 miles. I have gone through that experience and have seen my wife and child needing medical attention, which they could not get, not because there was not a doctor within 100 or 500 miles, but because it was back in the good old depression days, right in the depths of the depression, and I did not have money to hire a doctor. I was an itinerant, moving from community to community. In those days if one did not have his roots down somewhere, he was in bad shape indeed. There were so many people who were patients that the doctors were pretty callous toward any outsiders who happened to be in unfortunate circumstances. So both my wife and baby needed medical attention but could not get it. I know what that means. That is why I am sympathetic to people who are unable to obtain medical care. I believe we should have a medical plan in this country to enable poor people to get medical care. I have always been for that idea and am still for it. Of course it lays one open to the charge of being a Communist if he wants to get a doctor, even if he cannot afford to pay for it.

There are about 150,000 active licensed physicians in America, one for every 930 persons. That sounds high enough, but on closer examination we find that this is true in only 470, 15 percent, of the 3,000 or more counties. In 1,642 counties, 55 percent have one doctor for every 2,000 persons; in 600 counties, 5 percent or 1 doctor for every 2,000 to 3,000 persons. Thirty-seven counties have no doctors at all.

I should not be surprised if one or two of those counties were in Idaho. I can think of some counties there which are very sparsely settled and probably could not support a doctor.

I read:

The situation is generally the worst in rural States. The average farming community is unable to muster enough buying power to support good doctors. The poor health of farmers and farm workers is almost a direct result of this situation.

I remember, Mr. President, when we used to think of the farm as a healthy place on which to live. We are going to send our sickly children out to the farm, and they would get well and be robust in no time and return to us sparkling with good health. But that is not the fact any more. It used to be the case that the slum dwellers in the cities

were the most underprivileged and, consequently, their health suffered the most. But in these days it is the farm children who are the most underprivileged and whose health is the poorest, and for that reason they produce the poorest physical specimens. They desperately need medical care.

Even in the largest cities, with one physician for every 600 persons, a majority of the 600 probably cannot afford a doctor. Because of this the health of most low-income city families is as poor as that of farm families. The rest of the 600, that is, those who either have the cash or are covered by some form of health insurance, often have to wait weeks for an appointment. When the long-awaited day arrives, they frequently have a 15- to 20-minute session with a tired, overworked physician who has neither the time nor the energy to do an adequate examination. The situation is even worse if the patient happens to be a Negro.

Most Negroes cannot afford to pay a doctor's fee, and even the few who are fortunate enough to have the ready cash cannot even buy the service because of the scarcity of physicians who will treat colored patients. There are approximately 4,000 Negro physicians and approximately 12,000,000 Negroes in the country. That is about one doctor for every 3,000 Negroes.

Few white private doctors treat Negroes. Too many of them subject the Negroes to humiliation. The quality of medical care which the American Medical Association and most health workers consider of primary importance is therefore deteriorating because of the inadequate supply of physicians. The situation is becoming gradually worse. Modern medical practice requires more services, of better quality, from the practicing doctor. He is supposed to give more careful consideration to the mental problems of his patients. Seventy-five percent of all private patients have these problems, and they require more of the physician's time. Doctors are expected to do more complete physical examinations in order to discover cancer, heart disease, and other killers in their early curable stages. This, too, requires more time per patient. Today a practitioner must take time out from his busy practice.

It will take a national health insurance program on social security lines to lift the financial barriers to adequate medical care. This program, together with hospital construction legislation, will make it possible for rural communities and other communities to attract and support more doctors.

There will be an overwhelmingly sustained demand for medical services which cannot possibly be met at the current rate of production of doctors.

It is almost laughable how bitter some people become against union workers nowadays because they departmentalize so much. An electrician will not use a saw and a carpenter will not use a monkey wrench, and people get all up in the air about it. At the same time the same people who in most lines of professional business criticize—I have in mind especially doctors—are getting so that if one treats your big toe he cannot look at your nose, and if he treats your nose he will not even move over 2 inches to look at your eyes to see how they are. Medicine is becoming the most specialized of all crafts. I am not saying it is bad, perhaps it is good, but I hope that when some people are prone to criticize the carpenter or the plumber for not moving out of his particular field they will remember these others who are doing the same thing.

Of course, if you want to know something about the Army's attitude on its own personnel, you can do no better than read the Doolittle Report on Officer-Enlisted Men Relationships. There is one conclusion made by this committee which is more damning of the Army mentality than anything that has ever been said by antimilitarists. I give it verbatim:

There is need for a new philosophy in the military order, a policy of treatment of men, especially in the "ranks," in terms of advanced concepts in social thinking. The present system does not permit full recognition of the dignities of man.

How can you trust the youth of the country to men who have continued to operate for years under a system which does not permit full recognition of the dignities of man?

Mr. President, how can we trust the youth of this country to men who have continued to operate for years under a system which does not permit full recognition of the dignities of man?

This condemnation from the pen of men who have themselves been closely associated with the military condemns this bill better than anything I could say.

I should like to read a few excerpts from this little report. One of the fine conclusions of this report is that, "It is extremely difficult under existing procedures to get rid of incompetents and undesirables among the officer group." I think that the mothers and fathers of this country would enjoy knowing that their sons are going to be put under a system that is loaded with incompetents and undesirables.

There is another little comment in this report worth noting. The report states that—

The peacetime army did not adequately prepare officers for the wartime job of handling civilian soldiers; it did not offer a code of officer-enlisted man conduct flexible enough for application to an army where the bulk of the men in all ranks were civilians.

Mr. President, there are many defects in our system of training our military as it is, without enacting a vast new program without putting any safeguards into it whatever in the way of doing away with discrimination and segregation, and redefining the relationship between officers and enlisted men, as this report has suggested should be done.

It seems that we are very fond of having fancy reports made and then we do nothing about them. We have the President's report on civil liberties and we do nothing about it. We have the President's report on the draft, and they report many things, including the statement that the draft is necessary, but they give us a whole list of things that should accompany it, and all we do is enact a draft law and put none of the other good things in to try to make it acceptable. Then we have the Doolittle report on the relationship of officers to their men in the armed services. We get the report and do nothing about it. Let us either quit having reports and wasting the taxpayers' money on them or else act upon them when once we get them.

Mr. President, that is an interesting commentary on the peacetime army. It would seem to me to mean that the Army has a professional standard that sets them apart from ordinary civilians, and in fact that prolonged association with this standard and system makes them pretty much unfit to handle a bunch of raw civilians. I never heard a better argument against the draft.

Of course, the military men of all countries are not necessarily dumb. I certainly do not want to leave that impression. My purpose is merely to show that the mistakes they make are profound errors of judgment which come from their training, the kind of training that one of their chiefs of staff thought made them unfit for a certain type of civilian leadership. But the military men also have their own ideas of intelligence, ideas which they have used in the past to befuddle the civilian population.

I have at hand that interesting little story that came out of Germany some months ago. The very efficient British Intelligence Service had discovered a little document, called Protocol M, which purported to be a Soviet document giving instructions to German Communists to take action against the western Allied occupation. The New York Times correspondent discovered it was a forgery, but published long after the damage of the original discovery was done.

I should like to read a little comment on this Nazilike technique of getting out the big lie and then neglecting to correct it for a long time. And of course, the purpose is perfectly clear, to embitter relations between the former Allies.

Of course, the purpose is perfectly clear—to embitter relations between former allies. Mr. President, this is a deplorable, despicable thing that is going on in the world. They even resort to forged documents to try to embitter relations between this country and Russia, when anyone who stops to think at all must realize that if relations deteriorate to the point where war finally breaks out, where the cold turns to the hot war, it must mean the end of civilization at least, and the experts tell us quite frankly that all life on this planet can be destroyed simply by exploding 250 atom bombs any place on earth. It is not the explosion of the bombs that will kill everybody, but the whole world will become so radioactive that no one can live; and we have hundreds of bombs. Yet we are considering drafting boys and putting them in uniform.

I have in my hand an article taken from the Gazette and Daily of York, Pa., the liberal newspaper I mentioned a while ago, under date of April 12, 1948. April 12 happens to be my birthday. It was saddened to the extent that it is difficult to celebrate nowadays, because President Roosevelt died on April 12.

The title of this editorial is "Nazi Opportunity."

Writing in the New York Times of yesterday, C. L. Sulzberger reported that Protocol M which raised a considerable storm about a year ago, was discovered by

the British Intelligence Service to be a forgery.

Protocol M was supposed to have been a Soviet document, giving instructions for action by German Communists against the Allied occupation. It created quite a disturbance when first released to the press by the British. Learned arguments of the intentions of the Communists—the Russian Communists—were based upon this document.

Now the document turns up as a forgery, after the damage has been done.

Mr. Sulzberger adds that the market for such phony documents—

The market, Mr. President, mind you—

is probably better today than ever before in history.

If you are a good forger of documents you are all right; you can make plenty of money now.

He suggests that the Russians probably have been misled by the same sort of thing. He points out that as recently as a few days ago, the French Ministery of Interior was duped by a similar document allegedly detailing the activities of the French Communist Party.

This is a sad state of affairs.

Hitler masqueraded his preparations for aggression in the garment of anticommunism. It resulted in the most disastrous war of all time. At a cost of millions of lives, Germany was finally defeated. We thought, too, that we had defeated fascism.

Franklin D. Roosevelt had envisioned a world at peace. He saw ahead a unity of purpose among the Allies toward that end. It was the only way the real defeat of the Fascists could be accomplished.

Let divisive forces split the wartime Allies, and the result easily could be the ultimate victory of fascism through the quarreling among those who fought against this scourge of the world.

Well, here we are today, on the third anniversary of the passing of Roosevelt, on the verge of war with our recent allies—not really knowing to what extent the forgeries of our recent enemies have contributed to our growing war hysteria.

Here we are today, initiating a program for Europe's recovery, and west Germany—the sector of Germany occupied by the western powers—included in our recovery program, and those who suffered most at the hands of Germany, not only excluded, but regarded by us as threats to the peace of the world, perhaps on the basis of Nazi-forged documents. Here we are today, rebuilding the Reich, forgiving the Nazi industrialists who made Hitler's aggression possible, openly declaring that our Nazi friends will be a great bulwark against dreaded communism.

The only way we could have prevented this was the Roosevelt way—through unity among the Allies until the affairs of a war-upset world were settled. We should have known that the Nazis would use any tricks to divide us. It should have been the constant aim of our Government to make clear to the people of this country how important unity was, so that we would not be misled by the vicious propaganda of certain sections of the press and certain special interests.

We lacked the wisdom to lay the ground work for unity. As a result, we now pay in ill will for giving the Nazis their chance to divide us and lead us to the brink of war.

We weren't very smart, were we?

There is one aspect of the military preparedness business that has gotten everyone who considers it considerably worried as to whether the Army wants more manpower or not. That has been the Army's handling of enlistments. The Army apparently upped the requirements for its peacetime forces as against its wartime forces, thereby cutting down the proportion of men accepted into the service by enlistment. Then the Army comes along and offers more advantages to men who enlist for 3 years as against men who enlist for only 2 years. The result is that in the period April 1, 1947, to February 28, 1948, the Army discloses that 179,408 men enlisted as new 3-year enlistees, but during the same period they got only 10,219 men for 3-year enlistment periods. The reason is given in the fact that 3-year enlistees are given various options as to the type or branch of service and the place where they may serve, whereas the 2-year men are not given those options.

And yet the Army comes along and asks for a 2-year period for the draftees under the bill proposed. Giving the same privileges to 2-year enlistees would increase their number considerably more than the 3-year total, and a conservative estimate would give something like 350,000 men available by enlistment if these options are given to all alike. And if we increased the incentives for 3-year enlistments, those enlistments could be raised.

But that is not what the Army wants, apparently. They want a continuous state of crisis instead. I want to read a few remarks from a statement on this subject issued by the National Council for Prevention of War, entitled "A GI Mystery, or the Case of the Empty Barracks." The article is as follows:

Hardly anybody comes home these nights to the barracks at Fort Dix. In fact, all over the Army things are rough. It seems enough manpower just can't be had. So what does the Army do about it? Nothing. Or, worse, it remains as exclusive as a Chevy Chase country club.

Suppose you want to join up for 2 years. "Go 'way, lad," says the recruiting sergeant. The Army can't be bothered.

In fact, the Army during the entire 11 months prior to February 28, this year, only accepted 10,219 men for 2-year enlistments, forcing the other applicants either to sign up for 3 years or stay out. Army recruiters got 179,408 3-year men in spite of themselves.

WHAT'S BEHIND THIS MYSTERY?

Army recruiting methods, for one thing. They stack the cards against the 2-year recruits. A 3-year man gets everything but a chauffeur and a bronze star to start out with. A 2-year man gets little more than KP.

CLUE FROM THE PENTAGON

"Incredible," you say? Well, here it is in the words of the "big brass."

"Individuals who enlist for 3 years are given enlistment options: First, choice of service, branch, or unit. Second, choice of geographical location. Men enlisting for 2 years are not given these opportunities. This probably accounts for the fact that fewer men enlist for a 2-year period."

Source: Department of the Army, letter from Col. J. H. Riepe; file No. CS-GPA-032, June 16, 1948.

BUT THIS IS STILL A MYSTERY

While the Army practically says "No" to youngsters who are dying to get into the Army for 2-year enlistments, it at the same time lobbies busily for a draft which will force hundreds of thousands of others into the Army for the same 2-year period.

Mr. President, some telegrams were just laid on my desk. Perhaps it might be well to see how people feel about this. I have not read them. I do not know whether they say "Stay with it" or "Sit down and shut up." I shall read them, and we shall find out what the people think about this.

The first one is from New York:

NEW YORK, *June 18, 1948.*

Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:

As a veteran and citizen, I congratulate you on your stand against the draft bill. I hope you will be able to prevent little Hitlers with brass on their shoulders from corrupting the youth of this country.

JOSEPH BREUER.

Here is one from St. Paul, Minn.:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *June 18, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Senate Floor, Washington, D. C.:

We who want peace are with you and count upon you to spearhead the fight to prevent our needless destruction.

JOHN HINES, JR.

This one is from Richmond, Va.:

RICHMOND, VA., *June 18, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Resurrect democracy in America by talking the draft to death. Your filibuster is the most important thing going on in the world tonight.

HOWARD H. CARWILE.

This one is from Brookline, Mass.:

BROOKLINE, MASS., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Grateful for your fine courage in fighting the draft bill. It is unconstitutional and un-American. It represents the degree of fatigue and neurotic fear also senility now bankrupting the Nation and wrecking our democracy.

M. B. ROBBINS.

Here is one from Elizabeth, N. J.:

ELIZABETH, N. J., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Floor of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. We are with you.

MRS. S. MELSER.

Here is one from New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge continued filibuster to defeat draft bill keep up good work.

HARRY, REBECCA, AND JOY COHEN.

Here is another one from New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep the filibuster up. The people back you.

RAY TOBIN.

These seem to be all from New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Keep up fight against draft. Will get my vote November.

NELL GREENFIELD.

That is very gratifying.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*

Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:

My hearty support to you. Keep up your good work.

S. MIRIAM.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your fight against peacetime draft.
Mr. and Mrs. STERMART.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. You have my wholehearted support.
R. KATZ.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
I support your fight against militarism.
HARRY MATKOV.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
We are with you in your filibuster.
WESTSIDE CHAPTER, CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
We will vote for you in November. Keep it up.
LEE BASSEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your filibuster. Keep up the good work.
MAX SILVERMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work.
M. DAITCH.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1949.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good work. Am with you.
P. MARGOLIS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your magnificent fight against draft legislation.
MILDRED ELLINGSEN.

NEW YORK, N, Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
I hail your courageous fight against the draft bill.
MARION KLAPPER.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
We support your courageous fight against the draft.
MAX PERLOW,
Secretary-Treasurer, United Furniture Workers of America, CIO.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
As a Purple Heart vet I applaud your fight to prevent the peacetime draft. Keep up the good fight.
SID LEHMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up the good fight; the people are behind you.
R. STEVENS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up thrilling fight to defeat draft bill. All my support.
MIRIAM LEVY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
As a veteran and wife heartily support and deeply grateful for your efforts to prevent passage of selective-service bill.
MARVIN and SHIRLEY ROTHENBERG.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Am happy that one of our Congressmen has our people's welfare at heart. Congratulations. Keep up the filibuster on the draft bill. We don't want it passed.
SYLVIA A. SADKIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
We support your splendid fight to defeat the draft measure. This bill is definitely an aggressive war move and not in the best interest of our country. Keep up the fight.
Mr. and Mrs. SEYMOUR ATLAS.

BROOKLYN, N. Y. *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Keep up your fight. God bless you.
ROBERT GELLAR.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 19, 1948.*
Senator GLEN TAYLOR,
Washington, D. C.:
Citizens of this Nation can congratulate themselves on having one honest Senator who respects his duty to represent the desires and interests of the people instead of special interests of enemies of peace. God give you strength.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator take his seat, because of language unworthy of the conduct of a Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator from Idaho will take his seat, under the rule. The Chair will read the rule. Rule XIX, paragraph 4, reads as follows:

If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

Paragraph 3, immediately preceding, reads as follows:

No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

Paragraph 2 reads as follows:

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now proceed with the business before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The business before the Senate is a motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. BREWSTER. I move that the conferees be appointed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from South Dakota will first have to be put.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senator cannot raise a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order. He will have to sit down.

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the names of the conferees.

The CHIEF CLERK. Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. BYRD.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I understand that the unfinished business is the bill providing for the extension of the terms of office of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The unfinished business is the bill providing for the extension of the terms of office of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, is it not?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; that is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Malone
Baldwin	Green	Martin
Ball	Gurney	Maybank
Barkley	Hatch	Millikin
Brewster	Hawkes	Moore
Bricker	Hayden	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Brooks	Hill	Myers
Buck	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler	Holland	O'Daniel
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Jenner	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Connally	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Cooper	Kilgore	Russell
Cordon	Knowland	Saltonstall
Donnell	Langer	Smith
Downey	Lucas	Sparkman
Dworshak	McCarthy	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Ecton	McFarland	Taft
Ellender	McGrath	Taylor
Feazel	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McMahon	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey

Tydings	Watkins	Wiley
Umstead	Wherry	Williams
Vandenberg	White	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Senate will proceed to its business.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—INCREASE OF PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2655).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on Senate bill 2655, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, p. 9253.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adopt the conference report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the Senator going to give us an explanation?

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. President, the Senate accepted the House figures on the total over-all manpower strength for the three services. In the case of the Army, the Senate figure was 790,000, the House figure 837,000. In the case of the Navy and Marine Corps the House and Senate figures were the same, 666,882. The Senate figure on the Air Force was 453,000; the House figure 502,000. The trainees, 18-year-olds, as in the Senate bill, 161,000.

The conferees adopted an amendment similar to the Capehart amendment, allowing 90 days before they would be subject to induction. The 90-day period comes automatically. The date is 90 days after the bill becomes effective.

With respect to conscientious objectors, the Senate yielded to the House. Those who oppose any military service, as differentiated from those who have religious scruples against kind of service such as medical aid, are deferred and are not put in a conscientious-objector camp.

We also agreed to exempt men who have 12 months' prior service instead of the Senate provision of 18 months' past service. That applies to veterans.

The conferees agreed, and it is so written in the bill, definitely, that the intelligence score for entrance into the armed services shall be not 80, but 70, as in the House provision.

Members of the enlisted Reserve components can volunteer for 21 months' active duty, the same as the selective-service period of duty, which is 21 months instead of the Senate provision for 24 months' service. Short-term enlistments of 21 months are also provided in the conference report for men 19 to 26 years of age; in other words, through 25, in the Army.

No provision was adopted by the conference for drafting doctors or dentists, feeling that no great numbers would come in until after Congress meets again. The conferees felt we could not set a special category to come under the responsibilities of the draft until we found out that volunteers did not come in under the medical and dental provisions. The conferees felt they would come in, and that at least we would have a chance to look at the situation after the first of the year, before we would be compelled to do anything in a mandatory way regarding doctors.

The plan for enlisting 25,000 aliens in the Army was not agreed to by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.]

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" have it, and the report is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I am thoroughly opposed to the filibuster which has been proceeding, but there is no question of the fact that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] were on the floor asking recognition long before the Chair put the question. I want to raise a point of order and ask for a ruling to set aside the Chair's ruling on the vote just announced by the Chair so that either the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Idaho can be recognized for remarks on the conference report. Important as passage of the conference report is, we cannot as individual Senators deny two Senators the right to be recognized by the Chair when they were so obviously, to the senses of everyone on the floor, seeking to be recognized before the vote was taken.

I raise a point of order as to whether the ruling of the Chair should stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make a motion as to whether the Senate will sustain the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. MORSE. I raise a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he did not see the Senators of whom the Senator from Oregon speaks. He was merely putting the question, and the question was put and the decision was made.

Mr. MORSE. Then I raise a parliamentary inquiry as to whether the junior Senator from Oregon has the right at this time to make a motion that the Chair's ruling be reversed, the vote set aside, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] be recognized. I think it is obvious to the Presiding Officer that what the Senator from Oregon is seeking to do is to have the Senate pass on the question as to whether the Senator from Florida has the right to be recognized for remarks on the business which was pending before the Chair ruled that the report had been agreed to. After all, we are dealing here with a pretty fundamental right, so far as each and every Member of the Senate is concerned. I am standing here, Mr. President, to protest the ruling of the Chair, when two Members of this body were shouting for recognition before the time the Chair announced that the report was agreed to. We cannot, in my judgment, permit any Senator to be denied the exercise of his rights on the floor. I think the right of each one of us to unlimited debate under the rules shall have been denied if this action stands. I am simply making a parliamentary inquiry as to how I can give this body an opportunity to pass on whether or not the decision of the Chair is to be sustained.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. I am heartily in favor of the position taken by the Senator from Oregon, but I do not raise my point of order upon a mere parliamentary inquiry. I make the point of order at this time with reference to the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Florida, respectively, for to my own personal knowledge I could see them and could hear them demanding recognition. In the sense of pride and in the sense of law I make the point of order—not a parliamentary inquiry—that the result of the vote was invalidly announced by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate the Chair undoubtedly has a discretion as to whom he shall recognize when a number of Senators are seeking recognition, but I doubt very much whether that discretion gives the Chair the right to exercise it by refusing to recognize any Senator who is seeking recognition. For that reason, and for the sake of future interpretation of the rules, not that I wish to give any advantage, parliamentary or otherwise, to any Senator who seeks to delay a vote on the matter, I doubt whether the Chair could refuse to recognize either one of the Senators. They were both seeking recognition. I hope that the Chair, in all fairness to himself and to the Senate, will hold that, notwithstanding the fact that he declared the conference report agreed to, one of the Senators was entitled to recognition.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that since there are so many Senators who feel that the Chair overlooked a request for recognition, if a majority think the Chair was incorrect, I suggest a unanimous-consent request that the ruling of the Chair be vacated and that the Senator from Florida be permitted to proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. I want it perfectly clear, first, that just as the Senator from Oregon stated for himself, I am not countenancing or favoring the plan of filibuster which has been indulged in. I want it distinctly understood, in the second place, that I am in harmony with the thought of the Senator from Ohio as to the advisability of not shutting Senators off, as I am also in harmony with the idea of the Senator from Oregon; but I insist on my point of order which is before the Senate for determination. It is, Mr. President, that the announcement of the result of the vote was invalid. It is not a question of setting it aside. It is void.

Rule XIX of the Senate provides as follows:

> When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him.

It would be tyrannous, Mr. President, if the Presiding Officer had the right to disregard this rule and to hold that it is discretionary on the part of the Presiding Officer either to recognize or not to recognize a Senator.

So I insist on my point of order. Under the facts, of which I have personal knowledge, the two Senators referred to were on the floor demanding recognition. My point of order is that the announcement of the vote is invalid, and therefore insist, as against the Senator from Ohio, that the point of order has precedence and should be ruled upon.

Mr. TAFT. May I point out to the Senator that whether the Chair is mistaken or not is a question of fact, a question which is often difficult to determine, whatever the Senator may think. It seems to me that the proper way to proceed is by unanimous consent to vacate the order of the Chair and to permit the Senator from Florida to proceed. Many of the Senators were not present and do not know what the facts were. Where there is a question of fact of that kind, it seems to me only reasonable to reach the result by unanimous consent.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I will not give unanimous consent. My point of order stands and is made as forcefully as I know how to make it. I know what the facts were. I saw and heard. My point of order is presented again and at this moment to the present Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. My question is as to whether or not the Senator from Idaho had the right to recognition, after a previous ruling of the Chair that he was called to order and ordered to sit down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question that the Senator from Idaho had the right to be recognized on a different question. The Chair wishes to state now that he did not see either the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from Florida on his feet seeking recognition.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the other hand, the Chair desires to be perfectly fair, and if there be any question in the mind of the Senator from Missouri, the Chair will reverse the order he made, and let the matter rest as it was when the Chair put the question.

Mr. DONNELL. I greatly appreciate the courtesy of the Chair. I may say, however, that there is no question in my mind. I know the facts, and I assert them and state that my point of order should be sustained.

If I may have the privilege of the floor for a moment more, I may say that I am not willing to surrender my point of order in favor of the request for unanimous consent. Suppose unanimous consent were not given, my point of order would be before the Senate, and I understand that the Presiding Officer has indicated his intention to sustain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his desire to be fair, has agreed with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Chair. I understand the point of order is sustained. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state the question now before the Senate. The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the conference report. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Chair that I deeply appreciate the ruling he has now made. I join with the Senator from Missouri in assuring the Chair that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon did see both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Idaho on the floor calling for recognition, and I wish to assure the Senator from New York, the present Presiding Officer, that in reversing his decision the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon can give him our honor-bound word that those were the facts, and that in reversing himself we feel he is protecting us, as well as every other Member of the Senate, and we deeply appreciate the action of the Chair in reversing himself.

Mr. DONNELL. I join in the statement of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to repeat once more that the Chair saw neither the Senator from Idaho nor the Senator from Florida on his feet.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I made the statement I did make, if the Chair will permit me to say so, because I knew that if I gave him my word as to what were the facts, and the Senator from Missouri would give him his word, the Chair would reverse himself.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire whether this is to constitute a precedent, so that if any Member of the Senate at any time raises a question of this character on a ruling of the Presiding Officer, it will be a precedent that the ruling is immediately to be rescinded. All of us familiar with Senate procedure know that at times something resembling this situation has frequently arisen, when half a dozen Senators will be on their feet, and no Senator may be recognized and the pending matter may be disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to observe, in that connection, that nothing of this kind can really constitute a precedent. These matters in each instance rest with the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida. The Chair apologizes to the Senator from Florida for failure to see him.

Mr. PEPPER. The Chair is characteristically gracious. We recall that it is a saying in the law that "hard cases make bad law," and probably extremities sometimes force us to decisions which are undoubtedly regrettable and out of character.

I doubt very seriously if there is anything so important as preserving the democracy of this Republic, and I doubt if anything is a surer foundation of the abiding safety of the Republic than continuing recognition of democracy in the Senate of the United States. What has just happened is a new proof of the integrity of this body and of our democratic institutions in America.

For myself, I rose only to ask a question. I had not heard the statement of the able Senator from South Dakota as to what the length of the time of the draft was. I did not rise to address the Senate, and I do not now arise to address the Senate. The Senator from Idaho is no doubt quite capable of speaking for himself.

What I wish to ask, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield, is, What was the length of time of the draft that was agreed to in the conference report?

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Florida has the floor; and if he will yield to me to answer him, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. I am asking the question. That is all I wished to be informed of. I do not care for the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. The period of service is 3 months less than what was provided in the Senate bill for those between 19 and 26 years of age. It is 21 months.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is the length of the time of the draft?

Mr. GURNEY. The same as in the Senate bill—2 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. How much service is required in the Reserve?

Mr. GURNEY. That matter was not in conference, because the House and Senate provisions were both the same—2 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And the same service is required in the Reserve?

Mr. GURNEY. About the same as the Senate provisions originally required.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the distinguished chairman of the committee advise the Senate as to what is the provision of the conference report for the beginning of the draft—for the initiation of the actual proceedings under the draft?

Mr. GURNEY. The proceedings of setting up all the agencies necessary under selective service are to start immediately upon the enactment of the bill. No one can be brought in under selective service until 90 days after the date of the enactment of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it mandatory upon the President of the United States to begin the calling up of men under the selective service system set up by the conference report at the expiration of 90 days?

Mr. GURNEY. It is not necessary for the President to make the call. Calls will automatically come at the end of 90 days. Of course, monthly quotas are approved by the Commander in Chief.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I understand the Senator correctly, then, that there is nothing left in the conference report by way of any question of discretion or judgment on the part of the President of the United States as to whether the draft will be placed in effect at the end of 90 days?

Mr. GURNEY. The President does not have to make any decision on that. It automatically comes into existence 90 days after the date of enactment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. And Mr. President, I desire to express to the able Senator, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and to his fellow conferees my feeling that he and they have done a difficult job exceedingly well in the conference. I want to state now my congratulations and my gratitude.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I make the motion that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho. The Chair also wishes to apologize to the Senator from Idaho for failing to see him.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to read paragraph 4 of rule XIX, as follows:

> If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

I make the parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not the leave provided for has been granted to the senior Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already ruled on that point. That question arose on the motion to appoint the conferees, the first motion made by the Senator from South Dakota, to disagree and appoint the conferees. The ruling by the Chair was on that question. We are now on the second motion, that is, a motion to accept or agree to the conference report. So that the point the Senator from Connecticut raises does not apply. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I had intended to, and I fully believe I could have held the floor until midnight tonight, or later. I believe I physically could have done so. But what I have just witnessed here in so many of these good Senators coming to my aid and assistance——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator from Idaho has had ample time to discuss this matter. I still press my point. It seems to me, Mr. President, that when a Senator has transgressed the rules of the Senate, as has been ruled by the Chair, and he has been directed to sit down, that then the only way he can get back on his feet in any manner is to ask the permission of the Senate to do so.

Now, the particular motion which was under consideration at the time and the motion now pending both pertain to the matter that was the subject of debate when the Senator from Idaho was speaking.

Mr. President, I question the ruling of the Chair in that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to insist on his ruling, and that is that the question on which the Chair ruled the Senator from Idaho out of order is another matter entirely; it is a different motion. That motion has been disposed of. Therefore the ruling of the Chair in that instance, that the Senator from Idaho should take his seat does not apply in this instance. Another motion is before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In support of the decision of the Chair on that point, I might add that if the position of the Senator from Connecticut were valid it would be impossible for the Senator from Idaho to obtain the floor at any time during the day, although we may have in the meantime passed half a dozen other bills and been on some other questions. So the Chair is undoubtedly correct in his ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAYLOR. If I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will see that the Senator from Idaho gets it back.

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho yields to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Idaho yielded to the Senator from Kentucky not for a question. I want to raise the point of order whether the Senator from Idaho has not spoken once on this motion already.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. He yielded to the Senator from Kentucky, not for a question, but for other observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to hold in this particular instance that that is a pretty fine technicality. The Senator from Idaho is still on his original speech on this particular motion. The Senator from Idaho has been under some difficulty at the present time—which he brought on himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, as I said a while ago I think I could have held forth here indefinitely, but I deeply appreciate what has just taken place here, the evidence of devotion to the principles of democracy displayed by a majority of the Senators present at least. I have sincerely felt that this draft bill was jeopardizing our future as a democratic free people. I have disliked very much having to play the role I have indulged in during the night, talking at length. I disliked the inconvenience and discomfort that I have caused to the Members of the Senate. I feel that so long as the Senators have the regard for democratic procedures and principles which was displayed here a while ago this country is safe, although there will be other Senators elected later whose election will be influenced more greatly by the fact that the military has become strong, and I am afraid that we will permit the military to become even stronger to the point where our democratic freedoms will be seriously jeopardized.

Nevertheless, I do not want to inconvenience the Senate further, and inasmuch as the Members of the Senate have seen fit to come to my rescue when I felt that I was being unfairly treated—in spite of the fact that I have treated them sort of rough during the past several hours, I appreciate what they did, and I am going to take my seat, and just urge the gentlemen present, whether

as Senators or after they have retired from the Senate, to keep a close watch on the Military Establishment of this country, and be not afraid, should it become all-powerful, to oppose it and try to get it back under control, because I am afraid that is what we are headed toward in this country.

I want again to express my appreciation to the Senators who spoke up in behalf of the principles of unlimited debate in the Senate, which are basic in our rules, in spite of the fact that in doing so they were laying themselves open to further torture probably by having to listen to further extended remarks.

So with those statements, Mr. President, I am going to take my seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, so the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 6705.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6705, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

(For conference report, see p. 8839 of the House proceedings of June 18, 1948.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6705, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 18, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 84, 101, 125, 150, 151, 152, 178, 190, 199, and 231 to the bill (H. R. 6705) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 126 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$34,132,439."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 189 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 13 and 14 of said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(parcels of land adjoining Big Bend National Park necessary to connect the park road system with State Highway 227)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 211 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 212 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$9,928,509."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 214 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "$9,928,509."

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 126, 189, 211, 212, and 214.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska state with what the amendments he just mentioned deal?

Mr. WHERRY. Senate amendment No. 126 is the over-all amount. It represents the adjustment of the total.

Senate amendment 189 is to strike out lines 13 and 14 of the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof "(parcels of land adjoining Big Ben National Park necessary to connect the park-road system with the State highway 227)."

Senate amendment 211 has to do with the purchase of wildlife management areas in California.

Senate amendments 212 and 214 represent a change of totals.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. There is one statement that should be made about the conference report in the absence of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who asked me to say for him there is an amount for a project in Owl Creek, Wyo. This project, Senator O'MAHONEY says, is in phase B, and in order that construction of this project may be provided for it must be moved into phase A. I want the RECORD to show at this point that while evidently no decision was made in the conference committee, yet that was apparently the reason for the appropriation by the House, and the Senate conferees concur in that action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question in on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I note that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is present in the Chamber. I take this occasion to say to him that I appreciate very much his action earlier in the day when the Interior Department appropriation bill was under consideration, in calling attention to what I conceive to have been a clerical oversight in the submission of the conference report by which the Owl Creek project in Wyoming was listed as in phase B under the Missouri Valley project, instead of phase A, as was understood.

The Senator has made that statement upon the floor and I want him to know that it is very much appreciated not only by myself, but certainly by all of those in the State of Wyoming who will be benefited by the project.

I think I should add, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska in his labors upon the Interior Department appropriation bill subcommittee has done very successful service in increasing the appropriations for reclamation in the West. He has not insisted upon working only for his own State, but he has included projects in other States. I wish it clearly understood that as one of the Senators who has been delighted to cooperate with the junior Senator from Nebraska, I very much appreciate what he has done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is most unusual, because usually the Senator is needling me a little about the politics of the affair. I deeply appreciate the words spoken by my distinguished colleague and friend.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me add another word or two in connection with this reclamation matter.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress, the last Congress, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and I were the authors of a bill to amend the Oil and Gas Leasing Act. The bill amending the Oil and Gas Leasing Act was considered by the Senator from New Mexico and myself as being a means of increasing the revenues of the Federal Government, of increasing the production of oil, and of benefiting reclamation, particularly. I have had a recent report made to me by the Geological Survey on the results of prospecting under those amendments. The results have been very satisfactory.

In 1947 there were 12 new fields discovered, 20 new pools, 15 extensions of old pools, and 1 field redeveloped. In 1948 there have already been discovered 10 new pools and 1 extension. The overall result has been that whereas the annual royalty of the Federal Government before the adoption of the measure to which I refer was running at a rate of approximately $10,500,000, it ran, during the year 1947, at the rate of $16,725,000, thereby indicating that there has been increased revenue to the Federal Government, largely as a result of the stimulation to exploration which was given by that law. This addition of $6,125,000 goes into the fund which is divided 10 percent to the Treasury for administrative expenses, 37½ percent to the States in which the oil is discovered, and 52½ percent to the reclamation fund. Thus the reclamation fund, out of which the appropriations contained in the Interior Department bill for reclamation are made, has been enriched as a result of that legislation.

I am one of the Members of the Senate who greatly regretted the decision of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] to retire from this body; and I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to pay tribute to the sagacity and ability and foresight with which he has served in this body. Particularly do I wish to compliment him on the great service he has been to the public-lands States. He was for years chairman of the Public Lands Committee, now the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. When the next Senate assembles without the presence of the

Senator from New Mexico, it will be a loss to the Senate, to the State of New Mexico, and, I think, to the country.

The new discoveries have resulted in the addition to the estimated oil reserve of the Nation a total of approximately 411,665,000 barrels.

This addition comes at a time when the people of the United States are consuming more oil than at any time in history.

When I introduced the bill amending the Oil and Gas Leasing Act, I gave as one of the reasons for its enactment my belief that it would stimulate the search for new oil reserves and that it would bring into the public-lands States oil and gas operators who had never before drilled on the public domain.

This has proved to be the case, and if one is to judge by the present activity under the new law we may anticipate additional discoveries. This is particularly true in Wyoming and New Mexico where the rate of exploration is high.

Wyoming leads all of the States in the number and extent of discoveries. The total addition to the reserve is estimated at 255,285,000 barrels, with the other States showing the following results: Colorado, 2,000,000; Montana, 31,660,000; New Mexico, 56,100,000; and California, 66,620,000.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks about the increase of discoveries of petroleum, I should like to have placed in the RECORD a table which I have had prepared by the Geological Survey. The table shows the unit discoveries which have been made in the States of Colorado, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and California since January 1, 1947.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public land and unit discoveries since Jan. 1, 1947 (northwestern region)

Field	Serial	Location	Year of discovery	Type of discovery	Estimated reserves discovered
Colorado:					*Barrels*
Elk Springs	Denver 052174	30-5N-98W	1947	Extension	500,000
Maudlin Gulch	Denver 053129	35-4N-95W	1947	New field	500,000
Rangely	Various		1947	Extension	1,000,000
Total					2,000,000
Montana:					
Elk Basin (Unit)	Billings 038541	28-9S-23E	1947	Extension (Madison)	28,260,000
Cut Bank	Great Falls 085298	12-36N-6W	1947	do	500,000
Elk Basin (Unit)	Great Falls 038541	28-9S-23E	1947	Extension (Second Frontier)	2,500,000
Kevin-Sunburst	Great Falls 082159	19-34N-2W	1947	Extension (Ellis)	400,000
Bears Den	Great Falls 084925	29-36N-6E	1947	do	Gas
Total					31,660,000
Utah: Gordon Creek	Salt Lake City 064211	24-14S-7E	1948	New field (CO_2)	Gas
Wyoming:					
Adon (unit)	Buffalo 038017	2-52N-72W	1947	New field	500,000
East Lance Creek (unit)	Cheyenne 060101	26-36N-64W	1948	Extension	1,000,000
Do	Cheyenne 060101	26-36N-64W	1948	New pool (converse)	300,000
Do	Cheyenne 060101	26-36N-64W	1948	New pool (Leo)	600,000
Elk Basin (unit)	Patented land		1947	New pool (Madison)	104,100,000
Hatfield	Cheyenne 032122 (a)	2-19N-88W	1947	New pool (Tensleep)	3,200,000
Lost Soldier	Cheyenne 065546	3-26N-90W	1948	New pool (Madison)	30,000,000
Do	Cheyenne 065546	3-26N-90W	1948	New pool (Cambrian)	12,600,000
Big Medicine Bow	Cheyenne 032201 (a)	26-21N-79W	1948	New pool (Tensleep)	5,250,000
Mush Creek	Cheyenne 037630	15-44N-63W	1947	Extension	6,500,000
Neiber (unit)	Buffalo 037645	19-45N-92W	1947	New pool (Embar)	6,000,000
Pitchfork (unit)	Cheyenne 044259 (a)	11-48N-102W	1948	New pool (Madison)	600,000
South Sand Creek	Buffalo 037919	26-46N-91W	1947	New field	8,600,000
Seven Mile	Cheyenne 068646	8-17N-77W	1947	do	1,035,000
South Fork	Buffalo 037915	24-46N-92W	1947	do	1,000,000
Wertz Dome (unit)	Cheyenne 064912	1-26N-90W	1948	New pool (Madison)	18,000,000
Do	Cheyenne 029520 (b)	1-26N-90W	1948	New pool (Amsden)	6,000,000
West Poison Spider (unit)	Cheyenne 073678	11-33N-84W	1948	New pool (Frontier)	20,000,000
Worland (unit)	Patented land		1947	New pool (Embar)	28,000,000
Do	do		1947	New pool (Tensleep)	2,000,000
Alkali Butte (unit)	Cheyenne 045483	1-33N-95W	1947	New pool (Embar)	(1)
South Shoshone (unit)	Cheyenne 071173	25-50N-105W	1947	New field	(1)
Badger Basin	Cheyenne 069170	7-57N-101W	1947	Extension	(1)
East Antelope (unit)	Cheyenne 067655	26-27N-93W	1947	New field	Gas
Pine Mountain	Cheyenne 067682	26-35N-84W	1947	do	Gas
Sage Creek (unit)	Cheyenne 067759	6-57N-97W	1948	New pool (Madison)	Testing
Total					255,285,000
New Mexico:					
Sawyer	Las Cruces 065151	19-9S-38E	1947	New field	2,000,000
Black River	Las Cruces 065421	13-24S-26E	1947	Redeveloped field	100,000
Grayburg-Keely	Las Cruces 028784 (c)	26-17S-29E	1947	New pool (San Andres)	3,000,000
Teague	Las Cruces 030187	28-23S-37E	1948	New field	50,000,000
Unnamed	Las Cruces 057159	11-26S-37E	1948	New field	1,000,000
Total					56,100,000
California:					
Sunset	Los Angeles 033068	32-12N-23W	1947	New pool (Miocene)	5,000,000
Oak Canyon	Los Angeles 042151	32-5N-17W	1947	New pool (Miocene)	520,000
McKittrick	Sacramento 019414 (a)	30-30S-22E	1947	Extension	10,000,000
McKittrick	Sacramento 035506	29-30S-22E	1947	Extension	10,000,000
South Mountain	Los Angeles 055490	19-3N-20W	1948	Extension	2,400,000
Aliso Canyon	Los Angeles 055641	29-3N-16W	1948	Extension	900,000
South Mountain	Los Angeles 055656	19-3N-20W	1948	Extension	1,800,000
Ramona	Los Angeles 056697	13-4N-18W	1948	Extension	1,000,000
Kettleman Middle Dome (Unit)	Sacramento 019275 (a)	30-23S-19E	1948	New pool (Eocene)	35,000,000
Total					66,620,000

[1] No estimate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Wyoming embarrasses me greatly. Needless to say, however, I deeply appreciate the most kind remarks he has just made.

However, it is not in connection with that matter that I desired that he yield to me.

I wish to refer to the Mineral Leasing Act which he has just discussed. I was not aware of the figures he has placed in the RECORD. I know that both the Senator from Wyoming and I were prompted by the matters he has mentioned and by the strong desire to secure exploration and development in the Western States.

I have not been able to keep up with the matter in the other States, but I have

watched with great interest and gratification the development which has occurred in New Mexico, in large part as a result of this act. I may say now that it has even exceeded my fondest expectations. More pools are being discovered in New Mexico now than ever before, and a great part of that is due to this Minerals Leasing Act.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I.—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER

SEC. 1. This title may be cited as the "Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act."

SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as "agricultural commodities"), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it is shall have been brought within 4 years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) shall be applicable to the Corporation. Any suit by or against the United States as the real party in interest based upon any claim by or against the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this subsection (c) to the same extent as though such suit were by or against the Corporation.

(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business, and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases or entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this act.

(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 713 (a)).

SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a–4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of 5 years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive

additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than one-half the members of the Board.

SEC. 10. The executive staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. The executive staff shall include a controller. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 661).

SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agancy of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

SEC. 13. Records; annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses—

FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this act, or under any other act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than 5 years, or both.

EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine or not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall limit or extend any period of limitation otherwise applicable to such claims against the Corporation.

SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware Corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

SEC. 18. Effective date: This title shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1948.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW

SEC. 201. Section 8 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (U. S. C., 1940, ed., Supp. V, title 50, sec. 968), is amended by striking out "before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "on or before December 31, 1950."

SEC. 202. Section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 15, sec. 713a–8 (a)), is amended by striking out "the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

POLLUTION-CONTROL ACTIVITIES IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 418, a bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 418) to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows: Page 2, line 12, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "hereinafter declared to be a public nuisance"; page 2, lines 13 and 14, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "such interstate waters and tributaries thereof" and insert the following words "surface and under-

ground waters"; page 9, line 11, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$200,000" and insert the figure "$250,000"; page 11, line 25, of the amendment of the House, strike out the figure "$20,000,000" and insert the figure "$22,500,000"; page 12, line 25, of the amendment of the House, after the words "study of" insert the word "water", and strike out the word "of" after the word "pollution"; page 13, line 1, of the amendment of the House, strike out the words "interstate waters"; page 13, line 2, of the amendment of the House, before the word "pollution" insert the word "water", and after the word "pollution" strike out the words "of interstate waters"; page 14, line 17 through line 23, of the amendment of the House, strike out all after the words "SEC. 9 (a)" and insert the following: "Five officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 per centum of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b)."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

LABOR DISPUTE AT OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 726)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1937, it is my duty to report to the Congress concerning the labor dispute which recently existed at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The important facts concerning the dispute may be summarized as follows:

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory is Government-owned. Some 2,350 persons are there engaged in important atomic-energy research, but not directly in production of fissionable materials or weapons.

The dispute was between the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp., and the Atomic Trades and Labor Council, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The corporation operates the laboratory under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract with the Atomic Energy Commission. The corporation also operates two other important plants of the atomic-energy installation at Oak Ridge. The council represents some 900 employees who perform maintenance, operating, and service functions at the Laboratory.

The recent dispute resulted from the failure of negotiations concerning both wages and working conditions. These negotiations were begun with the predecessor contractor in the latter part of November 1947 and continued with Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp. beginning February 9, 1948.

It is clear that there was a difference in objectives sought by the council and the corporation. On the one hand, the council desired to preserve differentials over the two nearby atomic-energy plants as to wage rates and conditions of employment—differentials which have been in existence in the laboratory since its beginning. On the other hand, the corporation desired uniformity of wage rates and conditions of employment and the elimination of the laboratory differentials.

In a union meeting held Sunday, February 29, the employees voted to strike unless settlement were made by Friday, midnight, March 5, and this intention was reaffirmed by another meeting on the night of March 3. Accordingly, on March 5, I issued Executive Order 9934, creating a board of inquiry pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act. At my request, both parties agreed to maintain the status quo until March 19.

On March 15 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its first report. It found the existence of a labor dispute at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and it advised me of the facts of that dispute. It further found that grave danger to the national safety would result if the operations of the laboratory were interrupted.

Thereupon, at my request, the Attorney General on March 19 instituted an action and obtained an injunction in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. This order enjoined both the corporation and the council, and all persons in active participation with them, from engaging in any strike or lock-out or from interfering with normal continuance of work, or from making any change in terms or conditions of employment other than by mutual agreement.

On March 24, I reconvened the Board of Inquiry. Negotiations between the parties continued, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On May 18 the Board of Inquiry submitted to me its second report, stating that the position of the parties remained unaltered and the dispute unsettled.

On June 1 and 2 the National Labor Relations Board conducted a secret ballot of the employees to ascertain whether they wished to accept the final offer of settlement as stated and made by the employer. The employees, by a vote of 771 to 26, rejected the employer's last offer. On June 7 the National Labor Relations Board certified to the Attorney General the results of this election. On June 8 the employees at a union meeting took action looking to a possible stoppage if the injunction were lifted and if the employer unilaterally placed in effect the terms proposed in its final offer.

On June 10, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Attorney General moved the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 11.

During this period the parties continued negotiations, with the assistance of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. On June 15 the parties reached agreement on the terms of a new contract.

All parties to this dispute and the Government agencies concerned complied with all legal and procedural requirements of title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

A number of additional facts concerning this dispute are set forth in the first and second reports of the Board of Inquiry. Copies of these reports are transmitted to the Congress with this message.

Both parties are to be commended for achieving settlement of this dispute without an interruption of work.

The dispute at Oak Ridge has raised some question, nevertheless, as to the sufficiency of present collective-bargaining methods in atomic-energy installations.

This question is somewhat different from others which have arisen in the past. On the one hand, it is clear that the national security and the development of the beneficial arts and sciences are bound up with the progress of our atomic-energy program. Thus, every dispute which threatens to seriously impair that program imperils the national health and safety.

On the other hand, it is equally clear that the progress of our atomic-energy program requires the support and drive of broad sectors of the American economy. In order to encourage such support, the Atomic Energy Commission has lodged in its contractors a large measure of responsibility and authority. The progress of the program is equally dependent upon the full and willing support of the men and women who work in atomic-energy plants and laboratories.

Under these circumstances, it is imperative that the most successful techniques of the collective-bargaining process should be adopted for the atomic-energy program.

The objective should be twofold. The parties should continue to enjoy the maximum of voluntary action and freedom of choice. Secondly, the public interest must be protected at all times.

I believe that special study should be given to the problem of peaceful and orderly settlement of labor disputes in Government-owned, privately operated atomic-energy installations, such as those at Richland, Wash.; Oak Ridge, Tenn; Los Alamos, N. Mex.; the Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago, Ill., and others.

I propose, therefore, to establish a commission composed of men having expert knowledge in the field of labor relations to study this problem and to make such recommendations as they may find necessary. The commission should explore the question whether any special legislation should be enacted to protect the national interest without depriving management or labor organizations of the initiative and freedom necessary for the progress of our atomic-energy program. The commission should study ways and means of adapting to the atomic-energy program the best of our experience in the complex field of labor relations. The commission should concern itself also with special aspects of

the problem, such as questions of bargaining representation, uniformity of working conditions and wages, and procedures for grievance handling.

The commission should concern itself, in short, with the broad code of conduct which should be observed by management and labor in their relations with each other in this vital program.

In appointing this commission I shall request the advice of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, both as to the membership of the commission and the specific questions to be studied.

I believe that the report of this commission, which should be submitted as soon as possible, will be of great value in guiding contractors, labor organizations, and the Government in this new and vital field. I am confident that this is the best avenue to follow to achieve and maintain that proper balance between freedom and responsibility which is the tradition in all our economic relations, including those between management and labor.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on Senate bill 2242, a bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk.

(See conference report printed in House proceedings, p. 8855, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 18, 1948.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to be heard on this question before it is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida seeks recognition. Does the Senator from West Virginia wish to speak on the report?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the explanation. I merely wish to be heard before the question is disposed of.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in presenting this conference report on the displaced-persons bill, I desire to make a very brief statement respecting the displaced-persons bill as passed by the Senate, the bill as passed by the House, and the bill which has now been reported after an extended conference.

The Senate will recall the extended debate which took place when the bill was pending before the Senate. It is my position at the present time that the bill was debated on the floor of the Senate very fully and completely, and it is my belief that legislation dealing with the problem of displaced persons must be in accordance with two fundamental principles.

First, such legislation should be consistent with the best interests of the country; and, second, in view of the tremendous scope of the problem, the legislation dealing with it must, so far as practicable, be confined to displaced persons in Europe who were displaced as a direct result of the war, and who cannot be repatriated.

With respect to the differences between the bill as it passed the Senate and the conference report, the bill as it passed the Senate provided, after amendments were made on the floor of the Senate, for the admission of 200,000 persons within the course of 2 years. The bill, as reported by the conferees, permits the entry in 2 years of 205,000 persons, the difference being that the 3,000 displaced orphans to be admitted under the Senate bill had been included within the 200,000 limit. The conference bill lets the number of orphans come in over and above the 200,000 limit.

In addition, the conferees agreed to, and the bill as it comes from conference provides for, the entry of 2,000 persons who fled from Czechoslovakia prior to April 1, 1948. With the additions of these 2,000, as I say, the total number will be 205,000.

The bill also provides an adjustment of status, as it is called, for 15,000 displaced persons who are here on a temporary basis, that is, those who come in under temporary visas issued by the representatives of this Government.

Mr. President, it cannot be said that the category of 15,000 is a definite number fixed to come into the country, or to stay here. The bill simply provides that 15,000 may have their status adjusted by the Attorney General of the United States, as may be done in the case of any immigrant into the country on a temporary visa or temporary stay. If the Attorney General extends the time beyond 6 months, he must report it to the Congress; and if the Congress, after reviewing the case, finds that the Attorney General's viewpoint is sustained, then the person is deportable. That applies in the case of any temporary entrance. On the other hand, if the Congress approves within the session within which the list of persons is sent to this country or within the succeeding term, then that person obtains permanent status.

It will be recalled that certain vocational preferences were provided in the bill as passed by the Senate. As I recall, 50 percent of those who were to be admitted into the country were to be persons who had engaged in agriculture—agricultural workers—and who intended to go into agriculture in this country. In the conference report that figure has been changed to 30 percent, and a preference is given to the agricultural worker.

Under the bill as passed by the Senate, at least 50 percent of those admitted were to be persons who were natives of a land which had been annexed de facto by a foreign power. That would mean Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and eastern Poland, east of the Curzon line. In the previous debate, I fully discussed the reasons for that preference.

The conference report incorporates the provisions of the Senate bill providing for a three-member commission, but leaving the administration of the act in the hands of the regular immigration officials.

The conference report also provides for the opening of the German and Austrian quotas, with a provision that up to 50 percent of such quotas for the next 2 years, may be assigned to the Volksdeutsche. The Volksdeutsche, as the Senator recalls, are those persons of original German descent who may for generations have lived in Poland, Czechoslovakia, or Yugoslavia, and who, after the defeat of Hitler, under the Potsdam agreement were driven from their homes back into Germany or Austria.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL—CHANGE OF CONFEREES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, in order to ask that I may be excused from further service as a conferee on the Government corporations appropriation bill, and that a new conferee be appointed?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the request of the acting majority leader is granted, I shall ask that a new conferee be appointed.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope my request will be granted, because it is physically impossible for me to attend any further meetings of the conferees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

Will the junior Senator from Michigan suggest whom he desires to have named as a conferee, in place of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to refer to the seniority list of the committee. As I understand, at the present time it will be the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] will be named as an alternate conferee.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have stated, a first preference is to be given to agricultural workers.

I wish to say that a second preference is to be given, as was provided in the House bill, to persons who are household workers or construction, clothing, or garment workers, and others who are needed in the locality in the United States in which such persons propose to reside, or eligible displaced persons possessing educational, scientific, technological, or similar qualifications. That provision was taken from the bill as passed by

the House, in substantially the same language.

A third preference is given to eligible displaced persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted aliens in the United States, such relationship in each case to be within the third degree of consanguinity, computed according to the rules of common law.

Within those preferences, certain priorities are to be issued, first, to eligible displaced persons who during World War II bore arms against the enemies of the United States and are unable or unwilling to return to the countries of which they are nationals, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion; and, second, to eligible displaced persons who on January 1, 1948, were located in the displaced persons camps and centers. In exceptional cases, however, a preference may be given to persons outside, under the regulations of the Commission.

Mr. President, I believe that states the principal differences between the bill as passed by the Senate and the conference report.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As the Senator knows, the clothing industry in the United States is badly in need of qualified tailors and hand operators on clothing. I am informed that that need cannot be supplied in this country, but it can be supplied from European sources. Can the Senator state whether the words "clothing and garment workers" are intended to include and do include tailors and hand operators on clothing?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is my understanding that the reference to clothing and garment workers, would include anyone who works with clothing and garments, and certainly it would be my understanding that it would include tailors. However, if there were any reason to doubt for a moment that such persons were covered by the words used in the conference report, the reference in the report to other workers needed in such places in the United States where such displaced persons would reside, would certainly cover the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I read the conference report rather hastily, the number of persons who can come into the United States under it, from any one country could displace not more than 50 percent of the quota of immigrants from that country for that year. I should like to know this: If there are eligibles from Latvia, who are just the sort of people we want, and who qualify under this measure in every other way, will the fact that 50 percent of the quota for that country has been used for that year, keep other of such eligible persons from being admitted that year, but give them priority in the next year; or what will happen?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should have mentioned that point in the opening statement I made. I am glad the Senator has asked the question. I think it best that I read the provision of the conference report in that connection. It is to be found in subsection (b) of section 3:

> Upon the issuance of an immigration visa to any eligible displaced person as provided for in this act, the consular officer shall use a quota number from the immigration quota of the country of the alien's nationality as defined in section 12 of the act of May 26, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 212), for the fiscal year then current at the time or, if no such quota number is available for said fiscal year, in that event for the first succeeding fiscal year in which a quota number is available: *Provided*, That not more than 50 per centum of any quota shall be so used in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That eligible displaced orphans may be issued special nonquota immigration visas, except that the number of such special nonquota immigration visas shall not exceed 3,000.

In other words, it does not block the number of persons who may be admitted into the United States in any one year. I know exactly what the able Senator has in mind. For instance, the quota of Estonia is very low; I do not recall, but it is probably around 200 or under 200. The question asked by the Senator is, Would that primarily affect the number to come in in any one year? No; it would not. As many as are available, as many as will, may come in. As many as will, even beyond the whole quota, may come in. But the charge against future quotas is only chargeable to half the yearly quota. In other words, it leaves half the quota for persons, natives of that country other than displaced persons, to use it in those years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, then, to finish with that, they can be admitted in any number, if they are otherwise eligible, from Estonia, but 50 percent of the quota from that country would be pledged for years to come until that number is filled up. Is that correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes, that is right. In other words, this is a provision that was in the House bill, which was insisted upon by the House, called by some a mortgaging of future quotas up to 50 percent a year. It does not affect the number who may come in within any year of the 2 years covered by the statute, or rather within the whole 2-year period covered by the statute.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like the floor in my own right.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thought the Senator wanted me to yield for a question. I tried to give an explanation of the bill as it came from conference. It is the Senate bill as passed by the Senate by a large majority, with the differences I have tried to express in this opening statement. With that explanation, I am very glad to yield the floor at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I have not placed my signature to the conference report, and while the report was taken to the floor of the House and adopted, and I anticipate it will be adopted by the Senate, I still deem it my duty to state for the RECORD and to the Senate my reason for declining to sign the report.

Mr. President, there are two questions involved in the bill as to which I could not compromise the principle which I think is involved. While I realize a vote was taken upon each of the questions in the Senate, I still think the principle is so vital to the proper solution of the problem of displaced persons that it should now be called to the attention of the Senate, because I believe the bill is not workable in its present condition, and that in the future, amendments will of necessity be made, and therefore we should understand what we are about to do.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Merely that we may understand the basis of the Senator's statement, did the Senator vote for the bill in the Senate on final passage?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, Mr. President; I voted for the bill. I thought then it was as good a bill as the Senate at that time would pass; I believe now it is as good a bill as the Senate will pass; but I still think I should make these remarks to the Senate at this time because to me they deal with a vital matter. The questions I have in mind are two in number. The first has to do with the date for reckoning displaced persons under the bill. As I recall, the war ended on May 8, 1945. Some of the displaced-persons camps were in existence at that time, and were filled later by taking people who were displaced from wherever they were found.

Sometime subsequent to December 22, 1945, the President of the United States issued an Executive order allowing displaced persons from the camps to come into the United States under the regular quota. The report of the committee indicates that there were many. And, by the way, the President used the date of December 22, 1945, as being the date he would recognize persons as being displaced if they were in the camps prior to that date.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator give us any explanation for the vigorous insistence by the majority on the December 22, 1945, date, which was known to deny eligibility status to large numbers of displaced persons?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the record is quite full, because it was contended on the floor that the real displaced persons were those who were in the camps prior to December 22, 1945. But as the Senator from Michigan sees the proposition, all displaced persons in the camps prior to the time they were officially closed by the order of General Clay, are displaced persons.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have before me an editorial from the Denver Post of June 13, 1948, the heading of which is "Cutting out the bias," in which appears this paragraph:

> A second provision of the Senate bill, plainly containing an anti-Jewish bias, limits eligible DP's to those refugees who entered

the camps of western Europe before December 22, 1945. Most Jews, who comprise 18 percent of the total displaced persons, came to the refugee centers after that date.

Certainly there is an inference in the editorial statement and in the fact that justifies a possible assumption there might have been some conscious design to deny eligibility to the Jews.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me at once remove from the mind of the Senator from Florida any conscious design to discriminate against anyone whomsoever because of religion or faith. I think the other members of the committee will bear me out in that statement, and will do so emphatically. This was a displaced-persons bill, and there was not, and should not have been, any idea of bringing the faith or beliefs of any persons into the discussion. Let that be put at rest.

So far as the Senator from West Virginia is concerned, this is a displaced-persons bill, whoever they might be, and the persons earliest displaced, those more certainly displaced, were the ones who should receive first attention. I point out to the Senator who has raised the question—and I do not desire to discuss it because it has no part in the consideration—that there are displaced persons all over the world. Under IRO camps are maintained not only in Europe but in north Africa, in the Middle East, and in China.

We are advised by Sir Arthur Rucker, who is the deputy administrator of the PCIRO, that the representatives of the new state of Pakistan came before him and reported that there were 10,000,000 displaced persons in that country. Those people would be qualified. It is limited to Germany and Austria, where the American, the British, and the French zones are located, with respect to who may come under this bill. Perhaps that is discrimination, but it is wise and necessary discrimination as to the area dealt with in the bill.

As to other discriminations, I think the Senator will find that there are none, in fact, regardless of charges by groups and by writers. I do not think that there would be any unjust discrimination whatever under the effects of this bill.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would rather not yield. I have a conference to attend with regard to the Government corporations bill. It is very essential that I be present because of the closing of the session today. As soon as I can finish what I have to say, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The question has been raised as to whether the bill is, in effect, discriminatory. There is no doubt that it is discriminatory. It does not make any difference to the people who are being discriminated against whether it is a conscious or an unconscious discrimination, but it makes a difference to the people who are exercising the discrimination.

The reason this bill will not work is that it will suggest the filing of fraudulent applications because on December 22, 1945, registration was not complete in the camps. It was not known who were in the camps prior to that date or who were in the camps after that date, and not until April 21, 1947, was there an actual investigation to the extent of taking fingerprints of those who were in the camps. So on April 21, 1947, it was known exactly what persons were in the camps, by photograph, by fingerprint; and by record.

I have not agreed with the committee. I had presented these problems on the floor previously. I have not signed the report, because under the circumstances I felt my conscience would not allow me to sign it. I merely came to the floor to present the picture, so that we may realize what we are doing. If we do not solve the problem of displaced persons we shall have a cancer in Europe that may lead even to disturbances which will affect the whole world. For that reason I raise my voice today upon the floor.

I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the question propounded to the Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] with respect to the date of December 22, 1945, which was made the effective date of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized in his own right.

Mr. McGRATH. I join in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. To me it is a matter of deep regret that after 18 months of sincere, honest, and courageous effort on the part of so many thousands of humanitarian Americans, we come to this sad moment in the Senate of the United States when we probably shall have to write into the law of this country principles of narrowness, intolerance, and bigotry.

Mr. President, the date of December 22, 1945, was deliberately written into this bill because that date prohibited Jews from taking part in this program. The committee may deny it had that deliberate intent, but I want the RECORD to show that the committee had full knowledge that such would be the effect, whatever the intention of the committee may have been. It was pointed out in the committee by myself, that on this date most of the poor wandering people who had been driven from their homes and were still wandering about the war-torn countries of Europe had not been collected together.

If we take the date of December 22, 1945, there will be no record. If a person is able to claim that he was in a camp prior to that date, he would be recognized as a displaced person. Therefore a dishonest person could get out of the camp as a displaced person. But if we take the official record, as of April 21, 1947, we have something on which to work. Those who will administer the act will have something on which to work.

I say, Mr. President, if we unconsciously discriminate against those who are actually displaced persons, it is still discrimination. If we discriminate, we are in effect un-American.

Mr. President, there is one other provision in the bill which I think discriminates against the same persons. When it was brought up on the floor and in the conference committee, it was turned down, but I think we should realize what we are doing. We tried to make it fair in the bill so that there would be no question about taking persons from the groups. The groups were the nationality groups, with one exception, and that was the Jew. He was treated under IRO as a nationality, and therefore if we had applied the rule that there would be no discrimination among groups, we would have discovered that there would have been no discrimination as to nationality. Therefore everyone would have been able to say we were trying to bring into America qualified displaced persons, no matter what their race, their color, or their creed might be.

So when we boil it down and reach the question of whether we are actually discriminating, we will be unable, in my humble judgment, to solve the problem of displaced persons unless at some time this bill is amended or a law is passed providing that there shall be no discrimination as to groups, and that we shall use a date on which there were official records so that we can ascertain whether the applicants are really displaced persons. They had not been put into camps, so they are ineligible to participate under this program.

I want the RECORD to show that another discrimination is writen into the bill, which is a discrimination against those who come from the Catholic parts of Europe, by giving a great preference to another segment of the area from which these displaced persons were driven.

Mr. President, I feel that before there is a final vote on the conference report I should make the observation I have previously stated, namely, that we have approached this problem from the point of view of seeing what we could do to prevent displaced persons from coming to the United States, rather than how to bring them here. Our whole aim and purpose, it seems to me, has been to find reasons and excuses for not passing any displaced-persons legislation whatsoever.

I am firmly of the conviction that the only reason why we have a bill before us is that we do not dare, in the months ahead, face up to public opinion if we dare to adjourn the Congress without passing some legislation on this subject. I hope the people of the United States will not be fooled into thinking that we are doing, by this bill, that which by tradition and honor the United States of America should do for the displaced people of Europe.

Mr. President, I was a member of the committee which was appointed to go to Europe to study the displaced persons problem. I regret that I could not stay in Europe during the entire tour of the committee, but I was there long enough to visit more than 15 of the camps, and I think I am equipped with knowledge of the problem.

We came back to the United States and worked diligently and laboriously upon the legislation. I disagreed wholeheartedly and vigorously with the majority of

the committee. In committee I took the view which has been taken here today by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and my reward for making that kind of a fight was that when a conference committee of the Senate was appointed to meet with the conferees of the House of Representatives and try to get a workable bill, though I had been one of the Democratic members of the committee all during the progress of the legislation, I was denied a place upon the conference committee. Instead of my going on the conference, where I could have discussed this question intelligently, there was sent the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to represent the Democratic Party, when his view has all along been that we should not pass displaced-persons legislation at all, that we owe no obligation to these people. That is the kind of situation we had when the Senate should have had an opportunity to get a reasonable bill out of the conference of the House and Senate.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I resent such treatment at the hands of those who were responsible for it.

This morning the New York Times has a very splendid editorial very much in line with the editorial referred to by the distinguished Senator from Florida. We all have confidence in the fairness and in the integrity of the New York Times. It starts its principal editorial today by calling this bill a "shameful" displaced-persons bill, and I wish to read into the RECORD here and now the opinion of the distinguished editors of this newspaper:

Eighteen months ago a humanitarian drive, worthy of the best traditions of this country, was begun to save some of the lives of 350,000 men, women, and children in the displaced-persons camps of Europe. With sweeping support of Americans in every walk of life and of civic, government, labor, and religious groups, the Stratton bill emerged, symbolizing the highest principles as a basis for taking a fair share of the DP's—400,000 over a 4-year period—on the concept of justice for each group of DP's.

That bill died in committee, and two bills subsequently took the Stratton bill's place. In the House a more moderate bill, but nevertheless humane, was sponsored by Representative FRANK FELLOWS, to admit 200,000 DP's over a 2-year period. In the Senate a bill written by Senators REVERCOMB and WILEY was the antithesis of humanitarianism and deliberately sought to scuttle every high concept of either of the House bills.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McGRATH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator knows I voted for the bill personally, does he not, but did not write into it one word, one sentence, or one clause? It came out as a subcommittee bill, and as a committee bill, and my name is on it without authority from me. Is not that the fact?

Mr. McGRATH. I am very happy the Senator has interrupted me to make that point. I am very happy to know that the Senator from Wisconsin is disowning this bill, as I would disown it myself if it had my name attached to it.

Mr. WILEY. Will not the Senator answer my question directly? He sat on the subcommittee. Did I have anything to do with writing the bill? I will have something to say on the merits of the bill later. The Senator was a member of the subcommittee, and I should like to get the matter straight, because all over this country I have been credited as being the sire of the bill, and I should just like to know definitely if the Senator does not know personally that I had nothing to do with writing the bill or shaping it. Is it not a subcommittee bill, a majority of the subcommittee voting for it, and was it not afterwards adopted by the full committee?

Mr. McGRATH. When anyone says that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is the father of this bill he is stating an untruth.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGRATH. I agree with the Senator that he had little or nothing to do with the bill as it came out in final form.

Mr. WILEY. Or with drafting the bill. I did not sit on the subcommittee that drafted the bill.

Mr. McGRATH. The reason why the Senator's name is on the bill at all is that we reported the bill bearing the number that had been given the original bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin, and the Senator had very little to do with the recommendation or the approval of the concepts we now find in the bill that is before us in this conference report.

Mr. WILEY. One other question, if the Senator will yield. Is it not true that this bill was written by the majority of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The attention of Senators has been called to the responsibility for the bill. There was a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who is speaking now, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and myself. The bill was not written by any one individual. It came out of the subcommittee as a very definite compromise of the views of a subcommittee which wanted to present to the Congress an opportunity to vote upon a bill dealing with this subject.

The Senator from Rhode Island well knows that. He attended the meetings of the subcommittee. He knows of the extended and lengthy discussions had upon this subject in the subcommittee. He knows that it came out of the subcommittee as a compromise of the views of the subcommittee, that a majority of three voted to report the bill out, that one of the Senators did not agree with some of the provisions but did agree with others, and I think that the Senator from Rhode Island, while he did not agree with the terms of the bill as a member of the subcommittee, did want some bill brought out upon this subject.

That is the way the bill came before the Senate. No one individual, no one Senator, offered this bill or wrote it. This was a bill which came out of a subcommittee of five, in which there was definite disagreement about the terms, and eventually a sufficient number, a majority of the subcommittee, found a bill upon which they could agree, and reported it out.

That agreement was by way of compromise and settlement for the purpose of bringing this subject before the Congress of the United States so the Congress could determine it. There was no attempt here to bury the question of the displaced persons, but to give the Congress an opportunity to vote upon the question.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I am not surprised that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee wants now to disown the paternity of the bill, and I think he will be more ashamed of it as time goes on, than he is now.

Of course the final form in which the report came to the Senate represents compromises which were reached by the conference committee. But I am not going to let the record stand without saying that in every way that he could the distinguished Senator from West Virginia whittled down this bill to the point where it was most distasteful to us, and we reached the conclusion in the committee that if we were going to have any legislation whatsoever upon this subject, the only way to get it would be by writing the legislation on the floor. We agreed to have the bill reported, unsatisfactory as it was, in the hope that we might accomplish that purpose. I, myself, joined with other Senators in offering an amendment on the floor as a substitute for the bill. I and other Senators who shared the same views withdrew the substitute in the hope that in the final analysis we would not, by voting on the substitute, foreclose the possibility of getting a fair bill from the House and Senate conference.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is no question that the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from West Virginia were in disagreement on many points in consideration of the bill, and there is no question that the Senator from West Virginia today is not, as he previously was not, in favor of some of the terms contained in the bill today.

When the bill came to the floor of the Senate the figure was fixed at 50,000 persons a year. The Senate, by amendment, raised the number to 200,000 for 2 years. But regardless of that, the Senator from West Virginia accepted the verdict of the Senate, and went into conference to uphold the Senate's bill.

The Senate disagreed with and would not support the views of the Senator from Rhode Island, and now the Senator from Rhode Island complains about the bill. The Senator from Rhode Island denounced the bill as it came before the Senate, and when it was amended. The Senate has disagreed with the Senator from Rhode Island. The bill has been passed by the Senate, and although the

Senator from West Virginia disagreed with the bill as it was passed by the Senate, he stood by the judgment of the Senate in the conference.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island realizes that the damage has been done, and that we are now considering a conference report on which there is no opportunity to make changes in the bill. I realize that it is a matter of voting it up or down, approving it or disapproving it.

I merely want to make my own position clear upon the record that I think the bill is not only unsatisfactory, but it is largely unworkable. Time alone, of course, can answer many of the doubts we have within us at the present time.

I rose, Mr. President, to answer the question propounded by the distinguished Senator from Florida, and I had started to read an editorial from the New York Times. I offer the complete editorial for insertion in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. I do, however, wish to make a reference to one more paragraph, which I think sums up the situation very adequately when it says:

This week has brought a shameful victory for this latter school of bigotry. A joint conference committee approved virtually every narrow concept of the Senate measure, and the House yesterday endorsed the conference report.

The editorial goes on to say:

This is a sad conclusion. There is also no assurance that the 100,000 proposed for the first year's admissions will come into the country, because of the bill's unworkability.

What is the position of those of us who have a deep feeling for the bitter experiences of fellow human beings who have for years been driven from their homes and countries, forced to live under cruel circumstances which the enemies of our democracy and our way of life have visited upon them?

Mr. President, I have weighed this matter carefully in my own mind, and I can see before me 200,000 human souls that may probably in some small way be benefited by this bill. I can see their confreres, some six-hundred-thousand-odd of them, who can have no hope because we have seen fit to put a limitation of 200,000 on our action.

I have come to the conclusion, Mr. President, that if there is a chance to give aid and succor to any one of these that we should not miss the opportunity. I have come to the conclusion that it does not make a particle of difference whether a man is a Jew or a Catholic or a Protestant, whether he is a Balt, or whether he is something else, if he is in want and in misery, we ought to help him if we can. And while this bill discriminates against Jewish DP's, and while it discriminates against Roman Catholic DP's—and the Roman Catholics of this country know it, and they know that the Senate knows it; and the Jews of this country know it, and they know that the Senate knows it—yet these people have been persecuted before, and they have lived through it; and, Mr. President, neither of these groups because of further intolerant discrimination would want to deny what little aid may come to fellow human beings by this bill.

Doing therefore what I know in their hearts they would have me do, that is vote for this bill even though it does not do all it should for them, on that basis, Mr. President, I shall vote for the conference report in the hope that time will justify what I have said, and that our consciences will be aroused and that these wrongs will be righted in the not-too-distant future.

There being no objection, the editorial submitted by Mr. McGRATH was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SHAMEFUL DP BILL

Eighteen months ago a humanitarian drive, worthy of the best traditions of this country, was begun to save some of the lives of 850,000 men, women, and children in the displaced persons camps of Europe. With sweeping support of Americans in every walk of life and of civic government, labor, and religious groups, the Stratton bill emerged, symbolizing the highest principles as a basis for taking a fair share of the DP's—400,000 over a 4-year period on the concept of justice for each group of DP's.

That bill died in committee, and two bills subsequently took the Stratton bill's place. In the House, a more moderate bill, but nevertheless humane, was sponsored by Representative FRANK FELLOWS, to admit 200,000 DP's over a 2-year period. In the Senate a bill written by Senators REVERCOMB and WILEY was the antithesis of humanitarianism and deliberately sought to scuttle every high concept of either of the House bills. It cruelly favored one DP group above another, injected the religious issue, and because of its unworkable administrative provisions was a bill of exclusion rather than admission of DP's.

This week has brought a shameful victory for this latter school of bigotry. A joint conference committee approved virtually every narrow concept of the Senate measure and the House yesterday endorsed the conference report.

It is to their honor that four of the Senate-House conferees refused to sign the bill—Senators FERGUSON and KILGORE, and Representatives BOGGS and CELLER. This DP bill's main provisions are these: 205,000 DP's shall be permitted to enter over the next 2-year period, including 3,000 war orphans; 40 percent of admissions shall be allotted to DP nations of the Baltic States and Poland east of the Curzon line; 30 percent of admissions shall go to farmers, discriminating against other skills; those not in the camps by December 22, 1945, are not eligible for admission, discriminating against the bulk of Jewish DP's, who suffered the most cruelly during the war. Even the Volksdeutsche are given a boost—permitting these persons of German ethnic origin, many of whom had strong Nazi ties, to compete for regular quota numbers with bona fide DP's.

This is a sad conclusion. There is also no assurance that the 100,000 proposed for the first year's admissions will come into the country, because of the bill's unworkability. Perhaps most significant, this triumph for the Revercomb group holds disturbing portents for the future. Good bills have gone down the drain; a bad bill and a bad precedent bode ill for democracy, which finds discrimination on its books repugnant.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day I read a little skit wherein a school teacher wanted to have an essay written about Socrates, and was going to give a prize. The boy who received the prize wrote:

Socrates was an ancient philosopher. He went around giving advice. He got poisoned.

Mr. President, I am not going to give advice, but neither am I going to permit to go unanswered criticism of the subcommittee, three of whom agreed on the committee bill—one a Roman Catholic, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and two Protestants, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], while the other two—one a Catholice and one a Protestant—disagreed. I mention these facts much as I dislike to even mention the religious faith of a colleague, for I feel that such reference has no real place in our discussion. Unfortunately, references as to religion have already been made by others.

I heard no such argument in committee as I have heard on the floor of the Senate, as advanced by my friend Senator McGRATH. The injection of what we have heard said by my good friend not only disappoints me, but adds, I believe, to the confused thinking that has gone on throughout this country in relation to the bill.

Because my name appeared on the bill I have been the target of the worst kind of misrepresentation. The kind of propaganda that has gone out to my people is beyond belief. Folks have sent me letters in which they have said "I am not replying to this kind of rot," but many did, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the displaced persons in Europe today, although faced with many serious problems are, according to the record, better fed and better looked after in Europe than the people outside the camps in Germany. They are receiving more calories.

What was the real purpose of trying to get a workable bill? Senators realize how difficult it is to draft a bill that will work. I agreed wholeheartedly with the majority of the subcommittee, and I wish to tell the Senate why.

I appointed three men, one of whom is a former judge of the supreme court of his State, and a Catholic. He knew what was necessary to place in operation a working mechanism. He knew that 40 percent of all the applications for visas to this country were fraudulent. He knew that the record showed that this situation presented the finest vehicle in the world for Joe Stalin to get people into the United States. We know that 125,000,000 people have been taken over by the Communists without firing a shot but by penetration and infiltration.

When it is said that these three men, Christian, honorable men, Members of the Senate, permitted bigotry and religious bias to dictate their judgment, I think that is one of the nastiest things that has ever been said on the floor of the Senate. Knowing these men as I know them, working with some of them in Christian relationship, I know that what was said is not only wrong, but false.

These men have no prejudice against Jews or against Catholics. I, for one, absolutely detest and abhor every form of religious intolerance and discrimination. Senators sought to meet the impact of this DP problem in connection with all the other problems of America. They sought to evolve a mechanism that would permit, between now and January, 50,000

DP's to be siphoned into America on top of the quotas. Those men knew that next January, once the mechanism was arranged, the tide would be coming in if we had the jobs, the facilities, and the people in America who would take them and give them jobs and housing. They knew that there were 2,000,000 veterans getting married who did not have homes. They knew that this program should be handled with judgment and not with unreason. So they brought forth this bill.

I sat with the subcommittee on one or two occasions when the bill was being discussed. There was the same opposition then that we apparently have on the floor of the Senate now. But not once did I hear the question of religion or the question of race interjected into those discussions. It is not there, Mr. President and should not be there. I say that to the people of the country. I say that editorial writers, yes even for the New York Times, who write in such a vein should read the letter which Donald Richberg wrote to a Washington newspaper the other day. He spoke of the obligation of the men who write for the press to be acquainted with the facts before they attempt to educate the American public. I agree with that sentiment, Mr. President.

This Immigration Subcommittee was appointed by myself. The subcommittee went to Europe. They did not know that I was going to Europe. As I have heretofore stated, I went to Europe at my own expense. I went through those countries. I saw the situation. I felt the vast humanitarian implications of this controversy. Yet I did not come back and say a word to the subcommittee as to my own personal conclusions. I refrained from trying to influence them. But when the subcommittee had arrived at its conclusion, after the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and other members had arrived at their conclusion, I saw before me a working mechanism which, if it could be gotten through the two Houses would point to the solution of this problem.

As has been said by the Senator from West Virginia, we had before the Senate the question of who are displaced persons. We had that question in the committee. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] offered an amendment providing for the inclusion of 10,000,000 Sudeten Germans—the Volksdeutsche. If they had been included, what would have happened to the percentages? There are in India and China today tens of million of displaced persons.

But, Mr. President, we were facing a European situation of 800,000 displaced persons. If we pass this bill today, we are assuming that within the next 2 years this country will take one-fourth of them. But do not forget that we are feeding those DP's over there better than we are feeding the stricken German people. They receive more calories and have better housing conditions.

Since the day of victory in Europe 7,000,000 DP's have been handled and only some 800,000 remain.

This thing cannot be done overnight. The problem must be handled with reason, judgment, and foresight. We must have places to put these immigrants. How many of our people have come forth and told us how many displaced persons they would take? I wrote to the State of Wisconsin because the governor had appointed an able resettlement committee. I wanted to know how many the people of that State were prepared to take. A response came and I was glad to insert it in the RECORD, along with telegrams from my State, even though some of those wires disagreed with my own position. Last week 41 county agents sat downstairs as the guests of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, two House Members from Wisconsin, and myself. I asked how many offers to take DP's had been received, how many places could be found, how many would be taken in my own county. The county agent in my county said, "There was one offer in my county of 45,000 people."

Mr. President, we cannot take these displaced persons and simply throw them into this country. That would be a tragedy and a sin against the DP's themselves. We must have places to lodge them. There must be folks who will feed them and look after them. Already the homes of America are crowded because of our "ain folk." We are trying to build houses. We are trying to keep our economy stable, and all at once the charge is interjected that we have a prejudice against Jews and against Catholics. It makes my heart sick that that charge should be made against my associates, whom I know so well, whom I have learned to love because of their ability to work together for the general welfare and because they, like I, detest intolerance.

Here we are in the Senate, 96 Senators, no two of whom have the same educational, economic, religious, social, geographic, and political background. Consequently we do not see things just alike. But we all love our country. But, Mr. President, if we get to the point of misjudging our fellow citizens, if we completely unjustifiedly call them bigots, we lose our poise. We lose our perspective. We cannot see through the mist that divides us.

Of course this bill is not a masterpiece. No bill could be whipped into shape, under the conditions which exist today, which would fit the conditions of tomorrow. What we have here is a bill which is the result of Members of the House and Members of the Senate getting together. My distinguished colleague from Michigan voted for the bill as it left the Senate, and while he disagrees with some of the provisions I am glad to note he will vote for the same.

That brings up one other subject. I am partially responsible for what occurred in relation to the appointment of the Senate conferees. We were having a Republican convention in Wisconsin last Friday. I had to leave early. A fellow Senator came to me and said, "You will have to name the conferees." Without detailed thought, because I had not been in the midst of this thing, and because time was lacking with a thousand other things to be done, whom did I name? The ranking Democrat, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was absent because of illness. I named among others the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the ranking Republican who was acquainted with the bill and the facts. I was informed afterward that my original appointments would not stand by the bill aimed at in the Senate. They would not fight for the Senate bill. Then I also recognized that I had inadvertently omitted two Senators, one of whom had been on the original subcommittee; but my original appointments had been made with the best intentions. Of course I had named the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] chairman of the subcommittee.

That raises in my mind a very serious question. Personally I would not act as a conferee if I could not support a bill which went out of this body. I would not think it was my right to act as a conferee under such circumstances, if I could not basically support the measure which the Senate passed and what I was supposed to support. Perhaps others think differently.

I am not questioning the motives of anyone. But I think that matter should be thoroughly discussed on an appropriate occasion, and should be settled.

I am the guilty party because of necessary haste in desiring to go back to my native State and to attend the convention. Otherwise I probably would have appointed from the very start the ones I subsequently appointed. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] should certainly have been appointed in the first instance; and I appointed the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] instead of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who was ill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a privileged matter? I think an attack has been made upon me personally by the Senator from Wisconsin, and I demand that the Senator yield to permit me to inquire as to that.

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator has inferred that I declined to go along with with the Senate version of the bill, and that the Senator made a mistake in naming me as one of the conferees. I think the Senator did make a mistake in naming me as one of the conferees.

Mr. WILEY. Then the Senator and I agree.

Mr. KILGORE. Because since I was appointed as one of the conferees, I received a letter—and I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin has ever seen the letter. It was sent on April 15, 1948; and it says that the Senate version of the bill is unworkable.

Mr. WILEY. Who wrote the letter?

Mr. KILGORE. The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Robert A. Lovett.

Mr. WILEY. That answers itself, I think. I have no recollection of seeing such a letter.

I did not mean in any way to imply anything particularly derogatory. I wished to get the facts in the RECORD, and I think I have them in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I wish to return to the basic problem. Eight hundred thousand displaced persons, more or less, are involved. The Senate committee reported

the bill to the Senate. The Senate amended the bill, and after the bill was passed by the House, the bill went to conference. The conferees have reported.

When some say that the bill is not workable, only time will tell that. Of course, there can be all kinds of opinions as to that. I believe the bill has merit and will, if properly administered, do the job.

But, Mr. President, if we do not accept the conference report, in what situation will the displaced persons be left? Are we going to permit unfounded and loose statements to interfere with getting a mechanism which will serve the purpose so generally desired? I believe the bill we sent to the House was not only workable but would have done the job. It would have given us additional time to handle this problem. But this measure will permit the entrance of 105,000 DP's annually, plus 150,000 aliens under the quota, and probably an equal number of nonquota persons annually. I do not think the country could absorb more than that in 1 year.

So, Mr. President, if we sit back cooly and evaluate the situation, do we not arrive at the conclusion that we are doing the best we can? We are operating under trying circumstances, having to meet a number of difficult problems, staying up all night, and working during the following day, and probably during the following night.

I wish to say again that I believe that after we have rested and have had time to think about these matters, we shall arrive at the conclusion that although we have differed, although members of the subcommittee have differed, no Senator has meant to impugn the motives of any other Senator or has claimed that any Senator was anti-this or anti-that, or was anything but pro-American.

Mr. President, with those words, I shall take my seat.

INCORPORATION OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I now move that the bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause, and substituting the text of Senate bill 1183.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. HATCH conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senators who are engaging in the debate on this bill to make their remarks as brief as possible. I think there is no question but that the conference report will be adopted. So I hope Senators will make their remarks brief, for there are very important bills awaiting action. There is the problem of increasing the pay of approximately one million and a half Federal employees, and there are other questions which we are very anxious to reach and to dispose of. If this conference report is going to be adopted anyway, as I think it is, I hope Senators will make their remarks on it as brief as possible.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island has seen fit to criticize the appointment of the Senator from Mississippi as one of the conferees. The Senator from Rhode Island says he should have been appointed because he has seen the displaced-persons camps and could intelligently discuss the question.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. I did not predicate my right to be a member of the conference committee on the fact that I had seen the displaced-persons camps. I predicated it on the fact that I was the only available Democratic member of the subcommittee who had been appointed to study this problem, and I pointed out that we did go to Europe and did study the problem, and that I knew of the various angles to it.

As I have watched the appointment of conferees here in the Senate since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have observed that the conferees appointed have always been those who have been charged with the construction and handling of the legislation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, not for a speech. I have only a few remarks to make.

Mr. McGRATH. The Senator has my answer.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know that the Senator from Rhode Island is more intelligent than the Senator from Mississippi, and probably would have done better on the conference committee. But, Mr. President, I have seen as many displaced persons in Europe as the Senator from Rhode Island has seen.

As I conceive the situation, it is the duty of a Senate conferee to uphold the position taken by the Senate until a reasonable compromise can be worked out. I think that is our duty, under our oath of office.

I submit that that is all I did. We made one proposition to the House. That proposition was accepted, and a bill was worked out.

All that the Senator from Mississippi did was to uphold to the best of his ability the position taken by the Senate.

As I remember the debate, the Senator from Rhode Island complained about several provisions in the original bill. One was the provision that 50 percent must come from Baltic states east of the Curzon line, and he also complained about the provision that 50 percent must be farmers.

The fact is that the Senator from Mississippi and others of the conferees agreed to write in that restriction.

We brought back a conference report which certainly should be more palatable to the Senator from Rhode Island than the original bill passed by the Senate.

I submit that I considered it my duty as a matter of honor to uphold the position taken by the Senate of the United States. That is what I did without regard to religious or racial feeling of any kind or type.

Although I shall vote against adoption of the conference report, I think it is as good a measure as we could have gotten under the circumstances.

Mr. KILGORE obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to address a question to the Senator from Mississippi. I was trying to get him to yield to me before he concluded his remarks.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, did the junior Senator from West Virginia desire to ask a question? I understood that, after I sat down, the Senator desired to ask a question. Would the senior Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to my colleague for the purpose of a question, most certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to ask this question with respect to the attack made on this point by the Senator from Mississippi. Is it not correct that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] was on the subcommittee, and was the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know whether the Senator from Mississippi is even aware of it, but I want to say that on June 7, 1948, the Senator from Nevada wrote to the director of the staff of the committee, the Senator from Nevada being ill and confined to the hospital at that time, as follows:

With regard to the other matter about which is asked my opinion, namely, the

appointment of a conferee in my stead on the displaced-persons bill, I suggest and recommend Senator EASTLAND.

That was the request of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee dealing with this subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. He was the ranking Democratic member, and, by the way, he is a fine gentleman, a member of the Catholic Church. But those arguments and those reasons should have no place in this discussion. As I understand the rules or the customs of the Senate, conferees are appointed on the basis of seniority. When the Senator from Nevada refused to serve, the next two ranking Democrats were appointed conferees, according to the custom of the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, as one of the two dissenters to the conference report, I desire at this point to call attention to one paragraph in a letter which only came to my attention, and, I think, only came to the attention of anybody, this week. It is a letter dated April 15, 1948. Under the heading of "Eligibility," it makes this statement:

> The bill would exclude otherwise qualified displaced persons who entered Germany, Austria, and Italy after December 22, 1945. This would be extremely difficult to administer and would apparently result in discrimination against most of the Jewish displaced persons.

I ask at this time to include that as part of my remarks, and I would state that it is one of my reasons for dissenting in the report of the conferees. The principal reason is that, knowing that never before April 1947 was there an adequate census taken of displaced persons, I look forward to fraud, forged papers, and so forth, in an effort to obtain entry into this country under the pending bill. If we can place the date at the date on which General Clay made a census, which is April 21, 1947, I say that then there is no chance whatever of fraud, for forged passports, for forged birth certificates, or anything else.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> (2) Eligibility.—The bill would exclude otherwise qualified displaced persons who entered Germany, Austria, and Italy after December 22, 1945. This would be extremely difficult to administer and would apparently result in discrimination against most of the Jewish displaced persons. The Committee's report explains that the date of December 22, 1945, was selected because it was the date applied under the President's directive of that date. There was justification for establishing this deadline under the President's directive at the time of its issuance because the numbers applying for admission to the United States obviously exceeded those admissible under the quotas and also because it was desired to avoid an influx of refugees into the United States zone for the purpose of taking advantage of its provisions. However, our own consuls subsequently found this date so difficult to administer that the Department of State, on February 12, 1948, changed the date to April 21, 1947. This later date was the one on which General Clay closed the displaced-persons camps to further admittance.
>
> As far as discrimination against Jewish displaced persons is concerned, I should like to point out that almost all of the Jewish displaced persons who remain in Germany, Austria, and Italy arrived in those countries after December 22, 1945. They have been admitted to the displaced-persons camps and are fully eligible under the International Refugee Organization Constitution. Under the circumstances, it would be unfortunate to exclude most of this group from potential eligibility. It is therefore recommended that the date of eligibility be changed to April 21, 1947.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to press a question in connection with the Senator's having read a paragraph from a letter written to me under date of April 15, 1948, by Acting Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett, in which, as I understand, Mr. Lovett went on to say that unless the date were moved back to April 21, 1947, there could be no satisfactory administration of it. I want to ask the Senator if he knows that up until February 1948, while this committee was meeting and when it had been meeting for months and months, for the first time, in February of this year, the date was changed or fixed for the admission of displaced persons by making it April 1947, and that for more than 2 years the State Department had administered the admission of displaced persons under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, under the deadline date of December 22, 1945. In other words, when the Under Secretary of State or anyone else comes forward and says the act cannot be administered, he is flying full in the face of the very thing that has been done for 2 years under that very State Department.

Mr. KILGORE. That, I presume, is in the way of an interrogation. If I may counterinterrogate, I would ask my colleague if the contents of the letter were ever disclosed to any member of the Judiciary Committee, or to any member of the subcommittee? I certainly never saw it until this matter came up, or I would not have voted for the Senate bill when it passed originally.

CONVEYANCE TO CHEYENNE (WYO.) OF CERTAIN LAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5734) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say I have had a conference with the Senator from Wyoming and with the Representative from the Cheyenne district. The House bill contains a reservation which in my judgment protects the Federal Government. Also, the property is going to surround the Federal hospital and will be used for park and recreational purposes for the patients of the hospital as well as for other citizens. Therefore, I ask to withdraw my amendment and to have the House version of the bill approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise merely to express my appreciation of the action of the Senator from Oregon in withdrawing his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, before I begin my brief remarks on the pending question of the DP's, I want to make it clear for the RECORD that I never have questioned and I never shall question, so long as I am in the Senate, the motives of any fellow Member of the Senate. I have no sympathy with the questioning of anybody's motives in what they do. I give credit to my colleagues for the same sincerity that I myself try to show in dealing with all the problems that are constantly before us.

Mr. President, I shall support the conference report, because of the conviction that it is time we began to show attention and interest and America's deep feeling for the courageous people who have been in these camps for the past few years. It is far too late for us to have acted, but we must act now, and we must get the movement under way, in order that the problem may be solved.

I supported the amendments offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and others and myself on the floor. I am not going into those again. I support the position taken by the Senator from Michigan this morning in his presentation. I want to say also that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who was called to a committee meeting a few minutes ago, asked me to say for him that he identified himself fully with the position taken by the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and myself on the amendments which were offered during the debate and in our position with regard to the report.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator in mind the number of displaced persons there were when the war ceased in Europe? I think it was approximately 8,000,000, and the number has been reduced to approximately 850,000. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. In round figures, that is correct. In my opening statement in the debate I gave the figures. I think 8,000,000 was the number. Approximately 7,000,000 were repatriated. Of those remaining to be cared for approximately 600,000 are in the American zones in Germany and Austria.

My difficulty with the bill is that it does not solve that problem. We shall be called upon to pass additional legislation. But I am in favor of the report and shall support it, because it is time we started the wheels moving to get the problem solved.

Mr. WILEY. The point I am making is that there has been not only a major solution of the problem, but seven-eighths of it has been solved. I think the number is 150,000 less than one-eighth, and we are now seeking to solve the problem by getting information through the United Nations, by individual action; and by taking appropriate steps. The impression which has been given throughout the country, I am sure, is that nothing has been done, that we have just been sitting down and doing nothing.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator. Of course, the repatriation problem was largely solved after the war was over. Many persons went back to the countries from which they had fled. Our problem is to deal with those who were brought in as war prisoners and made to work, and those who fled from persecution.

I shall not discuss the Jewish problem, the Catholic problem, or the Protestant problem, as such. The reason I made as strong an argument as I made in the debate for fixing the eligibility date in 1947 rather than 1945 was that between 1945 and 1947 one of the most difficult situations arose in Europe, in Poland, where there was a pogrom, and the Jewish people were forced to flee for their lives. I consider that the members of that group which came over to our camps in Germany and Austria were received by General Clay because they were fleeing for their lives, and we said, "We will do for you what we do for the other persons." In was in 1947 that General Clay came to the conclusion that we would have to fix a date after which we would not take people into the camps. We did take them in up to that date, and they are our responsibility, whatever legislation we may pass at this time. So the fact that it affects the Jewish people particularly is only a coincidence. The best figures I can obtain show that if we leave the date in the bill as it is, 90 percent of the Jewish people in the camps in Germany and Austria will be left out, and only 10 percent will be taken care of.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am glad the Senator has made that statement, because it reflects my own idea, drawing the inescapable conclusion that by the adoption of the earlier date discrimination actually will be practiced. That is said upon the facts, and without charging any bad motive against anyone.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator completely. I am charging no bad motives against anyone. If we adopt the earlier date we shall still have the problem left on our hands, because 90 percent of the Jews in our camps will not be taken care of.

I am advised that the negotiations now going on in England with both the British and the Arabs with regard to the Palestine problem are being affected by the fact that the United States has not yet shown a willingness to take our share of these Jewish displaced people into this country. I am advised that our negotiations would be enormously strengthened with the Arabs and the British if it could be shown that we had been willing to do our share in taking in these persecuted and unfortunate people. It might be possible to help in the solution of the very tragic Palestine situation, and especially the immigration phase of that problem. It is a very important question, the significance of which I frankly do not think the Senators realized when they chose the earlier date.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I appreciate the viewpoint of the Senator from New Jersey and that he does not impugn the motives of Senators. I want to say that the motives, so far as I know, have been of the highest order. There was no intent to discriminate, and, I will say further, there was no discrimination, as the Senator views it, against anyone on account of his faith or religion. I shall speak to that point later. I know that great pressure was brought to bear, but the idea of the religion of any of these persons did not and should not enter into the matter. There were people of all faiths who presented their cause together. They did not bring up the question of faith. It was a question of a displaced person, whoever he might be, regardless of his faith. Since the point has been injected into the debate, I should like to speak on it later.

Mr. SMITH. May I interrupt the Senator to say that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked me if I would make my remarks very brief because of the pressure on us today. I want to keep faith with the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me finish my sentence. I want to say to the Senator that I can understand someone injecting the religious question into the matter on the outside, but it is difficult to understand how it could be injected into the debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Vote! Vote!

Mr. SMITH. The displaced persons came into the camps after 1945 for the same reason that the Balts fled from their area of Europe before the Russian advance, prior to 1945. So far as the classification is concerned, we have exactly the same reason. It was because General Clay recognized that situation and thought he ought to find a dead line for closing the camps, that he finally set the closing date of April 21, 1947.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the report, but I want to serve notice that I propose to continue my studies and efforts which have been going on for 18 months, and in January, when we return for the next session of the Congress, after seeing what progress has been made this summer, it is my intention to offer amendments to the act if it is found that what I feel are restrictive practice in the act are preventing us from finally settling the problem of our over-all responsibility for these people who are in our camps in the United States zones in Germany and Austria.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was very much pleased to hear the very frank and clear statement made by the Senator from New Jersey. I appreciate the fact that we are today laboring under stress, and the necessity for economy of time. I shall endeavor to recognize those conditions in the remarks which I shall make.

I think it only fair to the Senator from New Jersey to say that he has shown for many months a careful, honest interest in the solution of this problem. While last fall he was in Europe upon another matter primarily, nevertheless he gave generously of his thought and of his activities in the study of this problem.

Mr. President, I am happy to know that he will support the conference report. I think he is doing a wise thing in taking the action which he is taking.

It was indicated by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], by his questions to the Senator from Wisconsin, and by his questions and remarks with respect to the answers of the Senator from West Virginia, that there was an effort on the part of the committee to escape responsibility, I want to say first, Mr. President, that, so far as I know, there is no Member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary who seeks to escape responsibility for what he does, either in committee or upon the floor.

In the second place may I say, speaking with respect to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], that he is entirely correct in what he has said with respect to his participation in this matter. He was the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, he evidenced some interest, he appointed a subcommittee, he has interested himself and has informed himself upon the subject; but so far as the authorship of the bill is concerned, his statement is entirely correct as to the relatively small part, if any, which he had personally in the authorship. Yet, Mr. President, he has studied the matter, and stands behind and supports the bill and the conference report.

While I am on that subject, I may say that with respect to myself I do not attempt to shirk my responsibility in connection with the bill. I share the responsibility and am proud to share it with the other members of the subcommittee and of the Committee on the Judiciary. It was my privilege, under appointment from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, to make the trip to Europe. I was with the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from West Virginia, and members of our staff, and also the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] who, although not a member of the committee, as was mentioned by me on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, went over to Europe and contributed very materially to the work done by the committee and to the securing of adequate information.

Mr. President, this was a difficult problem. It was a problem in which we had human beings by the hundreds of thousands with whom to deal. It was a problem which appealed to the humanity of the situation and to the humane feelings of the members of our subcommittee and the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and, finally, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives themselves.

At the same time, our subcommittee and all these other Members of Congress were confronted with the fact that, after all, we are representatives in the Congress of the United States, and it is our duty to consider the effect upon the United States of America of any legislation, of whatever nature it is, that is before us for consideration and adoption. I say this was a difficult problem. It was one upon which it was difficult to secure an agreement from the members of the subcommittee. Day after day we had differences, and those differences were not reconciled until after the passage of days.

I wish to say that the distinguished members of the subcommittee which labored upon this matter, in my judgment, gave it of their best and of their conscientious thought.

The Senator from Rhode Island referred, as I recall his remarks, to what he thought was advisable in reporting the bill to the floor of the Senate, that upon the floor we would there have the opportunity of writing a bill.

In the first place, we all realize that it is difficult to write a bill upon any complicated situation on the floor of the United States Senate. Let me say in that connection that a very important part of this bill was at least preserved, and to that extent I would say it was corroborated, if I may use that term, by the action upon the floor. That was with regard to the fixing of the date of December 22, 1945. That matter was considered on the floor of the Senate, and the able Senator from New Jersey and others, I think, contributed strongly and vigorously to the argument in support of the adoption of the April date in 1947. But the Senate, after hearing the argument, and after considering it in the course of what the Senator from Rhode Island has called, I take it, the writing of the bill upon the floor, determined to adhere to the date of December 22, 1945.

Mr. President, we have heard here today the intimation, the very strong suggestion, that there were ulterior purposes in the selection of the date of December 22, 1945. I wish to say that, in my judgment, the problem we faced and the problem we attempted at least to make a contribution toward the solution of was the problem of taking care of a reasonable number of those persons who were displaced by the great global conflict, and who were in these countries of Germany, Austria, and Italy following the conclusion of the war as a result of the war.

The majority of the committee felt that, inasmuch as the German portion of the war had ended back in May 1945, we were certainly sufficiently liberal in extending the approximately 7½ months, as I recall, until December 22, 1945, the date which should be the final date of determination of who should be considered within the range of displaced persons.

It was not the problem, as I conceive it, of the Senate and of the Congress as a whole to attempt to solve the problem with relation not solely to war displaced persons, but of subsequent infiltrees who for some 16 or 17 months thereafter were coming into these various camps.

So, Mr. President, the date of December 22, 1945, was fixed upon as a date which was thought to be and I believe is a fair date for the conclusion of the period as to persons coming into these various countries, within which they shall be deemed to be eligible displaced persons. It has been intimated that there are various ulterior reasons for the selection of the priority to the persons who came from countries which are now de facto attached to a foreign power. I take it that it is perfectly clear that if a person went from a country now in the possession of a power which has de facto attached it to itself, as is the case of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and the Polish portion of the country east of the Curzon line, there is very grave doubt as to the safety of the persons who would attempt to return to those particular sections.

Mr. President, we had before us the thought that many people could safely go back to Poland, and I myself shared that view to a very considerable extent from information which we had. But I may say that in visits to those displaced persons camps—and I had the privilege of visiting numbers of the camps in company with these other gentlemen—I inquired of person after person, and while I could not make affidavit as to the exact source from which they originally came, my impression is very clear that many of them were from these countries which have been taken over and attached to a foreign power. My information was from them, in response to questions, that there was a widespread fear that if they should attempt to return to those countries or should return to those countries they would either become the victims of persecution from the people themselves, or would possibly become even the victims of murder, and there was fear in the hearts of these people that they might return there to a condition which had been already illustrated by the injury, persecution, and death of many of their own families and friends.

Mr. President, a statement was made, as I understood it, by the Senator from Rhode Island, to the effect that all the narrow concepts—I think he was reading from the New York Times when he used that expression, or possibly quoted it—that all the narrow concepts had been adopted into this bill as it comes out of conference. I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill as it comes out of conference is even more liberal than was the bill in the Senate. I say that advisedly with respect to liberality. After all, Mr. President, this country is faced with a situation in which there is no legal obligation upon it, but we do feel that there is a strong obligation of humanity.

In addition to those who might have failed to pass the tests to be permitted to come into this country, the conference report provides that 15,000 persons who are already here may be permitted to remain in this country under certain conditions.

It provides further for the admission of 2,000 persons from Czechoslovakia. It provides that as to 3,000 orphans they shall no longer be charged as a part of the initial 200,000, but shall come in over and above the 200,000. So, Mr. President, we have here the original 200,000 for which the Senate provided in its process of writing a bill upon the floor of this body, as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] stated, and the conferees included 15,000 more, plus the 3,000 orphans, making a total of approximately 220,000 who are comprehended within the terms of the bill.

Now as to the alleged narrowness of concept. I undertake to say that in many respects the interests of both the United States of America and the interests and the comfort and the sanitation of the displaced persons who shall come into this country are identical, and are so recognized in the bill.

There is a provision, as the Chair will well recall, by which housing for these people is taken into consideration, but it is taken into consideration from the standpoint that it shall not force other people already in this country out onto the streets. And certainly it conduces both to the benefit of the displaced persons and to the people of our own country that when they arrive in this country they shall not find themselves confronted by the necessity of going into homes which are already overcrowded and forcing, possibly, some of those who are already in the homes out of them.

Then, Mr. President, as to these so-called narrow concepts, may I refer to the provision that a certain number are required to be persons who have been engaged in agricultural pursuits. That was put in the bill for an extremely wholesome purpose, and the purpose was this, Mr. President. It was the thought of the majority of the committee—I am not so sure but that it was the thought of the minority as well—that it was inadvisable to bring into already crowded centers of population, New York City or other great metropolitan areas, numbers of people to crowd out those who are already there, or to make living conditions well nigh unbearable.

So, Mr. President, it was thought advisable that the provision should be inserted which requires that a certain proportion should be from those who are in the agricultural-pursuits class.

I may call to the Senate's attention that in the conference the percentage of this type of persons was reduced from 50 to 30 percent.

Mr. President, I have spoken of these so-called narrow concepts to which the Senator from Rhode Island referred. I am going to mention one more, and that is that the bill sets forth in substance a provision to the effect that these people shall be admitted to go in the parts of the country where they are needed. I submit most respectfully that that is

not an inappropriate concept to carry into this law.

Mr. President, the bill has received thoughtful, honest, honorable, and careful consideration. It is a matter upon which there is a divergence of opinion. It is one which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey recognizes possesses the possibility of difference of opinion but just as he does, I undertake to say that it is the part of wisdom to adopt this conference report, to approve it, and put it into the laws of our land.

TOLL BRIDGES OVER THE DELAWARE RIVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 6465) to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, was read twice by its title.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate passed Senate bill 2667, a bill identical with House bill 6465, which has just come over from the House. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6465) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I enter a motion that the Senate bill (S. 2667) be recalled from the House with a view to its indefinite postponement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had expected to accept the admonition of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] when he called our attention to the vast amount of work to be done, and asked Sentaors to be brief in their remarks on the pending matter. That had been my intention, and is now. I am not going to be disagreeable. But I also have certain deep convictions about the bill. I have been interested in it for a long time, and in the plight of the displaced persons.

I am going to cast a vote this afternoon of which I am somewhat ashamed. I think I have a right to say why I shall cast that vote. I say I am ashamed, because I am compelled to vote for a bill which in my judgment does amount to discrimination, unfair discrimination, and unjust discrimination. And because of the terms of the bill—not the conference report, but the bill itself which passed the Senate—it is my judgment that few if any displaced persons will come into this country, as was so ably pointed out by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. The other day in speaking upon this bill I stated that the cruelest and harshest thing this great Government could do to those unfortunate displaced people would be to hold out to them some promise and some hope that they would be able to come into this country to the extent of 200,000 or 205,000, only to find that the restrictions in the legislation were such that they could not qualify, and that they would be denied admission to this land.

I think the restrictions and limitations in this bill are of that kind, and that but few people are going to find any advantage from the bill we passed in the Senate, which has been improved in some respects by the conference. Mr. President, because I think it will be a disappointment, because I think it will dash down hopes which have been raised, and because it does not even approach a solution of the problem, I hesitate to vote for it; but I know that the situation in the Congress is such that if we vote down the conference report in all probability there will be no bill at all at this session.

I do not want to take that responsibility, Mr. President. I am convinced that a few people can come in under this bill. A start will be made, and because the bill does make a start I shall vote for the conference report.

Mr. President, that is about as briefly as I can explain my position. From now on and throughout the remainder of the day I hope Senators will not resort to personalities, but will extend to each other those courtesies which are so absolutely necessary if the business of the Senate is to be transacted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, I shall take only a few moments. I did not sign the report. I voted for the bill when it left the Senate because I considered it the lesser of two evils, and that we had better bring in some kind of a bill rather than none. But because I could not agree with the conference report, I felt it my solemn duty to protest. I want the Senate to understand my feelings and the reason why I did not sign the report. I made remarks earlier to the same effect.

I think we stand in this position at this time: We are again facing the lesser of two evils in relation to displaced persons. If we do not pass this bill as it is now, it is my opinion that no bill will be passed during this session. Therefore, I feel that I have no alternative other than to give some relief by my vote, and, therefore, I shall vote for the conference report, because if it is not adopted I feel certain that, the House already having voted by a great majority to change the date, so far as its bill was concerned, we shall not get any bill. Therefore, I shall cast my vote for the conference report. However, I believe that we should discuss it for a short time. If the act does not work—and I am convinced that it will not—in January of next year amendments should be made so that we shall have a better bill and give better relief in an effort to solve this problem.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I realize that it is most important today that we do not spend time on matters about which we can do little. But because of certain statements which have been made by members of the subcommittee with whom I served, and by others, I feel that I must spend a few minutes upon this subject.

I was a member of the subcommittee appointed to study the problem of displaced persons and served with the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH].

In our discussions in the subcommittee I found myself in agreement with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] upon most aspects of the problem. Together we offered amendments in the subcommittee, which were rejected. We filed a minority report with the full committee. In the full committee we offered amendments which were again rejected.

Upon the floor of the Senate, when the bill came up for consideration, I joined with the distinguished Senators from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], in offering amendments which we believed would improve the committee bill.

I am very sorry that the bill which was passed by the Senate, and the one which we consider today do not incorporate those amendments, and I am not personally satisfied with several provisions of the pending bill. Nevertheless, I must say in justice today that in my belief, the statements which have been made are not fair to the distinguished chairman of the committee on the Judiciary [Mr. WILEY], or to the distinguished members of the subcommittee, Senators REVERCOMB, MCCARRAN, and DONNELL. It has been suggested that the deliberations of the committee were conducted with the intent to discriminate against certain nationalities and faiths. I attended all the meetings of the subcommittee, and of the full committee and no discrimination against any nationality or religion was at any time suggested or considered.

I deplore the fact that it is necessary to talk about discrimination, for unless it is evident that it was intended, such talk is inflammatory and does no good to any group.

Does this bill, in fact, discriminate against religious groups? If I remember correctly the statistics that were given the committee, I believe that about 20 percent of the total number of displaced persons are Jews, 15 percent are Protestants, and the remainder are Catholics. With the great number of the displaced persons to be admitted from eastern Poland and with the large proportion of people of Catholic faith among all the displaced people, I cannot believe that in fact there can or will be any discrimination against those of that faith. There should not be because they stood

out strongly against fascism and stand strongly today against communism.

So far as the Jewish population is concerned, I must agree that the fixing of the date as of December 22, 1945, will cut off for the time being those who fled from Poland in 1945. I am informed that 20 percent of the displaced persons population are Jews, and that 20 percent of all displaced persons admitted should be Jews, upon the principle of fair treatment to all groups. If we assume that 200,000 will be admitted under this bill, and take into consideration that 40,000 have been admitted up to this time under the President's order, it follows that a total of 48,000 Jews should come in. It is my understanding that more than 20,000 have already been admitted. The committee statistics indicate that about 15,000 Jewish persecutees are eligible under this bill, and if Jewish people are taken from other groups the total will approach 48,000, and there should not be any discrimination as far as numbers of religious faiths are concerned. I give these facts in simple justice because I believe that the facts ought to be known.

This is a problem which can be greatly overemotionalized and overpropagandized because it is a human problem. I have made that statement before. My own interest in the problem was stirred because I saw them as a member of the armed forces. Since that time I have been greatly interested in the problem. When the question was before the subcommittee, I first believed that the date should have been fixed at December 22, 1945. Having seen the displaced people at first-hand I felt very strongly that those who had been forcibly and actually displaced during the war and who had been in slavery in Germany should have the preference over those who had been in their homes during the war but had come to Germany later. I so stated in the subcommittee; and that those who came later, who came by choice, should be treated as refugees and should come under the regular immigration quotas.

Later, when I saw that it would be difficult to administer the law on the basis of the December 22, 1945, date because complete records were not available as of that date I changed by mind; but in justice I must say that there is some strength to the argument that those who were forcibly displaced by war and who endured a type of slavery for years should have preference over those who made a choice later.

I also say that I do not believe the newspapers and others who are interested in the problem have given full importance to the affirmative positions of policy declared by this bill. It is the first declaration by a major nation that this problem shall be solved by resettlement. It is the first declaration by a major nation that these people shall not be required to come as single workers, and that they shall be permitted to bring their families with them and establish themselves as families upon our soil. These principles make a start toward the world solution of the problem. It must be solved on the basis of resettlement of family units.

I have great affection for my friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. We worked together on the bill. I know his deep and sincere interest in these unfortunate people. Yet I am sorry that the matter of suggested discrimination has been brought into the discussion today.

Mr. President, I hope that the passage of this measure will be the beginning of the resettlement of all the displaced persons. It is imperfect, but we cannot forget that it will bring into this country 200,000 human beings of diverse faiths and nationality who will find here the opportunity for a new life.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I believe that Congress will not be proud of its passage of this measure, and neither do I believe that the miserable people who are looking hopefully to the Congress for assistance will find any satisfaction in the measure.

I hold in my hand an editorial appearing in the Denver Post for June 13, 1948. The editorial is entitled "Cutting Out the Bias." It reads as follows:

[Denver Post, June 13, 1948]

CUTTING OUT THE BIAS

As was to be hoped, the displaced persons bill passed by the House Friday omits the worst features of the Wiley bill, which the Senate approved last week.

Like the Senate bill, the House measure, sponsored by Representative FELLOWS (Republican) of Maine, would admit 200,000 homeless Europeans to the United States during the next 2 years. In addition, it would open our doors to 2,000 Czechs who fled after the Communist coup in their homeland, plus several thousand orphan children.

But the House version does not contain the provisions of the Senate bill which are a crudely camouflaged effort to exclude Catholics and Jews from the program.

The discriminatory Senate bill contains an amendment requiring 50 percent of the DP's to be from "countries annexed by a foreign power"—obviously referring to Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, whose populations are overwhelmingly Protestant.

A second provision of the Senate bill, plainly containing an anti-Jewish bias, limits eligible DP's to those refugees who entered the camps of western Europe before December 22, 1945. Most Jews, who comprise only 18 percent of the total displaced persons, came to the refugee centers after that date.

The House bill eliminates the Balt proviso and extends the date of eligibility to April 1, 1947. This is a great deal more harmonious with the United States traditions of generosity and tolerance.

The shape and spirit of the final legislation will depend upon the action taken this week when a Senate-House conference committee meets to compose differences between the two bills.

The conferees will meet in an atmosphere fortunately removed from the poisonous demagoguery with which such "statesmen" as Representative RANKIN and Senator EASTLAND of Mississippi and Representative GOSSETT of Texas have polluted the atmosphere concerning the DP question.

With care in the choice of conferees, there is hope that the bill finally adopted will proclaim the sincerity of American brotherhood with freedom-aspiring peoples regardless of creed.

Then, at last the United States will be doing something toward a final solution to one of the most heart-breaking problems left by the war.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent, as chairman of the conferees on the Government corporations appropriation bill, that I be permitted to move that the Senate recede on amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to that bill, House bill 6481, and that the vote on this motion be taken without debate. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to move to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me make an inquiry. If the requested agreement is not entered, would the result be that no opportunity would be provided to move to instruct the conferees?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was unable to hear the Senator, due to the confusion presently existing in the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to inform the Senator, the Senator from Georgia asked whether, in the event the motion contemplated by the Senator from Michigan were defeated, opportunity would be given to offer a motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I would ask unanimous consent to have a vote to instruct the conferees.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that is included in the request, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I may say that the reason for making this motion, which is unusual, is that the conference appears to be deadlocked. This is the last day. There is a grave question as to whether we would get any agreement, otherwise.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Do I correctly understand that the motion is that there be no opportunity to explain to the Senate what is involved in this matter?

Mr. FERGUSON. I considered that the matter was debated at considerable length, and I also considered the present parliamentary situation.

Mr. HILL. I realize that the matter was debated previously at considerable length, and I have no disposition to go over that debate. But there have been some developments which I think should be stated.

Of course, the ordinary, customary procedure would be for the House to have a separate vote on this amendment, by having the conferees on the part of the House take the amendment back to the House. The Senate having had a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment, and having thereby voted to place this amendment in the bill, the normal procedure would be for the conferees on the part of the House to take the amendment back to the House and have a vote taken on the amendment in the House.

As I understand, up until today the conferees on the part of the House have refused to take the amendment back to the House. So the distinguished Senator from Michigan now presents the request which, as he has well said, is a rather unusual and extraordinary one, and is one which I know in my service here I have seldom, if ever, heard before.

I am not going to object to the request, but I wish the Senate to understand what this matter is.

The only thing we are asking now is the normal, regular thing, which is to have the Senate sustain its position by making an effort to have the House take a vote on this amendment. It is only fair, and only cricket, and only playing square that the House have a vote on the amendment. Certainly the Senate should not surrender or yield in its position until the House has had an opportunity to declare itself by taking a vote on the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me include in my proposal a further proposal that the debate be limited to 7 minutes for each side, and that the time be assigned by the acting majority leader and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request will be modified accordingly.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Michigan?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now make the motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I assign 4 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, so that we may take up this matter, of course without causing the Senator from Florida to yield the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to defer——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The floor is now under the control of the Senator from Massachusetts, who has yielded 4 minutes to the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has the floor, and has yielded to the Senator from Michigan to propound the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was agreed to, and there is to be 7 minutes' debate on each side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in order to avoid any controversy, I ask unanimous consent that when this particular discussion is concluded, the Senator from Florida again be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of the nature of the request and the importance of this matter and the fact that it relates to a conference report, although I hate to be, as it were, taken off my feet right in the middle of what I was saying, I yield for this purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to state the position in which the Senate finds itself at the present moment. We have been in conference for 3 or 4 days, during which time we have endeavored to get a settlement of the three items involving the building of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., for the TVA. The bill now carries assent from the Senate to $4,000,000. The total cost of that would be $54,000,000, plus about $30,000,000 for transmission lines and various accessories to the steam plant. I had advocated on the floor that the steam plant be not included. I assigned the reasons for that, and I do not care now to discuss them as to the stand I have taken.

The House had taken a vote on this same issue, which was 192 to 152. The Senate took a vote by yeas and nays, which was carried 45 to 37. We found later, this situation which is unusual. We face the real probability, not the possibility, but the probability, of getting no bill at all unless we recede. The proper procedure is that the House should vote first, but there is no way the Senate can compel the House to vote first. Rather than to have no bill a method was conceived and brought to the floor. I am of the opinion that if we want a bill we should recede. That shall be my vote. Every other Senator will, of course, have reasons for voting either for or against the steam plant, and will have to decide for himself how he should vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that in my judgment the issue here presented far transcends in importance the mere question of whether we shall proceed with the construction of the steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. There is involved the broader question as to whether we insist that all the ordinary parliamentary processes through which it is necessary that legislation should pass, if it shall ever be enacted, should be observed. This is the first time in my experience as a conferee that we have been met with the flat refusal of the Representatives of the other body to submit the matter to the House for a yea-and-nay vote when the conference could not agree and the matter at issue had been inserted by the Senate on a record vote.

Mr. President, I have seen on other occasions items in appropriation bills where there would be as many as four yea-and-nay votes in each House of Congress before the matter was finally determined. When conferees meet and cannot agree on any one item and have reconciled some 25 or 30 other matters at issue, the proper course is to sign a conference report and report back to the respective Houses the items in disagreement. In this case the conferees either have agreed, or can shortly agree, upon every one of the other 30 or 40 amendments to the bill, save and except this one. In the ordinary normal course of parliamentary procedure the report should go back to the House with the conference report signed as to the matters in agreement, and let the House take action on the matters in disagreement. After they have acted the papers can be messaged here and the Senate can determine its course. Until now, we have not had a free conference on this item, because of the fact that we were met with what amounted to an ultimatum that unless the Senate receded there would be no bill.

In these circumstances, Mr. President, we are not voting merely upon the New Johnsonville steam plant, we are voting to preserve the regular processes of parliamentary procedure, and in this case the Senate should vote down the motion to recede and overwhelmingly vote to insist, in order that we may not set a precedent here that will defeat legislation and degrade the Senate in the future. The matter should go back to the House. If the House then stands adamant in its position, that will be time enough to talk about a recession on the part of the Senate. Conference committees are the servants, not the masters, of the authority appointing them. When they cannot agree on important matters they should report the matters in agreement and ask for further instructions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not going to prolong the arguments that we discussed quite fully in regard to the steam plant at New Johnsonville, except to say that after listening to the arguments before the committee, I became convinced the plant was essential to the firming up of the power for the TVA, and that unless they have the opportunity of firming up the power, in my judgment it will throttle the development of that great area of our Nation.

I desire to join with my colleague, the Senator from Georgia, in saying it seems to me we should by all means insist on the committee amendments and refuse to recede at this time. After all, this is a two-House Congress, and if we are going to conduct the legislative business in the proper way I believe that the Senate of the United States has a right to expect that at least the House will act on the conference report with a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute merely to say that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is slightly in error in saying the House voted on the proposition. What happened was, they voted on a motion to recommit, which was an indirect vote. They have never had a direct vote on this proposal. The motion to recommit was a motion to recommit the entire bill, not this particular item. It is not accurate to say they have voted directly on the amendment.

As the Senator from Georgia and other Senators have said, it seems to me the Senate should stand by its position, and that the House should take the amendment and vote upon it directly so we may have an expression of the views of the House.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. My time has expired.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no more time.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if the motion to recommit in the House did not contain the steam plant amendment, so that in effect it was a direct vote on that question?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; but it was not a direct vote. The vote was to recommit the whole bill, not merely the amendment.

Mr. KEM. It contained the steam plant amendment, did it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. It included all the items of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining 3 minutes. I would simply say to my colleagues in the Senate that I am a new member of the conference committee, by reason of the resignation of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] from that committee. I became convinced, sitting in the conference for the few minutes I was present, that we could not expect the House conferees to make any change in their votes. They refused to take the matter back to the House. The chairman of the committee was the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who on the floor of the Senate had voted against the so-called steam plant. I personally voted with him as against the steam plant, but we both thought, and the other conferees thought, we should ask the Senate for its position on the matter. It is important because there are various other matters in the appropriation bill affecting various Government corporations, which will have to be taken care of by means of a joint resolution if we cannot get together. That is the importance of the issue. It is for each Member of the Senate to decide for himself whether to substantiate his previous position or not.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion until we use the remainder of our time? Has the time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator from Massachusetts has 3 minutes, the Senator from Kentucky, 2.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assign the remainder of my time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall not use all of the time that has been yielded to me. I do not think this is a matter of precedent. I think the rules of the Senate should be such as to permit us to meet situations as they arise. We cannot be held by precedent. We cannot vote or refuse to vote on a question merely because we think it will establish a precedent.

Mr. President, I want to say that I shall vote "aye," which will mean a vote to recede from insisting on the building of the steam plant. In other words, an "aye" vote would mean that the Senate would recede from the building of the steam plant and the appropriation of $4,000,000 to start the breaking of the ground and the initial start of the steam plant.

That is all I have to say at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee the remainder of the time allotted to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been attending conferences for more than 32 years, but I have never seen a conference before that was conducted in the way in which this conference was conducted. I want to say that the Senate Members, even those who differed with me, were exceedingly considerate all the time. The House members declined to consider the question of the steam plant of the Tennessee Valley Authority at all. They said they had made up their minds on the steam plant—that they were not going to recede. They took part in the discussion, but they did not yield or discuss any method of getting together. I have never before seen a conference of that kind. They laid the law down to us, put a pistol to our heads, so to speak, as it were, and said, "We will not consider what you may think about it." That was the situation. Under the circumstances, the chairman of the committee, Senator FERGUSON, acted very courteously and politely, and suggested that the Senate conferees would come back to the Senate for instructions, and here we are.

It seems to me that the Senate owes it to itself to stand by the position it previously took by a vote of 45 to 37. By that vote the Senate decided that the steam plant should be constructed. The House Members claimed that this question was involved in some motion to recommit made in the House, but that was not a vote upon the question in the House as we voted upon it in the Senate. We voted on the direct question of building this particular steam plant. The House voted on a general motion to recommit.

I hope the Senate will vote as it previously voted and vote for the steam plant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has a minute remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield my time to the Senate and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Feazel	Malone	Wherry
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Flanders	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
Green	Moore	
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair asks the clerk, for the purposes of the record and the information of the Senate, to read the three amendments from which the Senator from Michigan asks the Senate to recede.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the word "vehicle", to strike out "$27,389,061" and insert "$30,972,061"; on page 2, line 9, to strike out "$21,689,000" and insert "$25,689,000"; and on page 2, line 11, after the word "dams", insert the words "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn."

Mr. KEM and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KILGORE (when his name was called). I have a pair on this vote with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is absent because of a death in his family. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

During the calling of the roll,

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is it in order to ask what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to recede from the position the Senate has taken on the Tennessee Valley Authority amendment providing for the steam plant.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A vote "yea" is to recede?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote "yea" is a vote to recede.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announced that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—37

Baldwin	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bricker	Ives	Taft
Bridges	Jenner	Thye
Brooks	Kem	Tobey
Buck	McCarthy	Umstead
Byrd	Malone	Vandenberg
Cain	Martin	Watkins
Capehart	Millikin	Wiley
Dworshak	Moore	Williams
Ecton	Reed	
Ferguson	Revercomb	

NAYS—47

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Barkley	Hill	Murray
Butler	Hoey	Myers
Chavez	Holland	O'Conor
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Cordon	Knowland	Russell
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Downey	Lucas	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Stewart
Ellender	McFarland	Taylor
Feazel	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	McMahon	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Young
Hatch	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—12

Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
George	O'Daniel	White
Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson

So Mr. FERGUSON's motion was rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I understand that no further motion is necessary. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That was my understanding.

AMENDMENT OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to say that this is the second interruption we have had upon the consideration of a privileged matter, which is the DP conference report. A few moments ago there was an interruption and we were told that it would occupy but a few minutes to dispose of a matter, but extended debate occurred. I shall object from now on to the consideration of any further matters until we complete action on the pending privileged business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was it not the unanimous-consent agreement that at the conclusion of the vote the Senator from Florida should have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from West Virginia will yield, I will say that it is my understanding that it is not expected that there will be any further interruption before action on the DP measure is completed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to hear that. I shall object to any further interruptions until the completion of the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virgina object to action being taken on the conference report?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all that is required now is the appointment of conferees.

Mr. REVERCOMB. How much time does the Senator expect will be required.

Mr. WILEY. All that is necessary is that a motion be adopted and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well.

Mr. WILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MAGNUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall make my remarks very brief.

I have in my hand an editorial published in the St. Louis Star-Times of June 4, 1948, as follows:

DP BILL, A SORRY MESS

Earl G. Harrison, former United States Immigration Commissioner, now dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law College and chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, resorted to fiery language the other day in paying his respects to the Senate-approved bill to admit 200,000 homeless Europeans to this country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how long does the distinguished Senator from Florida expect he will speak?

Mr. PEPPER. Not more than 10 minutes.

I continue to read from the editorial:

Dean Harrison finds the bill a "sorry mess" and "a booby trap and a monstrosity which discriminates on the grounds of religion, nationality, and occupation." He charged it is "deliberately designed to exclude displaced persons, not admit them."

It is easier to believe that the bill was conceived in ignorance of the vital issues involved rather than a deliberate plot to circumvent American responsibility, but the effect is the same. If the bill became law, it would accomplish little toward enhancing American prestige abroad and contribute virtually nothing to the culture and economic advantage of this country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield, though it will prolong the time I had expected to consume.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Who is the Senator quoting?

Mr. PEPPER. I am quoting from an editorial published in the St. Louis Star-Times which quotes Earl G. Harrison, former United States Immigration Commissioner, now dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. I continue to read from the editorial:

The dean's bitter criticism on the grounds of racial and religious discrimination finds justification in the provision that 50 percent of the DP's must come from countries annexed by a foreign power, specifically Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and eastern Poland. These constitute far less than half the DP population and are predominantly Protestant.

He finds discrimination also in the provision that 50 percent of the DP's must be farmers and points out, as have other critics, that farmers are a small minority among them. The special provision admitting outside the quota regulations members of the notorious Volksdeutsche, the Nazi fifth column; the eligibility date which automatically eliminates most of the Jewish victims of Nazi barbarism and the provision that each refugee must be hired by Americans, sight unseen, before he is granted a visa are obvious cruel defects in the bill.

There is hope that the Fellows bill now awaiting action in the House, and which is far more liberal and realistic, will eventually get the congressional green light. The whole question must have much further exploration than it obviously has had in both Chambers if stupid and worthless legislation is to be avoided.

I have in my hand an article by Walter H. Waggoner, published in the New York Times of Friday, June 18. The heading is:

DP bill approved; four refuse to sign.

Compromise joint action hit as discriminatory—allows 205,000 entry in 2 years.

The article is as follows:

DP BILL APPROVED; FOUR REFUSE TO SIGN—COMPROMISE JOINT ACTION HIT AS DISCRIMINATORY—ALLOWS 205,000 ENTRY IN 2 YEARS

(By Walter H. Waggoner)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—A Senate-House conference committee agreed on an emergency displaced-person bill this evening, but only after a prolonged and bitter contest and harsh dissents from four members who refused to sign the agreement and two who did so "reluctantly."

The compromise measure signed by 8 of the 12 committee members provides for the entrance into the United States of 200,000 displaced Europeans and political refugees in the next 2 years.

In addition to 200,000 DP's proper, provisions are made for the admission of 2,000 anti-Communist Czechs who have fled their country since January 1, 1948; up to 3,000 homeless European orphans under 16 years of age, and 15,000 eligible DP's already in this country on temporary visas.

Senators HOMER FERGUSON (Republican), of Michigan, and HARLEY M. KILGORE (Democrat), of West Virginia, and Representatives J. CALEB BOGGS (Republican), of Delaware, and EMANUEL CELLER (Democrat), of New York, refused to sign the conference report.

Mr. CELLER, who has fought vigorously for the House [FELLOWS] bill since the beginning, assailed the conference measure as "worse than no bill at all."

"All it does is exclude all Jews," he exclaimed. "It is no solution to the problem. I will move to recommit it as soon as it appears. I'm heartsick about it."

Representative FRANK L. CHELF (Democrat), of Kentucky, told reporters: "Please emphasize that when I voted for this bill in conference that I did it reluctantly—say that again, 'reluctantly.'"

The author of the House measure, Representative FRANK FELLOWS (Republican), of Maine, was also indignant, but he declared: "Listen, we had to have something. That's why I voted for it and I reiterate Mr. CHELF's stand. I did so 'reluctantly.'"

Principal features of the compromise bill, and those which were subject to the fiercest debate and disagreement, are as follows:

Eligible displaced persons are those who were the homeless victims of nazism and fascism and in allied DP camps not later than December 22, 1945. This was the most sharply contested feature of the Senate bill. The House bill fixed the cut-off date at April 21, 1947, which, its advocates explained, gave DP status to the 10,000 to 15,000 Jews fleeing the Polish pogroms of January 1946.

Not less than 30 percent of the admission visas will be made available to DP's who are farmers, and intend to become farmers in the United States. This requirement is said by its opponents to discriminate against DP's of the Jewish faith.

The House bill had no provision of this sort, but the Senate version placed the percentage requirement at 50 percent.

Not less than 40 percent of the DP's compared with an original Senate minimum of 50 percent, must come from the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and Poland east of the Curzon line. Discrimination against both Jews and Catholics is also charged of this provision, on the ground that the Baltic countries are primarily Protestant, and the 40 percent requirement weights the division in their favor.

The so-called Volksdeutsche provision, attached to the Senate measure but rejected by the House, is also part of the conference agreement. It requires that 50 percent of the quotas available to the Germans and Austrians under the law be limited exclusively to those persons of "German ethnic origin" who are nationals of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Yugoslavia, but on the effective date of the bill are in Germany or Austria.

This is felt by many friends of DP legislation to allow admission to persons who might have been closely associated with the Nazis, rather than those who were more clearly the victims.

CARRY-OVER FEATURE WINS

The bill provides, as the House measure also did, that the number of DP's by which the first-year limit of 100,000 is short may be admitted under the second-year allowance. Known as the carry-over feature, this means that 120,000 will be granted visas in the second year if only 80,000 are admitted in the first.

No one will be granted admission, however, who will displace an American from a job, or unless he has "safe and sanitary" housing in which to live.

In a prepared statement Representative CELLER said that the agreement "completely scuttled" the House bill, and assailed many of its provisions as discriminatory. The "strangest of all," he added, was the "Volksdeutsche" feature which granted admission to "the quislings who fertilized the field for Hitler's panzer divisions."

Mr. President, I have read an editorial from the Seattle Times, an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times, and a special report to the New York Times with respect to the conference report. Very serious charges are made by a responsible press.

Far be it from me to suggest that there was any intentional design or purpose on the part of honorable Members of the Senate to practice any un-American policy. But, Mr. President, we know the principle of law that a man is presumed to intend the natural and probable consequences of his act. It is the effect of which I am speaking, not what was in the minds of Senators who conceived the language which provides the effect.

What do we have? When Europe's displaced people were stretching their plaintive appeals to America for succor and sanctuary, when they had been persecuted in their wretchedness and misery, when they had seen their families tortured and killed, this is what we give them. They plead for bread, and we hardly give them a stone.

What does the bill do? In the first place, the Stratton bill, which for months has been in this Congress, provided for 400,000 for a period of 2 years. That number has been cut in half. We now accommodate only 205,000 in 2 years, or 100,000 a year, on an average.

Secondly, what does the bill do? It weights the eligible groups to those who come from the Baltic countries, and gives a disproportionate number of the eligibles who come from that area the status of admission.

Mr. President, I am a Baptist and a Protestant.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. In just a moment.

But, Mr. President, as a Senator and as an American I am not voting on the basis of religious principles or preferences, and I do not want to see any religion, any race, or any nationality discriminated against by Congress. It is out of harmony with the American character and Constitution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am certain that the Senator does not want to make a misleading statement on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. He certainly does not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The newspapers and the organizations which have been driving in on this subject have their own selfish ends. When the Senator talks about the Balts being given special preference, let me say to the Senator that if he will read the original bill and the one reported from the conference, he will see that there is no reference to the Balts. Those mentioned are the Lithuanians, the Latvians, and the Estonians, which are the Baltic nations, and the Polish people east of the Curzon line who have been taken over by Russia. There are twice as many people east of the Curzon line, whom the Senator has not mentioned, and whom the newspapers and organizations which are fighting for their own selfish ends have not mentioned. There are twice as many Poles as Balts affected by this bill. I am sure that the Senator does not mean to make a statement and exclude more than half the people affected by the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida certainly does not. But when Members of the Senate such as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and others who have been conversant with this subject from the beginning, and when other responsible authorities sustain the opinion of the Senator from Florida, when that is the understanding of the press, and when that is the understanding of so worthy an authority as the dean of the Pennsylvania Law School, a former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, who is chairman of the Displaced Persons Citizens Committee—when they share the opinion expressed by the Senator from Florida as to the practical effect of the bill, the Senator from West Virginia will have to let me adhere to my own opinion of the practical effect it will actually have.

In the third place, what does the bill do? It has already been pointed out that in two ways it discriminates against the Jews. First, it denies eligibility to those 18,000 miserable Jews who fled from the pogrom of Poland in January 1941, fleeing for their lives to the sanctuary of the occupied American zone in Germany. Yet, Mr. President, in spite of every effort to get them into the eligible class, they have been factually excluded, whether by design or not. They are not permitted to be counted in the displaced-persons group, and for some strange reason the date has been tenaciously held to December 22, 1945, in spite of every effort of the House and of Senators who shared the opinion of Members of the House who wished the date moved up to April 21, 1947, so as to give those wretched people a chance of eligibility in this group of displaced persons.

In the next place, Mr. President, among the number who are to come in, 40 percent must be farmers. Is agriculture in America so needy of labor that we must consciously place a provision in this bill to require that a certain number be farmers? Was that done at the instance of agriculture? Was that pursuant to a policy of those who wrote the measure, knowing that the Jewish people affected do not have an agricultural background?

So, Mr. President, because of the date and because of the character of their employment and occupation, the practical effect of the provision in the conference report is to deny to the most wretched people of all, the Jews, the sanctuary which this bill was intended to afford.

Mr. President, I would hardly believe it possible that anyone who has been to the displaced-persons camps of Europe, anyone who has been to Dachau, Nuremburg, and to the other concentration camps under the evil Nazis, to see what the Jewish people have suffered, would ever countenance the possibility that they should be denied their proportionate share of eligible persons to seek sanctuary under this legislation.

Let me make one further point. The bill provides that those who may have been quislings or Nazi fifth columnists in the countries which were later the victims of Nazi aggression are included in the eligible class. We exclude the Jews fleeing from the Polish pogroms, but we reach out and extend the tender

hand of welcome and sympathy and inclusion to the quislings and the Nazi fifth columnists who, as one of the spokesmen said, prepared the field for the Nazi aggression. Is that the kind of legislation to which the Senator wishes to attach his name? Is that the solution of the displaced-persons question?

There are three things which I wish to mention at this point. The first is that before a displaced person may come to the United States, under this measure, someone in this country must provide for him. That means that such a displaced person must have a rich relative in this country or a relative of such financial means that he can satisfy the Government of the United States that he will look after the displaced person, or there must be an arrangement of some sort along those lines. Mr. President, that is contrary to the American tradition. I suspect that the ancestors of most of us came to this country poor, without any particular sponsor, and I suspect that the ancestors of most of us would never have gotten into this country at all if it had been necessary for some relative of theirs to be in this country first and to give some such assurance prior to the arrival of our ancestors. Mr. President, I say that the poor must be permitted to come to the United States or else we shall be going contrary to the rich American tradition.

In the second place, no eligible displaced person can come to the United States if he displaces any American in a job, and that point must be determined before the displaced person comes to the United States. How can it be determined that there would not be some displacements? The displacements might be minor, but I say that this bill, instead of being a welcoming bill, has written into it every obstacle that it seems possible to conceive of to keep out the displaced persons.

The last provision which I wish to mention is the one to the effect that displaced persons cannot come into this country unless it can be assured that they will find sanitary and adequate housing, yet, Mr. President, today the Congress is deadlocked as regards the feasibility of passing any kind of a housing bill. We do not even provide housing for our veterans; due to the delinquency of Congress, we have failed to make such provision. So how are we going to say that we can be sure that the displaced persons who will come to the United States will find sanitary and adequate housing without displacing someone else?

I am saying that we must suffer some hardships if we are to perform this American and Christian duty of giving sanctuary to these most wretched of all peoples on the face of the earth today.

But what has been done by the conference report is to limit the class and put obstacles in the way of their coming here—obstacles which will make it administratively possible to keep all of them out, if that happens to be the administrative policy in the execution of this act.

So I say this measure is unworthy of the Congress of the United States in the effect it has. The newspapers have said it will be considered abroad as out of character with American policy.

Yet, Mr. President, what can we do? We have protested against this measure; we have tried to improve it. Those efforts have been turned down or denied or spurned. Now we are presented with a choice between this measure or nothing. So if we are to do any good at all in this connection, this measure is the only vehicle we have.

So, like the able Senator from Michigan, the able Senator from Rhode Island, and other Senators who have voiced their conscientious objections to the provisions of this measure, I, too, state that I can do nothing other than support the measure; but I believe that the experience we shall have with it will rebuke the United States Congress and will reprove us for this policy.

I hope that in the new session of Congress it will be possible to correct the wrong we shall have done to these sad people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of my long record of work in connection with the displaced-persons issue this year, I feel that I owe it to myself and to the groups with whom I have worked to place myself on record in connection with this conference report.

I had hoped that the Senate bill would be amended in the conference much more than it has been, and that the final report would much more closely resemble the House bill.

However, I wish to say a word about the conferees, because they are very good friends of mine, and I am perfectly sure that they are acting in good faith and in accordance with their honest convictions on this issue. I have worked very closely with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] in some work outside the Senate of the United States, in the field of some religious brotherhood work; and I know of no two finer Christians than those two friends. I am satisfied that not only those two gentlemen, but also the other members of the conference committee, have taken action which, according to their sights and lights, represents their honest convictions on this issue.

However, the final recommendations they make are not satisfactory to me. But under the circumstances, I find myself compelled, because of the realities of the situation which now confront us in the Senate, to vote to approve the conference report.

Nevertheless, the adoption of this conference report will not end this issue, in my opinion, Mr. President, because I think we shall have resting upon us at future sessions of Congress a further obligation, namely, to correct what many of us consider to be some shortcomings in this conference report. It was in 1945, as I recall, when I first came to the Senate of the United States, that in one of my speeches in this body I proposed an international conference on the displaced-persons problem. I have always felt, and I still feel, that the calling of an international conference is the best way to handle the problem.

We are following a different course of action today, but I do not think it will be as good a course of action as would have been the case had we taken a leading part in urging the other countries of the world, which I believe have responsibilities equal with our own in connection with the solving of the displaced-persons problem, to call an international conference, to the end of seeing to it that proper provision be made for those people, who were so much persecuted by our enemies in World War II. One of the causes of the war, after all, was to be found in our determination to end persecution of minority groups. In my judgment, we fought the war in part to make clear to the world that we would not stand by and permit the type of persecution of which Hitler's Germany was guilty in relation to minority groups.

But I know we are confronted with the practical situation that this is the best measure which under the circumstances we can pass this afternoon. Therefore, I shall vote for it.

Mr. President, I close my remarks by saying that my difference with my dear friend the Senator from Missouri is an honest difference over a question of fact. I think it was a mistake to adopt in this measure the date of December 1945 which was adopted, because I think the bill will now result in an unintentional discrimination against Jews. But let us try this measure; let us put it into operation. Then, as reasonable men, on the basis of the facts which develop, let us seek to improve it at future sessions of the Congress, if experience shows that it needs to be improved.

Mr. President, there is great controversy in the country over this bill, as indicated by a statement which I hold in my hand. I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Frank Goldman of Lowell, Mass., president of B'nai B'rith, America's oldest and largest Jewish service organization, today issued the following statement on the Senate-House conference report on the displaced-persons bills:

"The conference bill on displaced persons substantially embodies the provisions of the Senate's bill, which President Truman described as discrimination against national and religious groups. The date selected to determine eligibility for admission into the United States, against the advice and recommendation of the State Department, has the deliberate effect of such discrimination.

"In the 105 years of its existence, B'nai B'rith has never witnessed proposed congressional action so violative of American principles of equality and fair play. The vice of the bill is aggravated by its sanctimonious pretensions.

"In the guise of a humanitarian measure, we have a gratuitous insult to millions of loyal Americans, as well as callous rejection of the pleas of innocent and worthy refugees.

"As an organization dedicated to the preservation of American ideals, we are constrained to condemn the conference bill as an affront to American traditions and a blow to American prestige in the eyes of the world.

"We respectfully call for the rejection of the discriminatory provisions of the bill by Congress."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall delay the Senate only a few moments on this matter. I was necessarily absent

from the city when this bill passed the Senate several weeks ago, and therefore I did not have an opoprtunity to express my views with reference to this matter, either by my vote or by stating my position in a speech on the floor.

As the Senator from New Jersey knows, I have been very profoundly interested in the problem facing us today. Twice within the last year I had an opportunity to visit some of the displaced persons camps in Europe, first with the Senator from New Jersey, as a member of the Smith-Mundt Committee, which visited approximately 23 European countries last September and October, and more lately, during the Christmas holidays, when I myself was in Germany on official business.

I visited one of the largest of what they called the Baltic camps in Germany, some 6,000 people who had fled from the Baltic nations because they had the courage to take all the chances on leaving their homes and families rather than to submit to the domination of the Government which had been imposed upon them from without. I have never seen under such unfavorable circumstances a finer type of citizenship—doctors and lawyers and school teachers and farmers and merchants, many of them speaking English, many of them afraid to go back because some of their compatriots had gone back and perhaps for a month or two they would hear something from them, but finally there was no word and the conclusion was that they had either been liquidated or sent off into exile. I went through two of the camps in which Jews exclusively were cared for and I want to say I never saw a better-organized camp of any sort. They also were housed in barracks which had previously been used in training the German soldiers, which brought about their disaster and brought about all the evils that have happened in Europe as the result of the training carried on by Hitler and his government of the German soldier.

I found that from the smallest child to the oldest person, they were orderly, they were of a type that might be welcomed into any country. When I walked into the room where there was a kindergarten school in progress in which there were some 15 or 20 young children, boys and girls, 3 and 4 and 5 years of age, as soon as I stepped in the door everyone of them rose and saluted me, and they did it very beautifully. I visited every school room from the kindergarten up to the graduating or senior class, and that same order, that same decorum, that same respect, that same consideration, and that same hopefulness I might say pervaded the entire body.

I took occasion during my visit in the camp to ask those in each room where they desired to go after they were discharged from the camp, and, from the little children all the way up to the senior class and to the parents of these children, all of them without exception expressed their desire to go to Palestine as soon as they were released or could be discharged from the displaced-persons camps.

I profoundly hope that order and government and peace and accord may come in Palestine, in order that all these displaced persons who want to go there may go. But I myself would not feel that our country had been injured or damaged in any respect if they came here instead of going to Palestine. For that reason I formed a profound sympathy for those people in every possible way, and while I know we cannot accept or receive in this country all the displaced persons—it is not necessary to do it—I very strongly supported the provision that we should accept 200,000 instead of the original 100,000 in the bill as reported by the committee. While with regard to any of these classes, these unfortunate people, who either were driven out of their country or voluntarily left it because they were unwilling to submit to tyranny, are entitled to a refuge and a haven somewhere in the world.

We are a Christian nation. We preach in our churches every Sunday, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Certainly we can accept, with all of its injustices and its shortcomings and with all its failures, a bill that enables 205,000 to come in here. If I had been writing the bill myself I should no doubt have made some of the provisions different and more favorable, but it seems to me this is the only chance now to get any legislation whatever. It may be the only chance for several months or years to get any legislation whatever. I think if we find from experience we have done injustice to any class of these worthy and distressed and distraught people in the camps of Europe, we can remedy the situation by future legislation and by amendment, rather than take the initiative again to bring in legislation in the hope that we may enact a better bill than the one now before the Senate. For those reasons I expect to vote for the conference report.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to remind me when I shall have consumed 2 minutes. I shall then take my seat.

Mr. President, in the bill we are about to send to the President for his signature, we have made only a start at meeting a grave moral question. If I were to grade this branch of the Government upon the contents of the bill, I should say we have taken a grade C examination. I am hopeful that when this Congress, or a slightly different Congress may I say, returns next January, we can take a new examination and produce a grade A bill.

Mr. President, one of the cancers of nazism was racism, and I regret very greatly that, regardless of the fine and good intention of my honorable colleagues who served throughout the long months in drafting the bill, there are those—and the editorials were read this morning—who seem to find within the four corners of the bill ample grounds for concluding and contending that injustice and discrimination have been practiced. I hope when we come back in January we may rectify the errors we have committed in the pending legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, above all I desire to bring this discussion to a close and have the Senate decide upon just what shall be done with the bill that has been reported from conference. However, in view of statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate, which I say are so unfair, so unwarranted, and so unsustained, I fear it is my duty as chairman of the conference, a position that fell to my part, that I should reply briefly and in a summary way to some of the things that have been said above the conference report.

I can understand, though I cannot commend, organizations representing certain groups of people who group themselves according to the common interest, driving hard to get an advantage, seeking to protect their own, as they may feel it; that is understandable. Yes, I sometimes can understand, but it is deplorable that individuals who write in newspapers, such as the editors, will become so zealous in their advocacy of their own personal desires they will go beyond the facts and try to prejudice the people. I can understand that somewhat. It is a deplorable situation in our country that that must occur.

I do not understand why upon the floor of a legislative body such as the Senate there should be brought in elements of discussion which have no place whatsoever, which are unfounded, and which cannot be warranted by the facts before us. As I recall, one of the Senators, in reading an editorial, spoke of the bill as "shameful." Of course, that is a very prejudiced and unfair remark. Looking into the situation, the idea of discrimination upon religious grounds is more shameful than is anything that I can think of in the legislation.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the conferees would not be guided or influenced by the idea of any man's faith. We have recognized in this country and in every part of the world that a man has a right to have his own faith. We are not dividing people upon that ground. We were asked to deal with the subject of displaced persons, and we went straight after that question. Representatives of the churches came before the committee. It was a grand thing to see them come in a body representing the various churches and to sit down together. I will say to the Senate that they did not raise the question of discrimination against one or the other. That question comes in from pressure groups which have been so active, and it has come from the prejudiced writers. So far as I am concerned, and I believe I may speak for my colleagues who signed this report, the subject of a man's faith plays no part in this bill.

Since it has been mentioned, however, let us get at some facts. I have before me a letter which is signed by the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., Latvian Relief, Inc., and Estonian Relief Committee, Inc. Witnesses representing those organizations appeared before the committee. Pressure groups, driving for their own ends, brought out this subject which seems to have influenced some persons. I thankful to say they have not influenced the members of the committee of the Senate who signed the report on behalf of the Senate.

I read from a letter of June 9, 1948, addressed to me, from the organizations which I have just named:

> The alleged discrimination against Catholics and Jews by reason of the provisions granting 50 percent priority to persons with

agricultural background and people originating from the nonenemy areas annexed by a foreign power, is found nonexistent in fact. As it is clear from the Judiciary Committee's report, the priority is intended for the people from the Baltic States, and Poland, east of the Curzon line. In this large block of displaced persons, Luthuanian, Ukrainian, and Polish Catholics and Jews make up the bulk of the numbers eligible under this bill.

We know, Mr. President, from the facts which are before us, that the charge of discrimination against those faiths is utterly unfounded in fact. I have seen some of the articles and editorials which speak of preference being given to the Baltic states. They absolutely ignore the fact that the same 40-percent preference is given to those states east of the Curzon line and a large part of Poland which has been annexed by another nation. The people in the annexed land are largely of the faiths which have been said to be discriminated against.

Mr. President, I read further from a letter which is a copy of a letter written by the Reverend Dr. Joseph B. Koncius, of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, and it is written to one of the writers who very bitterly and very falsely made the charge of discrimination. I read from that letter for the information of the Senate:

For your information I wish to state Lithuanians are 87 percent Catholic; Latvians, 35 percent, and only the Estonians 2 percent.

The Senator from Florida stated just a few minutes ago that there were none of that faith in the Baltic countries. Lithuania is the largest and most populous of the Baltic countries.

I read further:

This makes the average of Baltic people who are Catholics over 40 percent. The Senate Wiley bill—

which is the bill we are now discussing—

requires that 50 percent of the refugees allowed admission should consist of Poles and Ukranians from Poland's former territory east of the Curzon line.

Of course, that is a mistake. He means Polish nationals. That has nothing to do with the faith. We know that the faiths of east Poland, covered by this bill, in large measure are the faiths which are said to be discriminated against. I read further from the letter:

Seventy-five percent of these people are Catholics and their number is nearly twice that of the Baltic DP's.

I read further from the letter, which is a copy of a letter written to one of the news writers:

The Baltic DP's together with the Poles and Ukrainians from east of the Curzon line are among the first refugees who came to Germany, Austria, and Italy. Some of them had fled their native land from communistic aggression even as early as 1941. The majority of them arrived in 1944. The Senate bill is just in giving them priority as they have been the people who suffered the longest period in the concentration and DP camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy.

Mr. President, the reason that some preference, now 40 percent, was given to the people of those countries was this. Those people cannot return home. There is no question about that. If they go back to their native land, the people of East Poland, those of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, they are certain to suffer bodily harm and perhaps death. They were among the first who were seized by the Germans and forced into so-called slave-labor camps. That has already been explained, but it may well be repeated. Why was a dead line of December 22, 1945, fixed? It was fixed for only one reason, Mr. President, and that was that, knowing we could not take all DP's, we wanted to take those who were in truth and fact the earlier comers, the ones who were forced into labor, the real DP's who were, without their own choice, forced to go into camps and work during the war.

I have heard it said by one of the Senators critically—yes, unfairly critically—that December 22, 1945, was fixed "for some strange reason." There is no strangeness about it at all, Mr. President. The date of December 22, 1945, was first fixed by the President of the United States. When he issued a directive in December 1945 that the DP's should be given preference under the quotas into this country, the terminal date within which a person was to be considered as an admissible DP into this country was fixed in 1945, as December 22, 1945.

Is there anything strange about the date being fixed in the bill? No; it is the date which has been set and which was acted under, and every displaced person who has come into this country—and the number is approaching 40,000 at this time—has come in under the limit of the date of December 22, 1945. They came here under that date.

Why was that date fixed originally? It was because in 1946 people began to come in from all directions, not as displaced persons, but as immigrants traveling to some other land, not forced to come. The war was over, the fighting was over in May 1945, but in 1946 and 1947, and even up until this time, they are moving out of their countries. We cannot blame them. It is because of the economic conditions of the countries, because they are war-torn, because they cannot get along as well and as comfortably as they would like.

Do Senators think the committee should have mixed those who were not displaced persons with displaced persons? Was it not the duty of the committee, Mr. President, when we were called upon to make a displaced-persons bill, knowing that America cannot take them all, to see that displaced persons were taken rather than other nationals who simply emigrated because they wanted to get out of their land, and were not displaced or forced out of it?

I say that date is a strange date. It is the date under which for more than 2 years the State Department has administered the law, it is the terminal date which fixed the time which made a displaced person eligible.

I say there is something strange. Not until the committee, which has worked for a year, was trying to agree upon a date, not until February 1948, this very year, did the State Department change the date and move it up suddenly without any reason to April 21, 1947

My colleague from the State of West Virginia asked the question—and I wanted to get the floor and answer it—whether or not a letter written by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Lovett, was placed before the committee. I have the letter. The staff has a copy of the letter. Many things were placed before the committee. I have consulted with the staff. I do not know whether that exact letter was placed before the committee or not, but I take it it was, as were all data which came there.

The point in the letter was whether or not they could administer the act unless it was up to April 1947. That is the point I have raised, but I wish to say there can be no question about that point being opened before the committee, and not once, but time after time, by those who were advocating that as a permanent date for eligible displaced persons.

Not only was it before the committee, but here on the floor of the Senate, in extended debate with my colleague from West Virginia, present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey—and he has made the statement in this debate today—brought up that very question, saying that the State Department took the position that no law could be administered unless a terminal date were extended to April 1947. That does not stand up, it did not stand before the Senate when we voted upon the amendment, and it should not stand because for 2 years they administered the law under the date of December 1945.

I do not know why they make such a claim. No one knows. It is said they will bring in 50,000 by July 1, and they brought that many in under the December 1945 date. There has been no discrimination made until this time.

In order to have the date extended, what would have been done? They would have mixed in with the really displaced persons those who had chosen of their own free will to emigrate during 1946 and 1947.

Mr. President, we have covered this subject pretty fully. Some statement was made to the effect that we were going to permit to enter this country persons who had fought against America, persons who had supported Hitler. That is probably one of the most mistaken and unwarranted statements made in the debate, and I wish to read from section 13 of the reported bill, which rather indicates that Senators who make such a statement have not studied the bill or read it. I know they would not make a misstatement intentionally so misleading and so wrong.

Let me read section 13. Could language be clearer?

No visa shall be issued under the provisions of this act to any person who is or has been a member of or participated in any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States.

Yet this bill is assailed. Do Senators want a bill to pass which will permit to come into this country men who are hostile to the form of government of the United States? Why would they advocate such a thing? This is the bill they said they wanted passed without that provision in it.

I wish to say, Mr. President, this bill is not all the Senator from West Virginia

wants. I think it covers too many. I think the numbers are too large, for one thing. But there is one phase of the provisions of the bill upon which I stand, and which I think is justified, namely, that those who come must be found to be people who can fit into the life of America, must come here without displacing people who have jobs here, must come here in this day of housing shortage without displacing the people already here. Yet Senators complain of those provisions.

It seems sometimes that in the great sympathetic appeal to hearts—and I think it is a just appeal, I do not criticize it—Senators are willing that men generally are willing to turn their backs upon the situation in our own country—to the grave problems our own people confront.

Mr. President, I want to see the right thing done. There are two phases of the problem. One is a natural appeal to sympathy to help, and I hope the great heart of America will continue to feel for people anywhere in need. But there is another phase. With 2,000,000 families out of homes in this country, with 2,000,000 young servicemen entering schools, getting ready to go out looking for jobs, we cannot ignore them. That is why a provision is placed in the bill that those who come in must be able to find work. If there is work for them they must not displace others in that work. Secondly, whoever they may be and from whence they come they must not unhouse or displace other persons out of their homes in America. I think those provisions are fair.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] read an editorial based upon statements made by Earl G. Harrison. I asked him the question, if Senators will recall, from whom were the quotations taken in the editorial, and the Senator from Florida, who had read it to the Senate, and who used the editorial as an authority for his position, said it was by Earl G. Harrison. I do not know Mr. Harrison, but I understand that he is the dean of the law school at the University of Pennsylvania, a highly responsible position. I do not know anything about that. I do not know anything about him as a law teacher. But he is the chairman of perhaps the most active committee upon this subject that has resorted to every high-pressure method known to lobbyists in this country. He is the chairman of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. And, as pointed out previously in the RECORD, this is the organization which has a lobby here in Congress and a pay roll aggregating $152,000 a year to lobby the Congress to break down these barriers on immigration.

Mr. President, do Senators want that kind of a man as their authority in the criticism of any bill of the Senate?

Mr. LANGER. In addition to all expenses of every kind and character.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. That amount of $152,000 was the pay of some twenty-odd lobbyists who came here to Capitol Hill to try to influence the Members of the Congress upon this problem. I pay tribute to my colleagues who stood steadfast on this proposition, that all the high-paid lobbyists did not move them on this subject.

Let us see more about Mr. Harrison. Mr. Harrison, as I recall, was Commissioner of Immigration, and during the time he was Commissioner of Immigration from the year 1942 to August 1944, some very interesting things were done under the Immigration Act. That was the time when some 982 immigrants—whether it could be excused by saying that the war was on or not—were brought into this country in violation, I say, of the immigration law. That is just one incident in connection with him.

I am advised that on April 7, 1943, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born gave a dinner for Mr. Harrison and awarded him their annual medal. This committee was, in April 1944, 1 year later, listed as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee and was on May 8, 1948, listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

I think Senators should stop and wonder when such an authority is used here. But when unfair attacks are made upon Senators and upon the conference committee upon which I served, and had the privilege of acting as chairman, and such arguments are presented from such sources as this, let the RECORD speak for itself.

I do not want to discuss the case any further. Men may differ upon the general idea of immigration and upon its basic ideas. They may well differ. I do not think men can exactly differ upon what is best for their own country. I do not charge that they ignore the rights of their own country. It is simply a matter of opinion as to what is best.

I have heard more speeches made against the bill, coupled with the statement that the speakers are going to vote for it, than I have ever heard in respect to any proposed legislation in this body. I can understand that. The bill is not all I want. It is a compromise bill. Much of the legislation that comes out of this body is in the nature of compromise. We are doing the best we can. The bill was offered to the Senate. The House passed a different bill. We have met in conference and the bill is now presented to the Senate to accept it or to reject it as in the judgment of Senators they feel should be done.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I am not altogether happy about the bill. I wish it might have been better. I realize that all legislation that comes through Congress is a matter of comprcmise. More than a year ago, when the Stratton bill was first introduced into the House of Representatives, I came out in favor of it, and I would have favored that bill over the present bill. However, I support the present bill because I think it is the best bill we can get at this time, because of the great division of minds and opinions on this important matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on Senate bill 2242.

The report was agreed to.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREAT WEST—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, one of the most important questions that has been discussed recently is the reclamation program in the West. The President has referred to it. Publicists have been writing about it. I am convinced the public must be greatly confused over the conflicting statements.

I have prepared a speech for delivery in the Senate, which is too long to be delivered on what is probably the last day of this particular session. So I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPING THE GREAT WEST

Mr. President, ever since the opening of the West for settlement, the development of the great region west of the Mississippi has been undertaken impartially by both political parties in Congress. Westerners of every political complexion learned to work and stand together for the reclamation program which is the heart of western progress and prosperity. They have realized it is difficult for other Congressmen coming from sections of the country where excess of water is the problem—not scarcity—to understand how desperate is their need for Government help in reclaiming the western lands and bringing water to the arid soil. With this realization came a unity of purpose between Democrats and Republicans alike in explaining and illustrating the needs of the West to their eastern colleagues.

DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION TURNS RECLAMATION INTO POLITICS

The unity of western Representatives is now threatened in two quarters: (1) By those who seek to make political capital out of the reclamation program; and (2) by high-level officials in the Reclamation Bureau whose unwise tactics endanger western development. Both of these unfortunate occurrences have been blended together to make a political issue out of what was formerly a nonpartisan tradition.

The President of the United States is himself responsible for a partisan tinge. Speaking at Spokane and other places on his western tour the President made a sideswipe at Republicans and the present Republican Congress in these words: "You are not going to get those (water and power) projects as long as you have a Congress that believes in the theory of Daniel Webster: that the West is no good and there is no good in wasting money on it.

"There are still men in Congress who are following Daniel Webster, and they are chairmen of key committees which make these appropriations."

In this unfortunate remark the President made Reclamation a partisan issue by implying that Republicans do not care enough about the West to support western development programs. His charge is false and ridiculous in the face of the undisputable Republican championship of the West, as will be shown in this statement.

Taking cue perhaps from the President, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY of Wyoming also made an attack on Republican policy toward reclamation. The partisan nature of the attack seems evident from the very magazine chosen to carry it. Writing in the Democratic Digest (reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3283), a political publication, he declared: The reclamation program "stands in mortal peril at the hands of the present leadership of the

Republican Party." The usually astute Senator from Wyoming had merely to look honestly at the record of the Eightieth Congress, controlled by this same leadership, to ascertain how false his statement is.

THE TRUE STORY OF RECLAMATION APPROPRIATIONS

Republicans have not been niggardly with western programs. During the first year of their control of Congress they voted more funds for reclamation than the Democrats had provided in the most lush days of New Deal spending. Senator O'MAHONEY's assertion appears ridiculous when the $218,682,000 the Bureau has to spend in the fiscal year 1948 is compared with $101,361,631 in 1942 which is the highest sum ever appropriated to the program by the Democrats in all the years since 1932.

While condemning the mythical congressional "cuts," Senator O'MAHONEY has only praise for the extravagant requests of the administration and of President Truman's free-spending policies towards reclamation. In this case the Senator was trying to find praise for the administration's big talk and small performances. He conveniently ignores, however, the fact that the severest set-back that the Bureau of Reclamation has had to weather in the postwar period came from the President himself—not the Congress.

In August of 1946 President Truman—to use a favorite phrase of his Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus—put "Reclamation on the merry-go-round" by freezing one-half of the money Congress had appropriated for the Bureau's construction program. Badly needed irrigation and power projects were slowed down, contract negotiations were canceled, and the whole program was thrown out of gear.

The President explained his action was to assure a balanced budget, provide for debt reduction, and to "hold back our capital outlay for construction so that we do not commit the Government to heavy expenditures either for fiscal 1947 or for subsequent years by initiating too much work at this time."

These sentiments might have been in line with the general reconversion policy, but they were certainly not pleasant to the ears of a thirsty and power-hungry West, overburdened by an unprecedented increase in population. Even Commissioner Straus complained bitterly that "once momentum is accumulated, it cannot be stopped short without wreckage, destruction, and waste."

If President Truman was sincere in his belief that construction should be held back so as "not to interfere with private construction and the over-all job of reconversion," his freeze order would have been respected in that light. But leaning as always to the political winds, the President turned around 4 months later and contradicted his previous statement by requesting a mammoth appropriation of $145,952,200 for fiscal year 1948.

Later in 1947, he decried the mounting inflation before a special session of Congress, but his fears over inflated prices were apparently not strong enough to induce him to take the most obvious course to curb them. Instead of recommending a reduction in Government expenditures, he presented Congress with a $40,000,000,000 budget which included an expanded reclamation program of $278,000,000. Here again was a display of Democratic contradiction of principles, as well as contradiction in fact.

This is what the President recommended, but how did he apply his proposals in practice? Let me illustrate:

The construction of the Provo River reclamation project in Utah had been delayed during the war. A special measure was passed by this Congress to expedite the early completion of this project. In addition to the regular budget request, $1,000,000 of additional funds was determined by the Bureau of Reclamation to be necessary to expedite the completion of this project.

In order to support my request to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, it was necessary for me to get a budget request from the Budget Bureau for the additional amount. When the matter was placed squarely before the Budget Bureau, which is an arm of the President and a part of his official family, I was told that the President had issued a directive to the Budget Bureau that no new reclamation projects are to be undertaken and that there should be no acceleration of the construction of the old projects, unless it could be demonstrated that an emergency existed. This, of course, is a direct contradiction in practice to what the President had been saying to the Congress when he urged a greatly expanded reclamation program. In other words, he talked one way and acted another.

This budget was so obviously padded as to make a cut by a Congress committed to sound economy an inevitability. The Democratic administration undoubtedly planned it that way. By raising hopes of a vast spending program in the West beyond all reasonable limits, the Democratic Party leaders knew disappointment would be felt even more acutely by the water-hungry public. Through the wide propaganda machine built up by the administration, blame for dashing these hopes could then be nailed to the Republican Congress.

Senator O'MAHONEY belittles the early record of the Bureau of Reclamation by saying that in 30 years only 3,500,000 acres were irrigated, whereas in the past 15 years the total has been raised to 5,000,000 acres. What he neglects to point out is that the predominantly Republican administrations brought 3,500,000 acres under irrigation with an expenditure of only $330,000,000, while the additional 1,500,000 under Democratic control cost an additional $1,184,000,000.

But the cost per acre cannot be realistically compared any more than the number of acres per year brought under cultivation, and the Senator is walking on thin ice when he tries to leave such an implication in his figures.

Naturally, the lands which could be irrigated most quickly and easily were provided for first. The very complex, long-range, and most expensive projects have only been feasible from an engineering and economic standpoint in the last two decades. In the pre-Hoover Dam period, Reclamation's scope was very much smaller, for nothing like this huge dam's magnitude had ever been tried before.

Senator O'MAHONEY seems to forget that what he calls the "golden era" of reclamation was simultaneous with the worst depression in the country's history and that much of the money spent on reclamation projects during the thirties came from emergency funds appropriated to relieve unemployment. In other words, reclamation was looked upon as another "make-work" project by the New Dealers to help alleviate the depression primarily, and only secondarily to help the West. But to give recognition where it is due, this was perhaps one of the few "make-work" programs that was of lasting and beneficial value and in which there was no boondoggling.

The Senator also observes that Democratic policy is creating in the West a new and prosperous competitive economy. Yet to any careful observer of the Government management of power facilities in the Columbia Basin, Central Valley, or Davis Dam, it would appear evident that the Government is doing its best to crowd private competition out of the power market. The recent fight in California over the Bureau's insistence that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. could buy Government-generated power only if it agreed to act as a delivery boy for the Bureau of Reclamation is illustrative proof of the administration's disregard for competitive economy.

When the Congress does anything that meets with Senator O'MAHONEY's disapproval he charges it against Republican leadership. But when Congress acts commendably, as the Senate did in restoring much of the House's 1948 budget cuts, Senator O'MAHONEY cuts himself and his Democratic colleagues in on it by asserting that "We were enabled in the Senate to restore a substantial part of President Truman's recommendations." No mention is made about how Republican leadership in this instance discovered that the House had been misled by the Bureau's confusing figures and restored the necessary amounts to insure a progressive and economical construction program. But in one of the Senator's less partisan moments, he did recall the thoroughness of this leadership for he said on the floor of the Senate on July 22, 1947, after the largest Interior appropriation bill on record had passed that body:

"I feel that there has been a substantial gain in the preservation of the public interest in the bill as it has been presented by the conference committee. I join with the Senator from California, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, in expressing my gratification for the diligent, and I may say the combative, manner in which the Senator from Nebraska, KENNETH S. WHERRY, sustained the amendments of the Senate."

Even Commissioner Straus felt called upon to take off his hat to the generosity of the Republican Congress in providing for reclamation last year. The Commissioner told the National Reclamation Association in October of that year that "* * * the Congress not only last year but again this year made the largest reclamation appropriations in history. By any interpretation, Congress affirmed its appreciation, support, and confidence in the West's reclamation program. The Congress, as a whole, seems to be ahead of some self-appointed spokesmen or any pleaders amongst us for special interests. Just remember these facts when anybody tells you that the Congress does not support reclamation." Straus was speaking, let me remind you, of a Congress under Republican leadership. Does this sound like a Congress which the President charges is not interested in the development of the West?

THE ISSUE ON ELECTRIC POWER AND DEVELOPMENT

In true demagogic style, the Senator maintains in his later statement that the further development of hydroelectric power "cannot be entrusted to the tender mercies of the leaders of the Republican Party who have clearly demonstrated their complete lack of sympathy." Does a record appropriation for construction of power facilities as was voted by both Houses last year and the even greater one approved for the fiscal year 1949 represent a lack of sympathy? Never before has so much attention been paid or money appropriated for water and power development in the West as by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress.

Both Senator O'MAHONEY and the President have tried desperately to create an issue on which they believe they can make political hay. At the risk of dividing the West itself and setting class upon class, they are trying to make it appear that the Republican Party represents "selfish interests" and the Democratic Party is the champion of the people. No such issue exists except in the political minds of these two partisans who are willing for their own advantage to plunge the people of the West into needless political strife.

The power policy of the Republican Party has always been clear and in the best American tradition of freedom to the people to decide their own programs in their own localities. Instead of pushing public power upon communities where it is not needed or wanted, the Republican Party has always adhered to the policy of providing public power in areas where the people have been long accustomed to it or have voted their

desire for it. They have not tried to force upon the people anywhere programs dictated from Washington. Republicans have always respected local wishes on great national problems and have generously furnished the money to implement them.

BUREAUCRATS DRUNK WITH POLITICAL POWER

Rather than entrusting the vital function of reclamation to men with "lack of sympathy," it must be entrusted "to men of vision and leadership" says the Senator from Wyoming. By men of vision, he undoubtedly means the present Commissioner of Reclamation, Michael W. Straus * * * a man whose policies and administration have been so questionable that he has endangered the whole reclamation program which his predecessors built up so painstakingly for many years.

This man, who for the last 4 years has been heading the largest engineering organization in the world, had had no engineering or administrative experience to speak of when he was appointed to this powerful office. His practice of running an engineering outfit as a mammoth propaganda organization had become so intolerable to men of good will that both Houses of Congress just recently voted into law the proviso that, henceforth, no man who was not an engineer with many years of experience could hold this important position. As was pointed out in debate on the Senate floor, it had never before been necessary for Congress to prescribe qualifications for the Commissioner of Reclamation because it was commonly assumed by both parties that only the highest caliber men of the engineering profession would be considered for the office. Experience with the propaganda administration operated by Straus compelled Congress to take extraordinary steps to protect the western program.

The type of administration provided by this particular man of vision was aptly displayed during the spring and summer of 1947 by a mixture of confusion, cajolery, and direct attempt to thwart the spirit of the Antideficiency Act.

Commissioner Straus dipped more heavily than usual into his bag of political tricks a year ago April and May. He has always exhibited symptoms of grandiose delusions and unbridled liberties in the use of taxpayers' money entrusted to his Bureau, but ever since the spring of 1947 he has been like a man obsessed with the political possibilities of his power.

Fully aware that inflation demanded economy in Government spending and that Congress was compelled to be careful with the taxpayers' money, Straus set out to block every attempt at economy even if he had to resort to highly questionable tactics.

By presenting incomplete and confusing figures to Congress, he first misled the House into an error in their appropriation of funds for the reclamation program. Instead of appealing to the Senate for what he might have considered unnecessary cuts in vital projects, the Commissioner went over the heads of the people's elected representatives, and appealed to the reclamation users and supporters in the West to help him denounce Congress even before legislative action was complete. With the propaganda machine he has built up in the Bureau of Reclamation, he directed premature blasts at the Republican Congress from all over the West. This action, whether he planned it that way or not, had the effect of turning the reclamation program into a political instrument.

Westerners were led to believe that these great wealth-producing projects which they so sorely needed would be closed down and abandoned because of false economy upon the part of Congress. It was never brought out to them that the legislative process was only half completed and that the Senate had yet to act. Nor were they told of the confusion created by the Bureau itself because of its faulty figures and accounting procedures.

Straus was not interested in fact or equity. He was engaged in a political experiment to discover how far it lay within his power to inflame the West against a Republican Congress. After he started the political fire, his chief, Secretary Krug, fanned it into flame with the extraordinary scare that "the proposed budget reduction * * * would cause a tremendous set-back in the Nation's economy. That set-back might be enough to set off a major depression."

A flood of supporting propaganda thereafter flooded the 17 Western States and the people there, unaware of how they were being used, responded angrily exactly as the Bureau of Reclamation desired. They bombarded western Senators and Representatives with letters, telegrams, and phone calls reprimanding Congress and demanding enlarged appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. The manner in which this effect was achieved stamped it for a plain attempt to discredit a Republican Congress before completion of final legislation.

Mr. Straus has had much better preparation for propaganda activity than for directing a huge engineering and technical institution such as the Bureau of Reclamation. His Government experience started as public relations director for the Public Works Administration and later in the same capacity in the Department of the Interior. He worked hand in glove with the master of Government-inspired pressure groups, Harold L. Ickes, and has carried on the same practices even after his teacher had been dismissed from office. Since he has taken over the direction of Reclamation, the fine tradition established by his competent predecessors, all highly qualified engineers, has fallen to the point where the interests of the West are sacrificed to politics and enhancement of the power of bureaucrats.

PLAYING POLITICS AND JUGGLING THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. Straus was so pleased with the results of his 1947 trial run into politics that he went to the annual conference of Reclamation officials held at Salt Lake City a week after Congress recessed and boasted that by the same tactics he could get even more appropriations from Congress. Disregarding the plain and legal limits of the appropriations just provided by Congress he brazenly announced a program for 1948 totaling $195,000,000, which was $36,000,000 more than allowed by law. He was fully aware that he was exceeding his authority, but with cocksurety he announced he had "decided to go full steam ahead" on the Bureau's own program regardless of the fact that congressional appropriations were plainly intended to curb the Straus dreams of expansion.

He sought by his boast to the Salt Lake Conference to project a 6-year program of additional expenditures totaling $1,335,000,000 through 1954. Two months later his superior, Secretary Krug, expanded this into a 7-year program and called for an over-all expenditure of $2,148,000,000. Such was the arrogant assumption of power of these officials as against the people's representatives in Congress.

When called to task for these unwarranted statements, Straus and Secretary Krug released assurances that "the program is proceeding in strict accordance with the law and the determination of the Congress. No deficiency has been or will be incurred * * *. Any supplemental funds required to permit construction to proceed without waste of funds will be determined by Congress." They maintained that the appropriation would be spent as Congress wanted it spent, that it would all last until late in the fiscal year, and that Congress would have ample time to act before any project was shut down from lack of funds.

At the same time these solemn promises were being made publicly by Krug and Straus, the Bureau had overobligated itself on at least 19 different projects and had issued orders to its regional directors to "crowd construction to the utmost." In California, the assistant regional director informed his subordinates after Secretary Krug had visited the Central Valley project that "the Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1949 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible."

When enough of the money had been spent so that shut-downs would be unavoidable if additional money was not provided, Mr. Straus finally notified Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department, on September 29, 1947, of the accomplished fact.

The fiscal year for Straus had begun on July 1 and was to last 12 months, but within three, he claimed he was running out of money. He admitted that Congress had provided generously for most of the projects, and yet shut-downs would occur "no matter how much rescheduling and spreading on money is done * * * preliminary reports show that we cannot finish the fiscal year with funds available." Either by coincidence or design these shut-downs took place on a group of large and carefully dispersed projects from which could flow the maximum political dissatisfaction with Congress if the Bureau by propaganda could settle the blame there.

Mr. Straus talked of slow-downs and rescheduling only when it was past the time they would do any good, but neglected to explain why he did not consider them as possibilities 2 months earlier when he announced a program far in excess of the intent of Congress.

And so Straus' plan for creating discontent in the West and forcing Congress to appropriate more money than it deemed prudent continued as scheduled. Contractors were deliberately taken by surprise by unexpected notices that funds would soon be exhausted and they in turn protested to their Congressmen who were home for the recess. The familiar New Deal cycle was put into operation again—Government officials using a propaganda to mislead the public into lobbying for them.

Commissioner Straus had stated on October 30, 1947, that funds would begin to be exhausted some time after February 1. But within 2 weeks after Congressmen were unexpectedly called back to Washington for the special session on November 17, they were notified by their constituents that the Bureau had announced that some of the projects would be out of money on November 30, some December 15, and others on December 31. It was as if the progressive shut-down of projects was deliberately contrived to produce a rising intensity of anger against the Congress.

The only conclusion that can be reached for such a drastic change of schedule within such a short period is that originally Straus had decided to turn on the "heat" during the second session of Congress, but the unexpected special session provided too good an opportunity for the crafty Commissioner to ignore. He quickly revised his program of shut-downs when he saw a chance of getting more appropriations at an earlier date.

The notices of exhaustion of funds in the Central Valley project were not received by contractors until 4 days before the dead line, November 30. Four of the five large contractors completely shut down their vast operations and did not return to work until the latter part of February. They lost millions of dollars—and the Government and the project lost 3 months of the best construction weather due to the prolonged California draught. This loss of money and time is all the more condemnable in the light of evidence submitted to a House committee investigating the Bureau of Reclamation. In this investigation it was revealed that the

Bureau had on hand $7,000,000 in unobligated funds which it could have allocated to prevent the Central Valley shut-down.

The impact of these shut-downs on the economy of the West was so apparent and the criticism against the Bureau from Republicans and Democrats alike so strong that a joint hearing by both the Senate and the House Appropriations Subcommittees were held even before a request for supplemental appropriations was received from the President.

Although this joint hearing revealed many interesting and pertinent facts about the operations of the Bureau, it also proved again what a master of subterfuge is the Commissioner of Reclamation. Again and again Senator WHERRY asked Commissioner Straus why he announced within 5 days after Congress adjourned that he was going to spend $36,000,000 more than Congress had appropriated. Repeatedly Senators CORDON and CAIN inquired why they, as legal representatives of affected States, had not been forewarned of the pending shut-downs and why the matter had not been discussed with them before it was promiscuously announced all over the Western States. These questions were met with vague and evasive answers more carefully calculated to divert the Senators away from inquiries embarrassing to Commissioner Straus and the Bureau officials than to reveal the true state of their operations.

Even though it had been grossly imposed upon by the tricks employed by Mr. Straus and the Bureau, the Republican leadership quickly provided more funds than the President requested to meet the deficiencies created by the Bureau. In making its recommendation, the Senate Appropriations Committee regretted the lack of time to make a more thorough investigation of the Bureau's operations. From the testimony it did hear, the committee stated that the Bureau deliberately designed to exhaust its funds prior to the end of the fiscal year in clear violation of the intent of Congress. On this point the committee concluded: "If such a policy is allowed to be followed in the future, it would take out of the hands of the Congress and put into the hands of the Bureau and the contractors the control of the rate of expenditures on reclamation projects."

CONGRESS DEMANDS INVESTIGATION OF THE BUREAU

The committee's irritation lay not with the need for the additional money but with the highly questionable methods used by the Bureau to compel Congress to enlarge precipitously a program which it had carefully planned in the regular fiscal year appropriation.

The committee also took the stand as it had the previous spring, that the data furnished it by the Bureau was so varied as to clearly evidence the fact that "the whole accounting system of the Bureau needs complete overhauling. Contradictory data were such as to destroy the confidence of the committee in the reliability of the figures furnished by the Bureau."

At the time the bill was on the Senate floor for consideration, several Senators called for an investigation of the Bureau. They believed that the charges made against Straus and his cohorts deserved much fuller consideration. Among many charges leveled at the Bureau were those which maintained that public funds had been misused in disregard of express law, that the Bureau violated the Antideficiency Act, and its officers had issued false and misleading statements for the purpose of influencing Congress with respect to legislation.

This demand for an investigation had already been put in the form of Senate and House resolutions by Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY and Congressman ALFRED ELLIOTT, both Democrats from California, and members of Straus' own party. Senator DOWNEY had been battling with the Bureau for many years as chairman of the old Irrigation and Reclamation Committee and particularly over the administration of the Central Valley project of California. During this time, he had unearthed much evidence and had participated in many incidents which led him to believe that the Bureau was guilty not only of maladministration but of trying to "impose by high-pressure lobbying and propaganda an economic strait-jacket upon a sector of free and successful enterprise." We find no mention of this in Senator O'MAHONEY's article in the Democratic Digest magazine.

It was Senator DOWNEY who successfully accused the Bureau of planning to exhaust all available funds for the CVP before January 1. He produced a letter sent out by the assistant regional director to his subordinates which corroborated the Senator's accusations. On the floor of the Senate, Senator DOWNEY read a very significant paragraph from this letter dated June 17—1 day after the Senate had acted on the regular Interior appropriation bill. R. S. Calland, assistant regional director and chief engineer of the CVP, wrote:

"The Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible. We are concerned here lest we end the fiscal year with another carry-over.

"I wish to emphasize the Secretary's, the Commissioner's, and our regional policy which is to crowd construction to the utmost regardless of individual opinions as to adequacy of funds, and to repeat that I am now convinced of our ability to spend the amount that will be available in fiscal year 1948."

From June 17 onward and while this letter remained the secret of the Bureau, Commissioner Straus had been assuring California Congressmen that there were ample funds to carry the Central Valley project through the spring of 1948. But the Bureau, by undercover methods, had been driving ahead by every possible means, at any cost, however wasteful, to spend the full appropriations in half the allotted time. They succeeded in doing so by December 1.

Senator DOWNEY, through years of association, had come to so doubt the integrity of Mr. Straus and his cohorts that during the Senate appropriation hearings, he went through the unusual practice of having a Government official put under oath. He also accused Straus of attempting to organize pressure groups in northern California in violation of the Federal law (sec. 201 of title 18 of the Criminal Code which prohibits a Federal official from using funds appropriated by the Congress to influence Congress on pending legislation). The purpose of this propaganda was to take away from the Army engineers and turn over to Straus' Bureau the job of building and control of a dam on the American River. On the basis of statements made to the press, Senator DOWNEY claimed that Straus was not only guilty of gross impropriety in lobbying, but had also violated the penal statute of the United States.

He declared, and furnished evidence to support his view, that "the prosecution of this work (the CVP) was designedly held back at a lamentably low level in 1946 and 1947 for political reasons and was expedited to the utmost for political reasons in this year (fiscal year 1948). * * * Representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation for months now in the Central Valley by the hundreds have been gossiping over the Central Valley that the Bureau of Reclamation would show up Congress on this appropriation, and the Republican Party."

Senator DOWNEY is so sincere in his feelings and so confident of his facts that he deliberately removed himself from senatorial immunity by independently publishing a book containing the same charges he had made previously on the Senate floor. By publicly printing his assertions, he put himself in a position to be sued in criminal and civil actions for libel. Up to the present date, neither Commissioner Straus nor any of the other Reclamation officials who stand accused by Senator DOWNEY have started proceedings.

Senator DOWNEY is not the only Democrat who has had the courage to denounce "incompetency and maladministration" when he has seen it growing in his own garden. Congressman ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, Democratic Member of the House for 12 years and one of the best friends that Reclamation has had during those years from either party, also became incensed over the operations of the Bureau in the Central Valley. He took an active part in exposing the tricks of Bureau officials. Disgusted with them, he sponsored the amendment in the House to the 1949 Interior appropriation bill which takes the highly technical direction of the Bureau of Reclamation out of the hands of propagandists who now control it and will place eminent engineers at the helm instead.

The full details of wrongful manipulation by a few individuals of the huge Government investment in reclamation and power projects makes sordid reading for those who count upon steady development of the great West. The story belies Senator O'MAHONEY's attempt to shift the blame to Republicans for Democratic political gain. Republicans are not in charge of a Bureau whose affairs are now so badly mishandled.

REPUBLICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE WEST

Contrary to Senator O'MAHONEY's insinuations, Republican administrations have an unsurpassed record of solid achievements in building up the West from the days of Lincoln onward. The very foundation of western settlement stems from the Homestead Act of 1862, upon which the basic reclamation law also rests; and its wise provision that no man should own more than 160 acres of public land is still in effect today.

It was Republican administrations which created the Department of Agriculture, authorized Government aid in building the first transcontinental railroad, bought Alaska, organized the Weather Bureau, and enacted the Reclamation Act itself in 1902. The father of reclamation by any standard is Theodore Roosevelt and those men of true vision in the Republican Congress of 46 years ago which established the plan for which Democrats, nearly a half century later, claim credit.

Senator O'MAHONEY also conveniently forgets that it was Republican leadership which fostered rural free delivery. They established a majority of the national parks of the West, which brought recreation, business, and trade to this growing area. Republicans passed the Agricultural Marketing Act to build farm prosperity. They organized the Bureau of Mines to assist the West in the development of its basic natural resources.

It should also be remembered that the protective-tariff policies of the Republican Party gave the necessary help to many infant western industries, such as mining, sugar, cattle, and sheep, and agricultural fields generally. This protection came at a time when it was badly needed.

No amount of political chicanery can becloud these contributions from men of vision in the Republican Party. They worked unceasingly, efficiently, and economically for the betterment of the West in the firm belief that thereby the Nation as a whole is enriched.

TRIBAL FUNDS OF CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF WARM SPRINGS RESERVATION, OREG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House

of Representatives to the bill (S. 1243) to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, to strike out all after line 19, over to and including line 4 on page 4, and on page 4, line 5, to strike out "Sec. 4" and insert "Sec. 3."

Mr. CORDON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LANGER. I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2510 to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "$12,000."

WILLIAM LANGER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2849) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statute of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SETTLEMENT OF LAND CLAIMS TO PUBLIC DOMAIN IN ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to settle and extinguish land claims to the public domain in the Territory of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SETTLEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF TERRITORY OF ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition signed by sundry pupils of the Mark Twain Junior High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to carry out the President's civil-rights program; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of John P. Mullen, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 115, to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 265), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, Senate Resolution 130, agreed to June 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 201, agreed to March 11, 1948.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WE WANT PEACE—ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on peace delivered by President Truman at a Sunday morning breakfast given under the auspices of the International Labor Organization at San Francisco, on June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FALSE PROMISES—FALSE ECONOMY—THE 1948 BUDGET CUT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "False Promises—False Economy—The 1948 Budget Cut," prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Challenge to Freedom," delivered by him at the Columbus Day Banquet of the Progressive Club of Minneapolis, Minn., on October 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIRAM W. JOHNSON

[Mr. KNOWLAND, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public services of Hiram W. Johnson, late a Senator from the State of California, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. BROOKS, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by Hon. Addison T. Smith, formerly a Representative in Congress from the State of Idaho, on the life, character, and public services of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH BY SENATOR UMSTEAD ON MAY 4, 1948

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio speech delivered by him in North Carolina on Tuesday, May 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF SENATOR UMSTEAD FROM RALEIGH, N. C., ON MAY 18, 1948

[Mr. UMSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio speech delivered by him from Raleigh, N. C., on May 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY SUBCOMMITTEE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway by the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLORADO'S ATTRACTIVE WINTER PLAYGROUNDS—RADIO REPORT BY CEDRIC FOSTER

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio report by Cedric Foster, reporting in Denver over radio station KFEL on one of Colorado's attractive winter playgrounds, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JUDICIARY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "High Standard of Justice," published in yesterday's addition of the Washington Evening Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN THOMAS

[Mr. DWORSHAK, in accordance with the terms of S. Res. 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

HENRY CLAY—BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH BY DAVID B. G. ROSE

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a biographical sketch of Henry Clay written by David B. G. Rose, of Louisville, Ky., which appears in the Appendix.]

SPRINGTIME IN THE MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK REGION—POEM BY MAURICE H. THATCHER

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Springtime in the Mammoth Cave National Park Region," by Maurice H. Thatcher, former Representative from Kentucky, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR CONDITIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him before the convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers at Atlantic City, N. J., May 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOE BRIDGES: SPLENDID AMERICAN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him in tribute to John Joseph Bridges, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY SAM TUCKER

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Muddle, Do-Nothing Record of the Republican Congress," by Sam Tucker, from the Decatur Herald of June 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EAGLES' CONFERENCE ON EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks by him and a statement by Paul A. Strachan, and a bill introduced, all relating to services for the physically handicapped, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION ENACTED BY PREVIOUS REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of major legislation enacted by previous Republican administrations, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON COLLEGE OF LAW COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the annual commencement exercises of the Washington College of Law on June 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FEDERAL PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY H. E. BRYANT

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Word of Appreciation," published in the Maine Potato Growers News for June 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MUNDT BILL—TELEGRAM FROM ALFRED J. SCHWEPPE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received by him from Alfred J. Schweppe, of Seattle, Wash., which appears in the Appendix.]

CLIFFORD J. DURR

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD biographical data relative to Clifford J. Durr, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

COL. HENRY BANKHEAD

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles regarding the retirement of Col. Henry Bankhead, one from the Windsor Star, of June 12, and one from the Evening Citizen, of Ottawa, Canada, of June 21, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHAT UNESCO CAN DO IN THESE TROUBLED TIMES—LECTURE BY HOWARD E. WILSON

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a lecture on the subject What UNESCO Can Do in These Troubled Times, by Howard E. Wilson, at the conference of the American Federation of Teachers at Maywood, Ill., April 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL LITERACY EDUCATION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorial comments on adult literacy in the United States, which appear in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Senator REVERCOMB, from Under Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett, with regard to displaced persons legislation; which appears in the Appendix.]

THEATER FOR WASHINGTON—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Theater for Washington," from the Washington Post of June 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will appear after the adjournment of the session on Saturday next, a statement prepared by me relative to rural electrification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUMMARY OF WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there be printed a statement which I shall prepare summarizing the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so orderd.

A CITIZEN'S OBLIGATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final issue of the RECORD a statement which I shall prepare on a Citizen's Obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I am preparing on the subject of the oleo controversy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill and a copy of the bill as proposed to be revamped.

There being no objection, the statement and the bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Judiciary Committee received the Mundt-Nixon bill on the 21st day of May. The committee held hearings, assigning to the proponents about one-fifth of the time allotted and to the opponents about four-fifths.

Because the bill raised two questions—(1) of law, whether the bill is constitutionally written, (2) of policy—the committee called for opinions from distinguished counsel in New York and Washington and received a number of opinions from counsel representing various groups.

The committee also asked the Attorney General of the United States for an opinion. The opinions reflected generally the conclusion that there were constitutional objections to the bill. Thereafter, the chairman consulted with the subcommittee and with counsel, including Donald Richberg, in relation to the bill and, as a result, the objections that were raised were, in large measure, met by a revamped bill, but in view of the time element, it was found that the bill could not be brought to the calendar and action taken thereon in the Senate unless there shcuid be a special session.

I ask that the revamped bill be printed in the RECORD so that it can have further study by not only the committee members, but by anyone interested in the subject.

At this time there is no need to dwell upon the amount of unhelpful opposition, amounting in some instances to hysteria and emotional unbalance, and in some instances almost threats. The chairman of the committee feels that the subject of the penetration of communism is one that merits the consideration of every thinking American. He realizes that no legislation is an adequate cure for any crime—that it needs helpful cooperation of the citizenry, the officials and, in many instances, a tremendous lot of education. That is particularly true in this case where so much loose thinking has been found, and so forth.

Mr. President, I stated, when we originally received the Mundt-Nixon bill, that we would not act with rash haste on it, but would seek to make sure that the civil liberties of every American were protected, even the civil liberties of Communists.

Because we undertook to conscientiously consider all phases of the bill, we have been subjected to criticism by those who would have preferred for the Senate Judiciary Committee to simply rubber stamp the House bill and send it to the Senate floor.

I have condemned rubber stamping of administration measures, and I am completely opposed to rubber-stamp measures which are opposed by the administration, or for that matter, any rubber-stamp measure which is presented to any committee of which I am a member.

Let it therefore stand on the record, that the fact that the Mundt-Nixon bill did not reach the Senate floor was not in any way due to dilatory tactics by the members of the Judiciary Committee. Exactly to the contrary. We worked night and day on this bill. We used every available second and minute to analyze it. We met for many hours at a time, skipping luncheon periods, abandoning all other work, however pressing, in order to be adequate to our responsibility on this bill.

We have no apologies. We have no excuses. We do want this description of our effort, however, to stand in the RECORD.

We did not allow Communist and Communist-minded individuals to sabotage our consideration by extending the hearings indefinitely, nor did we allow those who wanted us to simply rubber stamp the bill to sabotage the congressional process by simply having us approve the bill without any consideration.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee and the entire Senate will have the opportunity to further explore this important subject of Communist infiltration in America. At the same time, in order to defeat the menace of communism, we will never resort to the tactics of fascism or any totalitarian method. We will act, as I humbly believe we have acted, in a truly American, fair, and democratic manner.

In summary may I say that the Mundt-Nixon bill arrived too late in the Senate. Let there be no recriminations, no accusations, because, unfortunately, time was not available to consider it in committee and the full Senate, with all the time and all the detail that its importance justifies.

Let not the Communists, however, take heart and crow about the fact that the Senate did not act on his bill. Let them not attempt to imply that they had anything to do with killing the bill. On the contrary, we emerged from committee meetings with a firmer conviction than ever before that the Communist threat must be met and will be met. The lack of action on the Mundt-Nixon bill is not, therefore, a victory for the Communists. It is merely due to the lack of time that was available. However much we despise communism, we love more our constitutional processes of congressional government, and we will not foresake them even to meet the Communist threat.

H. R. 5852

An act to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities

Be it enacted, etc.,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Subversive Activities Act, 1948."

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) There exists a world communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, political organizations which are acknowledged by such Communist dictatorship as being constituent elements of the world Communist movement; and such political organizations are not free and independent organizations, but are mere sections of a single world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

(7) In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such political organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as "Communist fronts," which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such political organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such "Communist fronts."

(8) Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of members, representatives, and agents from country to country is essential for purposes of communication and for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the movement.

(9) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and, in countries other than the United States, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiate their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(10) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the traditional Communist methods referred to above, and in accordance with carefully conceived plans, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries, against the will of the people of those countries, of ruthless Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(11) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.

(2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on, or advancement of views on, any subject or subjects.

(3) The term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, which (A) is substantially dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2, and (B) operates primarily to advance the political objectives of such world Communist movement.

(4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United

States (other than a Communist political organization and other than a lawfully organized political party which is not a Communist political organization) which (A) is under the control of a Communist political organization, or (B) is operated primarily for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2.

(5) The term "Communist organization" means a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

(6) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, post card, leaflet, or other publication.

(7) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone) or within the District of Columbia.

(9) The term "Board" means the Subversive Activities Board established by section 12 of this act.

(10) The term "final order of the Board" means an order issued by the Board under section 13 of this act, which has become final as provided in section 14 of this act, requiring an organization to register under section 7 of this act as a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to combine or conspire with any other person to perform any act which would substantially assist in the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual, with intent to assist in the establishment within the United States of such totalitarian distatorship. For purposes of this subsection, the term "totalitarian dictatorship" means a form of government, not representative in form, characterized by (1) the dominance of a single political party to such an extent that such party and its policies are indistinguishable for all practical purposes from the government and governmental policies of the country in which such party exists, (2) the suppression of opposition to such party, and (3) the denial of those fundamental rights and liberties of individuals which are characteristic of a representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship.

(b) Any person who violates subsection (a) of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and such imprisonment, and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to hold any office, or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

SEC. 5. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) in seeking or accepting any office or employment under the United States, to conceal the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

(2) to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States.

(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to appoint or employ any individual as an officer or employee of the United States, knowing that such individual is a member of such an organization.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) to make application for a passport, or the renewal of a passport, to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States; or

(2) to use or attempt to use any such passport.

(b) When there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to, or renew the passport of, any individual knowing that such individual is a member of such organization.

REGISTRATION AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Each Communist political organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist political organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist political organization.

(b) Each Communist-front organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist-front organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist-front organization.

(c) The registration required by subsection (a) or (b) shall be made—

(1) in the case of an organiaztion which is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization on the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such date;

(2) in the case of an organization becoming a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization after the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such organization becomes a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be; and

(3) in the case of an organization which by a final order of the Board is required to register, within 30 days after such order becomes final.

(d) The registration made under subsection (a) or (b) shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the following information:

(1) The name of the organization.

(2) The name and last-known address of each individual who is at the time of the filing of such registration statement, and of each individual who was at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement, an officer of the organization, with the designation or title of the office so held, and with a brief statement of the duties and functions of such individual as such officer.

(3) An accounting, in such form and detail as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, of all moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and the purposes for which expended) by the organization during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(4) In the case of a Communist political organization, the name and last-known address of each individual who was a member of the organization at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(e) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to file with the Attorney General on or before February 1 of the year following the year in which it registers, and on or before February 1 of each succeeding year, an annual report, prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the same information which by subsection (d) is required to be included in a registration statement, except that the information required with respect to the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of such subsection shall, in such annual report, be given with respect to the calendar year preceding the February 1 on or before which such annual report must be filed.

(f) (1) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records and accounts of moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and purpose for which expended) by such organization.

(2) It shall be the duty of each Communist political organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records of the names and addresses of the members of such organization and of persons who actively participate in the activities of such organization.

(g) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to send to each individual listed in any registration statement or annual report, filed under this section, as a member or as an officer of the organization in respect of which such registration statement or annual report was filed, a notification in writing that such individual is so listed; and such notification shall be sent at the earliest practicable time after the filing of such registration statement or annual report.

(h) In the case of failure on the part of any organization to register or to file any registration statement or annual report as required by this section, it shall be the duty of the executive officer (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) and of the secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of a secretary) of such organization, and of such officer or officers of such organization as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, to register for such organization, to file such registration statement, or to file such annual report, as the case may be.

(i) If there is in effect with respect to an organization a final order of the Board requiring it to register under this section—

(1) such organization shall, upon conviction of failure to register, to file any registration statement or annual report, or to keep records, as required by this section, be punished for each such offense, by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000; and

(2) each individual having a duty under subsection (h) of this section to register or to file any registration statement or annual report on behalf of such organization, shall,

upon conviction of failure to so register or to file any such registration statement or annual report, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

For the purposes of this subsection, each day of failure to register, whether on the part of the organization or any individual, shall constitute a separate offense.

(j) Any individual who, in a registration statement or annual report filed under this section, willfully makes any false statement or willfully omits to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such offense by a fine or not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

KEEPING OF REGISTER; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SEC. 8. (a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain in the Department of Justice a register of all organizations which are registered under section 7, and such register shall be known as the "Register of Communist Organizations." Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations shall be listed separately in such register.

(b) Such register, together with the registration statements and annual reports filed under section 7, shall be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open for public inspection.

(c) The Attorney General shall submit to the President and to the Congress annually (and at any time when requested by either House by resolution) a report with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of this act, including the names of the organizations listed in such register and of the data (including the names and addresses of the individuals listed as members of such organizations) contained in registration statements and annual reports filed under section 7.

MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 9. It shall be unlawful for any individual to become or remain a member of any organization if he knows that (1) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7 of this act as a communist political organization, (2) more than 30 days have elapsed since such order became final, and (3) such organization is not registered under section 7 of this act as a communist political organization.

USE OF THE MAILS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

SEC. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization which is registered under section 7, or for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring it to register under section 7, or for any person acting for or on behalf of such organization—

(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication and any envelope, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank: "Disseminated by ———, a communist organization"; or

(2) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement, with the name of the organization being stated in place of the blank: "The following program is sponsored by ———, a communist organization."

DENIAL OF TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTION

SEC. 11. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deduction for Federal income tax purposes shall be allowed in the case of a contribution to or for the use of any organization if at the time of the making of such contribution (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7.

(b) No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, for any taxable year if at any time during such taxable year (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES BOARD

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a Board, to be known as the Subversive Activities Board, which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, and one for a term of 3 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 3 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

(d) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $ a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(e) Upon application made by the Attorney General under subsection (a) of section 13 of this act or by any organization under subsection (b) of section 13 of this act, the Board shall determine whether any organization is a "communist political organization" within the meaning of paragraph (3) of section 3 of this act, or a "communist-front organization" within the meaning of paragraph (4) of section 3 of this act, as the case may be.

(f) Subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of a clerk and such examiners and other personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(g) All of the expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual designated by it for that purpose.

(h) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place.

(i) The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(j) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board such sums as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE BOARD

SEC. 13. (a) Whenever the Attorney General shall have reason to believe that any organization which has not registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act is in fact an organization of a kind required to be registered under such subsection, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for an order requiring such organization to register pursuant to such subsection.

(b) Any organization registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act may, not oftener than once in each calendar year, make application to the Attorney General for the cancellation of its registration and for relief from obligation to make further annual reports. Within 60 days after the denial of any such application by the Attorney General, the organization concerned may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the cancellation of such registration and relieving such organization of obligation to make further annual reports.

(c) Upon the filing of any petition pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section, the Board (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may hold hearings, administer oaths and affirmations, may examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States, and may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records deemed relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Board or any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of the organization which is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena the Board may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(d) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case by oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. The testimony in any hearing conducted under this section shall be reduced to writing and filed in the office of the Board.

(e) In determining whether any organization is a "communist political organization", there shall be taken into consideration—

(1) the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies, of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world communist movement referred to in section 2 of this act;

(2) the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization;

(3) the extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization;

(4) the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world communist movement;

(5) the extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives;

(6) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives;

(7) the extent to which in order to conceal its foreign connections (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists, (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis; and

(8) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization.

(f) In determining whether any organization is a "communist-front organization", there shall be taken into consideration—

(1) the relationship of persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein, to any communist political organization, communist foreign government, or the world communist movement referred to in section 2;

(2) the extent to which its support, financial or otherwise, is derived from any communist political organization, communist foreign government, or the world communist movement referred to in section 2;

(3) the extent to which its funds, resources, or personnel are used to further or promote the political objectives of any communist political organization, communist foreign government, or the world communist movement referred to in section 2; and

(4) the extent to which the positions taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those of any communist political organization, communist foreign government, or the world communist movement referred to in section 2.

(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is a communist political organization or a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act.

(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is not a communist political organization or a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act. A copy of such order shall be sent to such organization.

(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is not a communist political organization or a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to cancel the registration of such organization and relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports. A copy of such order shall be sent to such organization.

(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines that the organization is a communist political organization of a communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order refusing to cancel the registration of such organization and to relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 14. (a) The party aggrieved by any order entered by the Board under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j) of section 13 may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in the court, within 60 days from the date of service upon it of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Board be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Board, and thereupon the Board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all evidence taken and the report and order of the Board. Thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction to review the proceedings of the Board. In such review, the court shall review the evidence contained in the record so certified, make its findings of fact and conclusions of law thereon, and enter an order affirming or setting aside the order of the Board. If the court sets aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 13 it may enter a judgment canceling the registration of the organization and relieving it from the requirement of further annual reports. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, sec. 347).

(b) Any order of the Board issued under section 13 shall become final—

(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; or

(4) upon the expiration of 10 days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the Board be affirmed or that the petition for review be dismissed.

PENALTIES

SEC. 15. Any organization which violates any provision of section 10 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000. Any individual who violates any provision of sections 5, 6, 9, or 10 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 16. Nothing in this act shall be held to make the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act inapplicable to the exercise of functions, or the conduct of proceedings, under this act, except to the extent that this act affords additional procedural safeguards for organizations and individuals.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 17. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, which were, in line 8, to strike out "June 30, 1954" and insert "June 30, 1950", and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend for 1 year the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry."

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co.

and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1243) to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1683) to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the house had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmer's Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. BECKWORTH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 to the bill and concurred thereon, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 28 and 30 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6712) to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor; and

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6712) to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY. I submit a conference report on House bill 6771, making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today's RECORD, p. 9218.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the House bill 6771, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

June 19, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Military construction, Army: For construction, installations, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the Act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the Act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $76,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, including not to exceed $205,000 for the purchase, development, or construction in connection with, land adjacent to the Percy Jones Hospital, Michigan; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided*, That the funds made available in this paragraph by appropriation and contract authorization shall not be subject to section 10 of this Act." That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$70,000,000."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 28 and 30.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a compilation of the amounts involved in the bill and the results of the conference.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Military Establishment military functions appropriation bill, 1949, H. R. 6771

CASH APPROPRIATIONS

Regular and supplemental budget estimates	[1] $7,278,842,000
House bill	[1] 6,509,939,000
Senate bill	[1] 6,915,676,052
Conference bill	[1] 6,767,668,163
Conference bill under total estimates	511,173,837
Conference bill over House bill	[2] 257,729,163
Conference bill under Senate bill	148,007,889

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS IN BILL

Clothing and equipage (added by Senate and agreed to by conferees)	$25,000,000
Signal Corps (included by House and agreed to by Senate bill and not in conference)	50,000,000
Military construction, army (Senate included $75,000,000, which was agreed to by conferees)	75,000,000
Ordnance Department (Senate included $75,000,000 and $70,000,000 agreed to by conferees)	70,000,000
Total contract authorizations in bill as agreed to be conferees	220,000,000

[1] Includes $62,250,000 "Special Accounts, Department of the Army", which are not carried in bill, but which are reflected in totals to reconcile with totals used on page 33 of House Report.

[2] Includes $76,000,000 of a supplemental budget estimate for "Military Construction, Army".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was called out of the Chamber a moment ago when H. R. 6248 was disposed of. I should like to make some remarks, which will take about 3 minutes, which I should like to have inserted immediately following debate on the Military Establishment bill.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the conferees of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress for so courageously, so forthrightly disregarding the wishes of the common lay Members of the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, the Members of this body well know how the House and the Senate has on several occasions, in no uncertain manner, expressed its views about the extraordinary restrictions and controls, which for 62 years, have been adopted to protect the American people from that dangerous, that alien, that un-American, Fascist, communistic, subversive substance, legally denominated—oleomargarine, and sometimes illegally and unconstitutionally called just plain margarine.

Mr. President, in spite of the unprecedented pressure, the insistent presumption of the great majority of the common Members of both the Senate and the House, the conferees have gallantly resisted that presure and have reinstated the provisions of this bill which protects the flower of our manhood from the subtle and invidious influence of oleomargarine, sometimes known as just margarine.

Incidentally, at the same time, Mr. President, I also wish to call this to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the conferees have successfully required the Army to get rid of 10,000,000 more of the surplus dollars which so grievously burden our National Treasury.

Mr. President, it would be impossible I think, in any walk of life throughout our great land, to find a group of men more completely devoted to the higher law, to their own divinely inspired conscience, than are these conferees.

Their devotion to their own conscience is so strong that they are able, apparently, to resist the combined influence of practically all the housewives of America, in addition to that of the ordinary, garden variety, Member of Congress.

Mr. President, there is talk in the cloakrooms of another session of this Congress later this summer. I submit, Mr. President, in all sincerity that there is no need whatever for the ordinary, lay Member of Congress to come back to Washington for a special session.

It is clearly evident, Mr. President, that to save the world and the people of this country from disaster, all that is needed is to reconvene, preferably in secret, only those incomparable sages, the conferees of the Appropriation Committee.

From their deliberations the same results would be achieved and without the expense and trouble to everyone that is involved in going through the archaic ritual of pretended legislation. It is quite clear that regardless of what the common Members of this body may wish, the conferees make the decisions.

PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA FROM SALE OF TIMBER AND LUMBER

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 5355.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 5355) authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; was read twice by its title.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the bill merely provides for payment to the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota $50 per capita out of a balance of $1,000,000 in their timber fund.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, this matter has come to my attention, and I am in agreement with the purposes of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARYLAND SENATORIAL ELECTION CONTEST

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish this session of Congress to close without expressing my thanks and appreciation to the subcommittee of the Rules Committee, headed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], for the very fair, judicial, and thorough way the election contest between General Markey and my colleague, Senator O'CONOR, was considered and decided. I appreciate the fact that inasmuch as Maryland is close to the District of Columbia, no doubt the committee was subjected to constant pulling and hauling by the advocates of both the contestants. The fact that the committee decided in favor of the Democrat, when the committee was composed overwhelmingly of a Republican membership, is not only a high compliment to the committee itself, but reflects credit on the entire Senate as being above politics and meanness in a matter of so much magnitude.

On behalf of the people of Maryland, both Democrats and Republicans, and on behalf of my colleague, as well as myself, I thought this word of appreciation of the fairness and impartiality of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Indiana should stand in the RECORD as a guide for all of us, should we again be confronted with a contest for a seat in this body.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Senate bill, S. 2589, a bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to straighten out a parliamentary situation. House bill 6402 is a companion bill, and identical to Senate bill 2589. House bill 6402 was passed by the House of Representatives yesterday, and was sent to the Senate and now lies on the desk. I ask unanimous consent at this time, rather than waiting until some time later in the discussion, that House bill 6402 be now read, and that it be substituted for Senate bill 2589 as the business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be clear that House bill 6402 is substituted as the business of the Senate with the same force and effect as would apply to Senate bill 2589. It is an identical bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

STUDY OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a report, together with tables, from the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on the subject of civilian personnel.

Among other activities of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has been a continuing study of civilian personnel in the executive branch of the Federal Government which now has been constantly pursued since 1942.

There are other reasons for such a study, but the committee has found by experience that inefficient use of public personnel almost invariably is a clue to other—and frequently more costly—waste. Excessive employment is the smoke from nonessential fires.

In the course of its 7 years of operation the committee has made numerous recommendations. Those which have been adopted have resulted in savings averaging approximately a billion dollars a year. The average cost of the committee has been $15,000 a year. This year the committee was without funds although its authority was continuing.

Working without funds, the committee's activities naturally have been curtailed, but it has managed to continue its personnel studies.

There being no objection, the report and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There could be no better occasion than this to sum up the civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government. Briefly it is this:

1. As of this date civilian personnel in the executive branch numbers somewhere in excess of 2,050,000. This was the total in April and since then it has been increasing by the hundreds on a daily average.

2. This number is more than twice the World War I peak.

3. It is more than three and one-half times the level at the end of the last previous Republican Congress and administration.

4. It is more than twice the prewar emergency peak of 1939.

5. In the civilian establishments, departments, and agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment, civilian employment totals nearly 80,000 more than the World War II peak, and it is 165 percent of the prewar emergency peak of 1939.

6. The Military Establishment in April was employing nearly three times as many civilians per man in uniform as it employed at the World War II peak.

These figures are developed from studies by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and in order that the record may be complete and documented I shall submit seven tables compiled from the records of the committee. Every figure in these tables for the period since 1942 is based upon signed statements from the agencies involved (with exceptions which are noted). Prior to 1942 the figures are based upon such information as is available from the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

I shall not burden the Senate with reading the tables, but I shall summarize them in text and request that the tables be made a part of my remarks.

COMPARISON WITH WORLD WAR II PEAK

These tables will show an interesting comparison between Federal personnel by agencies as between now and World War II peak. In discussing this comparison it will be simpler to consider first employment in the civilian agencies and departments as distinguished from civilian employment by the agencies of the Military Establishment. Each is a whole subject in itself.

CIVILIAN DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Federal civilian personnel in all agencies, including those of the Military Establishment, is still more than half of the World War II peak. (See table 1.)

In civilian departments and agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment, civilian employment actually has increased a net of 77,592 since World War II peak. (See table 1.)

This is an increase of 6 percent in the civilian agencies, after taking into account all reductions, including those in the temporary war agencies which could no longer be justified. In April there were 38 agencies with personnel greater than the war peak and 36 with less. (See tables 2 and 3.)

Among the 8 regular departments of Cabinet level, excluding those in the National Military Establishment, 4 in April were employing a combined total of 124,128 more personnel than they were at the war peak. The other 4 recorded a combined decrease of 26,373. The net increase for these departments was 14 percent over the war peak. (Increases in the Post Office Department should be noted.) (See tables 2 and 3.)

Employment in the Executive Offices of the President, including the Mansion and Grounds, in April was 66 percent greater than at the war peak. (See table 2.)

The 36 agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment, with net reductions since the war peak, included 19 of the so-called war emergency agencies. All of these except Selective Service and Office of Defense Transportation have expired. The net reduction by these 36 agencies totaled 222,922 as of April.

More than 75 percent of the total net reduction was accounted for in the demise of war emergency agencies. Net reductions in all other civilian agencies totaled only 57,055. (See table 2.) Reduction in these agencies more than offset increases in the Veterans' Administration. (See table 3.)

As a partial offset to the 165,867 reduction resulting from expiration and curtailment of 19 war emergency agencies, there was 34,763 in new employment as of April for 10 so-called new postwar agencies. (See table 3.)

If employment in the new postwar agencies is added to that of other independent agencies, exclusive of the Veterans' Administration, there is a postwar increase of 7 percent in the independent establishments. (See table 3.)

Including the Veterans' Administration, there was an increase in the employment by regular independent agencies of 43 percent. Twenty-one of these agencies show net increases over their war-peak personnel. There were decreases in 13. (See tables 2 and 3.)

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Between July 1945—the war-peak month—and April 1948 net reduction in civilian personnel employed by agencies of the National Military Establishment was 77,592 greater than the net reduction in the executive branch of the Government as a whole, including the civilian employment by the military agencies.

Civilian employment in the National Military Establishment was reduced from 2,630,361 in July 1945 to 853,611 in April 1948—a net reduction of 1,776,750.

Civilian employment in the executive branch as a whole, including the Military Establishment, was reduced from 3,749,578 in July 1945 to 2,050,420 in April 1948—a net reduction of 1,699,158.

This of course means that there was a net increase during the period in civilian agency employment of 77,592. (See table 4.)

Of the total net civilian reduction in the Military Establishment, 1,776,750, nearly half, or 865,787, were industrial workers. And more than half of these, 527,059, were employed outside of continental United States. Among these a great many were foreign laborers, native to areas in which United States military installations and activities are located overseas. (See table 6.)

The War and Navy Departments were forced down to a total of 276,000, classified employees (exclusive of industrial workers) during fiscal year 1947, under the graduated personnel ceiling provisions, but civilian employment in all categories began a steady climb in January of this year. This was despite unification, and prior to any suggestion of the new military expansion program. (See table 4.)

The National Military Establishment in April was employing nearly 3 times as many civilians per man in uniform as it employed at the war peak. And this was true before the new military expansion program was proposed. In April there was a civilian employee for every 1.7 men in uniform. At the peak of the war effort there was a civilian employee for every 4.7 men in uniform. Since the postwar low point in December 1947, civilian employment in the National Military Establishment has increased 24,378, while the military personnel declined 48,333. (See table 4.)

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEES

One category of Federal employment frequently overlooked, but still on the pay roll, are the so-called industrial employees. This group includes those employed in Navy yards, arsenals, and so forth, and it includes also a great many foreign native laborers employed outside of continental United States.

A quick summary of the industrial employee situation would include the following facts:

Eight hundred and sixty-two thousand eight hundred and fifty-two of all Federal civilian personnel separated since the war peak—or more than half—were so-called industrial employees. (See table 5.)

Five hundred and twenty-seven thousand and fifty-nine—or nearly one-third of the total reduction in all categories since the war peak—were industrial employees of the Military Establishment employed outside continental United States. Many of these were foreign natives. (See table 5.)

Three hundred and thirty-eight thousand seven hundred and twenty-eight of the civilian reduction in the Military Establishment were industrial employees working inside the United States, in arsenals, Navy yards, and so forth, where continuation of strictly war projects could not be justified after the war ended. (See table 5.)

Although the National Military Establishment reduced civilian industrial employment heavily, civilian agencies actually have increased industrial employment by 2,935 since the war peak.

TREND

Federal civilian employment reached a war peak of 3,749,578, including civilian employment by the agencies of the Military Establishment which totaled 2,630,361 in July 1945. The civilian agency employment at that date totaled 1,119,217.

Employment in Federal agencies outside the Military Establishment rose sharply in the year that followed, and by July 1946 civilian agency employment had risen nearly a quarter of a million, or about 19 percent. (See table 2.)

Fiscal year 1947 (July 1946–July 1947) was the best civilian employment year from the standpoints of both the net number of separations and percentage of decrease exclusive of the Military Establishment. This was the year in which graduated ceiling reductions were in force as a means of compensating for the 1946 pay raises. The net reduction in civilian agency employment was approximately 8 percent, or 104,618, exclusive of the Military Establishment.

In fiscal year 1948—the first year under appropriations voted by a Republican Congress:

Thirty civilian agencies (most of them old line) requested and received more personal service funds for fiscal year 1948 than they received in 1947. (See table 6.)

One agency requested more personal service funds for 1948 than it had in 1947 and received the same amount. (See table 6.)

Six agencies requested more personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947 and received less. (See table 6.)

Three agencies requested less personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947 and were actually given more. (See table 6.)

One agency requested less personal service funds for 1948 than it had in 1947 and was given the same. (See table 6.)

Fourteen agencies requested less personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947 and received less. (See table 6.)

Funds available for personal service in fiscal year 1947 totaled $6,407,239,891.

Funds available for personal service in fiscal year 1948 totaled $5,655,238,259.

Over-all reduction in personal service funds between 1947 and 1948 totals $752,001,632. (See table 7.)

Personal-service funds for 1948 for the Military Establishment and other agencies still clearly overmanned on the basis of war requirements and immediate postwar conditions were reduced by a total of $718,331,120.

These agencies include Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Scientific Research and Development, War Assets Administration,

Maritime Commission, Selective Service System, Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary activities, and the Veterans' Administration, which had reached the end of the first phase of its postwar program. (See table 7.)

It was natural for these agencies to be reduced by their own postwar weight. With these items omitted, the reduction in personal-service funds which resulted from real efforts for economy in government routine for fiscal year 1948 totals $33,670,512. This reduction amounts to 0.005 percent.

Under appropriations by the current Republican Congress—

Thirty-one civilian agencies requested and were granted authorization for greater average employment in fiscal year 1948 than they had in 1947. This was more than half of the agencies of the Government. (See table 6.)

One agency requested authorization for greater average employment in 1948 than it had in 1947 and got the same. (See table 6.)

Eight agencies requested authorization for greater average employment in 1948 than they had in 1947 and were granted less. (See table 6.)

One agency requested authorization for less employment in 1948 than it had in 1947, and actually was granted more. (See table 6.)

Fourteen agencies requested authorization for less average employment in 1948 than they had in 1947, and were granted less. (See table 6.)

During the first 10 months of the current fiscal year the net reduction in personnel employed in the executive branch of the Government, exclusive of those in the Military Establishment, was 56,406, or less than 5 percent. (See table 1.)

In the executive branch as a whole, civilian personnel reached its low point in December when that total was 1,995,388. In January it rose at the rate of a little more than 200 a day. In February the increase was at the rate of about 400 a day. In March the rate of increase was 500 a day. In April it was increasing at the rate of 650 a day. The increases were in all categories, civilian agencies and military agencies, and in classified and industrial workers. In April the total stood at 2,050,420.

The President requested funds for 1948 employment averaging 2,151,537. Congress voted funds for an average employment of 2,012,163. The average for the year through April is 2,022,695. (See table 7.)

Original budget requests by the President for fiscal year 1949 would provide for employment averaging 2,086,000. While accurate calculation is impossible pending final enactment of all the pending appropriation bills, I venture the prediction that this figure will be increased 10 to 20 percent on the basis of personal-service funds authorized in the various money bills approved in the current session.

OBSERVATIONS

It is obvious to those who have studied the subject that over a long period of years the executive branch of the Government has indicated no inclination to reduce its own personnel, except in strictly emergency positions, or to furnish adequate information so that Congress might accomplish proper reductions without impairment of essential functions.

It is likewise obvious that Congress is reluctant to reduce appropriations for personal service as a means of requiring more efficiency in the administration of essential functions, and deflating the emphasis which is too frequently placed upon luxury functions.

TABLE 1.—*History and trends of Federal civilian personnel, 1918–48*

Agency categories	End of World War I, Nov. 11, 1918	End of Hoover administration, Dec. 31, 1932	Prewar emergency peak, June 30, 1939	War peak, July 30, 1945	GOP responsibility, June 30, 1947	Postwar low, Dec. 31, 1947	Apr. 30, 1948
Departments (except Military Establishment)	(1)	[2] 467,768	553,117	698,418	799,454	754,943	796,173
Independent establishments	(1)	----------	171,373	254,165	397,214	369,997	365,106
Emergency war agencies	(1)	----------	----------	166,634	1,281	722	767
Postwar agencies	(1)	----------	----------	----------	55,266	40,493	34,763
Military Establishment	(1)	96,037	195,286	2,630,361	861,645	829,233	853,611
Totals	917,760	563,805	919,776	3,749,578	2,114,860	1,995,388	2,050,420

[1] Break-down not available.
[2] Including independent establishments.

The table above shows that Federal civilian personnel—

1. Is now more than twice the World War I peak.

2. Is now more than three and one-half times its level at the end of previous Republican administration.

3. Is now more than twice its prewar emergency peak of 1939.

4. Is still more than half the World War II peak.

5. Exclusive of civilian employment by the Military Establishment, is within 56,406 of its level when appropriations voted by present Republican majority became effective July 1, 1947—a reduction of less than 5 percent.

6. Has been increasing since December 1947.

7. In civilian departments and agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment actually has increased a net of 77,592 since World War II peak.

8. In civilian agencies, and departments, exclusive of Military Establishment is approximately 165 percent of the prewar emergency peak of 1939.

TABLE 2.—*Federal personnel—comparison with war peak; reductions under ceilings and reductions under Republicans (for civilian agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment)*

Department or agency	World War II peak, July 1945	July 1946	July 1947	April 1948	Increase over war peak	Decrease under war peak
Executive departments (exclusive of National Military Eestablishment):						
Agriculture	91,624	102,437	85,003	75,351	----------	16,273
Commerce	35,243	35,227	37,204	40,146	4,903	----------
Interior	44,857	53,726	51,743	49,776	4,919	----------
Justice	27,129	24,573	24,798	26,270	----------	859
Labor	6,804	31,880	4,792	4,578	----------	2,226
Post Office	384,249	493,014	474,459	488,059	103,810	----------
State	11,380	21,184	21,355	21,876	10,496	----------
Treasury	97,132	104,372	86,587	90,117	----------	7,015
Subtotal, departments	698,418	866,413	785,941	796,173	124,128 +97,755	26,373
Executive Office of the President:						
Bureau of the Budget	591	766	565	612	21	----------
White House Office	56	203	270	222	166	----------
Executive Mansion and Grounds	47	79	65	91	44	----------
National Security Council	----------	----------	----------	18	18	----------
National Security Resources Board	----------	----------	----------	150	150	----------
Council of Economic Advisers	----------	----------	50	44	44	----------
Office of Government Reports	----------	----------	17	18	18	----------
Subtotal, Executive Office	694	1,048	907	1,155	461 +461	----------
Emergency war agencies:						
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	124	----------	----------	----------	----------	124
Foreign Economic Administration	6,512	----------	----------	----------	----------	6,512
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	1,292	546	----------	----------	----------	1,292
National War Labor Board	3,711	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,711
Office of Alien Property Custodian	753	----------	----------	----------	----------	753
Office of Censorship	5,807	----------	----------	----------	----------	5,807
Office of Contract Settlement	76	----------	----------	----------	----------	76
Office of Defense Transportation	3,191	99	92	47	----------	3,144
Office of Price Administration	64,818	33,330	----------	----------	----------	64,818

TABLE 2.—*Federal personnel—comparison with war peak; reductions under ceilings and reductions under Republicans (for civilian agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment)*—Continued

Department or agency	World War II peak, July 1945	July 1946	July 1947	April 1948	Increase over war peak	Decrease under war peak
Emergency war agencies—Continued						
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,362	334	71			1,362
Office of Strategic Services	2,350					2,350
Office of War Information	9,127					9,127
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	294	214				294
Petroleum Administration for War	986					986
Selective Service System	18,598	13,870	861	720		17,878
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,843					1,843
War Manpower Administration	28,234					28,234
War Production Board	12,002					12,002
War Shipping Administration	5,554	3,340				5,554
Subtotal, emergency war agencies	166,634	52,495	1,027	7	−165,867	165,867
Postwar agencies:						
Civilian Production Administration		3,861				
National Wage Stabilization Board		880				
Economic Cooperation Administration				113	113	
Office of Economic Stabilization						
Office of the Housing Expediter			7,084	4,554	4,554	
Philippine Alien Property Administration			122	159	159	
Philippine War Damage Commission			425	784	784	
Price Decontrol Board						
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission			4,105	4,990	4,990	
War Assets Administration		45,108	41,047	24,163	24,163	
Subtotal, postwar agencies		49,849	52,783	34,763	+34,763	
Independent agencies:						
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	41	97	114	113	
American Commission Protection Monuments in Europe						
Civil Aeronautics Board	343	424	553	598	255	
Civil Service Commission	7,014	4,140	3,434	4,096		2,918
Employees' Compensation Commission	515					515
Export-Import Bank of Washington	62	106	115	118	56	
Federal Communications Commission	1,494	1,337	1,332	1,361		133
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,222	1,176	1,151	1,122		100
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service				369	369	
Federal Power Commission	651	794	769	803	152	
Federal Security Agency	33,418	32,614	33,765	34,660	1,242	
Federal Trade Commission	453	500	500	557	104	
Federal Works Agency	20,459	23,553	23,478	22,302	1,843	
General Accounting Office	14,036	13,809	10,483	9,262		4,774
Government Printing Office	6,957	7,312	7,736	7,223	266	
Indian Claims Commission			11	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,030	2,298	2,271	2,250	220	
Maritime Commission	10,494	10,177	7,984	7,261		3,233
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,706	5,792	5,919	6,204		502
National Archives	348	363	376	344		4
National Capital Housing Authority	221	279	279	288	67	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	14	18	23	6	
National Gallery of Art	270	318	309	319	49	
National Housing Agency (housing and home finance)	15,418	18,249	14,042	11,723		3,695
National Labor Relations Board	807	985	821	1,610	803	
National Mediation Board	98	103	101	115	17	
Panama Canal	31,391	28,274	24,987	24,225		7,166
Railroad Retirement Board	1,784	1,928	2,794	2,755	971	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	13,191	12,172	7,622	5,634		7,557
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,151	1,193	1,162	1,111		40
Smithsonian Institution	406	501	521	509	103	
Tariff Commission	296	227	232	221		75
Tax Court of the United States	118	123	125	126	8	
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,349	11,306	14,716	14,697	2,348	
Veterans' Administration	69,751	181,094	217,872	201,910	132,159	
Subtotal, independent agencies	253,471	361,202	285,671	363,951	+110,480	30,682
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,119,217	1,331,007	1,226,389	1,196,809	+77,592	222,922
National Military Establishment:						
Office of Secretary of Defense				827	827	
Department of the Army:						
Inside continental United States	1,138,450	615,572	349,929	381,075		757,375
Outside continental United States	733,792	262,802	147,150	130,780		603,012
Department of the Air Force				(117,305)		
Department of the Navy:						
Inside continental United States	698,190	398,010	303,505	297,102		401,088
Outside continental United States	59,929	72,520	49,589	43,827		16,102
Subtotal, National Military Establishment	2,630,361	1,348,904	850,173	853,611	−1,776,750	1,777,577
Grand total	3,749,578	2,679,911	2,076,562	2,050,420	−1,699,158	2,000,499

The table above shows:

1. Civilian employment in the executive branch, exclusive of the National Military Establishment, during April 1948 was 77,592 higher than the war peak—an increase of more than 6 percent net including deductions for temporary agencies which have expired such as OPA, WPB, War Manpower Board, OWI, Censorship, etc. There are 38 agencies with personnel greater than the war peak, and 36 agencies with less.

2. Among the 8 regular departments of Cabinet level, excluding those in the Military Establishment, 4 are employing a combined total of 124,128 persons more than they were the war peak. The other 4 recorded a combined net decrease of 26,373. The net increase for these departments was 14 percent over the war peak.

3. Employment in the Executive Offices of the President, including the mansion and grounds, in April was 66 percent greater than at the war peak.

4. The 36 agencies, exclusive of the Military Establishment, with net reductions since the war peak included 19 of the so-called war emergency agencies. All of these, except the Selective Service System, the Office of Defense Transportation have expired. The net reduction by the 36 agencies totaled 222,922. More than 75 percent of the total net reduction was accounted for by the demise of war emergency agencies. Net reduction in all other civilian agencies totaled only 57,055.

5. As a partial offset to the 165,867 reduction resulting from the expiration and curtailment of 19 war emergency agencies, there was 34,763 in new employment for 10 so-called postwar agencies.

6. The net increase in 34 regular independent agencies over the war peak totaled

110,480, or 43 percent. Of course, the Veterans' Administration expansion accounted for a large part of the increase but, even so, increases were reported by 21 agencies whereas agencies with net decreases numbered 13.

7. The civilian employment total for agencies outside the Military Establishment rose sharply above the war peak during the first postwar year. By July 1946 the net increase totaled nearly a quarter of a million, or about 19 percent.

8. Fiscal year 1947 (July 1946–July 1947) was the best civilian employment reduction year from the standpoints of both the net number of separations and percentage, exclusive of the Military Establishment. This was the year in which the graduated personnel ceiling reductions were in force as a means of compensating for the 1946 pay raises. The net reduction in civilian agency employment was approximately 8 percent, or 104,618.

TABLE 3.—*Changes in Federal personnel (civilian), between World War II peak and Apr. 30, 1948*

Date	Executive departments exclusive of National Military Establishment	Emergency war agencies	Postwar agencies	Independent agencies			National Military Establishment			Total	Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment
				Exclusive of Veterans' Administration	Veterans' Administration	Total	Classified	Industrial	Total		
War peak	698,418	166,634	----------	184,414	69,751	254,165	1,221,927	1,408,434	2,630,361	3,749,578	1,119,217
April 1948	796,173	767	34,763	163,196	201,910	365,106	310,964	542,647	853,611	2,050,420	1,196,809
Net increase or decrease	+97,755	−165,867	+34,763	−21,218	+132,159	+110,941	−910,963	−865,787	−1,776,750	−1,699,158	+77,592

It may be noted from the table above that—

1. Employment in the eight executive departments, exclusive of the military departments, increased 14 percent. (Post Office Department increases should be noted.)

2. If employment in the new postwar agencies is added to that of other independent agencies, exclusive of Veterans' Administration, there is a 7-percent increase.

3. Reduction in emergency war agencies employment—which by no stretch of the imagination could be further justified—more than offsets the increase in the Veterans' Administration.

TABLE 4.—*Civilian and military personnel of the National Military Establishment, June 1945 to February 1948*

Month	Department of the Army[1]				Department of the Air Force[2]				Department of the Navy				Secretary of Defense		To'al, National Military Establishment			
	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Military personnel	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Military personnel	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Military personnel	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Civilian employees	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Military personnel	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
1945																		
July	1,872,242	----------	8,266,373	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	758,119	----------	4,028,718	----------	----------	----------	2,630,361	----------	12,295,091	----------
Aug	1,810,971	−61,271	8,186,444	−79,929	----------	----------	----------	----------	721,342	−36,777	4,058,817	+30,099	----------	----------	2,532,313	−98,048	12,245,261	−49,830
Sept	1,621,792	−189,179	8,023,304	−163,140	----------	----------	----------	----------	649,425	−71,917	4,058,908	+91	----------	----------	2,271,217	−261,096	12,082,212	−163,049
Oct	1,556,228	−65,564	7,564,514	−458,790	----------	----------	----------	----------	604,898	−44,527	3,955,018	−103,890	----------	----------	2,161,126	−110,091	11,519,532	−562,680
Nov	1,490,505	−65,723	6,487,053	−1,077,461	----------	----------	----------	----------	591,538	−13,360	3,603,900	−351,118	----------	----------	2,082,043	−79,083	10,090,953	−1,428,579
Dec	1,226,904	−263,601	5,333,978	−1,153,075	----------	----------	----------	----------	587,636	−3,902	3,241,607	−362,293	----------	----------	1,814,540	−267,503	8,575,585	−1,515,368
1946																		
Jan	1,156,944	−69,960	4,228,936	−1,105,042	----------	----------	----------	----------	586,994	−642	2,819,048	−422,559	----------	----------	1,743,938	−70,602	7,047,984	−1,527,601
Feb	1,114,211	−42,733	3,469,272	−759,664	----------	----------	----------	----------	592,856	+5,862	2,486,751	−332,297	----------	----------	1,707,067	−36,871	5,956,023	−1,091,961
Mar	1,073,864	−40,347	2,785,748	−683,524	----------	----------	----------	----------	561,501	−31,355	2,180,406	−306,345	----------	----------	1,635,365	−71,702	4,966,154	−989,869
Apr	1,064,018	−9,846	2,430,779	−354,969	----------	----------	----------	----------	543,854	−17,647	1,915,614	−264,792	----------	----------	1,607,872	−27,493	4,346,393	−619,761
May	1,000,240	−63,778	2,167,931	−262,848	----------	----------	----------	----------	529,664	−14,190	1,690,209	−225,405	----------	----------	1,529,904	−77,968	3,858,140	−488,253
June	927,075	−73,165	2,008,494	−159,437	----------	----------	----------	----------	490,239	−39,425	1,437,231	−252,978	----------	----------	1,417,314	−112,590	3,445,725	−412,415
July	878,374	−48,701	1,890,023	−118,471	----------	----------	----------	----------	470,530	−19,709	1,159,907	−277,324	----------	----------	1,348,904	−68,410	3,049,930	−395,795
Aug	800,828	−77,546	1,815,356	−74,667	----------	----------	----------	----------	419,280	−51,250	930,000	−229,907	----------	----------	1,220,108	−128,796	2,745,356	−304,574
Sept	736,825	−64,003	1,731,040	−84,316	----------	----------	----------	----------	394,740	−24,540	743,166	−186,834	----------	----------	1,131,565	−88,543	2,474,206	−271,150
Oct	699,841	−36,984	1,737,701	+6,661	----------	----------	----------	----------	384,336	−10,404	739,513	−3,653	----------	----------	1,084,177	−47,388	2,477,214	+3,008
Nov	653,190	−46,651	1,717,432	−20,269	----------	----------	----------	----------	380,880	−3,456	723,904	−15,609	----------	----------	1,034,070	−50,107	2,441,336	−35,878
Dec	629,194	−23,996	1,511,262	−206,170	----------	----------	----------	----------	377,383	−3,497	692,308	−31,596	----------	----------	1,006,577	−27,493	2,203,570	−237,766
1947																		
Jan	608,601	−20,593	1,319,483	−191,779	----------	----------	----------	----------	376,454	−929	660,174	−32,134	----------	----------	985,055	−21,522	1,979,657	−223,919
Feb	602,548	−6,053	1,253,619	−65,864	----------	----------	----------	----------	373,923	−2,531	646,268	−13,906	----------	----------	976,471	−8,584	1,899,887	−79,770
Mar	574,923	−27,625	1,199,456	−54,163	----------	----------	----------	----------	372,124	−1,799	636,855	−9,413	----------	----------	947,047	−29,424	1,836,311	−63,576
Apr	562,114	−12,809	1,147,948	−51,508	----------	----------	----------	----------	370,317	−1,807	629,024	−7,831	----------	----------	932,431	−14,616	1,776,972	−59,333
May	547,164	−14,950	1,081,492	−66,456	----------	----------	----------	----------	366,061	−4,256	621,614	−7,410	----------	----------	913,225	−19,206	1,703,106	−73,866
June	503,213	−43,951	1,020,819	−60,673	----------	----------	----------	----------	358,432	−7,629	610,967	−10,647	----------	----------	861,645	−51,580	1,631,786	−71,320
July	497,079	−6,134	989,664	−31,155	----------	----------	----------	----------	353,094	−5,338	601,871	−9,096	----------	----------	850,173	−11,472	1,591,535	−40,251
Aug	492,302	−4,777	972,569	−17,095	----------	----------	----------	----------	349,148	−3,946	602,727	+856	----------	----------	841,450	−8,723	1,575,296	−16,239
Sept	495,227	+2,925	955,698	−16,871	----------	----------	----------	----------	341,815	−7,333	601,698	−1,029	----------	----------	837,042	−4,408	1,557,396	−17,900
Oct	500,711	+5,484	940,582	−15,116	110,305	----------	329,523	----------	340,159	−1,656	602,549	+851	433	----------	841,303	+4,261	1,543,131	−14,265
Nov	491,413	−9,298	920,044	−20,538	111,229	+924	335,671	+6,148	339,219	−940	570,431	−32,118	455	+22	831,087	−10,216	1,490,475	−52,656
Dec	489,329	−2,084	911,537	−8,507	111,700	+471	339,246	+3,575	339,268	+49	540,921	−29,510	636	+181	829,233	−1,854	1,452,458	−38,017
1948																		
Jan	494,162	+4,833	898,472	−13,065	112,777	+1,077	353,143	+13,897	339,620	+352	513,687	−27,234	594	−42	834,376	+5,143	1,412,159	−40,299
Feb	495,884	+1,722	905,293	+6,821	113,680	+903	365,186	+12,043	340,131	+511	504,015	−9,672	675	+81	836,690	+2,314	1,409,308	−2,851
Mar	505,287	+9,403	909,493	+4,200	115,331	+1,651	368,348	+3,162	339,907	−224	500,353	−3,662	751	+76	845,945	+9,255	1,409,846	+538
Apr	511,855	+6,568	906,232	−3,261	117,305	+1,974	375,299	+6,951	340,929	+1,022	497,893	−2,460	827	+76	853,611	+7,666	1,404,125	−5,721
Net increase or decrease	----------	−1,360,387	----------	−7,360,141	----------	[3](+7,000)	----------	[3](+45,776)	----------	−417,190	----------	−3,530,825	----	+827	----------	−1,776,750	----------	−10,890,966

[1] Includes Air Forces.

[2] The Air Forces were divorced from the War Department as of September 1947 pursuant to the Unification Act, Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress. Air Force civilian personnel outside United States is still included in the Army civilian personnel reports. The Air Force figures set forth above are included in those for the Department of the Army for purposes of comparison between June 1945 and February 1948. Therefore, it should be noted that the civilian and military personnel figures for the Air Forces are compiled for current information.

NOTE.—Of the total decrease in the civilian employment of the Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force combined, 659,754 were industrial employees and 700,433 were classified employees.

NOTE.—Of the total decrease in the civilian employment of the Department of the Navy, 206,023 were industrial employees and 211,157 were classified employees.

NOTE.—Of the total decrease in the civilian employment of the National Military Establishment, 865,787 were industrial employees and 910,963 were classified employees.

Sources: Civilian-employment figures, monthly personnel reports to Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures; military personnel figures, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Department of Air Force Statistics Division.

The table above shows that—

1. Between July 1945—the war peak month—and April 1948 net reduction in civilian personnel employed by agencies of the National Military Establishment was 77,592 greater than the net reduction in the executive branch of the Government as a whole.

From the table above it may be seen that civilian employment in the Military Establishment was reduced from 2,630,361 in July

1945 to 853,611 in April 1948—a net total reduction of 1,776,750.

From table 2 it may be seen that civilian employment in the executive branch as a whole, including the Military Establishment, was reduced from 3,749,578 in July 1945 to 2,050,420 in April 1948—a net total reduction of 1,699,158.

This, of course, means that there was a net increase during the period in civilian agency employment of 77,592.

2. Of the total net civilian reduction in the Military Establishment (1,776,750) nearly half, or 865,787 were industrial workers. And, more than half of these—527,059—were industrial workers employed outside of continental United States, a great many of whom were native laborers; 910,963 of the total net reduction were among other categories of employees, including those of the classified civil service.

The War and Navy Departments were forced down to a total of 276,000 classified employees during the fiscal year 1947 under the graduated personnel ceiling provisions, but civilian employment in all categories of personnel began a steady climb in January this year. This was despite unification, and prior to any suggestion of the new military expansion program.

3. The National Military Establishment in April was employing nearly three times as many civilians per man in uniform as it employed at the war peak, and this was true before the pending military expansion program was proposed. In April there was a civilian employee for every 1.7 men in uniform. At the peak of the war effort there was a civilian employee for every 4.7 men in uniform. Since the postwar low point in December 1947 civilian employment in the National Military Establishment has increased 24,738, while the military personnel declined 48,333.

TABLE 5.—*Federal civilian industrial employees*

Date	Civilian departments and agencies inside and outside of United States	Military Establishment			Combined total		
		Inside United States	Outside United States	Total, Military Establishment	Inside United States	Outside United States	Grand total
November 1945	18,860	749,203	659,231	1,408,434	768,063	659,231	1,427,294
June 1946	20,539	601,235	338,208	939,443	621,774	338,208	959,982
June 1947	23,194	394,888	158,515	553,393	418,082	158,515	576,597
April 1948	[21,795	410,475	132,172	542,647	432,270	132,172	564,442
Total increase or decrease	+2,935	−338,728	−527,059	−865,787	−335,793	−527,059	−862,852

No records are available on civilian industrial employment prior to November 1945, but from trends in total employment it may be readily assumed that industrial employment in the war peak month of July 1945 was equal to, if not greater than, the number recorded above for November 1945.

The over-all World War II employment peak in July 1945 totaled 3,749,578. The net reduction from this peak through April 1948 totals 1,699,158.

Using the November 1945 industrial employment figure as the peak in this category, the table above shows:

1. Eight hundred and sixty-two thousand eight hundred and fifty-two of the separated personnel—or more than half—were so-called industrial employees.

2. Five hundred and twenty-seven thousand and fifty-nine—or nearly one-third of the reduction—were industrial employees of the Military Establishment employed outside continental United States. Many of these were foreign natives.

3. Three hundred and thirty-eight thousand seven hundred and twenty-eight were employees outside the classified service working in military establishments within the United States, such as navy yards, arsenals, etc., where it was impossible to justify continuation after the cancellation of war orders.

4. Industrial employees hired by the civilian departments and agencies actually have increased by 2,935 since the war peak pay roll. The majority of these employees work inside continental United States.

TABLE 6.—*Break-down of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948, showing individual increases and decreases for each department and agency* [1]

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED AND RECEIVED MORE PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE TO THEM IN 1947 (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN THE 1948 BUDGET)

Department or agency	Amount available in 1947	Amount requested in budget for 1948	Amount available in 1948	Comparison of amount available for 1948 with 1947		Comparison of amount available for 1948 with amount in budget for 1948	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
1. Commerce Department	$111,707,430.00	$143,672,870	$126,634,550		$14,927,120.00	$17,038,320	
2. Interior Department	138,615,435.00	160,772,965	139,382,513		767,078.00	21,390,452	
3. Justice Department	82,236,762.00	84,032,761	94,793,395		12,556,633.00		$10,760,634
4. Post Office Department	1,200,983,983.00	1,274,047,227	1,209,029,052		8,045,069.00	65,018,175	
5. Council Economic Advisers	218,162.00	318,000	292,000		73,838.00	26,000	
6. Housing Expediter	[8,454,000.00	27,840,830	19,585,082		11,131,082.00	8,255,748	
7. Atomic Energy Commission	[6,487,062.50	22,543,000	19,000,000		12,512,937.50	3,543,000	
8. Philippine Alien Property Administrator	[169,027.00	297,000	19,297,000		127,973.00		
9. American Battle Monuments	104,255.00	107,589	107,589		3,334.00		
10. Bureau of the Budget	3,051,883.00	3,150,406	3,076,308		24,425.00	74,098	
11. Civil Aeronautics Board	2,086,784.00	2,723,919	2,550,000		463,216.00	173,919	
12. Civil Service Commission	11,820,646.00	24,565,908	13,678,218		1,857,572.00	10,887,690	
13. Export-Import Bank	690,300.00	719,700	658,540		31,760.00	61,160	
14. Federal Communications Commission	5,415,366.00	6,205,000	5,556,481		141,115.00	648,519	
15. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	4,284,920.00	4,621,007	4,440,797		155,877.00	180,210	
16. Federal Power Commission	3,283,610.00	3,728,528	3,451,471		167,861.00	277,057	
17. Federal Security Agency	94,864,385.00	109,704,241	105,448,424		10,584,039.00	4,255,817	
18. Federal Trade Commission	2,673,760.00	3,629,534	2,712,400		38,640.00	917,134	
19. Indian Claims Commission	14,374.00	104,829	104,829		90,455.00		
20. Interstate Commerce Commission	9,324,314.00	10,438,375	9,532,534		208,220.00	905,841	
21. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	18,623,305.00	20,787,000	20,597,000		1,973,695.00	190,000	
22. National Capital Housing Authority	793,957.00	837,172	837,172		43,215.00		
23. National Capital Park and Planning Commission	87,141.00	115,199	110,081		22,940.00	5,118	
24. National Gallery of Art	771,591.00	833,600	823,026		51,435.00	10,574	
25. National Labor Relations Board	3,403,000.00	6,157,000	3,750,000		347,000.00	2,407,000	
26. Philippine War Damage Commission	590,580.00	2,548,563	1,778,599		1,188,019.00	769,964	
27. Railroad Retirement Board	6,916,700.00	8,579,620	8,579,620		1,662,920.00		
28. Securities and Exchange Commission	5,044,589.00	5,826,300	5,196,000		151,411.00	700,300	
29. Smithsonian Institution	1,537,461.00	1,775,485	1,651,861		114,400.00	123,624	
30. Tax Court of United States	646,428.00	686,944	686,944		40,516.00		

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED MORE PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE IN 1947 BUT RECEIVED THE SAME AS IN 1947 (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. National Mediation Board	$426,726	$437,626	$426,726			$10,900	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—*Break-down of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948, showing individual increases and decreases for each department and agency* [1]—Continued

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED MORE PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE IN 1947 AND RECEIVED LESS (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

Department or agency	Amount available in 1947	Amount requested in budget for 1948	Amount available in 1948	Comparison of amount available for 1948 with 1947		Comparison of amount available for 1948 with amount in budget for 1948	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
1. State Department	$83,599,877	$73,481,844	$60,742,133	$2,857,744		$12,739,711	
2. Treasury Department	305,923,535	307,601,803	277,631,359	28,292,176		29,970,504	
3. Office of Government Reports	469,900	513,475	215,500	254,400		297,975	
4. National Archives	1,209,145	1,540,830	1,185,335	23,810		355,495	
5. Panama Canal	41,210,013	44,596,708	41,197,275	12,738		3,399,433	
6. Tariff Commission	1,114,663	1,259,666	1,098,349	16,314		161,317	

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE IN 1947 AND RECEIVED MORE (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. Federal Works Agency	$64,362,500	$60,281,479	$64,624,546		$262,046		$4,343,067
2. Tennessee Valley Authority	38,886,103	38,837,458	43,718,147		4,832,044		4,880,689
3. White House Office	1,069,433	969,765	1,187,373		117,940		217,608

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE IN 1947 AND RECEIVED THE SAME AMOUNT (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. Government Printing Office	$23,937,562	$23,818,283	$23,937,562				$119,279

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED AND RECEIVED LESS PERSONAL SERVICE FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN WERE AVAILABLE TO THEM IN 1947 (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR 1948 AND AMOUNT REQUESTED IN 1948 BUDGET)

1. Agriculture Department	$237,422,679	$233,041,979	$206,023,700	$31,398,979		$27,018,279	
2. Army Department	1,695,586,499	1,488,548,042	1,383,326,462	312,260,037		105,221,580	
3. Labor Department	59,074,245	26,631,654	16,218,812	42,855,433		10,412,842	
4. Navy Department	1,204,423,265	[a] 1,037,871,138	931,422,188	273,001,077		106,448,950	
5. Executive Mansion and Grounds	163,628	151,830	151,830	11,798			
6. Office of Defense Transportation	332,098	287,029	198,916	133,182		88,113	
7. Office of Scientific Research and Development	568,857	77,400	88,400	480,457			$11,000
8. Office of Selective Service Records	7,192,675	3,797,430	3,107,420	4,085,255		690,010	
9. War Assets Administration	187,003,412	102,498,800	108,006,900	78,996,512			5,508,100
10. General Accounting Office	38,019,000	35,075,000	34,500,000	3,519,000		575,000	
11. Housing and Home Finance	42,332,238	39,050,055	31,724,189	10,608,049		7,325,866	
12. Maritime Commission	41,607,369	33,368,210	24,833,350	16,774,019		8,534,860	
13. Reconstruction Finance Corporation	38,624,000	37,809,000	30,537,000	8,087,000		7,272,000	
14. Veterans' Administration	587,819,059	578,940,796	563,302,478	24,516,581		15,638,318	

NEW AGENCIES CREATED BY CONGRESS SUBSEQUENT TO ISSUANCE OF PRESIDENT'S 1948 BUDGET

1. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service			$1,001,503		$1,001,503		$1,001,503
2. National Security Council			84,320		84,320		84,320
3. National Security Resources Board			405,000		405,000		405,000
4. Office of Secretary of Defense			[a] (3,676,000)		[b] (3,676,000)		[a] (3,676,000)
Total	$6,407,239,891.50	$6,101,933,932	$5,655,238,259	$838,184,561	$86,182,928.50	$474,026,873	$27,331,200
Net decreases				$752,001,632.50		$446,695,673	

AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED GREATER AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY GREATER AVERAGE (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)

Department or agency	Average number in 1947	Average number requested in 1948 budget	Average number possible in 1948	Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number in fiscal year 1947		Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number contemplated in 1948 budget	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
1. Commerce Department	30,488	38,309	33,573		3,085	4,736	
2. Justice Department	22,820	23,476	26,681		3,861		3,205
3. Post Office Department	438,718.8	464,107.7	439,943.7		1,224.9	24,164	
4. Selective Service Records	851	1,309	984		133	325	
5. Council Economic Advisers	29.75	49	45.72		15.97	3.28	
6. Office Housing Expediter	[2] 2,221	6,522	3,872		1,651	2,650	
7. Philippine Alien Property Administrator	[3] 35.5	154	148		112.5	6	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—*Break-down of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948, showing individual increases and decreases for each department and agency*[1]—Continued

Department or agency	Average number in 1947	Average number requested in 1948 budget	Average number possible in 1948	Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number in fiscal year 1947		Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number contemplated in 1948 budget	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
8. U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	[2]2,083	8,195	5,300		3,217	2,895	
9. Bureau of the Budget	590	610	595		5	15	
10. Civil Aeronautics Board	481.2	668.8	589.3		108.1	79.5	
11. Civil Service Commission	3,600.5	7,828.8	4,265.1		664.6	3,563.7	
12 Export-Import Bank	114.4	135.7	124.8		10.4	10.9	
13. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	949.1	1,202.9	1,157.9		208.8	45	
14. Federal Power Commission	786.2	944	828.3		42.1	115.7	
15. Federal Security Agency	33,519	37,870	35,645		2,126	2,225	
16. Federal Trade Commission	567	915	577		10	338	
17. Government Printing Office	7,962	8,090.5	8,008.4		46.4	82.1	
18. Indian Claims Commission	2.5	18	18		15.5		
19. Interstate Commerce Commission	2,298.8	2,628.4	2,338.4		39.6	290	
20. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,692.7	6,353.2	6,171.5		478.8	183.7	
21. National Capital Housing Authority	283.7	309	309		25.3		
22. National Capital Park and Planning Commission	15.99	26.61	24.1		8.11	2.51	
23. National Gallery of Art	368.8	320	318		9.2	2	
24. National Labor Relations Board	818.9	1,580	900		81.1	680	
25. Philippine War Damage Commission	161	733	532		371	201	
26. Railroad Retirement Board	2,405.2	3,124.2	3,124.2		719		
27. Securities and Exchange Commission	1,186.9	1,425.2	1,199.3		12.4	225.9	
28. Smithsonian Institution	526.4	581	540.4		14	40.6	
29. Tax Court of United States	122.2	131.7	131.7		9.5		
30. Tennessee Valley Authority	12,684	13,879	15,055		2,371		1,176
31. Veterans' Administration	205,515	213,965	207,891		2,376	6,074	
AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED GREATER AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY THE SAME AVERAGE NUMBER (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1948 AND 1947 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)							
1. National Mediation Board	94	96	94			2	
AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED GREATER AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY A SMALLER AVERAGE NUMBER (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1948 AND 1947 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)							
1. Interior Department	46,943.8	53,525.5	45,838.2	1,107.6		7,689.3	
2. State Department	20,500.6	22,519.8	19,213.8	1,286.8		3,306.0	
3. Treasury Department	99,398.2	99,509.8	88,565.5	10,832.7		11,004.3	
4. American Battle Monuments	90.8	100.9	64.4	26.4		36.5	
5. Federal Communications	1,387.2	1,623.3	1,377.1	10.1		246.2	
6. National Archives	364.9	451.0	350.0	14.9		101.0	
7. Panama Canal	26,624.0	30,268.0	26,354.0	270.0		3,914.0	
8. Tariff Commission	227.9	274.0	226.0	1.9		48.0	
AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN THEY HAD IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY A GREATER AVERAGE (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)							
1. White House Office	263.3	227	269.1		5.8		42.1
AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND MAY EMPLOY THE SAME AVERAGE NUMBER (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)							
AGENCIES WHICH REQUESTED LESS AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948 THAN IN 1947 AND WHICH MUST EMPLOY A SMALLER AVERAGE (WITH COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT IN 1947 AND 1948 AND COMPARISON BETWEEN AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT POSSIBLE IN 1948 AND AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT CONTEMPLATED IN 1948 BUDGET)							
1. Agriculture Department	76,002.7	71,743.1	63,412.4	12,590.3		8,330.7	
2. Army Department	679,801	552,202.9	539,059.8	140,741.2		13,143.1	
3. Labor Department	20,894	7,326	4,215	16,679		3,111	
4. Navy Department	381,600	371,330	333,940	47,660		37,390	
5. Executive Mansion and Grounds	61.4	60	60.5	.9			0.5
6. Office of Defense Transportation	67.4	65.2	42.8	24.6		22.4	
7. Office of Scientific Research and Development	172	14	17	155			3
8. Office of Government Reports	155	153	20	135		133	
9. War Assets Administration	52,173.55	29,327.1	29,531.75	22,641.8			204.65
10. Federal Works Agency	24,575.9	23,427	24,010.1	565.8			583.1
11. General Accounting Office	11,914.4	11,036.2	10,416.8	1,497.6		619.4	
12. Housing and Home Finance	11,685.7	10,674.6	8,580.7	3,105		2,093.9	
13. Maritime Commission	12,538	10,893	7,917	4,621		2,976	
14. Reconstruction Finance Corporation	9,426	9,166	7,403	2,023		1,763	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—*Break-down of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948, showing individual increases and decreases for each department and agency* [1]—Continued

NEW AGENCIES CREATED BY CONGRESS SUBSEQUENT TO ISSUANCE OF PRESIDENT'S 1948 BUDGET

Department or agency	Average number in 1947	Average number requested in 1948 budget	Average number possible in 1948	Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number in fiscal year 1947		Comparison of number possible in 1948 and number contemplated in 1948 budget	
				Decrease under 1947	Increase over 1947	Decrease under budget	Increase over budget
1. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service			200		200		200
2. National Security Council			14.8		14.8		14.8
3. National Security Resources Board			81		81		81
4. Office of Secretary of Defense			[3] (640.2)		[3] (640.2)		[3] (640.2)
Total	2,254,800.29	2,151,537.11	2,012,163.57	265,990.6	23,353.88	144,883.69	5,510.15
Net decreases				242,636.72		139,373.54	

[1] Agencies which received personal service funds and were authorized to employ personnel during fiscal year 1947, but which went out of existence during the course of the year, either by act of Congress or by Executive order or by transfer to another agency:

Alien Property Administration:
- Personal service funds $568,900
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 196.3
- Transferred to Justice Department, Sept. 30, 1946.

Inter-American Affairs:
- Personal service funds $399,750
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 153.25
- Transferred to State Department, Sept. 30, 1946.

Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:
- Personal service funds $392,700
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 130.9
- Liquidated Apr. 30, 1947.

War Shipping Administration:
- Personal service funds $536,100
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 178.7
- Transferred to Maritime Commission, July 31, 1946, pursuant to Public Law 492 (79th Cong.).

Civilian Production Administration:
- Personal service funds $9,314,100
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 3,104.7
- Liquidated Apr. 30, 1947.

Wage Stabilization Board:
- Personal service funds $399,750
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 133.25
- Liquidated purusant to Executive order, Feb. 23, 1947.

Office of Price Administration:
- Personal service funds $58,830,600
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 19,610.2
- Liquidated May 1947.

Price Decontrol Board:
- Personal service funds $30,900
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 10.3
- Liquidated July 1947.
- Established August 1946.

Agencies created during the course of fiscal year 1947, and the first months of fiscal year 1948, which may be classified as new agencies (they follow in order of their inception):
- Council of Economic Advisers: August 1946.
- Philippine Alien Property Administration: December 1946.
- U. S. Atomic Energy Commission: December 1946.
- Office of Government Reports: January 1947.
- Office of Housing Expediter: January 1947.
- Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: August 22, 1947 Public Law 101 (80th Cong. 1st sess.)
- Office of Secretary of National Defense: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.
- National Security Resources Board; Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.
- National Security Council: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.

[2] Agencies which were created in January 1947 and received funds and employed people for half of the fiscal year 1947. The figures for personnel are on a man-year basis.

[3] Personal service funds and personnel for the Office of the Secretary of Defense come from the funds and personnel of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy, and are included in the figures reported herein for those Departments. The figures are listed separately and in parentheses above for purposes of information only.

The tables above show that—

1. Thirty civilian agencies (most of them old line) requested and received more personal service funds for fiscal year 1948 (under Republican appropriations) than they received for 1947.

2. Thirty-one civilian agencies requested and were granted authorization for greater average employment in fiscal year 1948 (under Republican appropriations) than they had in 1947.

3. One agency requested more personal service funds for 1948 than it had in 1947 and got the same.

4. One agency requested authorization for greater average employment in 1948 than it had in 1947 and got the same.

5. Six agencies requested more personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947 and received less.

6. Eight agencies requested authorization for greater average employment in 1948 than they had in 1947, and were granted less.

7. Three agencies requested less personal service funds for 1948 than they had in 1947, and actually were given more.

8. One agency requested authorization for less employment in 1948 than it had in 1947, and was granted more.

9. One agency requested less personal service funds for 1948 than it had in 1947 and was given the same.

10. Fourteen agencies requested less personal service funds for 1948 and received less.

11. Fourteen agencies requested authorization for less average employment in 1948 than they had in 1947, and were granted less.

TABLE 7.—*Consolidated table of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948 (compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948* [1])

	1947 and 1948 Federal funds for personal service			1947 and 1948 average Federal employment		
	Appropriated and available for fiscal year 1947	Requested in budget for 1948	Appropriated and available for fiscal year 1948	In fiscal year 1947	Contemplated in budget requests for 1948	Possible under personal service funds available for fiscal year 1948
Executive departments (exclusive of National Military Establishment):						
Agriculture Department	$237,422,679.00	$233,041,979	$206,023,700	76,002.7	71,743.1	63,412.4
Commerce Department	111,707,430.00	143,672,870	120,634,550	30,488	38,309	33,573
Interior Department	138,615,435.00	160,772,765	139,382,513	46,943.8	53,525.5	45,836.2
Justice Department	82,236,762.00	84,032,701	94,793,395	22,820	23,476	26,681
Labor Department	59,074,245.00	26,631,654	16,218,812	20,894	7,326	4,215
Post Office Department	1,200,983,983.00	1,274,947,227	1,209,029,052	438,718.8	464,107.7	439,943.7
State Department	68,599,877.00	73,481,844	60,742,133	20,509.6	22,519.8	19,213.8
Treasury Department	305,923,535.00	307,901,863	277,631,359	99,398.2	99,569.8	88,565.5
Executive Office of the President:						
Bureau of the Budget	3,051,883.00	3,150,406	3,076,308	590	610	595
White House Office	1,069,433.00	969,765	1,187,373	263.3	227	269.1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	163,628.00	151,830	151,830	61.4	60	60.5
National Security Council			84,320			14.8
National Security Resources Board			405,000			81
Council of Economic Advisers	218,162.00	318,000	292,000	29.75	49	45.7
Office of Government Reports	469,900.00	513,475	215,500	155	153	20

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE 7.—*Consolidated table of personal service funds and personnel available under appropriations for fiscal year 1948, compared with funds and services available in fiscal year 1947, and funds and services requested in the President's budget for 1948* [1]—Continued

	1947 and 1948 Federal funds for personal service			1947 and 1948 average Federal employment		
	Appropriated and available for fiscal year 1947	Requested in Budget for 1948	Appropriated and available for fiscal year 1948	In fiscal year 1947	Contemplated in Budget requests for 1948	Possible under personal service funds available for fiscal year 1948
Emergency war agencies:						
Office of Defense Transportation	$332,098.00	$287,029	$198,916	67.4	65.2	42.8
Office of Scientific Research and Development	568,857.00	77,400	88,400	172	14	17
Postwar agencies:						
Philippine Alien Property Administration [2]	169,027.00	297,000	297,000	35.5	154	148
War Assets Administration	187,003,412.00	102,498,800	108,006,900	52,173.55	29,327.1	29,531.75
Independent agencies:						
American Battle Monuments Commission	104,255.00	107,589	107,589	90.8	100.9	64.4
Atomic Energy Commission [3]	6,487,062.50	22,543,000	19,000,000	2,083	8,195	5,300
Civil Aeronautics Board	2,086,784.00	2,729,919	2,550,000	481.2	668.8	589.3
Civil Service Commission	11,820,646.00	24,565,908	13,678,218	3,600.5	7,828.8	4,265.1
Export-Import Bank of Washington	650,500.00	719,700	658,540	114.4	135.7	124.8
Federal Communications Commission	5,415,366.00	6,205,000	5,556,481	1,387.2	1,623.3	1,377.1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	4,284,920.00	4,621,007	4,440,797	949.1	1,202.9	1,157.9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service [2]			1,001,503			200
Federal Power Commission	3,283,610.00	3,728,528	3,451,471	786.2	944	828.3
Federal Security Agency	94,864,385.00	109,704,241	105,448,424	33,519	37,870	35,645
Federal Trade Commission	2,673,760.00	3,629,534	2,712,400	567	915	577
Federal Works Agency	64,362,500.00	60,281,479	64,624,546	24,575.9	23,427	24,010.1
General Accounting Office	38,019,000.00	35,075,000	34,500,000	11,914.4	11,036.2	10,416.8
Government Printing Office	23,937,562.00	23,818,283	23,937,562	7,962	8,090.5	8,008.4
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42,332,238.00	39,050,055	31,724,189	11,685.7	10,674.6	8,580.7
Indian Claims Commission	14,374.00	104,829	104,829	2.5	18	18
Interstate Commerce Commission	9,324,314.00	10,438,375	9,532,534	2,298.8	2,628.4	2,338.4
Maritime Commission	41,607,369.00	33,308,210	24,833,350	12,538	10,893	7,917
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	18,623,305.00	20,787,000	20,597,000	5,692.7	6,355.2	6,171.5
National Archives	1,209,145.00	1,540,830	1,185,335	364.9	451	350
National Capital Housing Authority	793,957.00	837,172	837,172	283.7	309	309
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	87,141.00	115,199	110,081	15.99	26.61	24.1
National Gallery of Art	771,591.00	833,600	823,026	308.8	320	318
National Labor Relations Board	3,403,000.00	6,157,000	3,750,000	818.9	1,580	900
National Mediation Board	426,726.00	437,626	426,726	94	96	94
Office of the Housing Expediter [2]	8,454,000.00	27,840,830	19,585,082	2,221	6,522	3,872
Office of Selective Service Records	7,192,675.00	3,797,430	3,107,420	851	1,301	984
Panama Canal	41,210,013.00	44,596,708	41,197,275	26,624	30,208	26,354
Philippine War Damage Commission	590,580.00	2,548,563	1,778,599	161	733	532
Railroad Retirement Board	6,916,700.00	8,579,620	8,579,620	2,405.2	3,124.2	3,124.2
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	38,624,000.00	37,809,000	30,537,000	9,426	9,166	7,403
Securities and Exchange Commission	5,044,589.00	5,896,300	5,196,000	1,186.9	1,425.2	1,199.3
Smithsonian Institution	1,537,461.00	1,775,485	1,651,861	526.4	581	540.4
Tariff Commission	1,114,663.00	1,259,666	1,098,349	227.9	274	226
Tax Court of the United States	646,428.00	686,944	686,944	122.2	131.7	131.7
Tennessee Valley Authority	38,886,103.00	38,837,458	43,718,147	12,684	13,879	15,055
Veterans' Administration	587,819,059.00	578,940,796	563,302,478	205,515	213,965	207,891
Total (exclusive of National Military Establishment)	3,507,230,127.50	3,575,514,752	3,340,490,609	1,193,399.29	1,228,004.21	1,139,163.77
National Military Establishment:						
Department of the Army (and Air Force)	1,695,586,499.00	1,488,548,042	1,383,326,462	679,801	652,202.9	539,059.8
Department of the Navy	1,204,423,265.00	1,037,871,138	931,422,188	381,600	371,330	333,940
Office of the Secretary of Defense			[3] (3,676,000)			[3] (640.2)
Total (including National Military Establishment)	6,407,239,891.50	6,101,933,932	5,655,238,259	2,254,800.29	2,151,537.11	2,012,163.57

[1] Agencies which received personal-service funds and were authorized to employ personnel during fiscal year 1947, but which went out of existence during the course of the year, either by act of Congress or by Executive order or by transfer to another agency:

Alien Property Administration:
- Personal-service funds $588,900
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 196.3
- Transferred to Justice Department, Sept. 30, 1946.

Inter-American Affairs:
- Personal-service funds $399,750
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 133.25
- Transferred to State Department, Sept. 30, 1946.

Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion:
- Personal-service funds $392,700
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 130.9
- Liquidated Apr. 30, 1947.

War Shipping Administration:
- Personal-service funds $536,100
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 178.7
- Transferred to Maritime Commission, July 31, 1946, pursuant to Public Law 492 (79th Cong.).

Civilian Production Administration:
- Personal service funds $9,314,100
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 3,104.7
- Liquidated Apr. 30, 1947.

Wage Stabilization Board:
- Personal service funds $390,750
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 133.25
- Liquidated pursuant to Executive order, Feb. 23, 1947.

Office of Price Administration:
- Personal service funds $58,830,600
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 19,610.2
- Liquidated May 1947.

Price Decontrol Board:
- Personal service funds $30,900
- Man-years for fiscal year 1947 ..... 10.3
- Luqidated July 1947.
- Established August 1946.

Agencies created during the course of fiscal year 1947, and the first months of fiscal year 1948, which may be classified as new agencies (they follow in order of their inception):

Council of Economic Advisers: August 1946.
Philippine Alien Property Administration: December 1946.
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission: December 1946.
Office of Government Reports: January 1947.
Office of Housing Expediter: January 1947.
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: August 22, 1947. Public Law 101 (80th Cong.).
Office of Secretary of National Defense: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.
National Security Resources Board: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.
National Security Council: Public Law 253 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) creating the National Military Establishment.

[2] Agencies which were created in January 1947 and received funds and employed people for half of the fiscal year 1947. The figures for personnel are on a man-year basis.

[3] Personal service funds and personnel for the Office of the Secretary of Defense come from the funds and personnel of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy, and are included in the figures reported herein for those Departments. The figures are listed separately and in parentheses above for purposes of information only.

From the table above it may be seen that:

1. Funds available for personal service in fiscal year 1947 totaled $6,407,239,891.

2. Funds available for personal service in fiscal year 1948 totaled $5,655,238,259.

3. Over-all reduction in personal service funds between 1947 and 1948 totals $752,238,259.

4. 1948 personal service funds for the Military Establishment, along with other agencies still clearly overmanned on the basis of war and immediate postwar conditions, were reduced by a total of $718,331,120. (These agencies include Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Scientific Research and Development, War Assets Administration, Maritime Commission, Selective Service System, RFC which has liquidated its war corporations, Veterans' Administration which had reached the end of its first postwar phase, and National Military Establishment.)

5. It was natural for these agencies to be reduced by their own postwar weight. With these items omitted the reduction in personal service funds for fiscal year 1948 totals $33,670,512.

6. This reduction amounts to 0.005 percent.

7. The reduction in the number of people who could be employed with available funds was about 1 percent.

TRYGVE LIE, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on a topic of world-wide concern; namely, the job of Secretary General of the United Nations, and in particular, Secretary General Trygve Lie.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the most arduous and trying jobs in the world today is that of the Secretary General of the United Nations. I believe that the Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie, deserves the commendation of every Member of this body for the admirable manner in which he has been fulfilling his difficult role as top administrator of the top world organization. Mr. Lie carries on his work under far greater pressure than any official of any national government. He is the focal point of the multiple, combined, and conflicting pressures of more than 50 sovereign nations.

I consider it a tribute to his character and to his judgment that he has been able to perform his appointed tasks with a minimum of friction and a maximum of effectiveness. Mr. Lie has slowly but surely developed the prestige of the office of Secretary General to the point where it is not merely a post of administrative authority over the Secretariat, but a platform from which he can address the conscience of mankind.

I am particularly moved to offer this praise of Mr. Trygve Lie by the news of an action he has taken within the past few days with regard to the tragic Palestine war. The United Nations mediator on that war, Count Bernadotte, had requested the Secretary General to circulate an appeal from the mediator in the Middle East to all member states of the United Nations urging them to aid United Nations observers at ports throughout the world in an effort to control, restrict, and halt the migration of people into the truce area. This request, like most of the truce terms themselves, was rankly discriminatory against the one people that wants to reach that truce area, in particular, that part of the area controlled by the state of Israel. In effect, Count Bernadotte's proposal would have set up a world control over the movements of the exiled Hebrew people who now, at long last, have their own country, under their own government, and who naturally are making every effort to reach home.

Upon receiving this request, Mr. Lie, however, showed himself to be above any participation in such a discriminatory maneuver against the people whose state has been attacked by seven satellite countries of Great Britain. Mr. Lie suggested to Count Bernadotte that he address his request for world control of migration to the Security Council, on the grounds that the legality of such an action was questionable and could best be decided by the Council itself.

Mr. Lie thereby refused to associate his high office with the Bernadotte scheme for a world-wide dragnet—a scheme which the British have for several years been trying to put over in one guise or another, even in the American occupation zones of Europe. In Count Bernadotte's revised request—this time addressed to the Security Council—there was no mention of the original plan. The mediator had understood that Mr. Lie was too astute to be caught in this web.

Yes, Mr. President, the Secretary General of the United Nations is to be complimented. Not only did he refuse to allow the machinery of the UN Secretariat to be employed in a most dubious political maneuver, he also protected the sovereign rights of every member nation of the UN with respect to control of their own immigration policies. I, for one, would have opposed with my strength any scheme to restrict the movement of persons out of American harbors on the grounds that they might be heading for Israel.

It is worth remarking at this time that the very crux and core of this crisis in Palestine is precisely the issue of the right of the Hebrew people to return to the land of their fathers. This right, time and again affirmed in international covenants, to which our own country has subscribed with the approval of the United States Congress, is the basic right of the Hebrew nation to self-determination and settlement in its own country.

For what other purpose, may I ask, has the state of Israel been established and been recognized by our country and a dozen others, if not to prove a homeland and a haven for the stateless and oppressed Hebrews of the world, especially of post-Nazi Europe?

Mr. Lie is to be felicitated, in my opinion, for his rejection of any plan to distort the purpose of the United Nations—which itself voted in General Assembly to establish a state in Israel—by transforming it into an international control agency to deprive the Hebrew people of their rights as human beings to go to the land they now hold as their own.

WYOMING POSTMASTERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I observe that the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is in the Chamber. I should like to address a question to him.

For some time there have been pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service several postmaster nominations for the State of Wyoming.

One of these was the nomination of Kenneth L. Wingo, of Encampment, Wyo., a veteran of World War II, who enjoys the preference of veterans under the law. He was No. 1 on the eligible register—as a matter of fact, the only eligible on the register. His qualifications to serve are well established.

Also the nomination of Mr. George L. Gibson, of Powell, Wyo., likewise a veteran with veteran's preference, who successfully met the civil-service test and was No. 1 among three eligibles on the register.

The third nomination is that of Mr. Silvio J. Pedri, of Reliance, like the other two, a veteran of World War II, with 10 points disability preference. He was No. 1 upon the Civil Service Commission's list of two eligibles.

The fourth nomination was that of Mrs. Roxanna M. Smith, of Lingle, Wyo. She is currently acting as postmaster of that community, and has been since August 1946. Her popularity and efficiency are so well recognized by the people of her community that she had no competition. She was the only applicant for the postmastership, and therefore was No. 1 on the eligible register. All four of these nominees have complied with the requirements of the merit system.

These matters were called by me to the attention of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and to the attention of other members of the committee early in the session. At the time that was done there were no protests of any kind against any of these nominations from any person in their respective communities and I have heard of none since. I understood that the committee had voted unanimously to report the nominations about 2 weeks ago. The Senator from North Dakota so advised me. Thereafter, however, something happened. The nominations have not been reported despite the committee action.

Would the Senator from North Dakota indulge me by stating what the situation is with respect to these nominations?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that the resolution adopted by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee provides that, first of all, both Senators of the State in which the post office is located must concur in the nomination. At the time the nominations were before the committee, the understanding of the office staff was that no one had objected, and that both Senators had agreed to these four nominations.

Later the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] objected to each of these four nominations; and I am satisfied that he will take full responsibility for having objected to their being reported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Objection was filed after the committee had voted unanimously to report the nominations favorably, is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. The junior Senator from Wyoming stated that he objected to them before they were reported; but through some mistake the office staff felt that he had concurred when, as a matter of fact, he never had. I am sure that if the junior Senator from Wyoming were here he would take full responsibility.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared relative to Senate Joint Resolution 76 guaranteeing equal rights for women, together with a letter which I have written stating my position on this issue.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, it now appears that the Congress is about to adjourn without fulfilling a pledge made by both political parties. I refer to the pending Senate Joint Resolution 76 guaranteeing equal rights for women, which eight of us in this Chamber introduced.

Apparently no determined effort will be made by the leadership to consider this proposal which merely provides that the people of the several States be given this opportunity to accept or reject the question. It seeks only justice and equity for one-half of our population.

But the ironical aspect of the situation is that the two major political parties are about to meet in Philadelphia. And we can be sure they again will solemnly adopt a plank in their platforms promising women to sanction an equal-rights constitutional amendment.

If the two parties really mean what they say they will take favorable action today on our resolution, which has been in the Senate since February 21, a period of 4 months.

No more propitious year could be found in which to set in motion the constitutional processes which eventually would lead to inclusion in our great Constitution of this guaranty of equality for womanhood.

We are within a few weeks of the one hundredth anniversary of the first meeting on record, in behalf of woman's rights, held at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in July 1848. Women have progressed far within that century in their search for full equality under the law.

In the professions, in public life, in the scientific world and in the economic pursuits of our Nation, they have given incontestable evidence of their capacity for any duties or responsibilities of citizenship that may be assigned them.

The only handicap to their full and complete participation in all civic and national affairs is the discrimination that Senate Joint Resolution 76 would seek to remove.

I sincerely urge that the Senate consider and approve this resolution today, so that it may be put before the legislatures of the several States for their consideration and approval. Under our democratic system, the people have the right of decision on all matters. Let us give opportunity for their voice to be heard, through their elected representatives in the 48 States.

JUNE 15, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: You may count upon my earnest support for the submission of the equal-rights amendment, of which I was privileged to be a cosponsor, to the States for their consideration. I sincerely trust that our efforts to secure action on this amendment at this session will be entirely successful.

Increased participation by women in the political, professional and economic life of the Nation is greatly to be desired. The pending amendment fills a long-felt need in its provision that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

To all intents and purposes this equality is now freely granted, but the United States has been hesitant in giving constitutional guaranty of such equality. The splendid record made by women in public life, in the professions and in all phases of business and in many industries is evidence of their largely untapped capacities for public good in every walk of life.

This year would be an appropriate one in which to proclaim the constitutional equality of rights for men and women, marking as it does the one hundredth aniversary of the first women's rights meeting ever held in the world, at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in July, 1848.

Inasmuch as the amendment must be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, to become effective 3 years after the date of ratification, the operative data of the proposed legislation is at least 10 years away, which makes it all the more important that no time be lost in passing the amendment at this session.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1949

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1882, House bill 6935, which is the second deficiency appropriation bill, which we must pass and get to conference if we are to finish action on it tonight.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that I presume I should yield willingly. I have been used to this for the past 3 days. How long does the Senator feel that, within reason, it will take?

Mr. BALL. I do not believe that there are any controversies in the bill. I believe that as fast as we can consider the committee amendments and dispose of them, together with one or two correctional amendments, action on the bill can be completed. We did not finish work on the bill until late last night.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator that there are no serious controversial matters in the bill.

Mr. BALL. I think we can finish consideration of the bill in 10 or 15 minutes at the most.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have the utmost confidence in the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Arizona. Therefore I yield, hoping that their judgment is sound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative Branch—Senate," at the top of page 2, to insert:

For an aditional amount, fiscal year 1949, for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $8,020: *Provided*, That the rates of basic annual compensation for the following positions shall be: Four laborers at $1,320 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

For payment to Mrs. Adelaide R. Hasse for compensation for the compilation of the index digest of the Temporary National Economic Committee, $3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery for the second session of the Eightieth Congress, to remain available until December 31, 1948, $200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 16, after "per diem," to strike out "allowance in lieu of subsistence expenses for consultants and staff, at the rate of $10 within the continental limits of the United States and $12 abroad" and insert "and subsistence expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1949: To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1949, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for the "Capitol Buildings," including the objects specified under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 6, to insert:

Capitol Building: For an additional amount to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry forward the improvements affecting the Senate wing of the Capitol authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), and July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 472), $600,000. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts, including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as approved by the Special Committee on Reconstruction of Senate Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of Senate Chamber, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the Senate wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the Senate committee appointed under section 1 of the act of July 17, 1945, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of that act: *Provided*, That the amounts so approved by such committee may be obligated in full prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 2, to insert:

ADDITIONAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Acquisition of site: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to acquire on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise (any condemnation proceedings to be in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1415)), as a site for an additional office building for the United States Senate, all of the land, buildings, and other structures and alleys and parts of alleys (whether private or public) contained in that part of square 725 in the District of Columbia, bounded on the west by First Street NE., on the north by C Street NE., on the south by B Street NE., and on the east by the west boundaries of lots Nos. 104, 105, 840, 805, and 80 and by a line running from the northwest corner of lot No. 805 across the 30-foot alley to a point on the southern boundary of lot No. 840 due north of such corner and from such point to the southwest corner of lot No. 840, and also to acquire in similar manner lot No. 852 in said square 725, as such square appears on the records in the office of the surveyor of the District of Columbia as of the date of the approval of this land; and, upon acquisition of such property or any part thereof to provide for the demolition and removal as expeditiously as possible of any buildings or other structures on any

such land acquired and, pending such demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property; $1,100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to insert:

Construction and equipment of building: To enable the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, at a total cost (exclusive of site and other expenses authorized under the preceding paragraph) not to exceed $20,600,000, and in substantial accordance with the preliminary plans prepared under the authority of the act of July 11, 1947 (Public Law 169, 80th Cong.), and approved by the Senate Office Building Commission, with such modification as may be necessary or advantageous, to provide for the construction and equipment of a fireproof office building for the use of the United States Senate on the site hereinbefore designated, containing committee and office rooms and such other rooms and accommodations as may be approved by the Senate Office Building Commission, including connections with the present Senate Office Building and subway transportation system by suitable tunnels and transportation system under First Street and B Street NE., and structural and other changes in the present building and subway system necessitated thereby, and also including approaches, connections with the Capitol Power Plant and public utilities, and architectural landscape treatment of the grounds, $850,000; *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for materials, supplies, equipment, accessories, advertising, travel, personal and other services, and any other items required for the proper completion of the project, and to obligate in full the total amount of $20,600,000 herein authorized, prior to the actual appropriation thereof, notwithstanding that an initial amount of only $850,000 thereof is herein appropriated, and notwithstanding any other partial appropriations that may hereafter be made: *Provided further*, That upon completion of the project, the building and the grounds and sidewalks surrounding the same shall be subject to the provisions of the act of June 8, 1942 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 174 (c) and (d)) and the act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718), in the same manner and to the same extent as the present Senate Office Building and the grounds and sidewalks surrounding the same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 23, to insert:

Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnishings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, fiscal year 1949, $15,000, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Funds appropriated to the President," on page 13, after line 12, to insert:

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to enable the Commission during the fiscal year 1949 to carry out the provisions of S. 2242, Eightieth Congress, entitled "A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes," including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed 15, including 1 at not to exceed $3,000) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; and purchases and services abroad without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; $3,500,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with governmental and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Independent offices—Federal Security Agency," on page 15, after line 5, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

National Institute of Health, operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "National Institute of Health, operating expenses," $1,000,000; and the limitation under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949, on the purchase of passenger motor vehicles is increased from 10 to 16, of which 10 shall be for replacement only: *Provided*, That appropriations under said head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for carrying out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 16, to insert:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Working capital fund: For establishment of a working capital fund in accordance with and for carrying out the purposes of S. 2767, Eightieth Congress, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 2767, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency," on page 16, after line 7, to insert:

Administrative expenses, water-pollution control: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the administrative functions of the Federal Works Agency under the provisions of S. 418, relating to pollution-control activities, $75,000, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel, printing, and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 418, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings Administration," on page 16, after line 17, to insert:

Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For preparation of plans for buildings and facilities at Cincinnati, Ohio, for the use of the Public Health Service, as provided for by S. 418, Eightieth Congress, $200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 418, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 24, to insert:

Improvement of post-office facilities, Los Angeles, Calif.: For the construction of an additional story and the extension and remodeling of the existing Terminal Annex Station, Los Angeles, Calif., as provided for by H. R. 5750, Eightieth Congress, $1,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 5750, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 21, after the figures "$750,000", to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 21, to insert:

National industrial reserve: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the duties imposed upon the Federal Works Agency by S. 2554 or H. R. 6098, Eightieth Congress, relating to the retention and maintenance of a national industrial reserve, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $35 per diem, and maintenance, protection, repair, restoration, renovation, and other services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; $10,000,000; and in addition, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to enter into contract, for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000: *Provided*, That appropriations or funds available to the War Assets Administration for use in connection with property or functions transferred to the Federal Works Agency under the provisions of S. 2554, or H. R. 6098, Eightieth Congress, shall be transferred, in such amounts as may be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Federal Works Agency for the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either S. 2554 or H. R. 6098, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after the amendment just stated, to insert:

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Disaster relief, public facilities: For expenses necessary to alleviate damage or hardship caused by flood, tornado, fire, or other catastrophe respecting which the President

has heretofore made a determination under the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 233), by grants, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Federal Works Administrator, to local public agencies to assist them in defraying the cost of (1) the repair, restoration, replacement, or reconstruction of local public facilities damaged or destroyed by such catastrophe and (2) the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools necessary for children of families from Vanport City, Oreg., including personal services in the District of Columbia, $35,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1950: *Provided*, That no grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that other Federal funds are not available for such facilities and that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 4 percent of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses required in connection with such grants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 19, to insert:

Maintenance and operation of schools: For carrying out the provisions of S. 2795 or H. R. 6527, Eightieth Congress, relating to assistance to certain local school agencies, fiscal year 1949, $5,000,000, of which not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including travel, printing and binding, and personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either S. 2795 or H. R. 6527, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Accounting Office," on page 21, line 6, after the word "Salaries", to strike out "450,000" and insert "$680,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 6, to insert:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Contingent upon the enactment of the Federal Housing Act of 1948, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is hereby authorized to increase in the aggregate not to exceed $2,000,000 the allocation for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator, Federal Housing Administration, National Home Mortgage Corporation, and the Public Housing Administration for carrying out the provisions of said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 18, to insert:

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Maintenance and operation of properties: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Maintenance and operation of properties," $2,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 22, to insert:

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission: For expenses necessary for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to prepare and carry out a program for the commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, as authorized by the act of July 18, 1947 (Public Law 203), including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses of employees; travel, hotel, and other necessary expenses of the Commissioners; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $35 per diem; deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail; and rent in the District of Columbia; $15,000, to remain available during the life of the Commission: *Provided*, That the Commission may accept and utilize gifts of money or services from private individuals and organizations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 15, to insert:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the provisions of H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress, establishing the Selective Service System, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when specifically authorized by the Director; purchase (not to exceed 94) of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and purchase of typewriters; $31,800,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 8, to insert:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief," $245,000, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 12, to insert:

Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for "Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans," $1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services," and to be available for the purposes specified under this head in the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663), as extended by the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia," on page 24, after line 21, to insert:

PUBLIC WELFARE

Day-care centers: For all expenses necessary for the transfer, maintenance, and operation of a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of children of school or under school age, including personal services, as authorized by Public Law 123, approved June 27, 1947, as amended, fiscal year 1949, $150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 3, to insert:

PUBLIC WORKS

Operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Operating expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings," $12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 8, to insert:

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended (46 Stat. 500), $8,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Audited claims," on page 26, line 21, after the numerals "1945", to strike out "$8.80" and insert $1,566.19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 5, after the words "In all", to strike out "$28,167.50" and insert "$29,724.89."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture," on page 28, after line 11, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses for carrying into effect those provisions of the Housing Act of 1948, imposing duties upon the Secretary of Agriculture, including printing and binding and personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, technical services and research, $150,000, which shall be available for allocation by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several agencies of the Department, to local public agencies, and to State agencies through the Agricultural Extension Service: *Provided*, That this appropriation is made contingent upon the enactment of the Housing Act of 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Agricultural Research Administration—Bureau of Animal Industry—Salaries and expenses," on page 29, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$15,000"; and in line 8, after the name "Columbia", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 19, to insert:

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Insect and plant disease control: For an additional amount fiscal year 1949, for "Insect and plant disease control," to carry out the Golden Nematode Act of June —, 1948 (Public Law —), including not to exceed $11,970 for personal services in the District of Columbia and the purchase of not to exceed seven passenger motor vehicles, $492,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 13, to insert:

FOREST SERVICE

EMERGENCY RECONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR

Emergency reconstruction and repair: For the reconstruction or replacement of roads, trails, bridges, telephone lines, and other facilities and improvements in the national forests damaged or destroyed by floods in May and June 1948, $4,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 21, to insert:

LOANS TO FARMERS, 1948 FLOOD DAMAGE

Loans to farmers, 1948 flood damage: To provide assistance to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1948,

$6,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1949, which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize through any existing agency or bureau for loans in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe for the purpose of aiding such farmers to continue farming operations, and for all necessary administrative expenses in connection with making and servicing such loans, including printing and binding, and personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce," on page 32, after line 2, to insert:

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Census of business: For expenses necessary to collect, compile, and publish the 1949 census of business in accordance with the act of June —, 1948 (Public Law —), including personal services at the seat of government; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; $2,480,000, to be available July 1, 1948, and to remain available until December 31, 1951: *Provided*, That funds for administrative expenses may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation "General administration, Bureau of the Census."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 17, to insert:

Census of transportation: For expenses necessary to collect, compile, and publish the 1949 census of transportation in accordance with the act of June —, 1948 (Public Law —), including personal services at the seat of government; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; $220,000, to be available July 1, 1948, and to remain available until December 31, 1951: *Provided*, That funds for administrative expenses may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation "General administration, Bureau of the Census."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 6, to insert:

Census of mineral industries: For expenses necessary to collect, compile, and publish the 1949 census of mineral industries in accordance with the act of June —, 1948 (Public Law —), including personal services at the seat of government; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; $80,000, to be available July 1, 1948, and to remain available until December 31, 1951: *Provided*, That funds for administrative expenses may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation "General Administration, Bureau of the Census."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 34, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$341,499."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "one public airport" and insert "two public airports, one at Fairbanks and one"; in line 13, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000"; in line 17, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000"; and in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 6, after "per diem", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 6, to insert:

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946, $500,000: *Provided*, That such $500,000 shall be included in, and available for grants as part of, the discretionary fund established by section 6 (b) of said act: *Provided further*, That if and when an appropriation is made under this head for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and apportioned pursuant to section 6 (a) of said act, any portion of the sum appropriated herein which shall theretofore have been obligated for a project shall be assessed against the apportionment for the State in which such project is located and the amount of the State apportionment so assessed shall be transferred to the said discretionary fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 19, to insert:

Hereafter the salary of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration shall (unless increased to a higher amount by other law enacted either prior or subsequent to this act) be at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," on page 36, after line 7, to insert:

Departmental salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Departmental salaries and expenses," $150,000, and the amount made available under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1949, for transfer to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the Secretary is increased from $190,000 to $194,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 14, to insert:

Field office service: For an additional amount for "Field office service," fiscal year 1949, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 6, after the word "act", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation may be used to enforce any regulation prohibiting the export of one-hundred-pound bags of flour as or in gift packages of any type.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary," on page 37, after line 21, to insert:

Columbia Basin flood repair: To enable the Secretary of the Interior, through such bureaus of the Department of the Interior as he may designate, and in such manner as he shall determine, to reimburse applicable appropriations for costs of manpower and equipment diverted for flood work and to repair, reconstruct, rehabilitate, and replace structures, buildings, and other facilities (including equipment) under the jurisdiction of the Department damaged or destroyed by the flood in the Columbia Basin area, $2,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 12, to insert:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Red Lake Band, Chippewa Indians, Minnesota (tribal funds): For a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Minnesota, $130,000, payable from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber of the Red Lake Reservation: *Provided*, That this amount is made available contingent upon the enactment of H. R. 5355, Eightieth Congress, second session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 20, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Fort Sumner irrigation district, New Mexico: For the purpose of aiding and assisting the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico to protect its diversion dam and the existing works of said irrigation district from flood damage, in the event the Secretary of the Interior determines that flood damage is or appears to be imminent, $60,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 3, to insert:

Construction: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Construction," $453,000, to remain available until expended for Preston Bench project, Idaho: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 1987, Eightieth Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 8, to insert:

ADVANCES TO COLORADO RIVER DAM FUND

Boulder Canyon project: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Boulder Canyon project," $600,000, to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River dam fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Military Establishment—Department of the Army—Civil functions—Corps of Engineers," on page 41, after line 6, to insert:

Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for "Flood control, general," including the objects specified under this head in the "Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1949," $2,000,000, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Public works," on page 42, line 22, after the word "expended", to strike out "$47,983,200" and insert "$51,337,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Continental United States," on page 46, after line 21, to insert:

Naval Air Station, Key West (Boca Chica), Fla.: Acquisition of land, approximately 1,000 acres, $60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Outside Continental United States," on page 49, after line 17, to insert:

Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca, P. R.: Radio operating facilities, including collateral equipment, accessory construction and transfer of land, $3,294,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—Foreign Service," on page 52, line 22, after the word "Service", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,430,754."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 2, after the word "Service", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International activities," on page 53, after line 22, to insert:

United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, bureaus: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, $50,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation is contingent upon the enactment of S. 2341, Eightieth Congress, second session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 12, after the word "of", to insert "June 14, 1948"; in line 13, after the word "Law", to insert "643"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "(S. J. Res. 98)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department," on page 55, after line 6, to insert:

FISCAL SERVICE

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

Contingent expenses, public moneys: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Contingent expenses, public moneys," $12,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Refunds under Renegotiation Act, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 20, to insert:

COAST GUARD

Acquisition, construction, and improvements: For an additional amount under the title "Acquisition, construction, and improvements, Coast Guard," for replacement or rebuilding of aids to navigation and shore facilities, $400,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments," on page 57, line 10, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 177 and"; and in line 12, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$12,838,409.60" and insert "$15,231,868.15."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—General provisions," on page 61, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 401. Except as otherwise provided therein, the Renegotiation Act of 1948 (sec. 3 of Public Law 547, 80th Cong.) shall apply to all contracts entered into by the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force, obligating funds from any appropriations provided herein or hereafter or in any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1949, and all subcontracts under such contracts. This section shall also apply in like manner to contracts entered into by any other department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government pursuant to authority or direction of the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and chargeable against any such appropriations, and all subcontracts under such contracts. For the purposes of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 the term "subcontract" means any purchase order or agreement to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any article, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 16, to change the section number from "402" to "401."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 4, to change the section number from "403" to "402."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have four minor amendments proposed by the committee, which I send to the dask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the four committee amendments submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] on behalf of the committee.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "each," to insert "*Provided*, That the provisions of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, shall not apply to two positions of special employees under the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for 1949 is amended accordingly."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 17, to insert:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," fiscal year 1949, $100,000: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head for fiscal year 1949 shall be available for the preparation of plans and specifications for the National Institute of Dental Research buildings and facilities provided for in H. R. 6726 which shall be available for transfer to the Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations made herein shall be available only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 6726, Eightieth Congress, second session."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 20, to insert "National Industrial Reserve". Transfer this appropriation to follow line 21 on page 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, lines 15 and 16, strike out "June —, 1948 (Public Law —), S. (1675)" and insert "June 16, 1948 (Public Law 653)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

For payment to the following-named contractors in the following designated amounts in full settlement of their claims, legal or equitable, of any nature whatsoever arising out of or connected with the notice by the United States Reclamation Service of the exhaustion of funds for payment of contractors' earnings in connection with the construction of the Friant-Kern canal, California, Peter Kiewit Son's Co., $186,195.33; Arizona-Nevada Constructors, $348,867.62; Morrison-Knudson, Inc., and M. H. Hassler, $217,618.47; Bechtel Bros.-McCone Co., $32,018.51; in all, $784,699.93.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the amendment. The Senate will remember that last year a serious situation arose in the Central Valley, Calif. Because of lack of funds, as the contractors thought, they shut down their work. I am offering the amendment out of a feeling of conscientiousness. I offer it because I feel I was in part at fault because that situation arose. The only objection that can be made to the amendment is that it might set a precedent for similar claims at some later time; but I assure the Senate that under no circumstances within the lifetime of any Senator in this body could a similar situation arise. There would be no difficulty about the matter at all if in a half-dozen different places appropriate action had been taken. If the Bureau of the Budget had notified the Bureau of Reclamation that it was possible for them to divert funds to pay the contractors, the situation would not have arisen. If the contractors themselves had made inquiry in Washington, they could have learned that at the very moment they shut down the work Congress was in process of providing the necessary funds. If their attorney had done so, it would have been all right. I am offering this amendment because I feel that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I did not do my full duty to ascertain the facts when the matter was under consideration by the Senate.

In good conscience, therefore, I offer the amendment. The figures in the amendment are based upon instructions given by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to the contractors and the Bureau of Reclamation to get together and determine what would be a fair settlement of the damages. The contractors presented a bill for approximately $2,000,000. These figures were worked over and agreed upon between the Bureau of Reclamation and

the contractors as being a fair settlement of the loss.

In my opinion, the bill should be paid.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why do they not go to the Court of Claims.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because they cannot get into the Court of Claims.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because, under the law, a contract made with any contractor, whether it be by the Board of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation, if the contract is subject to appropriations by Congress, they have notice that if they do any work beyond that, however beneficial it might be to the United States, they have no standing in the Court of Claims.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why did they not file their claim in the regular way so that it would go through the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. My judgment is that neither the Judiciary Committee nor any other committee would devote the weeks of time that our committee devoted to a study of the problem, and give it any better judgment as to what should be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say that I think the amendment should not be agreed to. There is a committee which could proceed to hear the claim in the regular way, and that is the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator from Arizona move to suspend the rule?

Mr. HAYDEN. No point of order was made. If the point of order is made, I shall move to suspend the rule.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment violates rule V.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order raised by the Senator from Minnesota is sustained.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Chair to page 8410 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, wherein I filed a proper motion for suspension of the rules. I move that the rules be suspended and that my amendment be adopted. I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask for a division.

On a division the motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Michigan with reference to the committee amendment on page 21 of the bill, relating to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I notice that it reads as follows:

Contingent upon the enactment of the Federal Housing Act of 1948, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is hereby authorized to increase in the aggregate not to exceed $2,000,000 the allocation for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator, Federal Housing Administration, National Home Mortgage Corporation, and the Public Housing Administration for carrying out the provisions of said act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to answer the question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will address the question, then, to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I did not get the point of the Senator's question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have not yet stated the question. I was simply referring to the amendment on page 21 and calling attention to the fact that an additional amount of $2,000,000 is provided upon the passing by this Congress of the Federal Housing Act of 1948. I very much fear that as a result of the attitude expressed by the House of Representatives, or those who are in charge of that legislation, there will not be enacted into law a Federal Housing Act of 1948. But there exists this condition, that as a result of the $750,000,000 authorization which we gave to FHA in December, and an additional $400,000,000 authorization that we gave in March——

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to finish my statement, if I may.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator is laboring under a misapprehension, because this item was put in in pursuance of testimony which came up in that form in connection with the Housing Act of 1948. It has nothing to do with the situation of which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that. It is a figure that certainly ought to go in some other bill, rather than in this deficiency appropriation bill. This is the only place that there is any additional money provided for administrative expenses for the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. BALL. It was the only budget figure before the committee concerning this subject.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And is this the only place in this bill?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is outstanding throughout the United States today approximately a billion dollars in commitments for buildings to be erected under title 6 of the FHA Act. It is not 1949 money. In fact, we do not put up the money at all. We simply insure the loans. The loans were authorized in December 1947 and in March 1948, but as to the buildings, the money has not yet been spent. The commitments have been made.

There have been no inspection of these buildings because they have not been erected, and there is no money available with which to make the inspections or to process the loans or construction commitments which have been made. It is estimated that they need $1,650,000. Of course, we discussed this matter a few days ago when the Government corporations appropriation bill was under consideration, and I believe that the Senator from Michigan at that time misunderstood the situation from the statement he made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I thought the Senator was talking about a question that was connected with the pending bill. The matter the Senator is discussing is covered in the Government corporations bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; but there was no money carried in that bill, and if it was not carried, and if they need money, it seems to me it should be in this deficiency bill, and the payment should not be made contingent on the happening of something that is not going to happen.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand what the Senator is requesting.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They are going to come here July 1, or even today in connection with the various buildings for which commitments have been made throughout the country, and there will be no money with which to process those commitments, and no money with which to inspect the buildings when they are erected. This is not money which is appropriated, it is not money that is paid out of the Treasury of the United States. It is simply an authorization for the FHA to use a part of the fees which are paid in for that particular purpose. I believe, Mr. President, that some provision should be made in this bill to take care of these outstanding commitments.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and myself, I send to the desk an amendment which I wish to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, after line 8, it is proposed to insert, under a new heading "Rural Electrification Administration," a new paragraph to read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1949, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1949, $450,000, such sum to be in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for such fiscal year.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, an amendment increasing the amounts for REA administrative expenses was adopted on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, but was an amendment to the independent offices bill, where it did not belong, and the House conferees rejected it. When the deficiency subcommittee was considering the same amendment, we figured the Senate action of a few days ago would stand, and therefore we did not accept it. I think the committee would have been in favor of the amendment, because since then it has been thrown out of the other bill. So I am going to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if any consideration was given to an appropriation under the authority of the Smith-Mundt Act, Public Law 402, for the cooperative exchange of persons authorized by that act.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, we considered the estimate submitted by the State Department for $5,000,000. We were working under pressure at the time and did not have time to go into the estimate. What we had before us did not seem adequate, and the committee was unanimous in rejecting the item and in telling the State Department to come back January 1. We did not think a delay of 6 months would do any harm. We simply did not have time to go into the estimates the way they should have been examined.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this matter was discussed when the first deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration, and the committee withheld the appropriation from that bill on the understanding of the Department that it would be considered in connection with the second deficiency appropriation bill.

It seems to me that this is but another instance of the practice which has become very common in both Houses of Congress, that a legislative act is adopted by a very substantial majority, authorizing certain things, and in a way committing the country, as in the case of the ECA authorization, and then the appropriation committees follow along and completely disregard what the Congress has determined to be a policy.

For that reason, Mr. President, and in order to keep the record straight, I should like to propose an amendment, which I assume, from the attitude of the committee members, will be rejected, but I do think that an amendment carrying at least a million dollars should be offered to carry out the cooperative exchange of persons as authorized by Public Law 402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator submit his amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I offer such an amendment, to be inserted at the proper place, on page 53, I think it is, but I should like to have the clerk insert it at the proper point. I believe it would be in proper form if it provided "to carry out the exchange of persons under Public Law 402, $1,000,000."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For what purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to support the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a telegram in my hand from the president of the University of Florida calling attention to this omission, and stating in so many words that the commitments already made are going to be seriously affected, and that there will be disappointment and ill will instead of the good will that is intended to be created by the exchange of scholarships.

I certainly hope that the very modest sum requested by the Senator from Arkansas will be approved. He requests only one-fifth of the amount of the estimate of the State Department, and I am not at all certain that even that will be sufficient to carry on the program until, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, the matter can be presented in a subsequent bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize the amount is wholly inadequate, but in view of the attitude of the committee, if it does not intend completely to nullify the policy of the act referred to, I thought surely they would accept this amendment calling for this appropriation. In order to get this program going the committee did approve a small appropriation of $60,000, which was simply to get some organizational work done. That was not intended actually to finance any exchanges. That is hanging up in the air, and there will be no money for the actual exchange of persons under the law.

I reiterate, if we are not going to carry out the program we should not have adopted it, and if we have changed our minds I think those who have undertaken in the Committee on Appropriations to nullify the policy should offer a repealer of that part of the law. It should not be left in force, both our own people and other people expecting something to be done under it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. It seems to me that with a program under way, and relying upon an announced policy of the Congress, in good faith we should go ahead and finance the program. We are leaving our educational institutions and our educational leaders in the lurch by not backing them up in the efforts which they have already started in pursuance of legislation we have adopted. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated. I rather resent the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas that the Committee on Appropriations pays no attention to authorization acts passed by the Congress. We have in the regular bill $28,000,000 for this informational and educational program. The bill was passed early this year. The State Department had ample time to bring these estimates to the committee. Instead, they come in on the last day of the session, practically, asking us to approve estimates totaling $5,000,000 for this program. Just glancing through the items, I think most Members of Congress are of the opinion that this program is an exchange-of-students program. Out of $5,000,000 which the State Department requested, $500,000 went for exchange of students, and the rest of it went largely to employ war personnel here in Washington in about 20 different departments.

There was one item we did not have time to go into, and I do not have the faintest idea of what it means. That was an item of $250,000-plus for grants to labor unions. I do not have the faintest idea of what it means. But as a responsible Member of the Senate and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am not prepared to approve items of a quarter of a million dollars or any other amount, having no idea of what is planned to be done with the money. I have been in favor of exchange of students, but I must say that under the so-called Fulbright Act, which provided for exchange of students with the countries in the Orient, several hundred thousand dollars have been spent, and so far there have been only four students exchanged, which is a pretty expensive per capita proposal. I think the Appropriations Committee is entitled to enough time to go into estimates of this kind before we vote such amounts of funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe I understood the Senator from Minnesota to say that the State Department has made no effort to present these estimates. I was informed that the State Department presented them to the House committee and asked for hearings on them, but that the committee refused hearings, and, therefore, they had no opportunity until the measure got to the Senate. They could not, of course, make the House committee consider them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on page 16, after line 6.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the remarks I made just a short time ago with regard to the appropriation for the Cooperative Exchange of Persons, the report I hold in my hand from the Committee on International Interchange of Jurists, Section of International and Comparative Law, American Bar Association, be included, together with the remarks of Prof. Claude Horack, former dean of Duke University Law School, at the dinner given in his honor by the Inter-American Bar Association and the Duke University alumni, at the Dodge Hotel, Washington, D. C., June 16, 1948.

I merely wish to say that this report and statement applies directly to the matter which was being discussed with regard to the failure of the Committee on Appropriations to include an appropriation for the Smith-Mundt Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL INTERCHANGE OF JURISTS, SECTION OF INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

To the Members of the Section of International and Comparative Law:

Since the meeting of the association at Cleveland, Ohio, September 21–23, 1947, there have been a number of important developments in the various activities covered by the work of this committee. The following developments are of particular interest:

1. Fulbright Act: The Fulbright Act, approved August 1, 1946 (Public Law 584, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 754), provided for the education of students from the United States in foreign countries on scholarships financed by the proceeds of surplus war materials sold in those countries. Transportation of foreign students to and from the United States may also be paid from these funds. All grants to American citizens under the act may include tuition or salary, maintenance, and

travel expenses, and will be paid to the recipient in the currency of the country to which he goes. Grants will normally be made for the period of one academic year. Selection of candidates in general will be guided by excellence of scholastic or professional achievement, and preference will be given to veterans of World Wars I and II. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate a proficiency in the language of the country to which they go wherever it is essential to the project which they propose to undertake.

As previously reported considerable delay occurred in the negotiation of agreements to give effect to the provisions of this act. It is a pleasure to report now that the following agreements have been completed:

(a) Agreement between the United States and China signed November 10, 1947 (press release No. 890; Department of State Publication No. 3050).

(b) Agreement between the United States and Burma signed December 22, 1947 (press release No. 980; Department of State Publication No. 3051).

(c) Agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines signed March 23, 1948.

(d) Agreement between the United States and Greece signed April 23, 1948.

Many other agreements have been transmitted to eligible governments, the eligibility being established when a foreign government purchases surplus war materials from the United States.

A board of foreign scholarships to select American students for study abroad under the act has been appointed. As of April 1, 1948, the membership of that board was as follows:

Col. John N. Andrews, personal representative of the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Sarah Gibson Blanding, president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Laurence Duggan, director, Institute of International Education, New York, N. Y.

Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.

Walter Johnson, professor of history, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Ernest O. Lawrence, professor of physics, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Martin R. P. McGuire, acting dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Catholic University of America, Washington D. C.

Francis Trow Spaulding, chairman, board of foreign scholarships, Commissioner of Education, State of New York, Albany, N. Y.

John W. Studebaker, Commissioner, United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Helen C. White, vice chairman, professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Persons desiring information should write to the Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y.

2. Latin-American student exchange: Pursuant to the provisions of the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations of 1936, the exchange of students with Latin-American countries has been increased during the past year.

There are 35 students from Latin America who are now studying law in the United States as indicated in the following list:

State	Institution	Country of origin	Name
California	Los Angeles City College	Costa Rica	Zuniga, Robert Lionel.
Florida	University of Miami	Cuba	Morgado, Martha.
Louisiana	Louisiana State University	Honduras	Matamoros, Daniel.
Do	do	Panama	Ramirez, Martim.
Do	do	do	Ruir, José Antonio.
Do	do	Venezuela	Sahagun, Teresa.
Do	Southeastern Louisiana College	Nicaragua	Stadthagen, Salvador A.
Massachusetts	Harvard University	Bolivia	Rivero, E. Guillermo.
Do	do	Mexico	Sigueiros, José L.
Do	do	Nicaragua	Arguello, S. Adan.
Do	do	Peru	Reissner, Arthur J.
New Mexico	University of New Mexico	Mexico	Baez, Paul H.
New York	Cornell University	Venezuela	Mateu, José Armando.
Do	New York University	Argentina	Bledel, Enrique Einar.
Do	do	do	Bunge, Edsardo Alfredo.
Do	do	do	Gabay, Colombo Alberto.
Do	do	do	Nasjlet, Oscar Gmo.
Do	do	Brazil	Amaral, Sylvio Do.
Do	do	do	Betrao, Helio Marco P.
Do	do	do	Frazao, Guimaraes, C. A.
Do	do	do	Oliveira, Aitamir.
Do	do	do	Paashaus, Gustavo Cintra.
Do	do	Costa Rica	Facio, Segrada Gonzalo.
Do	do	Mexico	Carrillo, Hector.
Do	do	do	Zamora, Morales Jorge.
Do	do	Peru	Cisneros, Maximo.
Do	do	do	Guevara, Alberto Luis.
Do	do	Uruguay	Vallarino, Carlos Rivero.
Do	do	Venezuela	Laya, Morales Luis.
Ohio	University of Toledo	Ecuador	Cordova, Carlos Alberto.
Pennsylvania	Muhlenberg College	Brazil	Wisznat, Frederico A. G.
Virginia	Roanoke College	Cuba	Nuez, Lezcano V.
Do	University of Virginia	Panama	Wong, George Ramiro.
Do	do	Venezuela	Corneli, Goodrich Bruce.
Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	Costa Rica	Montealegre, José R.

Recapitulation

Country of origin:	*Number*
Argentina	4
Bolivia	1
Brazil	6
Costa Rica	3
Cuba	2
Ecuador	1
Honduras	1
Mexico	4
Nicaragua	2
Panama	3
Peru	3
Uruguay	1
Venezuela	4
Total	35

There are eight students from the United States who are studying law in Latin-American countries under Public Law 346—Seventy-eighth Congress (GI bill of rights) as of March 31, 1948.

Country and institution:	*Number of law students*
Costa Rica: University of Costa Rica	1
El Salvador: Universidad Autonomo de El Salvador	1
Cuba: University of Habana	2
Ecuador: Universidad Catolica del Ecuador	2
Mexico: National University of Mexico	2
Total	8

Dr. Felipe Gil, secretary of the University of Montevideo, visited the United States on a Department of State grant. There is one United States student, Irving Glenne Tragen, of California, studying labor legislation in Mexico under the United States Government travel-maintenance grant program. Mr. Tragen, who is carrying out independent research, is a member of the California bar.

3. Privately financed interchange of law students: The Institute of Inter-American Law, organized by Arthur T. Vanderbilt, dean of New York University Law School, began its work on September 2, 1947, with 17 students enrolled from eight countries in the Americas. Dean Vanderbilt was appointed chief justice of New Jersey. The work of the institute is being actively carried forward by Dr. Miguel A. de Capriles who is the director of the institute. Its work was the subject of an interesting address delivered by Dr. de Capriles at the Lima Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association. It is believed that this institute is performing a highly important function and we hope that it will succeed.

Another similar organization, namely, the Southwestern Legal Foundation of Southern Methodist University has been organized under the leadership of Dean Robert G. Storey, of the law school of that university. This institute is holding inaugural ceremonies on the date of our spring meeting, May 22, 1948. We wish it success in its activities. Its proximity to Mexico and Central America gives it a particularly favorable location for students from those countries. Exchange of students and professors from foreign countries will be stimulated.

4. No interchange with Russia: As indicated in our previous report, the United States Ambassador at Moscow, the Honorable Walter Bedell Smith, has endeavored to arrange for the interchange of persons for the advancement of cultural and scholarly understanding and knowledge with Russia. Although further efforts have been made to bring about such exchanges, no progress has been accomplished.

5. Fifth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association: The fifth conference of the IABA was held at Lima, Peru, November 25–December 8, 1947. The deans of several law schools of this hemisphere met at the University of San Marcos and under the chairmanship of Dr. Luis Alberto Sanchez, many important resolutions were drafted which were later adopted at the closing plenary session. The conference adopted 133 resolutions and brought together the leaders of the bar in an interchange of views on the problems of the legal profession which will be far-reaching in its effects on the legal history of their nations.

6. Survey of Pan American law schools: Resolution LXIV of the fourth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, held at Santiago, Chile, October 20–29, 1945, provided that the association "recommend to the various nations of the American Continent, in regard to the credit in other countries of professional degrees and diplomas granted by a recognized university in one of them, that such degrees and diplomas be accredited in the other countries, giving credit for studies which do not deal with the legislation or case law of the country in which the approval is given, and requiring an examination in studies which deal with such legislation and case law and the other requisites of practice in said country.

"(c) To recommend to the law schools of the universities of America that a congress of the professors of law be convened in order to study and determine the measures tending to achieve uniformity in the studies, programs, and curricula in the said schools.

"(d) To recommend that the same congress shall determine the qualifications that

may be necessary for entrance in said law schools."

At the fifth conference at Lima it was decided to recommend as follows:

"Resolution 92: (1) To reiterate the recommendations made by the fourth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association to the law schools of the universities of the Americas, that a congress of professors of law be convened in order to determine the role of law schools in legal education; to study measures which might tend to achieve uniformity in studies, courses, and programs; and to determine the qualifications that may be required for entrance to said law schools."

In order that students throughout this hemisphere may be encouraged to carry on their studies in different law schools it is essential that they should be able to receive credit for work previously done in accredited law schools. No complete up-to-date information with respect to the work of the law schools, however, is available and consequently no satisfactory arrangement for interchange of credits has been made between the law schools of the United States and those of the other nations of the hemisphere. In order to remedy this situation, the Inter-American Bar Association has arranged with the aid of a grant from the Department of State to send Dr. Claude Horack, retiring Dean of Duke University Law School, to the Latin-American nations to conduct a survey of their law schools including their curricula, methods, physical equipment, personnel, and exchange opportunities. Dr. Horack is scheduled to leave the United States from New Orleans on June 25, 1948, and after visiting practically all of the Latin-American countries will return to the United States about May 1, 1949. His report will be presented at the Sixth Conference of the I. A. B. A. to be held at Detroit, Mich., May 22–June 1, 1949.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH E. DAVIES,
WILLIAM CULLEN DENNIS,
ARTHUR K. KUHN,
JACOB M. LASHLY,
WILLIAM L. RANSOM,
CARL B. RIX,
HAROLD E. STASSEN,
WILLIAM ROY VALLANCE,
Chairman.

MAY 14, 1948.

REMARKS OF PROF. CLAUDE HORACK, FORMER DEAN OF DUKE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, AT THE DINNER GIVEN IN HIS HONOR BY THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AND THE DUKE UNIVERSITY ALUMNI, JUNE 16, 1948, DODGE HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The objectives of the trip through Central and South America and the Caribbean area are to help promote a better understanding between the law schools of the United States and the Latin-American countries. At the present time it is safe to say that only three or four law schools in the United States have a fair understanding of the type and objectives of legal education in these countries, and it is a fair assumption that the Latin-American countries know as little about North American legal education. Each group has a long history and tradition behind it which has affected its viewpoint. Should we be able to effect in even a slight degree a friendly and understanding attitude of one group toward the other, that in itself will be most worth while.

Already there is a very great interest in the interchange of students. Many young men from the United States are applying under the GI bill to study in Latin-American law schools because they see in this an opportunity to represent United States interests in these countries. On the other hand, there are now about 40 students from Latin-American countries who are studying law in the law schools of the United States. It seems quite apparent that this movement will accelerate, and within the next few years we may expect a very great interchange. The business interests of the Latin Americas that deal with United States business interests are equally concerned about having in their offices, or in the offices of their legal advisers, young men who know something of United States business and traditions and law.

The provision for extension of credit to Latin-American students has already been made by the Association of American Law Schools, which now provides for at least 1 year of transfer credit, and in some cases, such as in the schools of Louisiana, as much as 2 years.

Up to the present time the difficulty in most schools has been that a school in the United States has not known what to do with a student from Latin America or how to evaluate his credits, either for entrance or for law-school credit. In the short time I have been interested in this matter, I have already made a great discovery, and that is that I could send transcripts to Dr. Jorge Basadre, of the Pan American Union, or to the United States Bureau of Education, and I would be told what the credits were worth from the standpoint of requirements for admission. If I did nothing else, I would do a great service to the law schools of this country by bringing this fact to their attention. In a few cases on which I had to pass as dean of the law school, I wrote to all the law schools I could think of which had had some experience, to try to obtain some help, at least enough on which to pass a judgment as to the students' qualifications. The information I received was very sketchy and sometimes very inaccurate, yet here was a source of information about which I knew nothing and which would have made it much easier for a student to enter the law school of his choice. As this movement of students gains force, I know that Dr. Basadre's help and that of the Bureau of Education, will be of inestimable value and will do much to promote cultural relations in the Western Hemisphere. So our main objective is to secure better understanding of the purposes and methods of the schools involved in these interchanges and seek to effect a better understanding so that we may get to see the other fellow's viewpoint, with the result of securing better relations between lawyers and the countries they represent.

As to the manner in which the trip has been arranged, it is sponsored by the Inter-American Bar Association, the membership of which, as you know, is composed of various bar associations in the hemisphere. We are much indebted to the support given by the American Bar Association, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia and the Women's Bar, the Federal Bar Association, and the many other legal organizations which are members and have contributed through their membership to the support of the association which sponsors this trip. The major portion of the funds has been provided by the Department of State through a grant-in-aid, and I am also indebted to Duke University for the aid which it has given me to make possible this venture.

As to the countries to be visited, this takes in nearly all of the Latin-American Republics. After visiting with a number of law-school deans in Washington, I will proceed to Louisiana, the one civil-law jurisdiction in the United States, where I will talk with the three schools there to get their ideas about the interchange of students and how it can be best effected. Some day I hope to visit the interesting institution which was established by Judge Arthur Vanderbilt at New York University where at the present time a large portion of the Latin American law students are studying. There is a most sympathetic interest in the problem in Southern-Methodist University where, under the leadership of Dean Robert Storey, an institute similar to the one started by New York University is now beginning operations. Many other schools are considering the problem and are establishing courses which will be of particular value to Latin American students.

Because of the vast territory involved, it will not be possible at this time to visit all schools, but at least one law school in most of the Latin-American Republics will be visited. The first stop will be in Ecuador, then to Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Colombia, where the South American trip must necessarily end because this takes up to the 1st of December at which time the schools of most South American countries begin their summer vacations. The first stop in Central America will be at Guatemala, then to Honduras and to Mexico, and finally a hop to the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Cuba, and then back to the United States after almost 11 months. A survey can in no way be complete in this length of time, but at least it is a start and I hope it may be carried on by others in subsequent years until we have as full information about Latin-American schools as the American Bar Association now has through its system of school inspection and surveys covering the law schools of the United States.

It is interesting to note that a movement has started in South America for an association of law professors which in general outline seems to correspond with the objectives of the Association of American Law Schools, so that they may discuss law-school problems and secure a better understanding of each other, their objectives and methods, and establish somewhat uniform standards for those who are expecting to practice law.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a question about an amount on page 32, for the Bureau of Census, a matter in which I am very much interested. It applies, I take it, to my bill, S. 554, which was recently enacted. I take it also that it is not proposed to go ahead with the 20 percent of the budget estimate for the preparatory work unless the Appropriations Committee is going to provide for continuing the work after January 1; so that amount of money would not be lost if the work were continued after January 1, 1948.

Mr. BALL. We had estimates of mineral resources, transportation, and business totaling nearly $14,000,000. In the limited time available to us we could not go into those estimates thoroughly, but the Bureau representatives told us that they wanted to get the preparatory work done and the maps drawn in the next 6 months, but they would not actually employ the enumerators until 1949. So we allowed 20 percent for the preparatory work, with the understanding that we will early in January examine the estimates for the full enumeration work.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for his explanation. I am quite sure that this is something which is vital to business and industry. Colleges and other educational institutions are very much interested in it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Minnesota a question or two with regard to the matter referred to by the junior

Senator from Alabama. Is it not true that there is no provision made in the general appropriation bill for administering title VI mortgages, FHA mortgages?

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, I cannot answer the Senator. I am not on the subcommittee that handled the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I then make a suggestion, at least for the sake of the record. There are many millions of dollars of title VI FHA mortgages still unprocessed for which administrative funds are necessary. Would it not be appropriate for the record for the chairman in charge of these appropriations to state that it would be proper to use title II funds temporarily for administering title VI funds, and come back next January if necessary?

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, but I cannot answer the Senator. I think the Senator is under a misapprehension. I am merely substituting for the Senator from New Hampshire, chairman of the committee in charge of the bill. I certainly cannot take the responsibility. I am not an expert in the housing field. I could not take the responsibility when we did not consider anything in the committee of authorizing transfers of funds or in effect authorizing a deficiency.

Mr. FLANDERS. There have been no applications for these funds?

Mr. BALL. We had no estimates before the deficiency subcommittee involved in this bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then, Mr. President, I think perhaps this little colloquy is about as far as we can go, and I hope it will serve some useful purpose.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 22, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1949. We had a budget estimate of $108,000, and the committee cut it down to $75,000. The Senator from Illinois is much more familiar with the subject than any of the other members on the committee. Unfortunately he was not present when we considered this item. He wants to have inserted the full budget estimate and have it taken to conference. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has asked unanimous consent for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment on page 2, beginning in line 22, was agreed to. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote agreeing to the amendment is reconsidered.

Mr. BROOKS. I now move that the amount $75,000 on line 4, page 3, be stricken, and in lieu thereof $108,000 be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, is the bill still open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert "Federal Security Agency, Bureau of Employment Security: General administration, for an additional amount for general administration, $72,500."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this is an item which I understand came up from the Bureau of the Budget to the House too late to get into the bill, and was presented to the subcommittee probably in one of its last sessions. I wonder if the Senator in charge of the bill will accept the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota cannot consider the amendment, because the committee considered it specifically and turned it down. The item is for $72,500 for additional employees in the United States Employment Service to specialize on employment of handicapped persons. Frankly, the committee felt that there was no justification whatever for adding employees at the Federal level to deal with this question, since the only employment of handicapped people that can possibly take place is managed at the State level by employees of the various States, for whom we made grants in the regular bill this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word about the amendment.

Two or three years ago Congress passed a resolution which set aside a National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. If I correctly recall, in the resolution we requested the President to set up a committee or commission for the purpose of carrying on this program. Each year since that time the President has declared 1 week of the year to be National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and Congress has appropriated money in the past to help defray the expenses of this week. That is what this small item is for.

Of course it is true that most of the employment is at the State level. A great deal of it is in private industry, but a great deal of good has been done by the program which has been put on, urging people both in Government and in private industry to employ physically handicapped persons.

I dare say there is not a Member of the Senate who has not had the experience of trying to obtain employment for physically handicapped persons. We all know the difficulty we run into every time. Seventy-two thousand five hundred dollars is a pitifully small sum for us to give in extending help toward the employment of this great army of physically handicapped people throughout the country. It is a much bigger army than most of us realize.

I certainly urge upon the Senate favorable action upon this amendment to provide a small amount to help the physically handicapped people of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6935) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the Hames & Phelps Construction Co.; and

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, disagreed to by the Senate, and agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims re-

sulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals; and

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp. of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1779. An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Hamiotis;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 2798, to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That subsection (l) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following provision at the end thereof:

"'Any Federal savings and loan association may convert itself into a savings and loan type of institution organized pursuant to the laws of the State, district, or Territory (hereinafter referred to in this section as the State) in which the principal office of such Federal association is located: *Provided*, (1) That the State permits the conversion of any savings and loan type of institution of such State into a Federal savings and loan association; (2) that such conversion of a Federal savings and loan association into such a State institution is determined upon the vote in favor of such conversion cast in person or by proxy at a special meeting of members called to consider such action, specified by the law of the State in which the home office of the Federal association is located, as required by such law for a State-chartered institution to convert itself into a Federal association, but in no event upon a vote of less than 51 percent of all the votes cast at such meeting, and upon compliance with other requirements reciprocally equivalent to the requirements of such State law for the conversion of a State-chartered institution into a Federal association; (3) that notice of the meeting to vote on conversion shall be given as herein provided and no other notice thereof shall be necessary; the notice shall expressly state that such meeting is called to vote thereon, as well as the time and place thereof, and such notice shall be mailed, postage prepaid, at least 20 and not more than 30 days prior to the date of the meeting, to each member of record of the Federal association at his last address as shown on the books of the Federal association and to the General Manager of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Washington, District of Columbia; (4) that, upon the effective date of the conversion, the association has repurchased the total amount invested in its shares by the Secretary of the Treasury; and (5) that if, upon the effective date of conversion, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will hold of record shares of the association, its approval of the conversion has been obtained; (6) that, in the event of dissolution after conversion, the members or shareholders of the association will share on a mutual basis in the assets of the association in exact proportion to their relative share or account credits; (7) that such conversion shall be effective upon the date that all the provisions of this act shall have been fully complied with and upon the issuance of a new charter by the State wherein the association is located; it being provided that its act of converting into a State-chartered institution shall consitute an agreement to be bound by all the requirements that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation may legally impose under section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, and the association shall upon conversion and thereafter be authorized to issue securities in any form currently approved at the time of issue by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for issuance by similar insured institutions in such State, District, or Territory.

"'In addition to the foregoing provision for conversion upon a vote of the members only any association chartered as a Federal savings and loan association, including any having outstanding shares held by the Secretary of the Treasury or Home Owners' Loan Corporation, may convert itself into a State institution upon an equitable basis, subject to approval, by regulations or otherwise, by the Home Loan Bank Board and by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: *Provided*, That if the insurance of accounts is terminated in connection with such conversion, the notice and other action shall be taken as provided by law and regulations for the termination of insurance of accounts.'

"SEC. 2. Section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby each amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'All necessary expenses in connection with the making of supervisory or other examinations (except examinations of Federal home loan banks), including the provision of services and facilities therefor, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

HARRY P. CAIN,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$35,000,000."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House with an amendment to strike out "$35,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$40,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the immediate consideration of a number of routine resolutions which were unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to know what they are.

Mr. HAYDEN. They are a group of resolutions giving assistance to committees, and so forth.

Mr. BROOKS. They will be read, one by one, and the Senator can object to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not intimating that I am going to object, but I have the right to know what they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of a number of resolutions? The Chair hears none.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "TOWARD PEACE," A HANDBOOK ON AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, 1941-47

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG on July 23, 1947, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the manuscript entitled "Toward Peace," a handbook on American international relations, 1941-47, be printed as a Senate document, and that 1,000 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 260, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, Senate Resolution 260, reported by Mr. LANGER on June 15, 1948, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress $2,500 in addition to the amount and for the same purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946.

PRINTING AND BINDING OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, House Joint Resolution 190, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, in line 4, after the word "copies", to strike out "of a revised edition"; in line 11, after the word "domain", to strike out "such revised edition of", and to amend the title so as to read: "Authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 263, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 263) submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL on June 17, 1948 (an original resolution from the Committee on Armed Services), was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending March 31, 1949, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under the resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 262, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 262), submitted as an original resolution from the Committee on the Judiciary on June 16, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress $5,000 in addition to the amount and for the same purpose specified in Senate Resolution 120, agreed to July 26, 1947.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 247, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 247), submitted by Mr. REVERCOMB on June 2, 1948, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 265, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 265), an original resolution reported by Mr. BRIDGES from the Committee on Appropriations, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946; Senate Resolution 130, agreed to June 26, 1947; and Senate Resolution 201, agreed to March 11, 1948.

STUDY OF OPERATION OF MARITIME COMMISSION — AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE CERTAIN EXPENDITURES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 259, submitted on June 11, 1948, by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause, and in lieu thereof to insert:

That the authority, powers, and duties of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 152, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 25, 1947, and Senate Resolution 189, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1948, are hereby extended until February 15, 1949.

SEC. 2. In studying the operations of the United States Maritime Commission with a view to determining its economy and efficiency, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is hereby authorized to expend, in accordance with the authority conferred upon said committee by said Senate Resolution 189, Eightieth Congress, such sums as it may deem advisable from the moneys made available to said committee under the provisions of said Senate Resolution 152.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to have printed in a subsequent issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of the legislative record of this session of the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me ask about the request.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the usual request to have inserted in the RECORD a summary of the legislative record of the present session—in this case, the present session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean a summary which he has prepared?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; prepared under my supervision.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the right to insert in the RECORD—did the Senator from Kentucky mean to have the summary to which he referred inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Then I ask unanimous consent to have the right to insert a summary of the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio wish to compare his summary with mine, to see whether they are identical?

Mr. TAFT. They might not be identical. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a digest of the major legislation of the Eightieth Congress. He asked that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent that it also be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: I omitted to make the same request in connection with the summary I asked to have printed in the RECORD. I also ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VALEDICTORY OF SENATOR HAWKES

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, and my distinguished friends and colleagues in the United States Senate, when the Eightieth Congress ends, my term of office in the United States Senate will likewise end.

I shall have completed almost 50 years of active service in the harness of American business and a full 6-year term in this great deliberative body. I have always tried to make my service an effort to preserve our great form of government and the American system of free men. This effort will not end until my power to think and act have ceased.

I was born in Chicago November 20, 1878, of highly respectable parents whose ancestry on both sides of the family dated back to the early colonial days in America.

These ancestors grew up under New England traditions in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. They taught me that even though our family was of modest means, no boy who was reared under the American flag with the freedoms and opportunities guaranteed by our American constitutional system of government could possibly be rated as poor.

They told me no man is poor who is the beneficiary of the choice blessings and benefits of life provided through the wisdom of our forefathers, who courageously gave us the Declaration of Independence and then successfully fought to establish and preserve its principles through the creation and adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

They taught me further that the most precious possessions in this world, such as the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, could be lost unless we continually recognize that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

They taught me that my duty was to obey the law, uphold the Constitution, and stand out in the open for the principles which are necessary if our great way of life is to be preserved.

Many of my friends in the State of New Jersey and throughout the Nation came to me in 1941 and 1942 to urge that I be a candidate for the Republican nomination to the United States Senate from New Jersey.

I acquiesced in their plan to support and nominate me, for the reason that I felt—regardless of my lack of political experience—that I might nevertheless invoke my experience in our industrial and business system throughout the Nation, and make a contribution to the thinking of the people's representatives which would, in some small way, contribute to the preservation of the principles and practices which I consider necessary if we are to endure as the greatest nation of freemen on earth.

I want to say to my colleagues in the Senate that I have had here the greatest experience of my life. I have formed, on both sides of the aisle, many friendships which I shall cherish the rest of my life. I am deeply indebted to a number of Senators for their kindly interest in trying to help me understand what they were doing and how they were doing it. I believe I have acquired a little knowledge of such matters.

I have known for a great many years that the label "Republican" or "Democrat" is not the vital thing in the preservation of the United States of America. The great question is this: Does a citizen or representative of the people believe in the American system and wish to preserve and improve it or is he one of those who wish to exchange a success for a failure, by following what I call un-American activities?

My experience here will enable me to continue making a contribution toward the preservation of our form of government and our institutions.

From the standpoint of service to his country, no man could fail to have sorrow and regret at leaving the Senate. No personal gratification in looking forward to more ease and comfort could possibly compensate for the loss of opportunity to continue in this great deliberative body as a servant of the people.

There was nothing here I wanted for myself when I arrived, except the opportunity to serve the people and help preserve in our mutual interest the rights and opportunities which developed under our American system of freemen.

As I leave the Senate, there is nothing I want for myself, except to continue working toward that same objective.

I am thinking of the existing generations following me and of those generations yet unborn. They should be allowed to follow in the paths of liberty and opportunity through our system of reward for work, thrift, and the use of genius, coupled with the acceptance of individual responsibility to the limit of individual capacity.

Of course, every man in public service should like to have his acts meet with public approval; but it is far more important that he should stand on principle, in the hope that what he does will receive approval when the people understand, than it is that he should seek public approval at the expense of sacrifice of principle.

Alexander Pope said:

What's fame? A fancied life in others' breath; a thing beyond us, even before our death; * * *.

Benjamin Franklin made a remarkable public statement which should give comfort to every servant of the people who is trying to do his duty by standing on principle rather than acceding to political expediency. He said:

We must not in the course of publick life expect immediate approbation and immediate grateful acknowledgment of our services. But let us persevere thro' abuse and even injury. The internal satisfaction of a good conscience is always present, and time will do us justice in the minds of the people, even of those at present the most prejudic'd against us.

The recipe which Lord Macaulay gave to the British people in 1830, when the United States was in its infancy, was a good plan for the free people of Britain, and is still a good plan for the United States of America. The British people failed to follow that plan and they have ended in socialism.

Lord Macaulay appreciated that the siren voice of political promisers could easily lead many people away from the principles vital to the preservation of a government of freemen. He recognized if the leaders of a free people induced them to adopt temporary expedients at variance with the principles vital to their permanent welfare in an effort to avoid the problems and hardships of the day, it could only end in having the government become the master and the people, its slaves. This is what he said:

> Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the people by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties—by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment—by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the state. Let the government do this—the people will assuredly do the rest.

I urge all my colleagues in all seriousness and kindness to reflect on what has been happening in this great Congress the past 2 or 3 weeks at the close of the session. No government can support its people and assume all the individual burdens of its citizens without becoming the master of the people and defining what liberties they shall have left.

I am not attempting today to criticize the acts of any of my colleagues or any political party. I wish to set down in simple form the things which I believe must be done if we are to preserve our form of government—our system of human relations—our economic system based on freedom of the individual and his opportunity to improve his own relative position in life. Freemen must be willing to pay the price of success so far as that price lies within their ability and the talents which God Almighty has given them.

It is perfectly clear to me that we should immediately recognize the following basic things which must be solved if our system is not to succumb to the onslaughts which are being made by unthinking people who have come under the domination of shrewd, skillful planners throughout the world. If these planners are successful, it will mean the destruction of the underlying philosophy, principles, and privileges of our American system of freemen.

First. We must recognize that one of the principal routes to socialism and communism is national bankruptcy. Our national debt of $253,000,000,000 is, in reality, a mortgage upon every private business institution and all personal property in the United States because of the constitutional power to tax, which, if misused, is the power to destroy.

Few people appreciate that the national debt through the power of taxation is a burden on each citizen and a mortgage on his earning power and property rights. That applies from the highest to the lowliest individual in the land who owns property and has earning power. The distinguished and able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in a factual and realistic speech which he made in this Senate on May 19, 1948, pointed out to his colleagues and to the American people the fact that as we are now going our annual budget by 1951 will be just slightly under $50,000,000,000.

It should be apparent to all that when the rest of the world is able to provide the materials and when demand is less than production or supply, problems which we cannot now calculate will come before the American people.

We should all understand at this time that if we have less production, less profits, and higher taxes to meet the "must" bills, we shall then likely be confronted with a decreased initiative which in other countries has gone to the point where the Government has had to take over—and then socialistic or communistic practices have supplanted individual freedom and opportunity.

Second. Unless we soon recognize that if our Government uses its power to tax to raise funds for investment in fields of private business which heretofore have always been left to private citizens, we will find the same thing happening in our country that has already happened in Great Britain.

Governmental invasion of the business field, which we call the field of free competitive enterprise, is dangerous if our system is to endure.

Perhaps Abraham Lincoln expressed in simple terms as well as any other American the thought I have in mind. He said—and this is very simply expressed:

> In all things which the people can do for themselves as well as or better than the Government—then the Government should never interfere.

Mr. Lincoln was a champion and defender of the common man. He was more interested in the common man than almost any other man in public life of whom I have ever heard.

Our people must first understand the meaning of these encroachments by Government into the field of private business, and then they will have to decide whether our citizens as a whole have fared better under our American way of doing business than have the citizens in the other countries which have indulged in these socialistic practices which have ultimately led to complete control by the state.

The real cost to the people for things produced by private enterprise would be found to be less than the cost the people will pay for the same services from Government-built plants managed by Federal employees who are held to no accountability or responsibility for results attained. Under Government ownership it has been proved to my satisfaction that there is no way possible for the public to check operations and know real costs.

Third. We must soon get back to the place where all excess powers granted to the Chief Executive by the Congress must be returned to the Congress if we are to keep the wise balance between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the Government which were thought by our forefathers to be the safeguards of the people's rights and the protectors of individual freedom.

Fourth. We must in all our laws regarding employment relations never forget that our American system is one primarily based upon voluntary cooperation.

In enacting laws affecting or governing employment relations, we must bear in mind that America was made successful because the workingman of today has often become the owner or employer of tomorrow. That opportunity must always be kept alive under our system for the great majority of our people are in the employee class.

If we are to remain a free people, the solution of the greater part of all human relations problems must be left to the people, and must be brought about by voluntary action.

The whole history of the world shows that the more Government invades the field of regulating human relationship and action, the more it curtails the liberties of its people. When that intrusion has gone far enough, the Government becomes the master and the people have lost the freedoms and rights of action which made possible the development of the United States of America.

Fifth. The Chief Executive, the representatives in the Congress, and the judiciary must so conduct themselves as to convince all fair-minded citizens that none of them represents any special group or interest.

Respect for government is vital. That is why we should be careful in this great body always to remember that when we discuss or criticize our Government and try to improve it—we should recognize it as the most sacred thing we have, outside of our religion.

Therefore, the people's representatives must seek to find a fair balance in equity and justice between all groups and interests in the United States and thus retain that respect.

Sixth. Our Government and people have a definite obligation to do the fair and sound thing so far as it lies within our power to do it for all those who have given their service in defending the Nation in war.

The veteran and the veterans' organizations have a like obligation to seek only those things which are vital and necessary to them and which lie within the power of the people to do, without destroying the very thing the veteran sought to preserve on the battlefield.

I should like to interject here to my good colleagues and friends that I do not think any man had a better understanding of the veteran and what the Nation owed him, since I have been old enough to remember, than did Al Smith. I have always gone along with his philosophy and admired his feeling with regard to the veterans.

I have frequently said that those veterans who are substantially or totally incapacitated through their great service to their fellow Americans are entitled to the maximum aid within our power to give while yet we are preserving the lib-

erties and freedoms of our people for which they fought.

Seventh. I have been alarmed at the growing tendency of different citizens and groups, which make up our American economy, to ask the Government to solve all their problems and guarantee them against the ordinary contingencies which free men under our system of free competitive enterprise have, up to the last quarter of a century, accepted as their own responsibility. Our system is not a profit system but it is a profit and loss system. We seem to be trying to get rid of the loss and turn it over to the Government, and keep the profits. That is something for all Americans to think about.

If our American citizens expect to remain free men and preserve the free competitive enterprise system and yet operate under the philosophy that they can keep their profits if they are successful and, on the other hand, the Government will pay their losses or guarantee them against substantial loss if they experience such losses—then to my mind there will be no hope of ending anywhere except in statism with state control and state direction in the affairs of our citizens.

If group after group of our citizens are willing to raid the public treasury, and I say that advisedly, not because they approve of that course but because some other citizen or group of citizens has been successful in raiding the Treasury, then my conclusion is that we will soon be through with our great system which has been the outstanding success of the world.

We will find ourselves on a common level with the people throughout the world who are now engulfed in socialism and statism because they were willing to have the government assume their responsibilities rather than to accept those responsibilities themselves.

Eighth. My votes on foreign policy and foreign gifts and loans have been based upon my knowledge of the people in the various countries selected as the recipients of the unusual favors we have been granting.

There has never been a time when it would not have been more pleasant for me to have "gone along" than it was to vote as I did. Parts of certain legislation against which I voted would have been acceptable to me, but I have felt and still feel strongly that the representatives of our people must soon take an inventory of our debts and obligations—must analyze our power to continue with the programs they have undertaken—must analyze what could happen to our Nation if we have a depression—must recognize that the very things we are doing to build up foreign nations in competition with us must of necessity decrease our own earning power and ability to pay—and finally must recognize that we will have committed a crime against ourselves and the world if we find we have exceeded our ability to do things and thus have destroyed our vital leadership for the peace and stability of free men throughout the world.

Even those running an eleemosynary corporation must be guided by the amount of funds within their power to accomplish their objectives. Regardless of where their hearts might take them, their brains must direct every action if they expect to complete their kindly deeds and accomplish their objectives.

They must know how much a thing will cost, how far they must proceed with it, what funds are available now, and whether the source for future funds to complete their objective will be available.

Ninth. Everything I have learned in life teaches me that there are certain fields dealing with human relationship among a free people which can never be successfully covered by law.

I feel strongly that a compulsory law can never accomplish the desired results in fair employment practices which I use simply as an illustration. I have taken that position on the floor of the Senate, before this.

No law under our system can ever successfully force an employer to give any person satisfactory employment with hope for the future. Take the reverse. In the fourteenth amendment, we decided that no man in the United States should be forced to work against his will for another man. Fair employment practices can and should be developed in our Nation.

I might say at this point that in my business affairs I have had the most remarkable success in absorbing all kinds of people, colored and white, Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant, and mixing them together. The businesses with which I have been connected have never taken any cognizance of what a man's religion may be. Nor have we determined a man's rate of pay by the color of his skin. Performance is the best test. That development can best be brought about through voluntary processes—greater understanding between men—and through the making of an effort to eliminate all misunderstandings based on race, color, and creed.

I think it would help all of us if we could always remember that we had no choice for ourselves when we came into this world. We could not decide whether we would be black or white, Jew or gentile. But we all came from a common source, from God Almighty. If we try to treat one another properly, try to get along together, try to do the best we can and practice the Golden Rule, perhaps we shall make much more progress than by trying to put hard and fast laws upon the people.

Tenth. One of the most important things this great deliberative body should consider more completely than it has in recent years, and I think it is faced with it now, is the demarcation between States' rights and the Federal field of operation.

You, my colleagues, will soon be confronted with problems of leaving with the States the things which they can do for their own citizens as well as or better than the Federal Government. For example, this means you will be confronted with deciding what taxing areas are to be left to the States and what taxing areas are going to be preempted by the Federal Government. There may be areas where a different division than that now in existence will be necessary.

Unless the Congress shows that the Federal Government can stay in its own sphere as planned under our Constitution, and leave unadulterated to the States the rights which belong to the States, then I rather feel our people will be a little wary about how far we go into the United Nations and interalliance with other nations of the world.

If we cannot adhere to the form of government we started to build in this country, what right have we to assume that if we become entangled with nations throughout the world, some overall power will not take all our rights away?

If the Federal Government will function in the sphere it is intended to occupy and leave to the States the conduct of the affairs of the citizens of the States, then in my opinion the Representatives in the Congress and in the Federal Government will be able to apply themselves to the more important affairs and have time to do a better job for the Nation in keeping with the plan of our forefathers.

Mr. President, I went to Europe in 1945. I left the United States the day after VE-day and flew across the ocean. We spent Decoration Day at the Anzio beachhead, one of the most remarkable and memorable days I ever spent, because there I attended the Decoration Day services as the only funeral service for my boy, who had been buried at Milne Bay, New Guinea, out in the Pacific. I thought of every one of the 6,900 fine American boys buried in that Anzio beachhead cemetery the same as I thought of my own son. We went on to Rome, and in Rome on June 3, 1945, as a member of the Communications Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I talked to a group of American soldiers.

Those American soldiers expressed themselves quite freely. They stood up and said that from what they heard, apparently the war was not over, and they expressed the thought that unless the war was over they would like to stay in Europe and finish it.

I shall never forget a staff sergeant who had been through the war for 4 years. He rose and said, "Mr. Senator, I have at home two little boys. One is 8 years old and the other five. I have been through hell's half acre over here for 3½ years. I have lain out in the mud and have endured many hardships." He added, "If this war is not over now, I should like to stay over here and finish it, because I don't want those little boys of mine ever to have to do what I have done." He added, "We have this wonderful manpower on continental Europe, such as no nation ever had."

I commented that we as a nation could no more stay in partnership with a partner who was accused of heinous crimes and offenses against civilization than could a private individual remain in a business partnership with a man accused of dastardly crimes. I did not say that such accusations against our allies were true, but I said that we should ascertain the facts and know the truth, that it was our duty to do so if we expected to stand before the world as true disciples of justice and peace.

Further I said we should restate at that time the objectives for which we fought the war and announce the course we planned to take toward peace.

My reason for that statement was that we had 3,400,000 of the best trained and armed soldiers in the world on continental Europe at a cost considerably exceeding $200,000,000,000 and the loss of precious lives. The British had 750,000 similarly armed forces. If we had defined our plan of action and course for peace and justice then, our ally's attitude might have been entirely different than it was after that great force and power was removed from continental Europe months before we ever knew what we were talking about, and what our peace objective was. I am not sure that we know yet. Our course then was the most vital thing in the world. I felt action at that time could definitely prevent another war and definitely establish an agreement on principles which would lead to peace and might save us from complete exhaustion of our material wealth and thus save us from statism, which has almost engulfed the earth.

Every statement I made was misquoted back home, without my knowledge, while I was yet abroad in the service of my country, riding 25,000 miles through the air. For making my suggestion I was accused of trying to incite more war. Now, more than 3 years after the statement, those who criticized me are agreeing with what I said, and regretting that the course suggested was not followed.

Unfair attacks upon any group in our American life can be productive of division among our people. The maximum unity, respect, and confidence that we can obtain are vital to the protection of the rights and interests of every man in our country from the lowest to the highest.

If men in high places say publicly untrue things about each other for political reasons or any other reasons, and hire commentators, newspapers, or other public relations agencies to assassinate character, then how can we expect to preserve our Government and our freedoms? Only people who can and will find a way to get along with each other with due regard for honesty and the truth can remain free.

If the current abuse of free speech and propaganda is continued, it could well lead to the destruction of the safeguards which protect free speech. Thus free speech could prove to be its own executioner.

My whole statement means that if we want to preserve our liberties, we will have to pay the price. The price at times seems high to some because it means self-denial, self-control, self-restraint, standing squarely on principle out in the limelight where one is open to the fire of unjust and unfair criticism.

It means, as Mr. Farley, a distinguished Democratic national chairman, said, "Willingness to surrender office rather than compromise with principle."

It means refusal to compromise with principle for the sake of what some call temporary expedients.

It means acceptance of the consequences for acting as one's intelligence and conscience tell him is right.

It may mean loss or gain in material things.

Our forefathers were willing to pay the price of freedom. That price exacted from them all the things I have mentioned, including the supreme sacrifice in hundreds of thousands of cases.

I have often asked myself: Why were they willing to pay the price? The answer has always come back to me: Because they considered individual freedom, coupled with opportunity for self-improvement, the most valuable thing in the world.

Unless we as a people redeem our morals, rebuild our character, and recognize the mandates of our God differently than we have been and are doing, then we will not have the fiber and the courage to do the things necessary to pay for the preservation of individual freedom in its true sense.

So long as a majority of our people seek to give less for a dollar, they will get less for a dollar, and if they are going to be led astray by the philosophy that they can get something for nothing or that the world owes a living to the indolent, the shiftless, and the sluggards—there is no hope for the redemption of America.

Honest people should beget honesty in their representatives. Intelligence in the selection of representatives is vital to the preservation of representative democracy.

Our system of government and human relationship will not be preserved by the representatives of the people unless the people show by their votes that they wish it preserved.

On June 14, 1948, I received unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made entitled "Who Can Preserve Representative Democracy?" This speech, which subsequently appeared on page A3884, contained thoughts which had accumulated in my mind over a period of more than 45 years in American business.

During the coming adjournment period, I ask that you, my colleagues, read this speech for it is my humble opinion that the conclusions contained therein apply with as much if not more force today than they did when that speech was delivered on November 27, 1939.

To increase American voluntary cooperation, the keystone of our American system, we must redevelop respect for one another, invoke equity in our relations, and thus rebuild confidence between our citizens. One recipe for that program is set forth in the following little poem, The Man in the Glass:

THE MAN IN THE GLASS

When you get what you want in your struggle for self
And the world makes you king for a day,
Just go to a mirror and look at yourself,
And see what that man has to say.

For it isn't your father or mother or wife
Whose judgment upon you must pass,
The fellow whose verdict counts most in your life
Is the one staring back from the glass.

You may be like Jack Horner and chisel a plum
And think you're a wonderful guy,
But the man in the glass says you're only a bum
If you can't look him straight in the eye.

He's the fellow to please—never mind all the rest,
For he's with you clear up to the end,
And you've passed your most dangerous, difficult test
If the man in the glass is your friend.

You may fool the whole world down the pathway of years
And get pats on the back as you pass,
But your final reward will be heartaches and tears
If you've cheated the man in the glass.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may say as acting majority leader that I know I express the sentiments of every Member on this side when I say that ALBERT HAWKES is our friend; that we will always remember him as one who has proven himself to be of the utmost sincerity, honesty, and high integrity. He is a man of great ability. He has always fought for what he thought was right. He has always acted from the highest principles.

Mr. President, it has been my great and good fortune to know him. As he leaves this body, I wish for him continued health and happiness. He will carry with him our high regard. We will remember him for years and years to come.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to say that I am glad I have had the privilege of being on the floor of the Senate this afternoon to listen to the splendid advice, the very sound admonitions that have been given to us here today by the Senator from New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey and I entered the Senate together. I have grown to know him over the course of years—now almost six. I know him as a man who is absolutely devoted to his country, a man who is thoroughly courageous in advocating those things in which he believes, and as one who is fair.

We have not always agreed, but this much I know—whether in agreement or whether in disagreement—he was earnest and sincere in those things he advocated. Now, Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has chosen, through his own decision, not to be a candidate again for membership in this body. But that does not mean—certainly to me—that we shall not have his advice, that we shall not have his splendid help. I express the hope to him that he will frequently return to Washington and to the Senate Chamber, where he has served with such distinction and with such great service to his country.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say at the outset that I request that in the few remarks I shall make I

be not interrupted until I have concluded. I expect to speak a very few minutes and at the conclusion of my remarks I shall be happy to answer any questions that may be raised.

But before I discuss the bill under consideration I should like to take just a moment to pay a personal tribute to the Senator from New Jersey who has just spoken.

When I came to this body almost 4 years ago, he was one of the first Members of the Senate I met.

I became better acquainted with him, of course, as the years went on. I have come to the complete conviction that, while this statement is applicable to every other Member of the Senate, in connection with his particular habits, his particular attitude, his particular accomplishments, there is no man whom I have met who has proved more conclusively by his life and by his attitude the verity and the truth of the fundamental philosophies and policies which have guided him. He has been a great stimulus. We regret to see him leave; but, as the Senator from West Virginia has so ably said, his counsel and his advice will remain with us.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to add that I concur in the kind remarks which the Senator has made in regard to the Senator from New Jersey. I have worked with him on committees. It has been a pleasure to know him. He has my best wishes in his future work.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a combination of circumstances has entered the situation at this moment to cause me to alter my original intentions of about 10 days or 2 weeks ago, when the bill was placed upon the list of bills which must be passed before this session is over. It has been the unfinished business of the Senate for several days, but matters of urgent consideration which had to be decided have displaced it and postponed it from time to time, and certain other considerations have caused delay. So we come to what perhaps is the last day of this session, for the consideration of this bill, which now is House bill 6402, that bill having already passed the House of Representatives and having been substituted earlier today for Senate bill 2589, the bill to extend the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission for a year and 11 months from next August 1.

A few weeks ago the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through the Senate Members, filed a rather comprehensive majority report setting out the reasons, and, I believe, insofar as the real interests of national safety and genuine confidence in the progress of the Atomic Energy Commission will permit, the details as to why it is an utterly sound, utterly sensible, and utterly practicable, as well as utterly indicated procedure for those terms to be continued en bloc for almost 2 years after the original expiration date fixed by the McMahon Act on its original passage.

The majority report is not only on the desks of Members, and has been for days, but it was placed in the body of the RECORD at the time of filing. I feel confident that Members have seen the report. While it is a report of some length, Senators have undoubtedly gone through it and examined the very logical and sound reasons why this bill should become law.

There is a second matter which has arisen by virtue of the circumstances of the moment, which has caused me to alter my plans somewhat, and that is that on this last day of the session a most important bill to a great many people is now waiting to be considered and acted upon by the Senate, along with others which will follow. The bill is the Federal employees pay bill. I hope that we can proceed with expedition to consider and act upon that bill.

There is another consideration which moves me, and I think I should say it to Members of the Senate in all frankness and candor. It is simply a practical fact, and I think it goes without argument, that the bill which has already passed the House of Representatives and is here must, in the interest of atomic energy and the smooth and confident continuity of the atomic energy program itself, be passed today and become law. Any other course at this moment would be detrimental, and in some ways damaging indeed, to the atomic energy program.

The realization that this bill must become law is contained in the statements made by Members of the House of Representatives yesterday or the day before, when the bill was passed there. I invite the attention of Senators to the statement and reasoning of Mr. DURHAM, who is a member of the joint committee. Mr. DURHAM was one who voted against the bill in committee. While he feels that other proceedings would be better, he nevertheless makes this statement:

> I feel that it is in the best interests of the country to adopt this measure at this time.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois, also a member of the joint committee and one of the Members who voted against the recommendation of this bill, makes the same statement.

I merely refer to these statements as indicating that there is a realization of the vital necessity of this bill becoming law.

I had prepared, and have on my desk, and originally intended to deliver, a statement of some length, in which I attempted to outline in detail the supporting reason why this bill is a good bill, why it is a solution to the difficult problem facing us in connection with atomic energy, and why it must be passed.

The remarks which I had prepared for delivery amplify to some extent, but generally follow, the reasoning of the majority report. That report has been in the hands of Senators for perhaps a month—at least 3 weeks—and I assume that members therefore are familiar with it. It would be in some ways a recapitulation or a rehashing, perhaps, of the general outline contained in that report. I therefore propose to take 5 minutes or so to give merely a few highlights in the reasoning as to why this is a good bill, and then ask that the remarks which I had prepared to deliver at some length be printed in the RECORD as a statement, so that the reasons can be better amplified for the RECORD. Then if any questions arise in the minds of Senators I shall be happy to try to answer them. I then hope that Senators who have comments on the bill will be permitted to proceed with as little interruption as possible. I would then be confident that we could reach a vote very shortly on this measure. Later I shall ask that my prepared statement be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, atomic energy descended with a suddenness and startlingness upon the world, at the close of the Japanese war, that was beyond imagination. We suddenly found that we had on our hands the greatest explosive force that had ever been conceived by man, and we had to do something about it. It had vast areas of possibilities for humanitarian and peacetime uses, too. Having this great force on our hands and having the responsibility of it in connection with war, as well as peace, it became incumbent upon this country to find some solution for its control and its safeguarding.

In summary, without going into detail, I call attention to the fact that the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, called the McMahon Act, was passed after lengthy hearings, exhaustive examination, and exploration of the possibilities and the avenues of travel down which we might go. It became the law of the land, and today we are operating under that law.

In that act itself there is a recognition that it was a pioneering adventure into an unknown field, and that undoubtedly it would require amendment, change, and alteration from time to time as conditions unfolded.

It has created the greatest monopoly this Nation has ever seen. It has put in the hands of a commission more power, more authority, and more right to go into more economic and social fields than any other bureau or body of this Government has ever enjoyed before, with the possible exception of the martial emergency of war. We made the provisions contained under this act because the committee and the Congress knew of no other way to handle the matter with the greatest possible safety and security. But in doing so, as I say, we created this great monopoly, interlocked and interlaced with every business, industry, science, electronics, and all the technical professions. We set up a commission to administer this great authority and great power.

We provided in the law that the Commission should hold office for a 2-year period, and it was fully explained that during that period the administration of the policies of the atomic energy set-up under the act could be examined and judged and evaluated.

The law set up a unique relationship between an administrative body of the Government and the Congress of the United States, when it established the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and gave it power to examine and inquire into and learn about this new venture in public monopoly and public operation. Contrary to the original intent of the law, there has not really been a 2-year

period in which to evaluate the administrative policies of the Commission, as applied to the over-all atomic-energy policy as prescribed and laid down in the act.

The bill we are now considering, I wish to make very clear, has nothing whatsoever to do with the policy of our Government on atomic energy. That policy is outlined and set forth in the act. This bill goes only to the administrative programs to implement that policy. That point must be kept clearly in mind. Nothing in this measure changes the policy on atomic energy as prescribed in the law. This bill touches only the question of the further examination of the administrative programs that are applied to the policy in the development and progress of atomic energy.

I said that the full 2-year period for the examination of the beginnings of this program in its administrative part has not been had. The terms of office of the first commissioners would expire 2 years after the effective date of the act. The act became effective on August 1, 1946, and that would make the termination period of the terms of office of the Commissioners August 1, 1948. However, the President did not appoint the Commissioners until about the 1st of November 1946. He did not appoint the General Manager until about the 1st of January 1947; I think it was on December 30, 1946. The nominations of the Commissioners did not come to the Senate until January 20, 1947, and they were not confirmed until some time in April 1947, or approximately 1 year ago. They then for the first time got a reliable hold on their offices, and they then began to feel an assurance in the tenure of the office they had, so that they could go ahead with some confidence in the establishment of their administrative programs. The joint committee could not function until about a year ago. So the Commission and the joint committee began almost in infancy, on a reliable basis, approximately 1 year ago.

The Commission has adopted policies. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy began its studies and has carried them on; but up to this time the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in my opinion and in the opinion of the majority of the members, has not had sufficient time or sufficient opportunity in volume of experience, in learning about this subject itself, to give to the Congress any sound, reasonable judgment upon which it would ask the Congress to rely in fixing a permanent program or a permanent administrative policy for the Commission, in relation to this subject which is so vitally integrated into the American system.

Therefore, the joint committee by a vote of 11 to 5, with two members not voting, recommended to each House of the Congress that this bill be passed and that the terms of all the Commissioners be extended, en bloc, 1 year and 11 months after the 1st day in August next.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under that arrangement, there would be no need of confirmation; would there?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, this measure would automatically extend the present terms of office; would it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. We would simply take August 1, 1948, out of the calendar, really, and would insert in its place June 30, 1950.

Mr. CONNALLY. So the Senate would not have to act on the question of confirmation; is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. President, there are certain advantages to this procedure. One is that it will establish an uninterrupted continuity of service on the part of the entire Commission, without the chance of having any new appointments next year to the Commission. The entire Commission thus can go forward with confidence and with assurance for over 2 years from this date, and their administrative programs and patterns can be approached with a reliability which might not be the case under any other plan or program.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress can have opportunity to see the further development of their plans and programs; and then the Congress—the Senate and the House of Representatives—at that time, if sufficient evidence then exists and if sufficient confidence and judgment have then been established, can determine the permanent administrative pattern, whether it be this type or a slightly changed one, or whatever the developing facts shall show or indicate.

Just to illustrate, and not by way of suggesting that this should be done, but to illustrate the fact that responsible bodies in this country are now considering that we might well begin at this time to think about whether the basic philosophy of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 should be changed or not, I call Members' attention to the fact that I received yesterday by mail a copy of an article which is to appear in the July issue of the technical journal called Nucleonics. I have checked it and I find it is a reliable, reputable scientific journal, written perhaps for the education of the layman but nevertheless with a high degree of reliable scientific background, and it is published by McGraw-Hill Publications. This article, with the endorsement of the editorial staff of the journal takes up some suggestions under the heading "New legislation to replace McMahon Act," and it discusses for instance a completely new theory of administrative control of atomic energy. I do not say it is a good program or a bad program, but I use it merely to illustrate the fact that there is responsible thinking going on in this country now outside the Government, if you please, wondering whether we have the right approach to the control of atomic energy, wondering whether the interests of the country itself would not be better served by some other approach. I do not necessarily think it would; I have not come to those conclusions at all. But I do say that any organization that operates in secrecy as this must, that has such a limited economic power as this organization has, and as this program has, that is so vitally in control of perhaps the very safety and salvation of this Nation, can well afford to be examined carefully and scrutinized minutely by the Congress of the United States in calmness and over a sufficient period of time so that when a permanent program is finally decided upon, whether it be this one or another one, the Congress will have available the best and most voluminous supporting data, proved by experience, if you please, upon which the American people will rely and for which the Congress need not later be apologetic.

Just one other thing, and then I am through. Unfortunately in the past the cry of politics has been raised about this bill. May I call Members' attention to the fact that of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Manager of that Commission, of those five members I know the partisan politics of only two members. They are Republicans, and I am a Republican. I do not know the partisan politics of the other three members, nor do I know the partisan politics of the General Manager. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress, of which I have been honored by being selected as chairman, employs a staff of 16 people. I have never inquired the partisan politics of a single employee of the committee, and I have not been informed as to the partisan politics of any member of the Commission, directly or indirectly, by innuendo or insinuation. The knowledge of the politics of the individual has never been involved in the employment of a single member of that staff, with one exception. I know the politics of one man on the staff, and it is entirely collateral and not applicable at all to the question of his job. He was never asked his politics as a matter of qualifying for his job, and it has been a nonpartisan staff and a nonpartisan activity. I think it is safe to say that in the deliberations of the joint committee—composed of Democrats and Republicans—there has never been a partisan issue as a matter of discussion or action in the committee. I think every member of the committee will agree with that. So I say it is not partisan political activity from that standpoint.

Now let us see if it is partisanly political from the standpoint of the criticism that has been raised in certain quarters that all I want to do, or all we want to do on this side is to let a Republican President appoint the Commissioner. Let us see. If the present law, which provides for staggered terms from 1 to 5 years, goes into effect, the next President of the United States under existing law will appoint four of those Commissioners anyway, because four terms will expire in the next Presidential term. The bill extends the whole kit and caboodle of the Commission, if you please, for approximately 2 years; they do all expire at that time, but there would be five appointed at that time instead of four under the situation that presently exists under the law.

No, Mr. President, there is no controlling politics in this matter. There are differences of opinion, there are those who genuinely believe that the staggered

terms should be put into effect now, and I respect them for their opinion. There are those who do not believe in this type of Commission, if you please, and I respect them for their opinion. There are those who, for one reason or another, oppose the present provisions of the law, and I respect them for their opinion. But I have found there is the greatest unanimity of opinion in the Congress, among the public, among the scientists, and among the technical people that the 2-year proposition is a workable, a practical proposition and that it will, in fact, enable the Commission to continue with confidence in the development of its programs and its plan.

I said I was going to say just one more thing. I want to mention just one other thing. This was a tremendous job. The Manhattan District that had it during wartime developed a multibillion dollar corporation. It ramified throughout the country. It was in many ways a mysterious and a complicated establishment. The Commission took it over and is today still operating in great measure upon the pattern and the plan and the program of the Manhattan District. Certain changes have begun to be made, certain experiments have begun to be gone into, but the records and the history and the proof of the soundness of present administrative policies is not sufficiently mature at this time to warrant final conclusions in a matter of such vital importance.

Mr. President, I merely wish to quote one paragraph which I think is significant, to me, at least, in closing my remarks. I wish to call attention to the fact that this legislation is not to be interpreted or accepted as a criticism of the present Commission. Rather do I interpret it as a cooperative activity to enable them to go forward with greater confidence and with greater continuity of authority and operation of the Commission for an additional year and 11 months.

Personally, I believe this view is shared by the majority of the joint committee, I hope to see the present Commission given further and adequate opportunity to bring its administrative plans to a higher state of completion by extending their terms until June 30, 1950. I think it is fair to the Commission members. I think it is fair to the scientists, the technicians, the contractors, and the employees. I think it is in the best interests of the American people. The thing which would contribute to restlessness within the atomic-energy project would be the precipitate establishment of a permanent administrative arrangement, the advisability of which is now seriously questioned by many who have only the vigorous development of the program at heart.

I may have a word or two to say later, before the final vote, in an effort frankly and factually to discuss matters that might be in doubt. Above all I want to see atomic energy kept on a basis of acceptance by the Congress, of acceptance by the American people, and of united support and vigorous support by the Congress. I see no reason why that cannot be. I see no reason why the bill cannot contribute to that end, and I see every reason why the enactment of the bill will contribute to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, following my verbal statement, my prepared remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in considering the passage of H. R. 6402, the sole effect of which is to extend the expiration date of the terms of the present Atomic Energy Commissioners from August 1, 1948, to June 30, 1950, the Senate is considering a vital matter deeply affecting our national economy, our pattern of Government operation, and our national security.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was passed as a result of the urgent necessity for setting up the most reliable controls over atomic weapon production and development in order to maintain the preeminence of the United States in this field. In considering the provisions of the act, it became the inevitable conclusion of the committees of the Senate and of the House, and of the Congress itself, that a monopolistic enterprise in the hands of the Government was the unavoidable device by which security and progress could be combined and so the act was so designed.

The program for the operation of the atomic energy enterprise was defined in that act and still is the program of this Nation. I point out now that H. R. 6402 does not alter or change the program of atomic-energy activities in this country, but that it only goes to the matter of further time for the examination, consideration, and reliable establishment of administrative policies as set up and carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission, that most efficiently put into effect the program already established and confirmed by law. A commission of five civilians and a general manager were provided for with broad authority to adopt and put into effect these administrative policies. At the time of the passage of the act it was fully realized that this was a new venture in governmental operations; the theory of Government monopoly in this field was accepted by the Congress and the Nation because there seemed to be no other way to handle it. This theory demanded and the law confirmed the placing of vast and exclusive powers in the hands of the Atomic Energy Commission. These powers are more extensive than any peacetime powers heretofore possessed by any Government department and these powers are exercised throughout innumerable fields of our social and economic system. Tremendous appropriations and authorizations, which, when combined, exceed a total of over $1,000,000 a year are requested by this Commission and have been granted by the Congress without the furnishing of or the requirement of detailed break-downs as to their need and expenditure universally required in other agencies and departments of Government. Without specific comment at this time, I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that this situation is causing concern within the Congress and quote from the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill filed with the Committee of the Whole House on June 13, 1947, as follows:

"The committee considered a budget estimate totaling $250,000,000 for this purpose together with a contract authorization for an additional $250,000,000. The committee heard the Commission in connection with the estimates on two different occasions. On the first occasion, the committee found it impossible to obtain definite information as to the distribution and use of personnel requested or to secure a reasonably comprehensive break-down as to the distribution of funds requested for other objects of expenditure.

"The committee thereupon requested the Commission to make a further survey and report back at a later date, giving an administrative break-down as to personnel and a somewhat detailed break-down of other estimated expenditures in order that a concrete picture could be obtained as to the distribution of funds under the estimate of $250,000,000.

"The committee regrets to report that the second hearing of this agency failed to produce any substantial additional information which would warrant appropriation of the amount requested in the budget estimate."

In order to show that this impression of the House Appropriations Committee has not substantially changed in a year's time, I call your attention to the statement of that committee submitted to the Committee of the Whole House on June 8, 1948, in connection with the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill, in which the committee states:

"The committee is not satisfied with its relations to date with the Atomic Energy Commission. The committee is fully aware of the vital importance, particularly under present world conditions, of the work of the Commission and of the technical aspects connected with it, and is desirous of making every provision for its adequate support. However, the Commission's refusal to furnish the committee with information and appraisals of its various budgeted items, based on technical information which can be available only to the Commission, because of the scientific and secret character of the work involved, leaves much to be desired in establishing the confidence which the committee must have if it is to continue to supply these large grants of funds under conditions of secrecy which prevent full disclosure of the details involved.

"As a matter of fact, there is some feeling among the membership of the committee that the Commission has taken advantage of its strategic position in modern military defense to avoid facing the practical realities on less important and subsidiary elements of their budget. The impression left with the committee is one of general extravagance."

These passages are quoted above to show that the operations of the Commission and the Atomic Energy Enterprise are clothed with secrecy and with authority and that the absence of detailed information creates areas of uncertainty and dissatisfaction within important and responsible committees of the Congress.

This is not an unanticipated situation. The Congress realized that full examination into the activities of the Commission would not be in the public interest. Therefore, the Congress, also realizing that it must in some manner set up a mechanism by which information could be secured as to the development and the progress of the whole atomic energy project, established by law the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to which the Commission is required to report with full and current information in connection with its activities in this program. The joint committee is further charged with making continuing studies of atomic energy activities and to make such recommendations to the Congress, from time to time, as it feels to be in the public interest.

The Atomic Energy Act wisely provided that the terms of the first commissioners should extend for 2 years after the effective date of the act thus giving a minimum of 2 years' time during which the joint committee, the Congress, and the public might have an opportunity to evaluate the progress of the administrative policies which would administer the program set up by law. However, while the Atomic Energy Act became effective by the President's signature on August 1, 1946, the first commissioners were

not appointed by the President until October 28, 1946, while Congress was in recess, and the general manager was not appointed until December 30, 1946. The transfer of the affairs of the Manhattan district to the commission did not occur until January 1, 1947. Thereafter the Congress convened and the nominations of the commissioners and the general manager were sent to the Senate by the President on January 20, 1947. Hearings on these nominations consumed a substantial portion of the time of the commissioners and of the general manager until their confirmation on the 9th of April 1947, slightly over a year ago. Under the law, the expiration date of the commissioners is August 1, 1948. It is only fair to say, in justice to the commissioners themselves, that the uncertainty resulting from the circumstances surrounding the late appointments of the commissioners and the general manager, and the period of time consumed in their confirmation, made it difficult if not impossible for the commission prior to April 1947, to feel any reasonable security in the tenure of their offices or in the appropriateness of their attempting to set up substantial administrative policies for a peacetime operation under the act. In fact, it has been stated in hearings before the joint committee with the commission, that the commission actually did not feel that they were in "effective control" until approximately June of 1947.

By the same token, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy set up by the Congress for its own service, was unable to begin a satisfactory organization until late in April 1947. It was necessary for the Joint Committee to pioneer in the field of staff selection and to begin the development of a pattern of study of the atomic-energy program. The Joint Committee's responsibilities, by law, are more extensive than receiving information as furnished it by the commission. It is affirmatively charged with making continuing studies of the program and its administration. During the past year, the committee has been developing organization and techniques for the most effective receipt of information as well as initiating its own studies of the various phases of the entire operation.

The Joint Committee in a unanimous report of January 30, 1948, made to each House of Congress, clearly stated the inadequacy of cumulative information and the need for continued examination of policies and program, as follows:

"As a legislative committee, it does not feel that it should at this time draw any final conclusions respecting the operation of this program or the administrative policies in effect. Sufficient time has not elapsed to warrant conclusions of this kind. This is not to be construed either as an attitude of hostility or an attitude of approval, but on the contrary, expresses an attitude on the part of the committee to objectively evaluate the various phases of the program as a result of more mature operation."

Less than 3 months after this unanimous statement by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and approximately 4½ months prior to August 1, 1948, the expiration date of the terms of the Commissioners, the President sent to the Senate the nominations for commissioners with terms of 1 to 5 years beginning August 1, 1948. To the best of my knowledge no member of the joint committee or other Member of the Congress was consulted. I do not suggest that the President is under any compulsion to consult with members of the committee or Members of Congress as to his appointments. I respect the President's constitutional prerogative of exercising his judgment in connection with nominations which he is authorized to make. Atomic energy, however, has been approached by the Congress as a nonpartisan and therefore a nonpolitical common interest of the whole American people and the joint committee and the Congress have respected the nonpolitical nature of this program. It is surprising, therefore, and not without peculiar significance, that the President neglected to cooperatively consult with the joint committee or others in the Congress as to the progress, efficiency, or propriety of the present administrative plan.

As quoted above, the joint committee on January 30 expressed the need for more time to study the administrative pattern. Several members of the committee were giving serious consideration to the necessity for an extension of the terms of the present Commissioners and the reasonable postponement of the permanent 5-year term plan. The exceptionally early submission of the nominations by the President precipitated this issue and caused it to be passed upon by the joint committee and recommended to the Congress at a somewhat earlier date than might have otherwise occurred.

The joint committee did consider S. 2589, together with its companion bill, H. R. 6402, and reported both bills to the respective houses of Congress on May 17, 1948. The report of the joint committee on S. 2589 is on the desk of each member and sets out in more detail than time will permit in these remarks of mine the general reasons why the bill should be passed. Without taking the time to read that report now, I call attention of Members to the report and ask unanimous consent that a copy of that report be printed as a statement at this point in my remarks.

The report (No. 1342) is as follows:

"The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through the Senate members thereof, to whom was referred S. 2589, a bill to extend the time of the expiration date of the terms of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission from August 1, 1948, to June 30, 1950, report the bill back to the Senate with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

"The atomic-energy program was developed during World War II as a military project for the production of atomic weapons. They were successfully produced under military direction as a result of the unprecedented coordination of the highest degress of scientific, engineering, and industrial skills ever mobilized.

"In the process, startling and revolutionary scientific discoveries were made which suggested unlimited future possibilities for research and development in the field of social and humanitarian benefits. Complete emphasis, however, was placed on the development of a weapon and these other discoveries or possibilities were laid aside, at the time, for future investigation, research, and development in a peaceful atmosphere.

"With the end of the war the problem of how to handle atomic energy for the good of mankind became paramount. It was universally agreed that the bomb must be secured, if possible, against international use in war, and this principle became a major consideration in all domestic approaches or suggestions to the problem. It also became a special and intensive problem of the United Nations within which a special Atomic Energy Commission was immediately set up with specific terms of reference directed toward a solution of this problem.

"Meanwhile, the Congress commenced immediate studies for the purpose of passing proper legislation for the control and for the advancement and development of the limitless possibilities of this science. A special committee of the Senate and the Military Affairs Committee of the House over a period of months devoted time and held extensive hearings which eventually resulted in the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, approved by the President on August 1, 1946.

"In considering the original legislation, the Congress, and eminent citizens who testified, recognized the pioneering nature of the project; the revolutionary power of the bomb; the perils of unrestricted tampering with the dangerous products of atomic fission and the possibilities of new and unforeseen dislocations in industry and social fields. The fact that there was no historical experience for guidance, when considered with other factors, indicated that any legislation and any program undoubtedly would be subject to future change as a result of mature experience.

"In section 1 (A) of the act, it is clearly stated as follows:

" 'The effect of the use of atomic energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot be determined. It is a field in which unknown factors are involved.'

"The declaration continues:

" 'Therefore, any legislation will necessarily be subject to revision from time to time. It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life.'

"In section 1 (B) (5), the law further states:

" 'A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing polices and with international arrangements made by the United States, and which will enable the Congress to be currently informed so as to take further legislative action as may hereafter be appropriate.'

"The report from the Senate Special Committee on Atonic Energy, which accompanied S. 1717, states:

" 'It is recognized that many unforeseeable developments may arise in this field requiring changes in the legislation from time to time.'

"The Congress recognized that under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which placed this vast enterprise in the hands of a commission to operate, there was being created the greatest administrative monopoly with the most far-reaching power ever set up in this country; but there was no other course. The authority of this Commission is greater than any other commission or bureau either heretofore or presently established in Government. It ramifies throughout industry, management, labor, and natural resources. Its authority extends into the international field of atomic energy. Because of the secrecy necessary to preserve the knowledge essential to the production of atomic weapons the operation of this vast set-up is clothed with restrictions and mandates for security, and the opportunity for public examination and evaluation of its progress and of the impact of its activities upon our normal peacetime or even potential wartime economy are nonexistent. This situation is unique in administrative policy of our Nation. It places solemn responsibility upon your joint committee.

"The Atomic Energy Commission is presently operating on an annual basis of over $600,000,000 in cash and $300,000,000 in contract authorizations. It has unlimited discretion in the types and kinds of goods and raw materials it buys; it has complete control over the extent to which private enterprise may venture in this field; it preempts patents; it has full authority over all phases of production and activity in atomic energy; it has, subject to certain responsibilities of periodic direction by the President, complete discretion and control over the production of atomic weapons; it can make foreign contracts and arrangements; it can contract with State and local governments; it operates municipalities, is the landlord, and subsidizes many local services traditionally within the province of private enterprise; it has the duty of extensive participation in the fields of public health; it is authorized to participate and is participating in agricultural and industrial research and development and may give or withhold its aid in its discretion. Its broad powers enable it to establish and maintain countless programs which are not clearly defined. It employs, either directly or through its operating contractors, over 55,000 people who, with their families, probably total 200,000; it has discretionary au-

thority over the release or the withholding of information affecting the program.

"The Atomic Energy Commission, because of the nature of its duties and the extent of its power, can exercise decisive control over the destiny of our Nation and the lives of our people.

"The Congress, under the Atomic Energy Act, and in consideration of the inherent dangers and problems involved, deemed these broad powers essential for the protection of the public and in order to prevent if possible the devastating use of atomic weapons in war. In addition, these powers have been deemed initially essential in order that we may make the greatest progress and maintain our preeminence in the advancement of the science of atomic energy. Your committee refers to these powers therefore to illustrate the magnitude of the social and economic area within which atomic energy operates and to emphasize that its growth and integration into the American system of individual free enterprise must be carefully measured and that hasty decisions as to a permanent administrative pattern are unwarranted and unwise.

"Because of the unprecedented monopolistic control of atomic energy set up in the Government through the Commission, the Congress, in section 15 of the act, created the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy composed of nine Members of each House. This committee has a responsibility to 'make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy.'

"This section further provides that—

"'The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities.'

"It was intended that by setting up such a joint committee, necessary secrecy of the project could be preserved, but at the same time a responsible body of Congress would be constantly kept informed so that it would be able, from time to time, to make such recommendations for legislation affecting the policy and operation of the atomic-energy program, and to make such reports, as might be indicated in the public interest.

"Although the law went into effect on August 1, 1946, the President did not appoint the members of the Commission until October 23, 1946, and the general manager was not appointed until December 30, 1946. The transfer of the affairs of the Manhattan district (which was the wartime agency in charge of this project) to the Commission occurred on January 1, 1947. The nominations were sent to the Senate by the President on January 20, 1947, and thereafter beginning on January 27, a substantial portion of the time of the Commissioners and the general manager was devoted to hearings on the question of the confirmation of their nominations until their confirmation on the 9th of April 1947. The first terms of the Commissioners were fixed by law for expiration 2 years after August 1, 1946, which was the effective date of the act.

"In fixing the term of office for the first Commissioners at 2 years after the effective date of the act, it was the purpose of the Congress to provide at least a 2-year period for examination and observation of the program. The legislative intent to provide an initial 2-year term was predicated upon the sound reasoning that in an undertaking of this magnitude a minimum of 2 years would be necessary before any valid evaluation of the administrative policies could be made. These terms all expire on August 1, 1948. Since the Commission was not confirmed until the 9th day of April 1947 and from a practical standpoint has had uninterrupted and unquestioned security in the performance of its duties only since that time, it is obvious that there has been but 1 year for the reliable formulation of programs and for observation and study instead of the 2-year period wisely contemplated by the law.

"The transition from the military operation to eventual full control by the Atomic Energy Commission was accompanied by many dislocations and uncertainties. Following the confirmation of the Commissioners, they and the joint committee undertook the coordination of their respective duties; on the one hand, the Commission went forward with plans for the development of their administrative policies under the act and, on the other, the joint committee began to inform itself and receive information as to the entire situation and the proposals for future development.

"As noted before, the necessary activities of the Commission ramify throughout the general economy and the national policy of our Nation. It is a pioneering venture of a new, vast, and startling nature; there was no history or experience of a similar peacetime operation upon which the Commission or the joint committee could rely. In this year that has passed some programs have been set up and many policies considered, some of which have been adopted; many have remained under consideration without determination; others have been rejected. There has been some reorientation of attitude in connection with the setting up and expansion of these policies and programs. Not only have problems of personnel, science, industry, and labor been confronted, but many questions involving the interpretation of the act and the powers and responsibilities of the Commission have arisen.

"Many of the key members of the Commission's staff have been employed in recent months in connection with the establishment of new policies and new administrative approaches. Many of the Commission's policies are in the process of formulation. Many of the plans of the Commission are on the drafting table. These are conditions to be reasonably expected. Fairness to the Commission dictates that additional time be allowed for the Commission to develop more definitely its administrative policies in order to justify conclusion as to the final direction of this program.

"The Commission has just announced the recent test of an atomic weapon which is the culmination of researches and plans begun 3 to 4 years ago. The results of such progressive developments cannot now be adequately or properly evaluated as to their long-range effect upon the national needs.

"In the field of patents, while the law sets up a framework for establishing a program for patent acquisition and compensation, no such program has as yet been finally established in this field hitherto sacred to the individual.

"Recent events have shown that labor-management disputes in vital installations have threatened continuity of operation. In one instance a settlement was had 2 hours after the so-called deadline for a walk-out. At the time of filing this report, this same installation is again in the throes of a labor dispute and is presently operating as a result of injunction proceedings instituted under the Taft-Hartley Act. The effective period of that injunction is rapidly running out. The joint committee is determined that labor-management policies be reliably established so that continuity of operation can be assured in these vital plants. The joint committee has held hearings on this subject, but no satisfactory formula was presented or developed. The joint committee has asked the Atomic Energy Commission to provide it with its plans for the accomplishment of this purpose. The joint committee is aware that the Atomic Energy Commission is also vitally interested in the accomplishment of this purpose, but the Commission has not as yet developed its specific proposals for the reliable solution of this problem.

"The Commission recently has begun to put into effect a changing theory of sectional operation of the program which is in the nature of decentralization. This method of operation may have much to recommend it but only experience can demonstrate whether or not it is a progressive move.

"While many advisory groups have been set up by law and by the Commission, to give it advice and suggestions as to the development of pertinent phases of the atomic energy program, it is to be noted that the joint committee has received few reports of these advisory groups and, therefore, is in no position to reliably gage either the extent of these recommendations or the degree to which such recommendations have been accepted and put into effect or held in abeyance, or rejected, by the Commission.

"In a number of areas the joint committee has requested, from the Commission and other vital coordinating agencies, information, conclusions, and recommendations which will aid in evaluating the national program and its operation. Information has not as yet been furnished to the joint committee enabling it to fully comprehend or determine long-range goals of production and operation policies of the Commission. This reference is not made by way of criticism but merely to indicate that the composite circumstances involved in our public affairs and within our economy create a certain indefiniteness that needs time and the unfolding of events before long-range policies can be fully justified.

"It is to be noted that the Military Liaison Committee, the vital link between the defense establishments and the Atomic Energy Commission, has undergone a reorganization within very recent weeks. What the beneficial results of this action may be cannot be presently evaluated.

"Due to the nature of the Commission's operation, its budgetary and accounting problems are ramified and very extensive. The accounting situation has been more complicated because of the fact that under previous wartime operation of this project necessitating complete secrecy, utmost speed, etc., standardized accounting procedures were not in effect; therefore, historic detailed costs are not fully available. A satisfactory system has not yet been set up. This fact is recognized by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress as well as by the Commission itself in its most recent report of February 2, 1948.

"It is to be noted that, in addition to strict scientific and production activities of the Commission, it is involved, under existing policies, in the operation of cities and towns within the project. The problems of such operations are under serious consideration, both by the Commission and by the joint committee. Complicated problems of jurisdiction, of administrative authority, of voting rights, including prerogatives attendant upon residence, town management, court jurisdiction, heavy subsidies, schooling, public utilities, and other problems, demand careful and more mature experience and examination before any final policies with respect thereto can be adopted by the Congress or by the Commission.

"A vital section of the efficient and progressive advancement of atomic science is the reactor program. Recently a basic change in the operation of this program has been decided upon and certain preliminary steps to effectuate this change have been undertaken. The operation of this proposed program will be and must be continuously under the most careful observation for a substantial period of time. Only experience can evaluate this move.

"The importance of establishing satisfactory and adequate personnel programs in the operation of this project is evident. The necessity for security cannot be disputed. Policies for assuring the personnel security of the project under conditions of fairness

to individuals but at the same time protecting inviolate the rights of the public and the integrity of this national venture, have been and still are in a state of study and trial. The Commission has been searching for a final formula and the joint committee has been concerned with the necessity that a reliable formula be established.

"The unsettled international situation has a direct effect upon the pattern of our atomic-energy program. Had a satisfactory system of international control been established, certain provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, in due time, would have automatically become void and many vital powers of the Commission would have been transferred to an international agency. It is now conceded, however, after nearly 2 years of exhaustive effort in the United Nations, that satisfactory universal agreement for reliable international control of atomic energy is presently impossible. Only time and maturing events will enable us to determine the permanent direction of our administrative policies in this field.

"It is important to emphasize that these matters which have been referred to are conditions which suggest the formative nature of our atomic-energy program and by no means indicate a lack of progress. Further, they must not be interpreted as a criticism of the Commission or as evidence that the joint committee lacks confidence in the present Commission. Since the confirmation of the Commissioners on April 9, 1947, very definite progress has been made in our atomic-energy program. This fact is encouraging but would in no way justify any hasty conclusions based upon insufficient knowledge as to the advisability of any particular permanent administrative pattern in this gigantic but infant national venture.

"On January 30, 1948, your joint committee filed a unanimous report to each House of the Congress and, clearly recognizing the present inadequacy of the cumulative information and the definite need for continued examination before a final conclusion of any kind could be drawn about the long-range administration of this program, stated:

"'As a legislative committee, it does not feel that it should at this time draw any final conclusions respecting the operation of this program or the administrative policies in effect. Sufficient time has not elapsed to warrant conclusions of this kind. This is not to be construed either as an attitude of hostility or an attitude of approval, but on the contrary expresses an attitude on the part of the committee to objectively evaluate the various phases of the program as a result of more mature opportunity.'

"The passage of this bill will immediately give assurance of uninterrupted continuity in office for 2 years and 2 months following the date of this report during which the present Commission can continue without disruption or without the necessity of reappointment. Any programs and policies now under way can be observed and brought into substantial operation; it will give approximately 2 years more for the over-all evaluation of the atomic energy program and its theory of operation. It will insure continuity and confidence and it will give assurance of continuity of operation and program upon which all employees, contractors, and consultants may rely.

"The joint committee strongly emphasizes to the Congress that in the performance of its duty it has conducted, and intends to conduct, its business relating to atomic energy, and to the Atomic Energy Commission, on a totally nonpolitical basis. The joint committee unequivocally declares its determination to support the best and most progressive atomic energy program which can be developed to maintain our preeminence in this field. The committee has been guided, at all times, by one paramount principle and that is to maintain a course of conduct which will best serve to build confidence in, acceptance of, and support for a sound and vigorous atomic energy program. This is essential for the safety of the United States and for the peace of the world. It is in furtherance of this principle that your committee considered this legislation.

"Your committee therefore recommends that the bill do pass."

This report gives a general indication of the extensive powers, the ramified activities, and the many undetermined areas in which vital decisions and vital administrative programs have not been and perhaps as yet cannot be reliably established.

This report sets out the reasons why the joint committee urges that the Congress pass S. 2589 and continue the present terms of office of the atomic energy commissioners to June 30, 1950. This course of action will permit a more firm establishment of administrative policies and will allow time for an objective evaluation by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Before fixing the permanent administrative organization, additional mature experience will be available and therefore the interests of the American people will be served.

Unfortunately and without any justification, the cry of politics has been raised in certain quarters about this bill. The genesis of the injection of this political charge is in the White House, as evidenced by a news story in the New York Times of April 21, 1947, the date on which the President sent the nominations to the Senate, quoting an alleged White House spokesman who was said to have charged the Republicans with politics in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission. From then on every attempt has been made from administration sources to insinuate partisan politics in this issue.

I would like to make the record clear. I am informed as to the partisan politics of only two members of the Atomic Energy Commission and they, I am told, are Republicans. I do not know to what political party the other three members belong. I do not know the partisan opinions of the general manager of the Commission. Partisan affiliations have not been an element in the selection or employment of any member of the staff serving the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have never inquired, and so far as I know the others members of the joint committee have never inquired, as to the partisan association of any member of the staff.

The joint committee has kept entirely free of partisan activities or influences, believing that atomic energy and its development should and must be nonpartisan and should and must be approached from the standpoint of the broad interest of the American people. This bill is sponsored by a Republican and a Democrat. It is true that if this bill becomes a law the terms of all five commissioners would expire on June 30, 1950; and, therefore, if the pattern of 5-year terms was put into effect at that time, the next President would nominate five commissioners. It is to be emphasized and understood, however, that in any event the present situation were all present terms expire August 1 this year, the terms of four of the five commissioners would expire within the next 4 years and would be subject to the nomination and appointment by the next President of the United States.

Therefore, it is not a question, Mr. President, of Presidential appointments but rather a vital question concerning the establishment of a reliable and a satisfactory pattern of administration for atomic energy. By passing this proposed legislation, the Congress will eventually have before it a substantial history of development which will furnish guidance in the adoption of the permanent administrative pattern.

Again I call to your attention the fact that the joint committee and the Commission itself has had, for all practical purposes, only 1 year to operate in this unique field of Government activity. As pointed out in the report of the joint committee on this bill, many policies of the Commission have not been finally adopted and no evaluation thereof can be made by the joint committee. The joint committee has collected and is collecting considerable information but it cannot evaluate any over-all program until the policies of that program have been more adequately developed.

The statement has been made that the extension of these terms would disrupt the organization or interfere with progress in the development of atomic energy. I think it should be clear beyond argument that, to the contrary, the proposal would contribute to confidence and would insure continuity of authority and operation of the Commission for an additional year and eleven months. During this time the Commission can work out and put into effect policies that are now embryonic or in the early stages of proof. It is also to be recalled that this bill does not affect the tenure of the general manager of the Commission.

The members of the Atomic Energy Commission have worked zealously but in most instances they are still operating under the program and pattern of the Manhattan engineer district. This is not pointed out by way of adverse criticism but as plain fact. Our atomic-energy program as a peacetime program is vast and far-reaching. No doubt it has been grafted permanently upon our social and economic system but it is a matter of plain common sense that it be examined with caution and with thoroughness if it is to be successfully developed as an integrated part of our future life. Its monopolistic phases, its secrecy, its delegation of unprecedented peacetime powers demand the most careful study and the most reliable assurances that can be obtained.

Nor should any final policies be governed by personalities or individuals. If we are to remain a nation of laws and not of men, a nation in which fundamentals control and individuals administer, then we must realize that the atomic-energy program and the interests of the American people are the controlling factors and that individuals who administer the program, capable though they must be, are only important, temporary elements. Personally, and I believe this view is shared by the majority of the joint committee, I hope to see the present Commission given further and adequate opportunity to bring its administrative plans to a higher state of completion by extending their terms until June 30, 1950. I think this is fair to the Commission members; I think it is fair to the scientists, the technicians, the contractors, and the employees; and I think it is in the best interests of the American people.

The thing that would contribute to restlessness within the atomic energy project would be the precipitate establishment of a permanent administrative arrangement, the advisability of which is now seriously questioned by many who have only the vigorous development of the program at heart. The extension of 2 years will certainly give time for more satisfactory examination and proof and should represent a more satisfactory solution. I believe it represents a perfectly sound and practical compromise between those, on the one hand, who desire to set up the permanent administrative arrangement as originally contemplated in the law and those on the other hand who are presently definitely opposed to the beginning of the long-term arrangements at this time. I earnestly hope that the Senate will act

favorably on H. R. 6402, and I give you my assurance and, I believe, the assurance of my colleagues who support this measure, that the passage of this bill will be in the genuine interest of the vigorous development of the atomic energy program.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like at the outset of my remarks, which I shall make——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Feazel	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BALDWIN. I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2830, to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for five years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert "June 30, 1951"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended title proposed by the House, amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend for two years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry"; and the House agree to the same.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
WAYNE MORSE,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PRICE POLICIES OF LARGE INDUSTRIAL CORPORATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I gave notice yesterday that it was my intention to make some remarks about the price policies of large industrial corporations. It would be altogether inappropriate to make those remarks at this time. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may offer the remarks for printing in a succeeding issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be printed in the same manner as though I had delivered them on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the request of the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My request was simply this, that yesterday I gave notice that it was my intention to make some remarks on the Senate floor on the problem of price policies of large industrial and commercial corporations. I say it is altogether inappropriate to make those remarks in the present state of the session, and I merely ask unanimous consent, in accordance with the practice in former years, that the remarks be printed in a subsequent edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was not aware that it was the practice to have editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequent to the day of adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes, that has been customary for years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did I not also hear the Senator add that he wished to have the remarks printed precisely as though he had delivered them on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I dislike ever to disagree with my friend from Wyoming, but I believe that is in complete violation of the practice.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know it is a violation of the practice that was followed prior to the assembly of the Eightieth Congress, but during the Eightieth Congress I have noticed that rule has been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not believe that is quite a fair statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I endeavor to be fair.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The President pro tempore is in constant touch with the Chief of the Official Reporters on this subject, and whenever a situation of this sort occurs, it is usually brought to the attention of the President pro tempore. What the Senator suggests is not a good habit. The Senator I am sure will agree in that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senate does not operate on the same basis with the House with respect to the publication of undelivered remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that, and I would not make bold to make such a request if it were not for the fact that Senators did not want matters which were not pertinent discussed. Of course, I can take the floor and make the speech.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was about to say to the Senator that I have no objection in the world to the publication of his statement as a statement in the RECORD, but I do not think it should be printed as though delivered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall ask that it be printed in the Appendix, if that will satisfy the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My desire in requesting that it be printed as though it had been delivered was merely to be sure that the remarks were not printed in the minute type which we cannot read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONFERRING OF JURISDICTION ON NEW YORK STATE RESPECTING OFFENSES COMMITTED ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1683) to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State, which was, in line 8, after "State", insert "*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any Indian tribe, band, or community, or members thereof, hunting and fishing rights as guaranteed them by agreement, treaty, or custom, nor require them to obtain State fish and game licenses for the exercise of such rights."

Mr. ECTON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I am fully conscious of the fact that we are not many hours away from the adjournment of this session of the Congress. I am also conscious of the fate that awaits my efforts. I shall be defeated. The bill upon which we will be called to vote has been before the Senate now for about 5 weeks. It had been my earnest hope

that we would have had plenty of time to deliberate and consider a proposal which may well have such far-reaching consequences on the life and the peace and the happiness of the people of the United States and of the world.

I think that the present proposal which has been advanced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] can only be properly considered in the framework of the situation which confronts the United States and the world today—a situation in which the informed know that only the possession of a stock of atomic bombs by the United States of America maintains the balance of power in a very uncertain peace.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Connecticut, who was the former chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, I wish to take a moment to pay a tribute to my colleague from Iowa, who succeeded me as chairman, for the diligence with which he has undertaken his duties, and his unfailing courtesy to me at all times. It is with real regret that I find it necessary to disagree with the proposal which he has advanced.

Mr. President, our record in the field of atomic energy is something of which we can be rightfully and truly proud. I do not intend to take the time now to review the efforts which we have made to get this force under international control. I shall only briefly allude to it, because I have been the recipient of a bitter attack by the Soviet delegate, Mr. Gromyko, at the last session of the Commission seeking atomic agreement. Mr. Gromyko on the night before last said that the Senator from Connecticut and the former eminent Secretary of State, Mr. James Byrnes, were clanking their atomic armor, and that we have been backing a proposal to which the Soviet Union could not agree, and which was designed to promote war and not peace. I stated to the press at that time that I could no better answer him than to quote the immortal words of Bernard Baruch, when on June 14, 1946, in opening these negotiations he stated "that the world was engaging in a race between the quick and the dead." It is my sincere and heartfelt conviction that I have voted for life with all of the American policymakers in this field, and Gromyko has voted for death.

I say, Mr. President, it was the vision of some of us that we might be well today on the road to world disarmament if we had been successful in concluding an agreement with the other countries of the world, including Russia, for the complete control of this force, a force which can destroy and a force out of which can come life and good.

After interminable negotiations, and after interminable hours, and weary hours, and days of debate, all countries that were members of that commission came to the final conclusion that the only satisfactory and effective agreement for the international control of this force was the program that had been advanced by the Government of the United States. All governments agreed except the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, if they had agreed there would not have been need for appropriation in the Congress, as we have done, the sum of billions and billions for our defense. If they had agreed at Lake Success the dawn of a new and glorious day would have broken over a war-weary world. Today we would have been marching down the blessed paths of peace to which all decent men hope and aspire.

Mr. President, I know why the Senator from Connecticut has been singled out for the animadversions of Mr. Vishinsky and Mr. Gromyko. When they are attacked on their policy in Europe, when they are attacked on their policy in South America, when they are attacked on their policy in Turkey, or when they attack us respecting our policy in Greece, they bring forth their propaganda from Moscow, and if Senators listen to it, they will find that much of it has a certain ring of truth. So they do not particularly care what any Senator should say in this Chamber regarding their policies, economic propaganda, or social policies that they are advancing to seek domination of the world. But, Mr. President, they do care when you start to put the wood to them on this policy, because on this policy it is as demonstrable as that two and two make four that it is right, that it is objectively right, and that they cannot answer.

That is why I shall be expecting more and more attacks, not only from Vishinsky but from Gromyko and the rest of them, because they know that it is dangerous to have their obstinancy and intransigence shown on this vital and key policy upon which the world must depend for peace. They know it is absolutely necessary that they suppress the truth, if they can, regarding our efforts. Those efforts we must take forward to the world. We must advertise them to the world. We must let the world know that we are for total disarmament, and that this is the first and vital step. If the peoples of the world understand that, then we need have no fear whether they will back us in our determination to give our total support to a policy that there shall be total and complete peace and not total war.

Mr. President, I merely allude to our international policy as more or less of a framework for our domestic policy which is so vitally affected by the pending proposal.

The bill which became an act and which bears my name was an act upon which more work was done than by any Senate committee I know of, at least in my 4 years in the Congress. It was pursued line by line, comma by comma, paragraph by paragraph. It was torn apart and put together and torn apart and put together again. In the determinations and the deliberations that gave birth to this act there was not the slightest bit of partisanship, there was not the slightest suggestion of Democratic or Republican or any other kind of politics.

It would seem unnecessary to make such an assertion, Mr. President, because after all sane men know that what we are dealing with is a force that underlies the universe. It is the basic force of nature. There is no politics in the atom, gentlemen, and any suggestion that it has even barely attained the faint aroma of the pork barrel must be resisted with all the force at our command.

Mr. President, Senators know what that act provides. Senators know the law under which the Commission is operating this enterprise, the most gigantic of all Government operations and works.

I now wish to call attention to the statement of the former Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, for whom Senators on both sides of the aisle have such a deep and abiding respect. Mr. Patterson said:

> The news that reappointment of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission is to be resisted in the Senate on lines of political partisanship is bad news for the people of the United States. Under the law the five members of the Commission are appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The terms of all five members will expire on August 1. The President has reappointed them. The question now is whether the Senate will confirm. We must assume that those opposing confirmation are unaware of the immense risks that a disruption of the atomic energy program at this time would produce.
>
> Our survival as a Nation may well depend on the intelligence, the skill, and the vigor with which the atomic energy project is carried forward. Of all activities in the country, there is none more vital to our safety than this activity. If a hostile power should get the lead on us in the development of atomic energy, the future would be dark indeed.

There has been some argumentation to the effect that the pending proposal has not been politically inspired. I regret to say that I must take issue with my colleague from Iowa. I shall take issue because I shall advert to facts which seem to me demonstrably and conclusively to prove that the pending proposal was politically inspired.

On April 19, the morning press of New York City carried a story to the effect that nominations for the Atomic Energy Commission were about to be made by the President. Later, on the same day, the Republican policy committee met, and at noon the chairman of the policy committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] gave an interview to the press. In this interview he stated that the committee, at its meeting that morning, had resolved "to go slow on all confirmations of appointments made by the President."

On April 20, the next day, the President sent the following nominations for the Atomic Energy Commission to the Senate: Mr. David E. Lilienthal, Mr. Robert F. Bacher, Mr. Sumner T. Pike, Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, and Dr. William W. Waymack. On April 23, three days later, over a Nation-wide hook-up, on a program entitled "Meet the Press" the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee was asked if he included in this "go slow" policy Mr. Lilienthal, and he stated that he most assuredly did.

The fat was in the fire. Now, how to get it out?

The Senate Members had a meeting. In that meeting it was suggested that perhaps a further testing period for the Commission would be in order—say a year. I immediately protested, and

pointed out what I thought was the error in the proposal. Then that proposal went to the people and the press of this country. There began an outcry and an uprising which soon made itself evident, and the next proposal we got was that it should be changed to 2 years. Then we met again, and this time we met with some distinguished scientists, with men whose work had been of a key nature in the production of this atomic phenomena.

One of them was Dr. Oppenheimer. He probably did more at Los Alamos to bring the thing about than any other man. Dr. Rabi, of Columbia, also recognized as being preeminent in the field, was there, as was Dr. DuBridge, who at one time, I believe, was in charge of Los Alamos.

We talked over the problem with them, and they were told that if we were to bring the nominations before the Senate for confirmation there would be "a dirty political fight." In view of that fact, the scientists were asked what their advice would be in this situation.

I invite attention to the letter of Dr. Oppenheimer, addressed to the chairman of the committee, under date of April 29, after he was let into the secret that a proposal was to be made to avoid "a dirty political fight." Dr. Oppenheimer wrote:

DEAR SENATOR HICKENLOOPER: Thank you for inviting us to learn of your plans for the future of the AEC. You have asked us to write to you of our views, and this I gladly do. To my mind the way to assure the continuity of the work of the AEC and inspire confidence in its policies is to confirm the Commissioners. In all areas in which I am qualified to judge, they richly deserve confirmation; and above all, by their success in the "paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security."

You and other Senate members of the joint committee assured us that confirmation could be achieved, if possible at all, only after a long-bitter struggle and a long period of uncertainty, delay, and sustained attack on the Commission.

It is not appropriate for me to judge to what extent these difficulties are beyond the control of your committee. However, we may almost agree that a worse fight than last time over the issue of confirmation would gravely and perhaps fatally impair the work of the Commission and confidence in its stability.

The doctor concludes that if it is to be extended, for the sake of the United States, extend it for 2 years. But, first, he says "confirm them now to conform to the McMahon Act." Now, let us see what the other consultative witnesses who were brought in to pull the fat out of the fire say. Under date of April 29, Dr. DuBridge addressed the Senator from Iowa and said:

I wish to state right off that I am convinced that the AEC has made enormous progress toward its statutory objectives in the year that has elapsed since it was confirmed by the Senate. Furthermore, I have confidence that the AEC will be even more successful in the future in developing a sound basic program and an organization to carry it out.

It is of the most vital importance to the AE program of the United States that confidence and continuity should exist in its direction. It is necessary that the personnel of the Commission, of industry and of the national defense establishment should work in harmony toward the common end of the welfare and security of the United States.

To quote from the letter of Dr. DuBridge:

We were shocked to hear that such a controversy—

That is, unjustified attacks against the Commissioners and their work—

is even a possibility. I would hope that your committee could find a way to confirm the Commissioners in such a way as to avoid such controversy.

Then he goes on and states in great detail his estimate of the fine work which has been done by the Commission.

Mr. President, that may be rather amazing. Nevertheless it is the record; and it is well that that record should be told to the Senate and to the people of the United States. I beg to point out that the reasons which are given in the report of the majority to the Senate are not really the reasons which have dictated this proposal. The committee has seen fit to point out that in its estimation a further period of time is necessary for testing the qualifications of these commissioners.

Mr. President, every 3 months this committee receives a highly secret report of the work of the Commission. Twice a year a report of the Commission goes to the Congress, containing the reports which have been made. They are made in great detail—as much as can be given out for public consumption.

We have had the Commission before us hour by hour. I suppose that there is no activity of this Government that has received the continuing and close scrutiny that this group has received.

Mr. President, what is their job, and how have they done it? Their job is to assure the security of the United States of America through the production of fissionable material at the greatest rate they can, and to promote peacetime use and research.

I do not think I violate secrecy when I say that the Commission, at this date, is meeting the requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff laid down by them as necessary for the defense of this country. I think it is bitterly unfortunate that we cannot tell in much more detail of the accomplishments of the Commission since they took over from the Manhattan District. It is no secret now, because it has largely been told, that when they took over this project, Los Alamos was a shambles. We had succeeded, it is true, in making some laboratory bombs, but the Commission has succeeded in putting them on the production line.

In my talks with them, I find that they are regretful, as I am regretful, and as everyone of good sense is regretful, that they must devote so much of their time and their effort to the production of these weapons of war. That is one of the reasons why at the beginning of my remarks I outlined that unfortunate necessity and where the blame if any there is must rest in the verdict of history.

They have not been derelict in their trust in setting up the proper devices and administrations for the peaceful production and use of this God-given force.

Mr. President, those who see in this new development nothing but the atomic bomb are of but little faith and but little hope in regard to the possibilities of constructive progress in the future in this new field; their attitude is much the same as that of those who, with the advent of electricity, saw in the possibilities of its future use nothing but a chair for the electrocution of convicts.

But, Mr. President, there are achievements in the field of medicine and in the field of chemical substances and in the developments and work in that great building at Hanford, into which we are putting hundreds of millions of dollars, that hold wonderful promise for the future. For instance, the contributions in the way of the development of the breeding process, on which we reported to the Congress a few months ago, hold promise for the future the like of which has not been dreamed of by free men in all the ages of history. These men, whom we are so fortunate to have, see that vision and have that light of the future. They are going ahead bravely in every proper direction.

There has not been one word of criticism against the basic attitudes of the Commission from any responsible source. Of course they are not perfect. They are men. They have made mistakes, because they have done things, and they will make more mistakes. If they did not make any more mistakes, I would want to get them out of their present positions instantly.

Of course, the provisions of the measure now before us, carrying an extension of their terms for 2 years, constitute complete recognition of the fact that they should be confirmed for the appointments which the President has wisely sent to the Senate. If they are good for 2 years in this undertaking, then they are good for the statutory terms which are set out under the act.

Mr. President, if there is a determination by some to get rid of the Chairman of that Commission just as soon as it can be accomplished, I simply wish to point out that I see and observe signs and indications of an effort to take this force and put it back into the Pentagon Building. The evidence that was given by the Chairman, as contained in an article by the McGraw-Hill Publication Co., is not the first evidence that the senior Senator from Connecticut has had that that is the fixed intention of a very powerful group in our country.

When the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] introduced a bill, a few months ago, to turn this whole program back to the military, I pointed out to the Senator from Nebraska that there were so many things wrong in the world that it seemed a shame and a crime that we could not leave alone something that seemed to be in good measure right. I anticipate the efforts of those who wish to place others than civilians in control of this program, and expect them to persist; I thank God that with the help of the voters of the State of

Connecticut who have given me a franchise to remain on this floor for two more years, I shall during that length of time be here to resist that move with all the force at my command.

The members of the Commission seem to have done a good job. They seem to have carried out the responsibilities and duties which have been placed upon them by the statute. We know they are honorable men.

We tried for about 3 months to prove that they were not, but our efforts met with flat and complete failure; and a year and a half ago they were confirmed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote.

Despite that fact and despite the fact that they have done their job magnificently and have carried out the duties with which they have been charged by the law, their nominations have lain here since April 20, 1948, and they have not even been accorded the courtesy of a hearing before the committee.

Mr. President, the thing that the Senate should do with this bill is to reject it. It is now 25 minutes of 6. If the Senate will reject this bill, we on the committee can adjourn to a room just outside the door of this Chamber, and certainly there is not a Senator on the committee who will be able to voice a single objection that I believe to be worthy of consideration to the confirmation to which these men are richly entitled.

Mr. President, I could go on, but I am conscious of the hour. I said when I started that I would take 25 or 30 minutes. I notice that I have taken 35.

One editorial writer said that this proposal constituted fiddling with fission—a very apt description.

Mr. President, I advert to the sage advice of Bob Patterson. He indicated that the only safe course now, in the absence of international control, is to keep ahead in this matter, because if any other nation ever surpasses us, and if that country has designs against the peace of the world, then peace will be of very short duration.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that we can strike a blow here that will notify not only our own people, but the peoples of all the world, that we do understand that with which we are dealing; that we are determined to treat it in an absolutely nonpolitical, nonpartisan way. If we do that we will add to our strength and we will add to the defense of America.

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., OF MAINE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I cannot allow this session of Congress to adjourn without paying tribute to one of the kindest, most lovable, conscientious men who has ever graced this Senate Chamber. It has been my privilege to have served with him and under him in committee for 8 years, and it is a privilege that I will never forget, for he has exemplified all that is right and decent and fair-minded in the consideration of all legislative matters and in his relations with his colleagues.

I refer, of course, Mr. President, to the esteemed senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who some time ago announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection, and is retiring at the end of this Congress to a well-earned rest after 31 years of continuous service in the two Houses of Congress. I regret exceedingly, and I know that everyone of my colleagues regret, that Senator WHITE decided not to return to the Senate—I say "decided not to return" advisedly, because I am sure the people of Maine would have returned him by an overwhelming majority.

No man in this body, so far as I know, has earned greater esteem from his fellow members than has the senior Senator from Maine. Possessed of a fine sense of courtesy, an unfailing good humor, a rare tact, and equipped with legislative experience second to none, he has endeared himself to all who know him.

He has devoted his life to the public service. He came to Congress following his graduation from Bowdoin as secretary to his esteemed grandfather, the late great Senator Frye who during his long service was not only President pro tempore of this body but also chairman of the same committee which his grandson, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], heads today. His 4 years as a secretary and clerk proved valuable to him when he was elected to the Sixty-fifth Congress, the First World War Congress, in 1917. Following 13 years in the House, he came to the Senate in 1930, and in the 18 years that have followed he has made a mark to which all of us may aspire and seek to emulate.

The senior Senator from Maine will not be with us next year but he has left a mark which will keep his memory bright. He may well be called the father of two major legislative policies—communications and shipping. His work on the Safety-of-Life-at-Sea Convention, which set a new standard for all maritime nations to follow, is a monument to him that all who know anything about shipping will remember always. His interest in telecommunications, and particularly in the early days of radio when it was regarded as a toy, has carried through to this day. He was the principal author of every communications law now on the statute books and he worked indefatigably to the very end of this Congress in an effort to secure the enactment of new, more comprehensive and urgently needed revision of the present Communications Act. It is a matter of sincere regret to me, and, I am sure, to every member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as well, that the difficulties in reconciling diverse views in the industry, prevented the earlier consideration of a bill which would have gone far to clarify and resolve some of the more pressing problems in the broadcast industry today. I am sure, however, that when communications matters are considered in succeeding Congresses, whether Republicans or Democrats are in control, the views and opinions of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], as expressed in the bill authored and reported by him in this Congress, will be reflected in whatever legislation is finally enacted.

I find it difficult to find the words to express the feelings that I have for our esteemed colleague. Those of you who have served with him know what I mean when I say there is about him an indefinable graciousness and decency—a lovableness that is beyond my poor means of explaining. Never a partisan, I know that his Democratic colleagues on the committee as well as on the floor regard him fully as highly as do his Republican friends, and in saying that I believe I am indicating the true measure and character of Senator WHITE.

The senior Senator from Maine is a great American in every sense of the word; he is a true gentleman in every sense of that word. His State, the people of his State, and his family may well be proud of what he has done for the people of this Nation in his 31 years of service here; he leaves with the warmest good wishes of all of us who wish him many years of health and happiness in his home.

PRINTING OF REPORTS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am informed that the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance expects to submit two or more reports during the coming recess or adjourned period of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that at the time these reports are submitted to the Secretary of the Senate they be printed as Senate documents with illustrations, and that thereafter a compilation of the various reports by the Advisory Council with other relevant materials on the subject be printed as a Senate document with illustrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6402) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to comment very briefly on the pending bill and the situation which the Senate confronts in respect to it. I dislike to be in the middle between my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and my able friend from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] in an argument over atomic energy, because it has been my privilege to cooperate with both of them for a considerable period, and I am unable to recall a single instance where we have had anything but the happiest relationships and cooperations. But, Mr. President, I feel that I owe it to the able Senator from Iowa as the ranking Republican Member on the Senate side of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and chairman of the committee, to state emphatically and categorically and without any reservation whatever that I think the course which he has recommended to the Senate in the pending bill is in the interest and welfare of the uninterrupted advantage of atomic energy as an American asset.

I am sure I shall be acquitted of engaging in any conspiracy against Mr. Lilienthal, as intimated by the Senator from Connecticut, as being one of the impulses of the pending bill. I am sure I shall be acquitted of any sort of political racketeering in connection with either Mr. Lilienthal or his associates on

this Commission. I simply feel, Mr. President, on the basis of the facts as I see them and as I think I know them, that I must submit my total disagreement with the conclusions of the Senator from Connecticut and my complete adherence to the thesis submitted by the able Senator from Iowa. When the Senator from Connecticut was speaking, he read from a letter from Mr. L. A. DuBridge, of the general advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission, and he read one sentence which I want to reread. That sentence, which is from the testimony of a witness for the Senator from Connecticut in behalf of his appointment, reads:

I would hope that your committee could find a way to confirm the Commissioners—

Referring to the Atomic Energy Commissioners—

in such a way as to avoid controversy.

Mr. President, I think this bill is the precise and prayerful answer to those exact specifications. I suggest that the Senate contemplate the alternatives to the passage of the bill, a bill which horizontally extends for 2 years the terms of all the Atomic Energy Commissioners, pending the subsequent staggered appointments for from 1 to 5 years each.

I suggest that the Senate consider the alternatives to the passage of this bill. The first alternative would be an effort to confirm the existing Commissioners under the reappointments which the President has sent to the Senate. Surely it is an axiom that that is impossible, short of another controversial contest of substantially the same nature as that which plagued the subject when the appointments were originally submitted. Surely it is obvious that it could not be done in the closing days of this session.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator feel that if such a contest were pitched on the floor of the Senate there would be any consideration that would move the Senator from Michigan to do other than he did so magnificently a year and a half ago?

Mr. VANDENBERG. My answer to the Senator is that I am unable to respond conclusively to his question at the moment. So far as my own information goes, I should be inclined to stand precisely where I stood before, with respect to the Commissioner to whom the Senator refers. But since the Senator faces me with this inquiry, I am bound to say that I have heard from other Senators a suggestion of dissatisfaction regarding divers and sundry alleged exhibits, let us say, upon which I would not care to pass final judgment until I knew precisely what is involved. Therefore I am unable to say with finality that my position would be the same. But my expectation is that it probably would be. I submit to the Senator that that is beside the point, because there are those Senators who very deeply feel that they do have a justification for challenging the record of several members of the Commission, as the able Senator from Connecticut understands and well knows. I am bound to say for myself that I think it has been an act of very generous cooperation with the viewpoint of the rest of us, Mr. President, that some, let us say the minority of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy—the minority which does feel very deeply and sincerely and conscientiously that some of these nominations should not be confirmed—I think it is a very great tribute to their lack of political impulse in this situation to be willing to join with the rest of us in stabilizing the entire situation for another two highly critical years.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to point out to the Senator that if there is any member of this body who has in his possession any information which would lead him to vote against the confirmation of the Commissioners, I submit he will have to challenge his conscience before he votes to extend the terms of the Commissioners as provided under this bill. That, I submit, is really the heart of this whole difficulty. By confirming their appointments for 2 years, by extending their service for 2 years, we are giving a vote of confidence to the Commissioners and are demonstrating that they are highly worthy. If any Senator on the floor believes that they are not worthy of confidence, he should vote "no" on the bill, and we should call up the confirmation and fight it out. God in his heaven did not ordain that this Congress should end tonight. That determination comes from the majority leadership.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his concluding contribution, by which he has so clearly demonstrated that he is anxious to discuss political partisanship in connection with the subject. I do not respond to him, because I am not interested in that phase of the matter at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Michigan in the remarks he has made. I have a friend on the Commission, Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, but formerly of Virginia. I voted for his confirmation last year. He is an able and valuable member of the Commission and an exceptionally fine man. I am personally interested in seeing him confirmed again. Considering the fact that we have only a few hours left before we expect to adjourn this session of the Congress sine die, and there is a division of opinion as to what should be done, it would be in the interest of my friend on the Commission for me to vote for an extension of the term of 2 years and at least stabilize the situation for that period.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his comment. It is completely in line with my own irresistible conviction on the subject.

Mr. President, if we must discuss the question of whether this is a political bill, I want to submit one or two exhibits.

Under the presently existing law the President has 20 years of appointive tenures in respect to these Commissioners. Under the proposed new law, the new President who comes in next January, has 25 years of appointive tenure. I respectfully submit that the difference between 20 years and 25 years does not constitute a ripper bill.

Secondly, so far as the tenures of the existing Commissioners are concerned, under the existing law, they would have a total tenure of 15 years maximum. Under the proposed law which is now pending, and which is supposed to be some sort of a political racket, they would have a total tenure of 10 years, plus a subsequent chance for further appointment. I again submit that we cannot make either a political racket, a political conspiracy, or a ripper bill out of those unanswerable equations.

Mr. President, let me get back to the contemplation which I was submitting to the Senate. If we do not pass this bill, we confront one perfectly obvious alternative. We cannot have the interim appointments confirmed, and everyone knows it, including the Senator from Connecticut. All that we can have as a result of the refusal to pass this measure is a group of five interim appointments which will be good only until next year and which will clothe the entire enterprise with complete insecurity and completely inadequate reliance.

Mr. President, there is one thing upon which the able Senator and I will completely agree, and that is that we both are dedicated to the best welfare of atomic energy as a resource and asset of the Government of the United States. I agree that the Senator from Connecticut has that objective in his heart, and I know he will yield the same concession to me.

I do not see how, in choosing between these alternatives—and that is the sole question concerning the Senate; there is no political conspiracy here, there is no ripper bill here, the facts deny both these indictments—the only question pending is the choice of alternatives, and I again say that I cannot see how any Senator who is devoted to the continuity of reliable, dependable atomic development, which is of such vital concern to the United States, can say that a set of temporary interim appointments which have no stability whatever can possibly be a preferable choice to two solid years of reappointment for the entire Commission, with a report which asserts that the bill is passed without any prejudice against any of them.

So, Mr. President, with this brief word I wish to associate myself with my distinguished friend from Iowa not only in behalf of the necessity of the pending measure, but equally in behalf of its good faith.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not desire to make any lengthy statement; in fact, I shall make a very brief statement. Everything has been said that can be said on this question, I think, and my only reason for rising now is because I associated myself with the Senator from Iowa in sponsoring the pending legislation.

I realize that there are differences of opinion with respect to Mr. Lilienthal and some of the other members of the Commission. I wish to make it plain that when I associated myself in sponsoring the bill with the Senator from Iowa, I was not reflecting any dissatisfaction or any criticism whatsoever of Mr. Lilienthal. If I had the opportunity I would vote today for his confirmation. I have full confidence and faith in him. I know he is a great administrator, and I believe he is doing a splendid job. That is not the situation we are facing. I hope that the Senate will not follow the advice of the Senator from Connecticut and vote down the pending bill, because I think it would be a very reckless thing to do, a very reckless thing for the safety of our country.

Atomic energy is a new science. We are not able at the present time to measure its potential, but we do know enough about it to realize that we must regard it with great respect, and that we must give it every possible assistance and cooperation in its development.

At the present time the Atomic Energy Commission are carrying on a very large program. They are building a great plant near Chicago. They are enlarging the work at Hanford, Wash. They have contracts outstanding with many of the universities of the country. They are right in the midst, I might say right in the middle, of a very great program, and to interrupt that program at the present time with any break in the continuity in the terms of the Commissioners might be a very serious thing indeed. Two years will give them an opportunity to finish the enterprises upon which they are now engaged.

Mr. President, for this reason, and for other reasons which have been mentioned by others, I sincerely hope that the Senate will vote the continuance of 2 years rather than insist upon bringing these men up for confirmation or for rejection by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A great many Members of the Senate are somewhat confused and disturbed as to the alternative which faces the Senate on this proposition. As I understand, if the bill shall not be passed, these nominees would not be confirmed, and the President would then probably appoint all of them during the interim, which would terminate in January. They would have 6 months tenure under interim appointments. If the bill is passed, as I understand, it will extend the terms for 2 years without confirmation. Is that the fact?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true. The original bill gave them an extension of a year and a half, 18 months, and no new appointments would have to be made. After that period they are to be appointed in a staggered relationship one to the other, one for 5 years, one for 4, another for 3, the fourth for 2, and the fifth for 1.

The pending bill extends the terms of all the commissioners a full 2 years, and at the end of the 2-year period they will come up in their staggered relationship for appointment. So that the 2-year interim, the 2-year continuance in office which the bill provides, will add stability, and will not make any changes at a time when stability is an absolute essentiality.

There is nothing quite so important as that, because, as I have said, they are engaging in new enterprises, a big plant at Chicago, and the other plants, and these men are right in the very beginning of that work. They are undertaking something, and they should not be removed from office until they have an opportunity to fulfill and complete the assignments which they have assumed in the interest of our defense, and in the interest of the United States generally.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's answer, and the situation which prompted me to ask the question, present an unpleasant alternative on both sides. Personally I am for these men. I think they have done a good job, and I should be willing, of course, to confirm them for the entire period provided in the law as it is now. But we cannot confirm them. No matter what happens here with regard to the pending bill, I assume we cannot confirm them.

If that is true, the question is, Which is better for the program and the Government and the people, regardless of any politics which may have been injected into the matter originally that prompted the reduction of the term and the introduction of the pending bill or the original bill?

What I was seeking from the Senator, who is a member of the joint committee, was as between the two alternatives, assuming the impossibility of confirmation and the possible interim appointments which would last until January—and assuming they were reappointed in January, the question of their confirmation would then arise again—as between that situation and the 2-year period for which the terms would be extended, which, in the Senator's judgment, is better for the program, for the Government, and the people? That is what is disturbing me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think the choice is very hard to make. I had very little difficulty in making it myself. Looking at the matter from the point of view of the good of the country, and the good of the new art and the new science, it is not very difficult for me to make the decision, and I hope it will not be difficult for others to make it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me in his time, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut the question. He has done a wonderful job, I wish to say, in regard to the whole program. He has been not only industrious and sincere, but he has been patriotic, and he has devoted himself to this matter with a singleness of purpose which I think is as highly commendable as could have been expected from any Member of this body.

I ask this question of the Senator from Connecticut: If we are faced with the alternative which I posed to the Senator from Colorado of 2 years certain tenure for all these commissioners, or failure to confirm and interim appointments for 6 months, and assuming even that they would be reappointed at the end of 6 months and the fight would again arise over their confirmation, which of these two alternatives, if there is an alternative, would best serve the program of continuity of the work the Commissioners are now doing, and the program, which is essential, as I agree with the Senator from Connecticut, to our national defense? I will say that that question has been posed to me by a large number of Senators, and I should like to have the benefit of the Senator's judgment in regard to the alternative, if it is an alternative.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that the best thing that could happen for the welfare of this Commission, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, and therefore the best thing in my opinion for the welfare of the United States, would be the rejection of this bill and the confirmation, before the Senate recesses, of these Commissioners. I cannot accede to the dilemma that is posed by the Senator from Kentucky, because in my opinion the issue that is raised here is so vital, and so basic to our whole future system of preparedness that I cannot accede to the dilemma upon which the senior Senator from Kentucky finds himself impaled.

I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that these men are in a real sense like the Commander in Chief of the Navy, Admiral Denfeld, or General Bradley of the Army. We must not establish a precedent in this matter that shall serve those who might wish for political reasons to change the Chiefs of our Army or Navy. In my opinion the bill should be rejected, and if it is rejected, then I say to the Senator from Kentucky that this Congress may adjourn at 12 o'clock tonight, but if it adjourns sine die at 12 o'clock tonight those Commissioners will be confirmed for the statutory time provided for under the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I further pursue the matter? If I were as sure as the Senator from Connecticut seems to be, that the rejection of this bill would result in their confirmation for the full term, I would certainly agree with him. But I am wondering on what basis we have any assurance that if the bill is rejected, the nominees would be confirmed, and if they are confirmed, whether the dilemma of which I spoke would then arise.

Mr. McMAHON. The reason I am so confident, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, that that would be the course of events, is that I cannot conceive that the leadership on the other side of the aisle would permit the Congress to recess and go home leaving this situation to interim nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank both Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak but briefly. It was not my intention to speak at all, but I understand there may be a question as to whether a record vote will be taken. Therefore, I wish to make my record on the bill. I still hope we can have a record vote, because I know of no good reason why Members of the Senate should not be willing to put themselves on record on this question.

I have analyzed this problem to the best of my ability. I have listened to

the able arguments of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and my dear friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. Although I seldom find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Michigan, I regret that on this occasion I do, because the issue to me is very simple. These men are either qualified or they are not qualified for the positions to which they are appointed. If they are qualified, then it seems to me they are qualified for the statutory period and not for any compromise period that has been worked out short of that statutory period. I think the interests of the country are so great and so serious in this matter, Mr. President, that we ought to know for a certainty whether or not these men should be entrusted with the solemn duties and obligations which are theirs under this assignment.

As the Senator from Connecticut has pointed out, these nominations have been before the committee now since some time in April. I think the issue should be met here as to whether or not we ought to confirm them because we think they are able to do the work for the statutory period, or reject them, and if they are not able to do it for the statutory period, then I say we ought not to confirm them for a lesser period.

Therefore I shall reluctantly vote against the proposal to confirm them for a 2-year period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The bill (H. R. 6402) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2589 will be indefinitely postponed.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO PRINT TRIBUTES TO DECEASED SENATORS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators having statements on the life, character, and public service of the deceased Senators for whom memorial services were held on April 21, 1948, may have leave to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be issued subsequent to the adjournment or recess of the session today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF POSTAL AND OTHER GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House bill 6916.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department was read twice by its title.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for immediate consent of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, there have been on the calendar for some time bills recommended by our Civil Service Committee for increasing the pay of postmasters and also a bill increasing the pay of Government employees in general. There have been constant conferences with the House as to what they might be willing to accept, and we finally worked out an agreement, so far as we can reach an agreement, under which the House agreed to a $450 increase for postal employees. The House up to this time has been unwilling to increase the pay of other employees, and the House has sent to the Senate a bill which merely increases the pay of postal employees by $450, and also imposes certain increases in postal rates.

It is my proposal that we amend the bill by a substitute which increases postal employees pay $450, and which increases the pay of other employees $360, and which provides certain other increases in the upper brackets, which will be explained by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator from Ohio say that the total amount of the increase for postal employees is $450?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, $450 per person.

Mr. President, very roughly it seems to me that both of these classes of employees ought to be increased, and if my proposed substitute is adopted it will be sent to conference with the House, and I hope the House may take the increase for the other employees as well as the postal employees. I cannot guarantee that they will do so. Some House Members seem to be in favor and others not, but I think very likely the conferees on the part of the House might accept that addition to the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the House bill provide for an increase of $450?

Mr. TAFT. The House bill provides an increase of $450, and we propose to go along with the House on that amount. It is the highest figure it is possible to get the House to accept. We also propose to add a general increase of $360 for other Government employees as well as a provision for reclassification, which would give them on an average an additional increase of perhaps something a little less than $100. That increase will be $88, according to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. It provides also for an increase in the salaries of those above $10,000 which will be explained by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Both these groups are entitled to an increase. Very roughly, the figures show that whereas the cost of living has increased about 70 percent, the postal pay increase will be about 70 percent, both over 1939 figures.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio have an estimate of the cost of those two increases?

Mr. TAFT. The two increases will cost approximately half a billion dollars. I will leave it to the Senator from Vermont to say exactly what it is. I think the postal increase is about $185,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Ohio, and for the information of the Senator from Virginia, that the postal increase amounts to about $206,000,000. The increase to classified workers amounts to about $305,000,000. There are certain other officers and employees with respect to whom the increase would amount to about $1,000,000. Those are the top figures.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator says.

Mr. TAFT. Roughly speaking, the postal increase is $200,000,000, classified employees, $300,000,000 and one or two million for the upper brackets.

Mr. BYRD. The postal employees increase is more than $200,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. The figure is $206,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. Two hundred six million dollars for the postal employees, $305,000,000 for the classified employees; and then the higher executive officers, from the Cabinet class down through heads of bureau, amounting to $1,000,000. Then there is $11,000,000 for legislative, judicial, customs clerks, and other miscellaneous workers, making a total of $523,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. May I ask the Senator from Ohio whether he proposes to increase the postal rates in his substitute?

Mr. TAFT. No. The substitute does not increase postal rates. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service felt that there were a number of those rates brought into question. They did not want to accept the rates. They want to have the question in conference, where they can discuss the individual raises which are proposed. It seemed the wise thing to substitute a bill without those rates, so that they will all be in conference.

Mr. BYRD. This will involve an increased burden on the Treasury, so far as Senate action is concerned, of $523,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I think the rates should clearly be increased.

On the general question of the justice of the increase, I cannot see any answer to the fact that if the cost of living has increased 70 percent since 1939, if the general salaries of workmen in factories today have increased about 110 percent or 120 percent, if the average of all nonagricultural workers has increased 80 percent, it seems to me that we cannot be criticized. I do not see how we can avoid the duty of at least a 70-percent increase for general employees. This proposal works out almost exactly as a 69-percent increase for civil-service employees over prewar, and about a 75-percent increase for postal employees, over prewar. In 1939 postal employees

had gone for a much longer period without an increase—practically since 1923, as I remember—and they were comparatively lower at that time than other civil-service employees. I think the additional 5 percent is justified.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator takes into consideration, does he not, the other increases made since 1939?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes. This includes everything. I have all the figures. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the table, from which I will eliminate the unnecessary matter.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE B.—*Comparison of compensation of Federal classified and postal employees with compensation paid in private industry*

[NOTE.—Cost of living increase since 1939=69.3 percent [1]]

Item	Number of employees at present [2]	Amount, 1939	Present		Proposed increase: [3] $450 postal, $360 classified	
			Amount	Percent increase over 1939	Amount	Percent increase over 1939
Manufacturing employees: [4]						
Annual earnings:						
Estimated full-time average [5]	15,850,000	$1,363.00	$2,850.00	109.0		
Estimated actual average [6]	15,850,000	1,020.00	2,700.00	165.0		
Weekly earnings (production workers only)	12,600,000	23.86	49.26	106.0		
Hourly earnings (production workers only)	12,600,000	.63	1.22	94.0		
Retail trade employees:						
Annual earnings:						
Estimated full-time average [5]	6,800,000	1,224.00	2,450.00	100.0		
Estimated actual average [6]	6,800,000	930.00	2,300.00	147.0		
Weekly earnings	6,800,000	21.17	36.67	73.0		
Hourly earnings	6,800,000	.54	.99	83.0		
Federal Government employees in positions under Classification Act: [7]						
Total	[8] 823,807					
Average rates, weighted by the employment in each period:						
Annual		1,993.00	3,006.00	51.0	$3,377	69
Weekly		38.33	57.81	51.0		
Average rates, weighted by July 1947 employment in both periods:						
Annual		2,288.00	3,006.00	31.0	3,377	48
Weekly		44.00	57.81	31.0		
Annual starting rate by grade:						
Grade 2:						
SP-1	288	1,020.00	1,690.00	66.0	2,070	102
CPC-2	25,193	1,080.00	1,690.00	56.0	2,070	91
CAF-1	4,113	1,260.00	1,756.00	39.0	2,070	64
CPC-3	22,558	1,200.00	1,822.00	52.0	2,130	77
SP-2	12,597	1,260.00	1,822.00	45.0		
Grade 3:						
CAF-2 and SP-3	119,828	1,440.00	1,954.00	36.0	2,430	68
CPC-4	18,387	1,320.00	2,020.00	53.0	2,430	84
CAF-3 and SP-4	155,013	1,620.00	2,168.00	34.0	2,500	54
CPC-5	7,648	1,500.00	2,244.00	50.0	2,570	71
Grade 4:						
CAF-4 and SP-5	100,239	1,800.00	2,394.00	33.0	2,870	59
CPC-6	18,286	1,680.00	2,469.00	47.0	2,870	71
P-1, SP-6, and CAF-5	69,569	2,000.00	2,645.00	32.0	2,970	49
CPC-7	9,489	1,860.00	2,695.00	45.0	2,970	50
Grade 5:						
CPC-8	3,371	2,000.00	2,896.00	45.0	3,470	74
CAF-6 and SP-7	29,506	2,300.00	3,021.00	31.0	3,470	51
CPC-9	1,227	2,300.00	3,272.00	42.0	3,595	56
P-2, SP-8, and CAF-7	72,661	2,600.00	3,397.00	31.0	3,720	43
Grade 6:						
CPC-10	894	2,600.00	3,648.00	40.0	4,220	63
CAF-8	13,152	2,900.00	3,773.00	30.0	4,220	46
P-3 and CAF-9	58,869	3,200.00	4,150.00	30.0	4,570	43
Grade 7:						
CAF-10	6,770	3,590.00	4,526.00	29.0	5,270	51
P-4 and CAF-11	32,236	3,800.00	4,902.00	29.0	5,270	39
Grade 8: P-5 and CAF-12	24,929	4,600.00	5,905.00	28.0	6,320	38
Grade 9: P-6 and CAF-13	11,002	5,600.00	7,102.00	27.0	7,470	34
Grade 10: P-7 and CAF-14	4,372	6,500.00	8,180.00	26.0	8,570	32
Grade 11: P-8 and CAF-15	1,610	8,000.00	9,975.00	25.0	10,070	26
U. S. Post Office Department: [9]						
Average annual earnings: [10]						
Total	296,209	1,894.00	2,857.00	51.0	3,307	75
Departmental	1,710	2,239.00	3,232.06	44.0	3,682	64
Field service:						
Total	294,499	1,892.00	2,855.00	51.0	3,305	75
City delivery carriers	66,335	2,098.00	2,954.00	47.0	3,404	70
Clerks, first- and second-class offices	104,745	2,165.00	3,012.00	39.0	3,462	60
Annual starting rates: [11]						
Clerks, first- and second-class offices	80,182	1,700.00	2,100.00	23.5	2,550	50
Mail handlers	5,213	1,500.00	2,000.00	33.3	2,450	63
City delivery carriers	67,896	1,700.00	2,100.00	23.5	2,550	50
Clerks, railway-mail service	23,115	1,900.00	2,300.00	21.1	2,750	45

[1] Based upon the increase in the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics between Aug. 15, 1939, and Mar. 15, 1948.
[2] Federal employment shown in this column represents total within grade, although rates shown are starting rates only.
[3] Increases for "postal" employees are flat amounts for each person. Increases for "classified" employees include (*a*) an average $100 per person resulting from revision of the Classification Act of 1923, plus (*b*) a flat increase for the balance shown.
[4] Source: BLS, Department of Labor.
[5] Full-time equivalent annual earnings, as published by the U. S. Department of Commerce. Data for 1947 estimated.
[6] Full-time equivalent annual earnings, as reported in the line above, minus estimated loss in earnings through lay-offs, sickness, strikes, etc.
[7] Source: Federal Employment Statistics staff of U. S. Civil Service Commission.
[8] Excludes 212 messengers under 18 years of age in present CPC-1, and 3,836 clerical-mechanical employees paid at hourly rates. Employment is as of July 31, 1947; comparable employment as of Dec. 31, 1947, was 784,000.
[9] Source: Office of Budget and Planning, U. S. Post Office Department.
[10] Employment represents an average for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. Earnings represent total pay roll for the fiscal year divided by the average employment.
[11] Employment is as of June 30, 1947.

NOTE.—The 823,807 employees shown above in Federal positions under the Classification Act of 1923, represent only those in the executive branch within continental United States (exclusive of clerical-mechanical employees who are paid on an hourly basis) as of July 31, 1947. (This group numbered 794,000 as of Dec. 31, 1947.) The figure, therefore, is lower than the 846,155 employees upon which the estimates of annual pay-roll costs of proposed pay increases were based, which covered all employees in positions under the Classification Act of 1923 (exclusive of clerical-mechanical employees) as of, roughly, the first quarter of 1948, including employees outside continental United States and those in the legislative and judicial branches and District of Columbia government.

The 296,209 employees of the Post Office Department, shown above, represent the average number of regular employees during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, whereas the figure of 458,000 on which pay-roll cost estimates were based represent the estimated average number of both regular and substitute employees, including substitutes hired for the Christmas season, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio whether he agrees with the statement which was made before our committee in investigating this subject, in justification of the increase. The statement was:

In 1947 Federal employees in classified positions received an average gross salary of $2,856, as compared with an average of $2,140 in August 1939; but in terms of what the current salaries buy, the $2,856 is worth only $1,719 today. It is also important to note that up until the early part of 1941 the purchasing power of the Federal employees remained fairly constant. From then on until the latter part of 1942 it declined rapidly.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the general statement. I have not had time to check the exact figures, but the general effect of the statement is entirely correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. Does the Senator from Ohio see any justification for raising one group of employees without giving a general raise to the other Federal employees?

Mr. TAFT. I think they all ought to be increased. I cannot see any reason for a distinction.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I think there may be an amendment to be considered before the substitute. The substitute is marked "Committee Print No. 2" and has been distributed on the desk of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. TAFT was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948."

TITLE I—INCREASES IN PAY RATES OF POSTMASTERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

INCREASE IN BASIC PAY RATES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 101. The rate of compensation of each postmaster, officer, and employee in the postal service whose rate of compensation is prescribed by the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, and by the act entitled "An act to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the pastal service," approved May 21, 1946, is increased by $450 per annum, except that any such rate which is paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall be increased 22.5 cents per hour, and rates of compensation of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall each be increased 22.5 percent.

INCREASE NOT TO DEFER PROMOTION

SEC. 102. The increase in any existing rate of compensation provided by this act shall not be construed to be such an increase in the rate of pay as, under the provisions of the act approved July 6, 1945, as amended, would defer an increase in pay by reason of promotion.

INCREASE IN EQUIPMENT ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL CARRIERS AND SPECIAL-DELIVERY MESSENGERS

SEC. 103. (a) Sections 17 (e) and 22 (d) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, are each amended by striking out "6 cents per mile" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 cents per mile."

(b) Section 22 (d) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is further amended by striking out "75 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1."

(c) The act entitled "An act to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes" (Public Law 467, 80th Cong.), is hereby repealed.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923, AS AMENDED

COMPENSATION SCHEDULE

SEC. 201. (a) Hereafter the rates of basic compensation for officers, employees, and positions in the departmental and field services, who are required to be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, shall be in conformity with the following compensation schedule of per annum rates:

Grade	Minimum rate	Intermediate rates	Maximum rate
1	$1,410	$1,475, $1,540, $1,605	$1,670
2	2,070	$2,130, $2,190, $2,250, $2,310, $2,370	2,430
3	2,430	$2,500, $2,570, $2,640, $2,710, $2,780	2,850
4	2,870	$2,970, $3,070, $3,170, $3,270, $3,370	3,470
5	3,470	$3,595, $3,720, $3,845, $3,970, $4,095	4,220
6	4,220	$4,395, $4,570, $4,745, $4,920, $5,095	5,270
7	5,270	$5,445, $5,620, $5,795, $5,970, $6,145	6,320
8	6,320	$6,570, $6,820, $7,070	7,320
9	7,470	$7,720, $7,970, $8,220	8,470
10	8,570	$8,870, $9,170, $9,470	9,770
11	10,070	$10,370, $10,670, $10,970	11,270
12	11,570	$12,070, $12,570, $13,070	13,570

Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $1.07 an hour, and head charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $1.12 an hour.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended:

Grade 1 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 1 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service under such act.

Grade 2 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grades 1 and 2 of the subprofessional service, grade 1 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, grades 2 and 3 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, and grade 1 of the clerical-mechanical service under such act.

Grade 3 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grades 3 and 4 of the subprofessional service, grades 2 and 3 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, grades 4 and 5 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, and grade 2 of the clerical-mechanical service under such act.

Grade 4 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 1 of the professional and scientific service, grades 5 and 6 of the subprofessional service, grades 4 and 5 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, grades 6 and 7 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, and grade 3 of the clerical-mechanical service under such act.

Grade 5 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 2 of the professional and scientific service, grades 7 and 8 of the subprofessional service, grades 6 and 7 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, grades 8 and 9 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, and grade 4 of the clerical-mechanical service under such act.

Grade 6 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 3 of the professional and scientific service, grades 8 and 9 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, and grade 10 of the crafts, protective, and custodial service, under such act.

Grade 7 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 4 of the professional and scientific service and grades 10 and 11 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 8 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 5 of the professional and scientific service and grade 12 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 9 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 6 of the professional and scientific service and grade 13 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 10 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 7 of the professional and scientific service and grade 14 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 11 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include all classes of positions that are or would be properly placed in grade 8 of the professional and scientific service and grade 15 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service, under such act.

Grade 12 of the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) shall include positions the duties of which are to plan and direct or to plan and execute frontier or unprecedented professional, scientific, or other specialized programs of outstanding difficulty, responsibility, and national significance, requiring extended professional, scientific, or other specialized training and experience which has demonstrated outstanding leadership and attainments in professional, scientific, or other specialized research, practice, or administration; to serve as the head of a professional, scientific, or other bureau where the position, considering the kind and extent of the authorities and responsibilities vested in it, and the scope, complexity, and degree of difficulty of the activities carried on, is exceptional and outstanding among the whole group of positions of heads of such bureaus; or to perform consulting or other professional, scientific, or other specialized work of equal importance, difficulty, and responsibility.

No position shall be placed in grade 12, and no officer or employee to whom the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, applies shall be compensated at any of the rates of such grade, except by provision of an act of Congress referring to that specific position, or after prior approval by the Civil Service Commission. Such prior approval shall cover the evaluation of the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of the position and the qualifications of any proposed appointee thereto.

The Civil Service Commission shall submit to the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report setting forth the number of positions placed in grade 12 in the respective departments and agencies during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each: *Provided, however,* That in any instance where the head of the department or agency may consider full public report on these items detrimental to the national security, the Commission is authorized to omit such items from its annual report, and in lieu thereof, the head of the department or agency shall present such information in executive sessions of such committees of the Senate and House of Representatives as the presiding officers of those bodies shall designate.

(c) Whenever payment is made on the basis of a daily, hourly, weekly, or monthly rate, such rate shall be computed from the appropriate annual rate specified in subsection (a) according to the method prescribed in section 604 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945.

(d) The following paragraphs of section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, under the headings indicated, are hereby repealed:

"PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC SERVICE

"Grade 9 in this service, which may be referred to as the special professional grade, shall include all positions which are or may be specifically, authorized or appropriated for at annual rates of compensation in excess of $10,000."

"CLERICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND FISCAL SERVICE

"Grade 16 in this service, which may be referred to as the special executive grade, shall include all positions which are or may be specifically authorized or appropriated for at annual rates of compensation in excess of $10,000."

INITIAL SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 202. (a) The existing rate of basic compensation of any officer or employee in a pay status in a position required to be compensated in accordance with the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of section 201 shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If his position is in grade 1 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$1,080	$1,410.00
$1,170	1,475.00
$1,258	1,540.00
$1,330	1,605.00
$1,402	1,670.00

(2) If his position is in grade 2 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$1,690	$2,070.00
$1,756	2,070.00
$1,822	2,130.00
$1,872	2,190.00
$1,888	2,190.00
$1,954	2,250.00
$2,017.60	2,310.00
$2,020	2,310.00
$2,093.04	2,370.00
$2,168.28	2,438.28
$2,243.52	2,513.52

(3) If his position is in grade 3 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$1,954	$2,430.00
$2,020	2,430.00
$2,093.04	2,430.00
$2,163.20	2,500.00
$2,168.28	2,500.00
$2,243.52	2,570.00
$2,318.76	2,640.00
$2,329.60	2,640.00
$2,394	2,710.00
$2,469.24	2,780.00
$2,544.48	2,850.00
$2,619.72	2,889.72
$2,694.96	2,964.96

(4) If his position is in grade 4 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$2,394	$2,870.00
$2,469.24	2,870.00
$2,496	2,870.00
$2,544.48	2,870.00
$2,619.72	2,970.00
$2,641.60	2,970.00
$2,644.80	2,970.00
$2,694.96	2,970.00
$2,770.20	3,070.00
$2,845.44	3,170.00
$2,895.60	3,270.00
$2,920.68	3,270.00
$3,021	3,370.00
$3,146.40	3,470.00
$3,271.80	3,541.80
$3,397.20	3,667.20

(5) If his position is in grade 5 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$2,608	$3,470.00
$2,895.60	3,470.00
$3,021	3,470.00
$3,099.20	3,470.00
$3,146.40	3,470.00
$3,271.80	3,595.00
$3,397.20	3,720.00
$3,522.60	3,845.00
$3,648	3,970.00
$3,773.40	4,095.00
$3,898.80	4,220.00
$4,024.20	4,294.20
$4,149.60	4,419.60

(6) If his position is in grade 6 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$3,648	$4,220.00
$3,773.40	4,220.00
$3,898.80	4,220.00
$4,024.20	4,395.00
$4,149.60	4,570.00
$4,275	4,570.00
$4,400.40	4,745.00
$4,525.80	4,920.00
$4,651.20	5,095.00
$4,776.60	5,095.00
$4,902	5,270.00

(7) If his position is in grade 7 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$4,525.80	$5,270.00
$4,651.20	5,270.00
$4,776.60	5,270.00
$4,902	5,270.00
$5,027.40	5,445.00
$5,152.80	5,620.00
$5,278.20	5,620.00
$5,403.60	5,795.00
$5,654.40	5,970.00
$5,905.20	6,320.00

(8) If his position is in grade 8 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$5,905.20	$6,320.00
$6,144.60	6,570.00
$6,384	6,820.00
$6,623.40	7,070.00
$6,862.80	7,320.00

(9) If his position is in grade 9 of such compensation schedule, and his existing basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$7,102.20	$7,470.00
$7,341.60	7,720.00
$7,581	7,970.00
$7,820.40	8,220.00
$8,059.80	8,470.00

(10) If his position is in grade 10 of such compensation schedule, and his existing rate of basic compensation is at a rate per annum of— / Such rate shall be increased to a rate per annum of—

$8,179.50	$8,570.00
$8,478.75	8,870.00
$8,778	9,170.00
$9,077.25	9,470.00
$9,376.50	9,770.00

(11) If his position is in grade 11 of such compensation schedule, his existing rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted as follows:

(A) If he has had less than 18 months of service creditable for within-grade salary advancements under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $10,070 per annum.

(B) If he has had 18 but less than 36 months of such creditable service since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $10,370 per annum.

(C) If he has had 36 but less than 54 months of such creditable service since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $10,670 per annum.

(D) If he has had 54 but less than 72 months of such creditable service since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $10,970 per annum.

(E) If he has had 72 or more months of such creditable service since his last equivalent increase, his existing rate shall be adjusted to $11,270 per annum.

(b) A previous salary advancement of $25 per annum, or a salary increase under paragraphs (1) to (10), inclusive, of subsection (a) shall not be considered an "equivalent increase" for the purpose of within-grade salary advancements under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(c) Upon adjustment of the salary of any person pursuant to subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph 11 of subsection (a) any creditable service in excess of that required for such adjustment shall be credited toward the first within-grade salary advancement subsequent to such adjustment.

(d) Each of the rates, $2,438.28 and $2,513.52 in grade 2, $2,869.72 and $2,964.96 in grade 3, $3,541.80 and $3,667.20 in grade 4, and $4,294.20 and $4,419.60 in grade 5, is authorized to be paid only to those employees whose existing compensation is initially adjusted to that rate under this section.

BASIS FOR CLASSIFYING POSITIONS

SEC. 203. Section 2 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof, and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) Each position shall be placed in its appropriate class and grade. The basis for determining the class and the grade in which each position shall be placed shall be the duties and responsibilities of such position and the qualifications required by such duties and responsibilities.

"(2) In placing positions in classes and grades, there shall be taken into consideration all material facts which, in a given case, are relevant to the degree of difficulty, the weight of the responsibility, and the qualification requirements of the work involved in the position, such as (1) kind and variety of work; (2) nature and extent of available guide lines for performance of work; (3) nature of supervisory control exercised by others over the work; (4) initiative, originality, or judgment required; (5) purpose and nature of personal contacts required by the work; (6) nature and scope of recommendations, decisions, commitments, and conclusions involved; (7) kind, scope, and extent of knowledge, ability, and other qualities required; (8) kind, length, and quality of experience necessary; and (9) nature and extent of supervisory control over the work of other employees.

"(3) Additional duties and responsibilities assigned to an employee because of his exceptionally efficient service shall be given due weight in placing his position in its appropriate class and grade.

"(4) Supervisory positions shall not be placed in a class and grade solely on the basis of the size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit or the number of subordinates supervised. Such factors may be given effect only to the extent warranted by the work load of the organization unit and then only in combination with other factors, such as the kind, difficulty, and complexity of work supervised, the degree and scope of responsibility delegated to the supervisor, and the kind, degree, and value of the supervision actually exercised."

STANDARDS FOR CLASSIFYING POSITIONS

SEC. 204. The third paragraph of section 3 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is further amended by inserting "(c)" before the first sentence of such paragraph; by inserting "(e)" before the sixth sentence of such paragraph; and by amending the second, third, fourth, and fifth sentences of such paragraph to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The Civil Service Commission, after consultation with departments and agencies, shall prepare and publish standards for placing positions in their proper classes and grades. The Commission is authorized to make such inquiries or investigations of the duties and responsibilities and qualification requirements of positions as it deems necessary for this purpose. Such standards shall, in terms of duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements, define the various classes of positions that exist in the service; shall establish the official class titles; shall show the grades in which such classes have been placed by the Commission; and shall be published in such form as the Commission shall determine. At the request of the Commission, departments and agencies shall furnish information and cooperate in the preparation of such standards.

"(2) The Commission shall keep such standards up to date. From time to time, after consultation with the departments and agencies to the extent deemed necessary, it may revise, supplement, amend, abolish, merge, or divide existing standards, or prepare new standards, so that, as nearly as may be practicable, positions existing at any given time within the service will be covered by current published standards.

"(3) The official class titles so established shall be used for personnel, budget, and fiscal purposes to the extent deemed necessary by the Commission, but this shall not prevent the use of organizational or other titles for internal administration, public convenience, law enforcement, or similar purposes."

AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURE

SEC. 205. Section 4 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) In conformity with standards issued pursuant to the provisions of section 3 (d) of this act, departments and agencies (1) shall place all positions in their departmental and field services in their respective classes and grades and (2) shall review the determination of the class and grade of a position whenever it materially changes with respect to its duties, responsibilities, or qualification requirements and shall revise such determination when the facts warrant.

"(b) Action taken under the authority of subsection (a) of this section shall be final unless and until changed by certification of the Commission: *Provided*, That departments and agencies shall refer to the Commission for final action such positions in the departmental service as are not at the time covered by standards published by the Commission.

"(c) The Commission shall postaudit actions taken under the authority of subsection (a) of this section, and shall have authority on its own motion, or at the request of the employee occupying the position, or otherwise to ascertain currently the facts as to the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of any position. In connection with such postaudits, departments and agencies shall provide the Commission with information regarding the duties and responsibilities of positions, reasons for placing individual positions in the respective classes and grades, and related information requested by the Commission.

"(d) Whenever the Commission, after investigation and after affording the department or agency concerned an opportunity for explanation and for submitting further information, shall determine that any position subject to this act (1) has not been placed in its proper class and grade, or (2) has not been placed in any class and grade, the Commission shall place such position in its proper class and grade and shall certify its findings and a statement of the necessary corrections to the department or agency concerned and to the General Accounting Office.

"(e) Departments and agencies shall take action in accordance with such certificates of the Commission. The Commission's certificates shall be binding on all certifying, pay-roll, disbursing, and accounting officers of the Government. Any pay adjustment shall be effective at the beginning of the pay period in which the Commission's certificate is received in the appropriate administrative office.

"(f) The rate of basic compensation to which an officer's or employee's existing rate shall be adjusted when (1) the standards issued under section 3 (d) of this act are first applied to his position or (2) an error in placing his position in a class and grade is corrected, shall be in accordance with the compensation schedule established by section 201 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948 and shall be governed by regulations issued by the Commission: *Provided*, That if such rate is lower than the rate at which he has theretofore been receiving compensation, or at which he was hired, and the Commission finds that the circumstances of the individual case warrant (A) continuance of the rate at which he has theretofore been receiving compensation or at which he was hired, or (B) adjustment to any standard rate falling between the rate specified in (A) and the appropriate rate as set out in such compensation schedule; it may authorize such continuance or adjustment. If any officer or employee of long and efficient service is transferred or reassigned, not for delinquency or misconduct, to a position in a lower class or grade, and the Commission finds that the circumstances of the individual case warrant (i) continuance of the rate at which he has theretofore been receiving compensation, or (ii) adjustment to any standard rate falling between the rate specified in (i) and the appropriate rate as set out in the compensation schedule, it shall so notify the employing agency and such continuance or adjustment shall be made accordingly.

"(g) Whenever the Commission finds that the actions of any department or agency in placing positions in classes and grades are not in accordance with standards issued pursuant to section 3 (d) of this act and that the errors or failure in applying such standards are sufficiently serious to warrant immediate supervision by the Commission of future action, the Commission may, in its discretion, after affording the department or agency an opportunity for consultation and explanation, withdraw or suspend in whole or in part the authority of the department or agency to take final action and require approval of such actions by the Commission prior to their becoming effective. After any such withdrawal or suspension, the Commission may restore such authority when, in its judgment, such restoration is warranted by the corrective steps taken by the department or agency to prevent future errors or failures. The Commission shall promptly notify the General Accounting Office of any such withdrawal, suspension, or restoration.

"(h) In determining the rate of compensation which an employee shall receive, the principle of equal compensation for equal work irrespective of sex shall be followed."

WITHIN-GRADE SALARY ADVANCEMENTS

SEC. 206. Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "12 months" and substituting "52 weeks" therefor; and by striking out "18 months" and substituting "78" weeks" therefor.

ADDITIONAL SALARY ADVANCEMENTS

SEC. 207. Subsection (f) of section 7 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is amended by inserting before the words "this subsection" wherever they appear therein the words "the first sentence of," and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Within the limit of available appropriations, as a reward for long, faithful, and outstanding service, under standards to be issued by the Commission, and subject to prior approval by the Commission, or delegation of authority as provided in subsection (g), the head of any department or agency is authorized to award additional salary advancements to an employee beyond the maximum rate of the grade in which the employee's position is placed, but no employee's

salary shall be increased beyond the maximum rate for his position by more than three such additional salary advancements, and no employee shall receive more than one such advancement during any 3-year period. Each such additional salary advancement shall be equal to the highest increment between any two consecutive rates of the grade in which the employee's position is placed, and shall be subject to the following conditions:

"(1) The employee shall have completed at least 3 years of continuous service, certified by his department or agency as being of outstanding value to the Government, at the maximum rate of his position, or at such rate in excess thereof as is authorized by this subsection, without change of grade or rate of basic compensation except that due to an act of Congress of general application.

"(2) He shall have had, in the aggregate, not less than 10 years of service in the position which he then occupies, or in positions of equivalent or higher class or grade.

"(3) The performance of an employee who is receiving additional salary advancement beyond the maximum rate shall be reviewed annually, and if this review reflects a failure to render outstanding service the employee's rate of pay shall revert to the rate which he received immediately prior to his last advancement."

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 208. Rule 6 of section 6 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that appointments or other assignments to positions in grades 11 and 12 may, with the prior approval of the Civil Service Commission, be made at, or subsequently adjusted to, any rate of the grade."

SEC. 209. Whenever the Civil Service Commission shall find (a) that a sufficient number of qualified eligibles for positions of a given class cannot be secured in one or more areas or locations at the existing minimum rate for such class, and (b) that a sufficient number of such eligibles can be secured by increasing the minimum rate for such class in such areas or locations to a rate not higher than the middle rate of the grade in which such class is placed, the Commission may, by regulation, establish such higher rate as the minimum rate for that class in the areas or locations concerned. Each such regulation shall specify the date, not more than 1 year from the date of issuance, when it shall cease to be effective unless extended by another such regulation.

SEC. 210. The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of the foregoing provisions of this title in the departmental and field services and to identify the positions falling under section 211 of this title.

SEC. 211. Section 5 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) This act shall not be applicable to positions and employees in recognized trades or crafts, or other skilled mechanical crafts, or in unskilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual-labor occupations; and the rates of basic compensation of such positions and employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose.

"(b) This act shall not be applicable to employees of the Transportation Corps of the Army of the United States on vessels operated by the United States, vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, vessel employees of the Department of the Interior, vessel employees of the Panama Railroad Co., or other vessel employees of the United States; and the rates of basic compensation of such employees shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with wage practices of the maritime industry."

TITLE III—INCREASE IN RATE OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

COVERAGE

SEC. 301. The provisions of this title shall apply to civilian positions, officers, and employees (other than officers and employees who serve without compensation) in or under (1) the executive departments (2) the independent establishments and agencies in the executive branch, including wholly owned Government corporations and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; (3) the Administrative Office of United States Courts; (4) the Library of Congress; (5) the Government Printing Office; (6) the General Accounting Office; (7) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; (8) the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and (9) the Court of Claims.

HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 302. The rate of basic compensation of the head of each executive department and of the Secretary of Defense shall be $20,000 per annum; of each Under Secretary of an executive department, of the Solicitor General of the United States, of the Assistant to the Attorney General, and of the First Assistant Postmaster General, $18,000 per annum; and of each Assistant Secretary of an executive department, of each Assistant Attorney General, of the Second, Third, and Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, of the Counselor of the Department of State, and of each of three special assistants to the Secretary of Defense, $15,000 per annum.

HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS AND AGENCIES

SEC. 303. (a) The rate of basic compensation of the Comptroller General, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Federal Security Administrator, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the Federal Works Administrator shall be $18,000 per annum. In any case in which the responsibility immediately below that of an officer referred to in the preceding sentence (other than the Housing and Home Finance Administrator) for the direction and administration of the functions of his agency is concentrated in a single position, the rate of basic compensation of such position shall be $16,500 per annum. In any case in which such responsibility is concentrated in more than one but not more than three positions the rate of basic compensation of each such position shall be $15,000 per annum. The rate of basic compensation of the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Public Housing Commissioner, and the Federal Housing Commissioner shall be $15,000 per annum.

(b) The rate of basic compensation of (1) the other full-time members of independent boards or commissions (including the boards of directors of such wholly owned Government corporations as the President may designate and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) in the executive branch and not within or under any executive department or agency; (2) the heads of other independent establishments or agencies in the executive branch; (3) the governors of Territories or possessions; (4) the Commissioners of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; (5) the Director of the Administrative Office of United States Courts; (6) the Librarian of Congress; (7) the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; (8) the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board; (9) the Chairman of the Munitions Board; (10) the Chairman of the Research and Development Board; and (11) the Public Printer, shall be $16,500 per annum. In any case in which the responsibility immediately below that of a board, commission, or other head of an agency referred to in this subsection, for the direction and administration of the functions of such board, commission, or agency is concentrated in a single position, the rate of basic compensation of such position shall be $15,000 per annum.

(c) The rates of basic compensation of the heads of the component parts of the Executive Office of the President (other than the Bureau of the Budget), and of such secretaries, administrative or executive assistants, and other immediate staff assistants to the President in the White House Office as the President may designate shall be $18,000 per annum, $16,500 per annum, or $15,000 per annum, to be determined by the President of the United States.

(d) The rate of basic compensation of the Architect of the Capitol shall be $15,000 per annum; and that of the Commissioners of the Court of Claims shall be $11,270 per annum.

(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of any position with respect to which the Congress shall hereafter fix the rate of basic compensation.

TITLE IV—INCREASES IN PAY RATES OF LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, AND CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES

INCREASE IN PAY RATES OF EMPLOYEES IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SEC. 401. (a) Section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of such section the following: "thereby, plus, except as hereinafter provided, (1) 18 percent of his rate of compensation (including the additions thereto provided by the foregoing portion of this sentence), or (2) $360 per annum, whichever is the lesser. No employee in the office of a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, and no clerical or professional staff member of a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives shall be paid, with respect to any pay period, any additional compensation under the provisions of clause (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence, or any compensation at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, unless such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or the chairman of such committee, shall so certify in writing to the appropriate disbursing office, and in such event payment of such compensation shall begin on the first regular pay day following such certification, or following the effective date of title IV of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or laws, the basic compensation of any employee, other than an administrative assistant, in the office of a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be fixed by such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner at any multiple of $5 per month which is not in excess of $5,700 per annum. Any such increase shall be made by certification in writing to the appropriate disbursing officer before the first day on which compensation at such increased rate is to be effective."

(b) The annual compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the Presiding Officers of the two Houses), as fixed by section 201 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, shall be increased by $360.

INCREASE IN PAY RATES OF EMPLOYEES IN JUDICIAL BRANCH

SEC. 402. Section 521 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of such section the following: "thereby, plus (1) 18 percent of his rate of compensation (including the

additions thereto provided by the foregoing portion of this sentence), or (2) $360 per annum, whichever is the lesser."

INCREASE IN PAY RATES OF CUSTOMS CLERKS, IMMIGRANT INSPECTORS, AND CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH WHOSE RATES ARE FIXED BY STATUTES OTHER THAN THE CLASSIFICATION ACT

SEC. 403. (a) Each of the existing rates of basic compensation provided by the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service," approved May 29, 1928, as amended and supplemented, and those provided by the second paragraph of section 24 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended and supplemented, are hereby increased by (1) 18 percent of such rate, or (2) $360 per annum, whichever is the lesser. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of basic compensation.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, rates of basic compensation specifically provided by statute (including any increases therein computed in accordance with section 602 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and section 4 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946), for positions in the executive branch or the District of Columbia municipal government which are not included in section 102, as amended, of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 or in the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, and are not increased by any other provisions of this act, are hereby increased by (1) 18 percent of such rate, or (2) $360 per annum, whichever is the lesser. Such augmented rates shall be considered to be the regular rates of compensation.

(c) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees who, on the effective date of this act, are receiving basic compensation at the rate of $9,975 or more per annum in positions not subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or to the provisions of title III of this act, but in organizations subject generally to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and for which a single or maximum rate of basic compensation has heretofore been fixed by statute at $9,975 or more, shall, upon recommendation by the head of the department or agency concerned and approval by the Civil Service Commission, be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

MINIMUM RATE OF COMPENSATION

SEC. 404. If any rate, as increased by section 402 or 403 of this act, except a rate provided for a foreign service staff officer or employee is insufficient to provide compensation of $2,070 for each 2,080 hours required to be devoted exclusively to the service of the United States by any worker who has attained his 18th birthday anniversary, such rate shall be adjusted by the head of the employing agency so as to provide such compensation. Such adjusted rate shall be considered to be the regular rate of compensation. For the purpose of this section, the number of hours required in the case of any position to be devoted exclusively to the service of the United States, if not determined by law, shall be determined, from time to time, by the head of the employing agency.

MAXIMUM RATE OF COMPENSATION

SEC. 405. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out "$10,000" where it first appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,270."

(b) Section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,270."

(c) No officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of this title, except section 401 (b) or 403 (c), be paid with respect to any pay period, basic compensation, or basic compensation plus any additional compensation provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, at a rate in excess of $11,270 per diem.

INCREASE IN MAXIMUM PER DIEM RATES FOR TEMPORARY OR INTERMITTENT SERVICES

SEC. 406. (a) As to departments and agencies subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, expert and consultant personnel employed by contract in accordance with section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress, may, notwithstanding provisions of other laws, be compensated at any rates of compensation not in excess of the daily rate equivalent of the highest annual rate provided for grade 11 by section 201 of this act.

(b) Section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress, is amended by striking out "payable under the Classification Act", and inserting in lieu thereof "provided for grade 11 by section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1948."

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

RATES OF PRESENT INCUMBENTS NOT TO BE REDUCED

SEC. 501. In no case shall the rate of basic compensation, authorized by law, being received by the incumbent of any position subject to this act on the date of enactment of this act be decreased as a result of the enactment of this act so long as he continues to occupy the position occupied by him on the date of enactment of this act, other than by reason of action of the Civil Service Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 203, 204, or 205, or by reason of the provisions of section 211; but when the position becomes vacant, the basic rate of compensation of any new appointee shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

SEC. 502. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The additional amounts required by any agency for that purpose shall not be subject to any limitations now imposed by law (other than appropriation acts) on the amount that may be appropriated for the salaries of its officers and employees.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 503. This act shall take effect with respect to any officer or employee on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not quite understand the Senator's reply to the question of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Roughly there is a $523,000,000 increased expenditure, but how much will the increased postal rates carried by the House bill return as compared to the present rate?

Mr. TAFT. Approximately $125,000,000. So they fall by about $80,000,000 to pay for the increase in postal salaries. I may say that there should be a further increase in postal rates, but the House committee apparently prepared these figures for increases very rapidly, and our committee thinks with some lack of discrimination, which we should like to consider in conference. I think next year there should undoubtedly be a much larger increase, to pay not only for these increases, but also the deficit which already exists in postal receipts.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yeld?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say for the information of the Senate that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service yesterday approved a Senate resolution authorizing a study of the whole question of postal receipts and postal rates by a management engineering firm, unspecified in the resolution, the report to be made the middle of next January. We are satisfied that only a scientific investigation will determine what these rates ought to be. We have had a perfect hail-storm of letters, telegrams, and objections by telephone and verbally, over the proposals in the House bill, indicating that it is most unwise to undertake to make changes in postal rates quickly and without real study. That real study the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service desires to make.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Would it be in order for me to offer at this time an amendment to the proposed substitute for the House bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that there is an amendment which has priority over the Senator's amendment. It will be offered by the junior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator from Washington willing to defer offering his amendment?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to the original bill and amendments to the substitute are in order. Amendments to the original bill will take precedence.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, beginning with line 14, it is proposed to strike out all through line 16, and insert the following:

SEC. 214. This title, except section 204, shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted. Section 204 shall take effect on January 1, 1949.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, briefly, let me state what the amendment proposes to do. Section 204, as thus amended, will be effective January 1, instead of 60 days following the enactment of this bill.

The purpose is to give the mail-order houses and nurserymen a chance to change their catalogs and revise their price schedules.

I do not think there are objections from the committee to this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to know how much revenue is expected from this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The increased postal rates are supposed to provide approximately $125,000,000 additional revenue annually. I do not know how much this amendment will remove from that amount, but only a percentage of the total amount since the effective date is only being delayed 6 months on part of the authorized increase. Perhaps the

Senator from Vermont can give you the amount.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, my guess would be approximately $16,000,000. If the House proposal for an increase in the postage is to be retained, I feel that this amendment is an excellent one, because so many price lists include postage, as in the case of nurserymen and mail-order houses, and so forth, that they would be completely upset if the increased postage were installed now.

So it seems to me that this is an appropriate amendment to the original bill.

I must say that I hope the original bill will not pass; but this is an appropriate amendment to it, and is in order, and I would suggest that we adopt it by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer, and ask to have stated. It is an amendment to the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the substitute will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the substitute, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. The provisions of this act granting an increase in compensation to employees of the United States and of the District of Columbia shall not apply to any employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia prior to the time that legislation providing a sales tax in the District of Columbia is enacted by the Congress and becomes effective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not understand the answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Washington. Is it in order to offer amendments now to the original House bill or to the substitute, or both?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order to offer amendments to both, but amendments to the original bill take precedence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I shall offer to both, and at the proper time I shall ask to have the amendment called up.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to inquire whether my understanding is correct. I understand that the amendment just being offered is to the substitute, for it refers to the classified employees of the District of Columbia rather than to postal employees of the District of Columbia.

I would make only one comment about this amendment. Certainly I am but one of many who wish we did not have to offer such an amendment, for the amendment says in effect that the pay raises intended within this bill shall go to everyone throughout the country except 7,000 employees who are classified employees within the District of Columbia. But we cannot very well, within this District, sponsor or approve of deficit financing; nor can we, without much more study than has been given to the problem, take automatically out of the real property within the District of Columbia sufficient revenues with which to meet this obligation. The District of Columbia has approximately 18,000 employees, about 8,000 of whom are classified. If this amendment did not prevail, those 8,000 would benefit from these wage and salary increases, while 10,000 other employees within the District of Columbia would receive no increase at all.

Over a period of months the fiscal subcommittees of the District of Columbia Committees of both the House and the Senate have wrestled with our local District of Columbia problem of how to obtain sufficient revenues to meet justifiable demands for services within the District of Columbia. Our coordinated and agreed-upon program was a sales-tax and a revised income-tax program.

As is known to nearly everyone in the Senate, opposition has been taken to that program. The program represents the moneys and revenues out of which we could meet such an obligation as will be incurred by the passage of this proposed legislation.

In the absence of having moneys with which to meet our obligations, it becomes necessary to adopt an amendment of the kind in question, which would deny to 7,000 people what hundreds of thousands are to receive throughout the rest of the land.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we hope later in the evening to put the District of Columbia sales tax on the agenda.

In the meantime, I shall accept the amendment of the Senator from Washington. I have a right to modify my amendment to include the amendment of the Senator from Washington, and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate briefly on this pay-increase bill.

The committee has been at great pains to try to work out this matter. It has not been an easy thing to do, because the members of the Senate committee had different views on it, as compared to the views of the House committee. I could say that our committee reported two bills, one which I introduced—being Senate bill 1949—and another which was introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself, being Senate bill 1531.

This proposed amendment is a combination of the terms and provisions of both those bills, with a substantial reduction in amount.

I should like to present a matter for consideration by the Senate in connection with the differential between $450, as provided for the Federal postal employees, and the amount to be provided for the regular Federal employees.

An examination of the chart introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio will demonstrate that for some period of time the postal employees have lagged behind the Federal employees, so far as salaries are concerned. I only need to state that the average annual wage of the Federal employees in 1939 was $1,993, and presently it is $3,006, as compared with $1,894 for the postal employees in the earlier period, and $2,857 presently, on the average. That explains the differential.

I, for one, would like to see the postal employees, particularly, receive a larger increase than is provided here.

The House reported a bill carrying an increase which would be effective, as I recall, for only 1 year. It provided a larger amount than this measure does. This amount, however—$450—is stated in that bill as a permanent increase.

I hope, Mr. President, that this bill will pass as amended by the Senate so that we can take it into conference and come out with a bill that will grant these substantial increases to the postal employees, and also a substantial increase to the Federal workers.

I might say also that in this bill there are some very salutary provisions. We have heard criticism for a long time to the effect that the heads of departments and agencies in the Government have their compensation fixed on the basis of how many workers they employ in their particular department—the more workers, the higher their pay. That provision, Mr. President, is eliminated in the pending bill. The bill also contains a new classification of the Federal service, a simplification of it. I think it also furnishes a good foundation upon which the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in succeeding sessions can work out a real, sensible, and sane reorganization of Federal employment and Federal pay.

As the matter now stands, it seems to be in great confusion, with a great number of classifications and rates that are highly complicated. There is an effort in this bill to reduce that complication and to bring greater simplification into the system.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator to explain the increases made in the various grades. Is that in addition to the $360?

Mr. BALDWIN. There are some increases made in the grades, but those increases in most instances are less than $100. I think there are none over. But the bill also provides that the increases resulting from the changes in classification will not be added to the $360 increase. In other words, under the terms of the bill, the most a Federal employee outside the postal service can get is the $360. If by reason of the reclassification he gets an increased amount, that will be deducted from $360.

Mr. BYRD. The total is $360, is it?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. Just a moment. If I may say so, I think there is a slight mistake.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am glad to be corrected by my friend.

Mr. FLANDERS. The average is $360, with some around $44, as an extreme, and some $44 less, as an extreme. The average is $360.

Mr. BYRD. That is, up to what grade? Ther are larger increases to certain officials, I see.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from Virginia that it is carried clear up to and through grade 11. One

of the things which has been out of order has been that the lower grades have been pressing up against the $10,000 limit. The reclassification also takes care of that. We have had many cases in which the boss was getting less than the men under him.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think the Senator has got the answer to the question in regard to the higher officials.

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator mean the Cabinet officers?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Cabinet and under-Cabinet officers, the heads of boards, bureaus, and commissions.

Mr. FLANDERS. I can give the Senator from Virginia a summary of it.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, up to grade 10 the average increase is $360, is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Then what about grade 11?

Mr. FLANDERS. It also includes grade 11. There is a new grade 12 which is included to take care of the flock of special bills we have had coming in which call for higher salary increases for scientists and similar special employees.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator explain the increases above grade 11?

Mr. FLANDERS. Let us start at the top. Cabinet members are increased from $15,000 to $20,000, under secretaries are increased from $10,000 to $18,000, and assistant secretaries from $10,000 to $15,000. Heads of the seven largest agencies, which includes the Federal Security Administrator, Federal Works Administrator, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Comptroller General, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, whose present salaries range from $10,000 in the case of the Bureau of the Budget, up to $17,500 in the case of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; are all raised to $18,000. Those are the heads of boards, commissions, and other independent agencies.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, could we have order? We canot hear what is being said by Senators. It is a private discussion. We cannot tell what is going on. May we have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. FLANDERS. The heads of boards and commissions and other independent agencies and deputy heads of the above are raised from $10,000 or $12,000 to $16,500. Assistant heads are raised from $10,000 to $15,000. One interesting thing for instance is that the Federal Trade Commission members had their $10,000 salaries set back before World War I. If the salary was right then, it is dead wrong now, and this remedies the thirty-five-odd-years increase in the cost of living with which all of us who are over 35 years of age have had some experience.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, under this particular bill and classifications about which the Senator from Vermont has just been talking affecting those in the higher bracket, the total over-all of all those increases will amount to about $1,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is the addition it would make to the Federal pay roll?

Mr. BYRD. Does the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut raise them $5,000 each? Is that the approximate amount?

Mr. FLANDERS. It would not be possible to raise them a given amount over their base because their base is scattered all over the lot.

Mr. BYRD. What is the largest raise made?

Mr. FLANDERS. Under Secretaries are raised from $10,000 to $18,000. That is the largest raise.

Mr. BYRD. Cabinet members are raised from $15,000 to $20,000, are they not?

Mr. FLANDERS. From $15,000 to $20,000, and the final result is an even gradation from the $20,000 of the Cabinet members down through to the old $10,000 flat.

Mr. BYRD. That is a pretty heavy raise for Under Secretaries—$10,000. It is nearly doubled.

Mr. FLANDERS. We have been losing Under Secretaries very heavily of late. There is a hole in the bag in which Under Secretaries are kept, and this is intended to stop up that hole.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Was any consideration given to increasing the salaries of the Indian Claims Commission, which has now been appointed and which is a very important Government organization? It is comparable to the Court of Claims, which formerly handled these claims.

Mr. FLANDERS. I can get that information for the Senator shortly. I do not have it right at hand.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to say to the Senator that that is a Commission performing duties which were formerly performed by the Court of Claims. The salaries of the Commissioners of the Court of Claims have all been vastly increased.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from Texas they have been raised to $16,500.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Indian Claims Commission?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Indian Claims Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is, the members of it. There are three members of it.

Mr. FLANDERS. All the members of it. It is set on a level comparable with others with similar responsibilities and similar experience.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the pending bill, then, the salaries of the Indian Claims Commissioners will be $16,500?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want it to be confused with any other commission.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Is that the Commission which was just recently created?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Indian Claims Commission? I do not know how old the Commission is, sir.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not very old. It was created only about 2 years ago.

Mr. HATCH. About 2 years. The salaries of the Commissioners are being increased from $10,000 to $16,500.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the comparable figure for other officers of the Government having comparable responsibility, and requiring comparable ability. The present salary scheme, I will say to the Senator from New Mexico, in the upper ranges, is a crazy patchwork. Some have been far out of line and some have furnished standards to which the rest should be brought.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that a short time ago the salary was based at $10,000 per year, and inside of 2 years' time an increase of $6,500 seems rather unusual, to me. I have no objection to it, but I was wondering why that quick jump in salary was made.

Mr. FLANDERS. Even though 2 years old, the salary could have been set a bit too low, as is the case with the Federal Trade Commissioners, whose salaries were set too low in 1912. The salary is far too low now.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont whether, in the fixation of the amounts the committee or the subcommittee had the benefit of expert advice from the Civil Service Commission, or whether it was the result of extensive study, or otherwise.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from Maryland that he is asking questions which he is perfectly competent to answer, since the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the junior Senator from Vermont spent many months working on this reclassification of salaries. We had the advantage of nearly 2 years of work previously carried on by the Civil Service Commission in a more or less easy-going way, which we brought to a head, so that we could do our work on the basis of that work. We have also held hearings with the personnel services involved in the Government, including personnel men from as far away as the Pacific coast. We have had hearings which involved the organized groups in the Federal service, and we have taken into account every possible means of gaining information.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I intend to vote for this bill, of course, but I am disappointed that the original Senate bill is not the bill which we are considering. I appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, months ago, which committee is under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like, if I may, to say a word to the Senator from

South Carolina. His disappointment is easy to understand, but we are faced with the hard choice of having a bill which can be enacted into law, or having a bill which cannot be enacted. I am satisfied that we can enact into law at this session nothing more favorable than what is in this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall vote for the bill. I was here and voted for the bill providing increases for the postal employees some years ago.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The bill refers to basic compensation for the heads of departments, and so forth. Is their overtime to be added to that, or is that the total compensation?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the total compensation.

Mr. BYRD. The executive assistants to the President and his staff assistants are listed in the bill at $18,000 a year. Do they receive $10,000 at this time?

Mr. FLANDERS. Not all of them. I think that is the lowest salary, if I remember correctly. It is not set at $18,000. There are three rates from which the President may choose. One assistant now receives $15,000, one receives $12,000, and the rest receive $10,000.

Mr. BYRD. Referring to page 26, what is the present salary of employees in that category?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is section 303. I will get the Senator the figures in a moment. They range all over the lot. The Comptroller General now receives $12,000. The Senator will recall that an exceedingly competent and faithful public servant in the Bureau of the Budget had to resign because of his low salary. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget now receives $10,000.

Mr. BYRD. Under the bill he is increased to $18,000?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Would it be a fair statement to say that in the higher brackets there will be an increase of approximately 50 percent?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. In some instances, as much as 80 percent?

Mr. FLANDERS. That salary was correspondingly low.

Mr. BYRD. I am speaking of the average. Some of them are increased 80 percent and none of them less than 50 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. It is approximately 50 percent, yes.

Mr. BYRD. Some have been increased 80 percent, from $10,000 to $18,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. At the top, which is the Cabinet, they have been raised only 33⅓ percent.

Mr. BYRD. But others have been raised 80 percent, have they not?

Mr. FLANDERS. Some have been, yes.

Mr. BYRD. Has the salary of any of them been doubled?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not remember an instance of any salary having been doubled.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that in the lower salaried positions the employees are raised $350, but the $10,000 men will receive $18,000, or an increase of 80 percent.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from South Carolina that in the latter case we are in an entirely different situation. Instead of gathering employees from thousands of possible applicants, the head of the administration of the Federal Government is looking around the country and picking out the best man here, and the best man over here, and the best man there. I will say that I picked out the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] that time.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his generous offer but I must respectfully decline to accept it.

Mr. FLANDERS. The administrative head is picking out individually the best men he can find for the purpose, and that is a far different thing from running an employment agency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have been here for a number of years and I have always heard that the Federal Government could not secure enough personnel. Through restrictions, and through the Civil Service Commission's ratings they are treated more or less unfairly, in my judgment. But when we raise the salary of a man from $10,000 to $18,000, and then tell the postmasters and the poor Government workers that all we can do for them is to give them a few meager hundreds of dollars to balance their food bill only, it is rather disappointing. I shall vote for the bill, but under the most trying circumstances, knowing that it is wrong.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would again call the Senator's attention— and I think the Senator from South Carolina knows that I have a great deal of respect and affection for him—I call his attention to the fact that of the $523,000,000 only $1,000,000 goes to the higher officials and I think it is a good investment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have the deepest affection for the Senator from Vermont, and my association with him has been most pleasant. Of course only $1,000,000 goes for that purpose, but I am interested in the masses of the employees.

Mr. FLANDERS. They are getting a total of $523,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. But we are dividing the money among 2,000,000 of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is my amendment in the nature of a substitute in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I may say that I am very much in favor of the bill. I agree with what the Senator from Ohio said about the necessity of raising the pay of these employees due to the increase in the cost of living. I believe that the bill certainly should be passed.

My amendment is also designed to increase the real incomes of the employees included, in addition to the relief of everyone else in the United States. I believe we should make such a contribution. All the amendment does is remove a tax upon a basic article of food. I hope the sponsor of the substitute will accept the amendment. As has already been demonstrated, I believe the majority of both the Senate and the House of Representatives have already approved the amendment, which I offer to the bill. In other words, the amendment is certainly appropriate to the bill, being a revenue measure. I ask for the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied that most of the Senators on the floor do not know the substance of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator understood it.

Mr. WHERRY. We cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will cease conversation so that the speakers can be heard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator from Nebraska understood. This amendment is designed, like the bill, to increase the real wages and incomes of Federal workers and postal workers. All it does is remove a tax from a basic food in which they are all interested as consumers.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the food?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is legally known as oleomargarine. [Laughter.] It is sometimes known as margarine.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas, for whom likewise I have a great deal of respect and affection, that the purpose of the bill is to have the legislation in such form and with such content that it can be enacted into law within the next few minutes. While I sympathize with the desire to reduce the cost of living by the reduction of any tax on any necessity of life, yet I fear that the Senator's amendment would interfere with the possibility of getting the bill passed within the next few minutes, which seems to be necessary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am unable to follow the Senator's reasoning, in view of the fact that the House of Representatives voted 260 to 106—nearly 2½ to 1—in favor of this very amendment only about a month ago. I also remind the Senator of the fact that the Senate voted, in the only way it could vote—that is, on a motion to bring the bill up—57 to 26 only within the week. Last night this body voted to remove the restriction from the military appropriation bill.

Since I mention that, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to what

I consider a very arrogant and petty act on the part of the conferees. Last night they removed that very slight restriction upon the sale of this article to the armed forces, in spite of the fact that the House had approved it, and also in spite of the further fact that the Committee on Armed Services of the House had reported unanimously a bill removing by direct legislative action the same restriction that was in the appropriation bill.

In other words, it comes down to this, I submit to the Senator from Vermont, that both Houses overwhelmingly have approved the removal of this tax, as well as the removal of the restriction on the purchase of the article by the armed forces. Yet, due to the supposed crises of passing the pending bill and another, we cannot get a direct vote in the Senate. This measure was reported by the Committee on Finance I think on June 2, with a unanimous vote, with a statement that it was in the public welfare, and the committee recommended its immediate passage. I submit it is quite as important to the people of this country, by and large, as any other bill that has been acted on today.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, obviously if we begin to offer irrelevant amendments on bills, we will simply block the passage of any more bills whatsoever. I think it is fair in this case to move to lay the amendment on the table. Therefore, because of the fact that I think it is irrelevant, and that the time has come when we have to dispose of irrelevant amendments, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas be laid on the table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Chavez	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Feazel	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to lay the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on the table. The motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, some time ago I accepted the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] relating to the District of Columbia. I now modify that amendment. The amendment provided that the increase should not apply prior to the time the legislation providing a sales tax in the District is enacted by Congress. I am proposing to strike out the words "a sales tax," and insert the words "adequate revenues to meet the obligation," so as to read "prior to the time that legislation providing adequate revenues to meet the obligation in the District of Columbia is enacted by the Congress and becomes effective."

So that it is not necessary that the revenue be provided in that particular way. I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to page 21, section 207, line 17. Apparently by the language there the head of a department has the right to increase the salaries of the employees of his department. I think that is a very remarkable procedure, which will result in getting an uneven scale of salaries, and then the demand will be made that all should be raised to the high standard. Is it correct that the head of a department can increase salaries in his own department?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should be glad to give to the Senator from Virginia an explanation of that section. It provides that employees who have given long, faithful, and outstanding service and have for a period of 3 years been at the top of their grade shall, with and by the appproval by the Commission, receive an additional salary advancement equal to the highest salary increment of their grade. An employee may receive not more than three such advancements, and the 3-year period must elapse between each of these advancements. Essentially that is to reward exceptionally long and faithful service for which the more or less mechanical provisions of civil-service grades do not provide.

Mr. BYRD. It is absolutely with the head of the department, is it?

Mr. FLANDERS. No; with the approval of the Commission.

Mr. BYRD. The head of any department or agency can increase salaries in his department.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; but he must have the approval of the Commission.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but the Commission has never yet failed to approve an increase in salary. I have been dealing with the Civil Service Commission for a long time, and it has never failed to favor an increase. If it has, I do not know when it was.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator's experience may be largely unfortunate. But we ran into many cases in which advances have been refused. I could not give the ratio.

Mr. BYRD. Under some standard as established by the Civil Service Commission, the head of the department, then, is the final arbiter as to whether the salaries shall be increased?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Commission is the final arbiter. I shall try to explain the situation briefly. Let us say that the Senator from Virginia had on his beautiful apple farm a man of a degree of intelligence and manual dexterity that made him excellent for certain particular operations on the Senator's farm. The employee has worked for years. He is faithful. The Senator cannot advance him to an executive activity of some sort, because he just is not made that way. But he has worked very long and very faithfully, and I am sure the Senator would want to give him small advances over a long period of time.

Mr. BYRD. The law already provides for that. There are in-grade promotions at a certain date all through the civil service, and employees are promoted and increased periodically. The Senator from Vermont knows that.

Mr. FLANDERS. This is for those who over long years have reached the limit.

Mr. BYRD. But if they work over a long period of years they get the increase that goes with the length of service. The point I make is that if it is left to the head of the department it will result in an uneven scale of wages, and then the demand will come to Congress to increase all employees up to the increases that have been made by a head of a department. I do not think that authority should be given.

Mr. FLANDERS. We do have to depend on the administration of the Commission, and in this case the final authority goes back to the Commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I invite the attention of the junior Senator from Vermont to the following sentence which I find beginning in line 19 of page 29. I desire to ask the interpretation of the committee of the meaning of the sentence, which reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or laws, the basic compensation of any employee, other than an administrative assistant, in the office of a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be fixed by such Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner at any multiple of $5 per month which is not in excess of $5,700 per annum.

Now if I understand the English language, that is an authorization to any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or the rest, to fix the salaries of all the employees of his office at not to exceed $5,700 per year, because it says "any employee"; not any single employee, or any two employees, or any three, "any employee." Is it intended to mean any single employee?

Mr. FLANDERS. The distinction, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming, is not between single and married employees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, now the Senator is indulging in his usual good humor.

Mr. FLANDERS. The provision in question simply permits the Senator to do what he is already doing now within the present ceiling. It simply raises the ceiling by the same amount that the average ceiling of the average Federal employee is raised. It gives him the benefit of the same increase.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But is it not said here that the increase is in multiples of $5 per month, and the only limitation is $5,700, but it affects every employee in the office. There is nothing in the sentence to make the present ceilings apply. And there is nothing in the paragraph to make them apply.

Mr. FLANDERS. The present ceiling applies to every employee in the Senator's office.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But there is a schedule for the various employees.

Mr. FLANDERS. There still would be, but they would be in multiples of $5 a month.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Apparently I have not made myself clear to the Senator. This sentence, if it should be enacted into law as part of the bill, and the bill should be approved, would have the effect of repealing every other law dealing with this subject. This will be the latest expression of legislative intent governing these positions. I am sure that it is not the intention of the Senator or of the committee to repeal the various classifications and categories, but merely to allow a promotion to a limit of $5,700 for one employee in the office. Am I mistaken about that?

Mr. FLANDERS. The only effect that this provision has on existing law or laws is that it modifies such other law or laws in one respect only.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not say so.

Mr. FLANDERS. That would seem to me to be inherent in the English in which it is stated. That certainly is the purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to have the expression of the purpose. In my opinion it certainly needs a legislative explanation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood a few minutes ago, after I made a brief statement, that the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for whom I have the greatest respect, made the statement that salaries would be raised 33⅓ percent. Am I correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. What I said was that in the case of Cabinet officers the salaries are raised 33⅓ percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say this: I supported this bill from the day it went to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I testified before that committee. I understood that the Federal pay raise bill for postmasters and various other Government employees was in the Congress of the United States because of the increased cost of living. If we raise the salary of someone who makes $10,000 a year by 33⅓ percent, that does not make sense to the poor fellow who makes $1,200. While I am still going to stand by my friend and vote for the bill, because I understand from him that this is the only thing we can get through, I want the RECORD to show that I do not believe that the $10,000 people ought to be raised to $18,000, and the poor people three or four or five hundred dollars a year. The poor man pays the same for beefsteak as the fellow who has money, and the poor man pays the same for other things he needs in this life, as does the rich man.

I do not believe that a 33⅓-percent increase in salary is justified in the higher brackets. I supported the bill and testified before the committee. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] gave me that privilege. I was acting upon the theory that we would adjust salaries in line with the cost of living, and do something to help the poor people. My good friend the Senator from Virginia says that some salaries are raised 80 percent. Is that correct? That does not make sense.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say briefly to the Senator from South Carolina that this part of the bill was drawn to meet the recommendations of the present President of the United States, transmitted to this body in a message.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. Just a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. The President of the United States sent a civil-rights message down here, too.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should also like to say to the Senator from South Carolina that any future Democratic President, or any future Republican President, or any future President of the third party, the name of which I do not at the moment remember, will ask for this consideration for the higher salaries.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I simply wish to invite the attention of the Senate to what it is voting for. I have a list of these increases. Some of the salaries are doubled. Others are increased 80 percent. I believe that the officials who hold the higher positions should perhaps have an increase; but when we talk about increasing the average employee 10 percent, and then increasing salaries in the higher brackets 80 percent——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I do not recall any legislation in this Congress since 1939 which has increased the salary of Cabinet officers or others included in this bracket.

Mr. BYRD. It makes no difference.

Mr. BALDWIN. On the other hand, Federal employees, and some post office employees, industrial employees, and retail workers, have had very substantial increases, all the way from 65 percent to 100 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator know of many persons who refuse Cabinet positions?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not.

Mr. BYRD. They are increased from $15,000 to $20,000. I do not say that there should not be an increase, but I say that the increase is entirely out of proportion to the increase given to the postal employees and the average employee of the Federal Government.

Mr. BALDWIN. I can only respond by saying the same thing my friend from Vermont said, that these men fall into an entirely different classification. They are all specialists of one kind and another. I do not doubt that it would be extremely easy to find anyone to take a Cabinet position in the Government of the United States; but I did not suppose that we lacked applicants for such a position. I supposed that we wanted men who were peculiarly and specially qualified for a particular job.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator believe that there are now able men in the Cabinet?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think there are some who are able, and I think there are some who are not so able; but I hope that we shall be able to attract extremely able ones. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. That is the reason the Senator is proposing to increase the salaries.

Mr. BALDWIN. That has nothing to do with it. If that were the case, we would have had a provision in the bill which would not be effective until the 1st of January, but we are generous. We are willing to have this go into effect right now.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to point out one thing, and that is that every Senator and every Member of the House is receiving about $16,500, or between $16,000 and $16,500. That is not as large a salary as it seems when written out expressly in so many words.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator enumerate the perquisites? The salary is $12,500.

Mr. TAFT. There is an allowance of $2,500 for expenses, which is tax-free. That is equivalent to another $3,500, making about $16,000. So when we give the head of a department $16,500 we do not pay him anything very different from what we are paying Members of Congress.

Mr. BYRD. Some of them are being paid $20,000. Under secretaries receive $18,000.

Mr. TAFT. They have always received more than Members of Congress. We have increased our salaries more than 50 percent. I do not believe that these increases are out of line with what we have done for ourselves.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to make this statement: So far as the Senator from Virginia is concerned, I am willing to vote for the $360 increase to the classified civil service and $450 to postal employees, but I am not willing to vote for the schedule of high salaries in the higher brackets. I do not believe that the schedule has been coordinated and put together in a uniform manner. From time to time Congress has fixed salaries by legislation. This bill changes act after act which Congress has passed fixing salaries. I submit that in the closing hours of the session we ought not to take as drastic a step as this without knowing more about it.

Furthermore, the bill changes the classification in a way that needs careful study.

Mr. President, I shall vote for that part of the bill which gives the classified employees and postal employees an increase, but I am not at this time going to vote for these very high increases, some of them as much as 100 percent, and others 80 percent, for higher officials in the Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have a vote? We have several conference reports ready, and they are privileged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute as amended.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to strike out all of title III, which relates to increases in salaries in the higher brackets. That would leave the increases to apply to the classified service and to the postal employees. Then when Congress reconvenes, if, as the Senator from Connecticut says, we have a Republican President, perhaps we can go into the question further and see what can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute bill, as amended, which is offered as an amendment to the bill.

The substitute as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. O'CONOR conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio desire to have the two Senate bills indefinitely postponed?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I ask that the two Senate bills be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objections, the bills will be indefinitely postponed.

SENATOR McKELLAR AND THE TVA

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1942.*

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: We have been informed that some unadvised people of Tennessee have challenged your loyalty to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Such people certainly are misinformed.

We who have served with you on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate venture the statement that but for you the dams along the Tennessee River and its tributaries never would have been built. We know that this is true concerning the Pickwick, Guntersville, Chickamauga, Hiwassee, Gilbertsville, Watts Bar, Fort Loudon, Holston River, and Watauga Dams. As to all of these dams, we know that the Budget Director did not recommend them, but all were built through amendments offered by you, first in the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and then in the full committee, of which you are a member. We know that none of these dams, except Douglas, had the approval of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and that the members of the Authority not only disapproved all of them, except Douglas, but came to Washington and lobbied with us not to appropriate the money with which to build them. We know that your amendments providing for these dams were vigorously fought, the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, taking the lead in a fight against them. The dams were approved by the committee by the closest kinds of votes, sometimes the vote in the subcommittee or in the full committee was a tie, but by your vigorous support of the dams and your untiring energy in their favor the bills were finally passed by the Senate and sent to conference. You were one of the conferees on each and every one of these bills, and it was due to your skillful management and untiring devotion to these matters that the House Members of the conferences finally yielded and the bills were passed and the dams built. If ever a man was beset with difficulties you had them in the building of these dams.

We are informed by the clerk of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that $667,969,270 has been spent on these dams. Every dollar of that money was invested in the dams through your efforts. Some of us who are signing this letter were strongly for you and some of us were just as strongly opposed to you in the building of these dams, but we unite in saying that the amendments providing for the building of the dams never would have been reported out of our committee and the dams never would have been built but for you. The committee was almost evenly divided in every case. It was well known to the members of the committee that the Tennessee Valley Authority wanted to build only three dams as a "yardstick" and that they did not want to build a system of dams for the purpose of going into competition with the private-power companies. You wanted just what has finally been accomplished.

We wish to say, also, that when the proposal was made to buy most of the private power companies of Tennessee, all except those in northeast Tennessee, you piloted that measure through the Senate over just the same kind of Senate opposition that you had before, and this proposal, in our judgment, would not have been passed but for your support.

We wish to add that Douglas Dam, when it did not have your approval, was twice beaten in the committee and in the Senate. It would not have passed the last time, except for your support and vote. The amendment passed the subcommittee by one vote, and that was your vote.

We take pleasure in assuring you that, in our opinion, there would have been no Tennessee Valley Authority such as you now have but for your untiring and vigorous support of the Authority and the dams.

Very sincerely yours,

John H. Overton, Pat McCarran, Rufus C. Holman, Gerald P. Nye, Styles Bridges, Chan Gurney, Wallace H. White, Jr., M. E. Tydings, H. C. Lodge, Jr., Carter Glass, Carl Hayden, Elmer Thomas, Burnet R. Maybank, Harry Truman, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Jas. M. Mead, Dennis Chavez, Theodore Francis Green, Francis Maloney, Richard B. Russell, Wall Doxey.

LETTER FROM THE COMMISSIONER OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an insertion?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have received a letter from the Honorable Watson B. Miller, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate. Senators who are sponsors of special bills for the relief of immigration cases will be especially interested in this matter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1948.

Hon. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This refers to your telephonic request of Wednesday concerning the resolution of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the substance of which is set forth in the letter dated June 16, 1948, from Mr. Arens, staff director of the committee.

I shall be glad to comply with the suggestions made that:

1. In the case of any alien concerning whom a private bill is pending in the Senate, but concerning which bill unfavorable action shall not have been taken by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by the end of the present session of the Congress, deportation should be stayed until April 1, 1949; and

2. In the case of any alien concerning whom a private bill has been introduced in the Senate, but concerning which bill unfavorable action has been taken by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary prior to the end of the present session of the Congress, deportation should be carried out.

It will be appreciated if you will have Mr. Arens send me a list giving the names of the aliens in both categories as well as the immigration file numbers if the numbers are available.

Sincerely,

WATSON B. MILLER.

THE HOUSING ACT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the status of House bill 6959? It is a housing bill which I think has been sent over from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the subject of a message from the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask whether the House bill has been sent to the Senate; and if so, has it had its second reading? What is the status of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been read at all in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, if it is to be brought to the attention of the Senate, for consideration, unanimous consent to that effect will be required; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 6959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may the title of the bill be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator please to withhold his objection until I can present an explanation of the bill. The explanation will take only approximately 5 minutes.

Mr. President, this bill was passed in the House of Representatives by a vote of approximately 317 to 90.

As I understand the amendments to title I of the National Housing Act, they provide that the limit on FHA title I insurance is raised by an amount of $35,000,000, to a total of $200,000,000.

The maximum mortgage amount for title I, class 3 loans is raised from $3,000 to $4,500.

Insurance is provided up to $10,000 limit for loans for repair or conversion to provide additional housing for two or more families in existing structures, with occupance preference given to veterans.

TITLE II—DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED PERMANENT WAR-HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

All permanent, Government-owned war housing must "be sold for cash as expeditiously as possible and not later than December 31, 1949," at a price not less than value as determined by an FHA appraisal.

War housing may be transferred to the Army, Navy, or Air Force if such transfer had been requested prior to April 15, 1947.

Preference for sale to veterans is provided both as to individuals buying separate houses and as to cooperative groups buying whole projects. After the preference period has expired, there is no restriction on the sale except that it must be for cash.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

This title is a complete revision of title III of the National Housing Act, and provides for a greatly restricted secondary market operation by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

The FNMA is authorized to buy FHA loans under sections 203 and 603 and VA loans under section 505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act—second loans. This precludes purchase of FHA loans on rental housing under either section 207 or section 608, as well as purchase of VA loans under section 501 of the GI bill of rights. Purchase of loans from public agencies is prohibited.

The purchase price may not exceed 98 percent of the unpaid loan balance, and purchases are limited to mortgages not exceeding an original principal of $10,000. Loans must be offered by the original mortgagee and must be dated after June 19, 1948. Purchases from any single mortgagee are limited to 25 percent of eligible loans made by the lender after June 19, 1948.

The capital stock of FNMA is increased by $10,000,000 to $20,000,000. Its obligations may not exceed 40 times capital and surplus. The bill specifically continues the present FNMA as an RFC subsidiary under the supervision of the FHA Commissioner and empowers the latter to liquidate the FNMA when the need for it no longer exists.

TITLE IV—TAX INCENTIVE FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL RENTAL HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS

The title amends the Internal Revenue Code by permitting an amortization deduction for income-tax purposes of 10 percent per year for the first 5 years for new rental housing and new rental units created by conversion of existing structures. This deduction would be in lieu of the present amortization deduction. The taxpayer may elect to discontinue the special deduction at any time within the 5-year period.

To be eligible for the special deduction, construction of the rental-housing facilities must be started on or after July 1, 1948, and before the close of July 1, 1950, and the FHA must certify (a) that there is a shortage of rental housing in the area, and (b) that the units will be "of such character and will be rented and at such rentals" as will tend to relieve the shortage.

Excise tax in sales of trailer coaches are removed until July 1950.

TITLE V—GI HOME-LOAN INCONTESTABILITY CLAUSE

This title simply adds to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act a clause making the mortgage guaranty incontestable in the hands of a secondary purchaser.

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Title VI of FHA is extended until March 31, 1949, and the insurance authorization is raised by $1,600,000,000 to $6,950,000,000, of which $800,000,000 is reserved for rental housing under section 608 and $200,000,000 for multifamily dwellings under section 603. The maximum mortgage amount under section 603 may be raised to $9,100 at the direction of the Administrator.

The new feature of this title is an authorization of FHA to insure, under section 603, individual house loans up to 95 percent of value provided the mortgage does not exceed $6,000. The bill also permits 95-percent loans for rental housing under section 608 if the mortgagor is a veterans' nonprofit housing cooperative.

The title raises the maximum interest rate from 4 to 5 percent if the FHA Commissioner finds that "in certain areas or under special circumstances the mortgage market demands it." This applies to both section 603 and 608 loans.

Amendments to section 609 provide for more liberal insurance of loans to house manufacturers, and a new section 611 authorizes insurance of construction loans for mass producers of housing.

TITLE VII—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

This is the yield-insurance plan and is identical with section 402 of the T-E-W bill.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

This title increases the lending authority of RFC from $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 and authorized RFC to subscribe to FNMA stock to the extent of $20,000,000.

Mr. President, that very briefly sketches the high lights of the bill, which finally came out of the House by the vote I mentioned, of 317 to 90.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the parliamentary situation which requires unanimous consent, but I think that a piece of legislation of the importance of housing would seem to require that the political party blocking a vote should do it in the open. Within a very few days it is my guess that we are going to have a call from the President of the United States for a special session of this Congress on housing, and those who are responsible for defeating this bill, and the political party responsible, should make themselves known at this time, so that all may know where to place the responsibility for the special session. Throughout the fall campaign we are going to hear speech after speech from every rostrum in the country and from every schoolhouse in the country with respect to the failure of Congress to enact housing legislation. I want to know who is responsible, what Senator is responsible for defeating the bill the majority leader seeks to lay before us. I want to make it plain that housing is the most vital domestic issue today. Make no mistake about that.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall answer the distinguished Senator from Colorado first, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] after the Senator from Nebraska concludes.

Mr. WHERRY. To be perfectly frank, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] objected to a unanimous-consent request, making his position very plain. I requested him to withdraw his objection in order that I might explain the bill, thinking that possibly after an explanation, we might be able to get the bill up for consideration.

I may say to the Senator from Colorado that, as he well knows, under the rules, it is necessary that we have unanimous consent. The bill has not yet gone to committee. I believe it has not had its second reading yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, it will be necessary to move to discharge the committee, which would require that the motion lie over for 1 day. If we intend to adjourn tonight, the only way we can

get it up for consideration is by means of unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield to anybody except the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understood the bill had come over from the House.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot understand why it requires a unanimous consent agreement before this body, but I shall not argue the point.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana, because he was so kind as to withhold his objection a little while ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret to have to renew objection to the consideration of this bill at this time. Let me say to the Senate that for the past 4 years the Senate has been working on over-all housing bills. During the Seventy-ninth Congress the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was passed by the Senate without objection. During the Seventy-ninth Congress that bill was sent to the House, and there it was pigeonholed. During this Congress the Senate passed Senate bill 866, after full hearings. That bill was recommended not only by the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the House Committee on Banking and Currency, but by a joint committee of the House and Senate. Notwithstanding all that, there is a little czar over in the House who heads the Banking and Currency Committee, and he has seen fit again to stymie the passage or even the presentation of our bill before the House of Representatives. Senate bill 866 was passed by this body and was considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is now before the Rules Committee of the House. When House bill 6959 came before us it received little or no committee hearings. Instead of using Senate bill 866 as a vehicle to place before us the contents of this bill, the House saw fit not to do that, so what we have today is almost a brand-new bill with a few of the titles from the so-called Taft-Ellender bill, and we are now asked to pass that bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill will be open for amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. I understand we can offer a substitute, amend it, and all that. But let me say to the Senate that if the little czar who heads the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, has been able to prevent the House from voting on Senate bill 866, my guess is that he will be in equally as good a position to prevent a vote on Senate bill 866 if we attached it to the House bill. As I see it, there is no chance for the House of Representatives to consider Senate bill 866, which they have had before them for some time.

Mr. President, I renew my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator withhold his objection long enough for me to yield to other Senators?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I want to make the RECORD clear. Seven times, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee over a period of years, I voted for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I voted for it on the Senate floor. I voted against substitution. I want to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska tonight the fact that we are discussing a bill which has been sent over from the House. I feel certain that the chairman of the committee, with whom I have always had the pleasure of working and supporting housing for the GI's, is interested in this matter. I have a letter from my attorney who says that the only GI loans covered by the secondary market provisions of the Wolcott bill are second mortgage loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under section 505. These are the cases where first mortgage loans are insured by the FHA. They amount to only 15 or 20 percent of the GI loans, while section 501 loans amount to 80 to 85 percent of the GI loans. So, again, Mr. President, they have left out the GI loans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, a more detailed statement on the secondary market for home mortgages.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECONDARY MARKET FOR HOME MORTGAGES UNDER THE WOLCOTT BILL, H. R. 6959

One of the most urgent needs in the current home financing picture is a Government-sponsored secondary market for home mortgages insured by the FHA or guaranteed under the GI Act.

Through the Federal National Mortgage Association we have had such a market for FHA mortgages, on both sale and rental housing until last June. We also had such a market for GI home loans.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as passed by the Senate would have continued the secondary market which we now have for FHA mortgages on both sale and rental housing, and would leave also provided a secondary market for all GI home mortgage loans. It would have provided a half billion dollar revolving fund for this purpose.

Last week there were many complaints by lenders that the Federal National Mortgage Association had suddenly issued a stop order to prevent further purchase of FHA mortgages.

The reason for this was the introduction of the Wolcott so-called housing bill—H. R. 6959. That bill changes even the present secondary market for FHA mortgages. It provides that no mortgage may be purchased for more than 98 percent of the unpaid principal plus accrued interest. In other words, banks and other lenders could sell such mortgages only at 2-percent discount. The reason for the stop order thus becomes apparent. Had it not been issued the Federal National Mortgage Association would have had millions of dollars of mortgages dumped on it the next morning, and its present funds would have been exhausted immediately.

But that is only one of the completely unsound and unworkable provisions of the secondary market provisions of this Wolcott bill.

It prohibits further purchases of FHA mortgages for urgently needed rental housing under sections 207 or 608 of the National Housing Act. It prohibits the purchase of FHA mortgages on veterans cooperative projects.

Unlike the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which made provision for the purchase of both section 501 and section 505 GI mortgages, the Wolcott bill limits such purchases only to section 505 GI mortgages. These are the second mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration where the first mortgage is insured by the FHA. They amount to only 15 to 20 percent of the GI loans, while the section 501 loans amount to about 80 to 85 percent of the GI loans.

So the Wolcott bill would exclude 80 to 85 percent of GI loans from the secondary market. It would exclude from the secondary market all mortgages on veterans cooperatives insured by the FHA. It would require all banks and other lenders to sell their mortgages in the secondary market at a 2 percent discount.

It is therefore perfectly apparent that the secondary market provisions of the Wolcott bill are wholly inadequate. They would not meet the needs of the banks and other lenders, and would discriminate against rental housing loans, loans guaranteed under the GI Act, and FHA insured mortgage loans to veterans cooperatives.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] rises to his feet, propounds an inquiry, and shows an honest doubt in his mind, I have a very sympathetic interest in relieving his apprehension and improving his understanding. I want to include in the scope of my remarks every Senator in the Chamber. This bill which has come before us this afternoon is a snare and a delusion; it is a hollow shell; it is a phony housing bill. It is put up to deceive the American people and to deceive the Senate. It is the result of the machinations of a group of men in the real-estate business and the real-estate lobby operating with certain men on Capitol Hill. It is a hollow sham. As the Senator from Louisiana truthfully said, four times this deliberative body has passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill containing public-housing provisions. We passed it again this year. It went to the House, and the House committee passed it, but the real-estate crowd would not recognize the action of the House committee. So this monstrosity was produced. The men in the House who sent this bill here are denying the right of the representatives of the American people in the House of Representatives to cast their votes for or against public housing, and slum clearance, and farm housing. I say as to that sort of action, "It shall not pass."

All over this country there are millions of little people who have been seeking homes; veterans of the last war who are hungry for a home. The point I make is that they have been looking with hope and encouragement toward Capitol Hill. It was my privilege to address a veterans' convention in the auditorium of the Labor Department 3 months ago. I never saw a body of men so enthusiastic

as they were about the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

This bill which is now before us would never be signed by my friend from Colorado. There is a tax depreciation scheme of tremendous magnitude involved which is interesting only to the millionaire real-estate owners of the country. So I ask the Senate to reject this House bill and pass the bill which has received years of preparation and hard work by a committee headed by my friend and old colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who put into it honest-to-God effort to produce an honest-to-God housing bill, to remove the menacing slums, to give public housing to the little people of the country, 500,000 homes in a 5-year program.

Now we are handed this monstrosity. It is a miscarriage of justice in the housing field. It is not a housing bill of the kind which the Senator of Colorado has in his heart and mind. This is a scheme, a circumlocution process. Give us the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, or no bill at all, because that is the only bill which has provided for public housing and slum clearance and farm housing.

Millionaires are behind this monstrosity sent over from the House. I say again, it shall not pass. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] objected to the consideration of the bill. We fought for the Senate bill, but a little group of men got together and turned thumbs down.

So I say to the Senate, support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Do not make a mockery of our years of effort for the people of the country who need public housing.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Colorado asked me to yield first.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to remind the Senator from New Hampshire that, according to the testimony, in addition to cutting out the public housing and cutting out the slum clearance and cutting out the farm housing, 80 to 85 percent of veterans' loans guaranteed under the GI act would be cut out in this House bill. But in the bill which our committee, of which the Senator is chairman, reported out and which the Senate passed all these would be covered.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. It knocks out help to veterans.

Mr. TOBEY. The veterans have been flimflammed by this legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I trust that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will still withhold his objection because I think that, now that we have brought the question up, there should be a chance given to those who want to ask questions on the bill to say something about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The question before the Senate is: Shall we consider this matter?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The question is not at all on the merits or demerits of the bill as it came from the House, or the merits of Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill, or the other way around. Those bills are not before us.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only way in which we can enact a bill which the Senate likes is by bringing this measure up and amending it and sending it back to the House, proceeding in such a routine legislative manner.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me enlighten the Senator. When it goes back, the Senator may as well know that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has said he will not take it to conference. It is a dead smelt.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to have me yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to give the House a chance to kill housing if that is what they want to do. Let the House assume full responsibility.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am yielding to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One Senator at a time, please. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very anxious to establish responsibility. I want to know who killed cock robin. If we act upon this bill, if we amend it, if we send it back to the House, if it is killed back there, the country will know whom to blame, and that is what I am seeking.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Please let me make one observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to explain the reason why we have brought the bill forward now. I am not saying that this bill has all the merits the House says it has, I am not saying it has all the bad qualities my distinguished colleagues, and the chairman of the committee, who has done so much work on the subject, says it has. I suggest to Senators that this is the mechanical parliamentary situation. The House passed this bill and sent it to the Senate. If the bill is taken up tonight by unanimous consent and amended in any way Senators desire to amend it, even putting in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, then it will go back to the House and will go to conference.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator knows that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has said he will not take it to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not acquainted with that.

Mr. TOBEY. He said that just within 24 hours.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know anything about what that man said.

Mr. TOBEY. I give the Senator my word for it.

Mr. WHERRY. I take it. [Laughter.] I have the highest regard for the Senator from New Hampshire, and he knows it. I still think, however, that it is impossible, in the present situation, to get a housing bill, because there was no chance to get a conference on a housing bill, until this bill was passed. This bill has been passed. The Senate can put on as an amendment the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and send it to the House, and then if they do not send it to a conference, it seems to me the responsibility will be entirely upon the House of Representatives. Do not Senators agree with me? That is the mechanical situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just one moment. I am not saying that this bill is one that should go back to the House. The Senate is going to amend it in any way it desires to amend it. But the unfortunate situation is—and I respectfully call this to the attention of my colleague from New Hampshire, and I pay him a compliment and a tribute for the work he has done on housing—I can see it in no other way, if we recess or adjourn tonight or before next week, or whenever we do finally terminate this session of Congress, to get a bill into conference except by taking the House bill and amending it as the Senate desires to amend it, and sending it back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I say to my good friend from Nebraska that if we were to follow the suggestion he has made, one objection from the House side would make it impossible for the matter to go to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; let us send it over there.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me suggest a way by which this could be done more easily. Let the Rules Committee in the House——

Mr. WHERRY. We have no control of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. But one objection will block it, and the way to do it is to let the Rules Committee of the House simply permit, as it were, the House Members to vote on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and we can have a bill passed within the next 2 hours.

Mr. WHERRY. May I propound a question to my distinguished friend?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not deny that the procedure I suggested would accomplish the purpose, does he?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I thought it would, I would not object, but I know it will not.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know what the conferees would do, but the only

thing we can do is to give them a chance to turn it down.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Frankly, Mr. President, it makes me rather sick away down deep inside to see the Senate arguing tonight, not over whether we should have housing legislation, but over whose name that housing legislation should contain. Much of the controversy here tonight is not over the question of what the bill should contain, but rather whose name should appear as sponsor of the bill. So that we will have it crystal clear as to what the Senator from Louisiana is vetoing if he persists in his objection, he is vetoing, not the bill the House passed, for he knows as well as I do that we can amend that bill in any way we see fit. He knows we can amend it by substituting practically every section of what he sees fit to call the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Rather than do that he is vetoing the right of this body to pass any housing legislation.

If the Senator from Louisiana—and I weigh my words well when I say this—if the Senator from Louisiana persists in this privilege which unfortunately he enjoys here tonight, then he will be doing a number of things.

First, he will be freezing in the present public-housing units tenants who are making as high as $22,000 a year. He will be making it impossible for the Congress to do with the public-housing units, 190,000 of them, which are in existence, what it could do, so that they would be available to the men who really need those units. He will be saying, "I, myself, one Senator from Louisiana, want you to see that in the city of Detroit, for example, men making $22,000, or $14,000, or $12,000, a year shall continue to occupy these subsidized places which some low-income veteran with a wife and two or three children could have occupied."

Second. If the Senator from Louisiana persists in his objection, he will be absolutely vetoing any right for the veterans of this Nation to form veterans' cooperatives, the type of housing cooperative which the Joint Housing Committee, on which were men representing every line of thought—the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]—unanimously agreed that we should provide for in housing legislation. If the Senator from Louisiana persists in insisting upon the privilege which, I say, unfortunately he has tonight—a privilege upon which he can insist—he will be vetoing the work which our Housing Committee has done.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from Wisconsin mind if I ask him a question? It is not quite germane, but what the Senator is saying now brought something to my mind like a flash. Has the Senator talked with the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee about this legislation?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have.

Mr. TOBEY. And was not the conversation the Senator had with the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee the subject of whether or not this bill would be taken up in conference with the House if it is sent back to the House?

Mr. McCARTHY. It was.

Mr. TOBEY. Did the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee say he would take it to conference, or did he say he would not take it to conference?

Mr. McCARTHY. I discussed with him what I thought were the necessary amendments. I told him I thought the bill was incomplete without having some research section—not the setting up of a laboratory within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, but the provision for a section within that Agency, to work with the municipalities to secure some semblance of standardization of building codes and to work with the industry to attempt to obtain standardization of measurements. Mr. Wolcott said he had no objection whatsoever to such amendments. I suggested to him what I thought with respect to salaries of the heads of the housing agencies. Take Mr. Foley, for example. He has dropped from $12,000 to $10,000 a year since he was promoted. I said I thought the salaries were entirely inadequate, and that we could not expect to obtain competent men to run fifteen- or eighteen- or twenty-billion-dollar empires on salaries of $10,000 a year. I told him I expected to submit an amendment providing for salary increases. He consented to that. Since that time, however, the Senate has passed a wage increase which takes care of that problem.

I suggested to him that the bill would be incomplete unless we had the type of slum-clearance provision which our Housing Committee wrote. Incidentally, that is not the provision in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner original bill. It is in the bill which the 14 men of the Joint Housing Committee studied during the whole of the summer and recommended.

I suggested to him further that we should have some type of public housing, not of the type which we have had in the past, which allows the housing authorities to skim the cream off the lower income group, but a public housing measure which would start down at the bottom. He said he was heartily opposed to any public housing. I did get the impression, however, that he would take it to conference. Even though I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Michigan, Representative WOLCOTT—I believe he is a very sincere, honest and able man—I do not believe the Senate should be guided by what one Representative says. If the majority of the Senate still feels that public housing is necessary, obviously the answer is not to kill all the housing legislation, but, rather, to take the House bill and amend it so as to put the best possible provisions for public housing in the bill and then go to conference with it. Perhaps the presently proposed five-year plan may not be adopted in conference, but it is entirely possible that a compromise can be made on a one-year plan or a two-year plan. After all, we shall be back in session next year.

Mr. President, I hope that one Senator will not take it upon himself to veto—not the House bill, because by his objection he would not be vetoing the House Housing bill; he would be vetoing the right of every young veteran, every young man who is desirous of getting a home within a reasonable time, to get such a home. I would hesitate a long time before I would take it upon myself to veto the right of the American people because I might happen to dislike some part of a bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Wisconsin and I have labored together in this matter. The fact is that the chairman of the House Banking and Currency refuses to give the peoples' Representatives in the House of Representatives a chance to vote on these salient measures of public housing and slum clearance. He has told the Senator from Wisconsin that he would not bring the bill to conference if public housing and slum clearance were contained in it. He has told others the same thing. There, Mr. President, we see the die cast. There we see the position, and we are meeting tonight to do the best we can in view of the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask Members of the Senate if we cannot suspend what we are discussing for a while in order to take up a number of conference reports on which action is very necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long does the Senator think it will take to do what he has in mind? I have been on the floor of the Senate now for 4 hours waiting for this occasion. I have not had anything to eat.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe some others of us are in the same situation as the Senator from Louisiana is in. We have been in session now for 2 days and 1 night and are entering into the second night. I should like to get a number of privileged matters out of the way. It will take only a few minutes to do so.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26 to the

bill and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further anounced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCCOWEN, Mr. LANDIS, Mr. BREHM, Mr. KEARNS, Mr. BARDEN, and Mr. LUCAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 8 to the bill and concurred therein.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL AGENCIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III, which was, on page 1, beginning with line 3, to strike out all over to and including line 10, page 2, and insert:

That section 302 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to provide training for not to exceed 10 Filipino engineers, to be designated by the President of the Philippines from the regularly employed staff of the Philippine Public Works Department and the engineer officers of the armed forces of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in the construction, maintenance, and highway traffic engineering and control necessary for the continued maintenance and for the efficient and safe operation of highway transport facilities."

SEC. 2. Section 305 (b) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) To accomplish such purposes the Public Health Service shall at the earliest practicable time survey the health situation in the Philippines, and is authorized to replace, expand, or install such health services and facilities in the Philippines as are deemed essential to preservation of health, and may assist in the rehabilitation and development of a Philippine quarantine service for prevention of introduction of disease from abroad or from one island to another. The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippines; may establish and maintain in the Philippines a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide not to exceed 1 year of training in public-health methods and administration, through study at appropriate schools or colleges in the United States and supplementary field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 90 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippines subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and not to exceed 5 months of training in such methods and administration, through field work and observation of public-health work, to not more than 10 additional Filipinos, to be so designated. It may replace equipment and supply reasonably necessary additional equipment, utilizing for this purpose, so far as possible, surplus property, and may recommend to the Commission the repair or construction under the provisions of section 304, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, of buildings deemed essential to the rehabilitation of public health and quarantine functions."

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON. I submit a conference report on House bill 6481, making appropriations for the Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for the Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949 and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, 8, and 21.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Corporation is authorized to pay not to exceed $1,482.90 for services actually rendered by former employees during the fiscal year 1947 and for which there is no present authority to pay, as follows: L. Brown, $120.06; W. Finch, $140.11; J. Johnson, $116.16; S. Jones, $86.31; R. Neely, $148.71; G. Sanders, $103.19; N. L. Sanders, $123.82; G. Walker, $130.78; W. Winfield, $183.37; W. Scruggs, $153.60; E. Donley, $102.68; H. Thomas, $74.11"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26.

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE M. REED,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6481, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 19, 1948.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corpora-

tions and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Before the period at the end thereof, insert: ": *Provided further*, That section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (Public Law 248, approved December 6, 1945), shall not be applicable with respect to the Panama Railroad Company until after June 30, 1949."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: After "plus accrued dividends thereon" insert: "which, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall be computed at a rate approximating the average interest cost incurred by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation on its total borrowings during each respective fiscal year."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: "not later than July 30, 1948, as of June 30, 1948 (the corporate records for the fiscal year 1948 to be closed by Defense Homes Corporation prior to actual transfer thereof)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding provisions of law to the contrary, in addition to the foregoing the Corporation is authorized to utilize, from the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1148a), such sums as may be necessary (a) to make loans, during a period of five years, to bona fide fur farmers in accordance with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148), all such loans to carry full personal liability of the borrowers and to be secured by such collateral as is deemed by the Corporation to be necessary to afford reasonable assurance of repayment, the aggregate principal amount of which loans shall not exceed $4,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and (b) not to exceed $25,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration in connection with such loans, which amount and the aforesaid item of $146,800 may be combined for accounting purposes."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

"Section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (Public Law 248, approved Dec. 6, 1945), shall not be applicable with respect to the Virgin Islands Company until after June 30, 1949.

"The Virgin Islands Company is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States not to exceed $500,000, for which purpose there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $500,000. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such loans to the Company for repayment not later than 1 year after the making thereof, at rates of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of any such loan to the Company.

"Not to exceed $97,880 of the funds available to the Company shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis), including salaries of officers, Washington office personnel, and the accounting, purchasing, and pay-roll departments; clerical services; traveling, automobile, office, and sundries expenses; stationery and office supplies; telephone and telegraph; postage; dues and subscriptions; repairs, and maintenance of office buildings and equipment; employees' welfare; and public relations: *Provided*, That such total sum shall be inclusive of the gross amounts of the foregoing categories of expenses before apportionment of any part thereof to manufacturing or other expenses: *Provided further*, That such administrative expenses shall be exclusive of salaries of the engineering and shipping departments, storekeepers, and plant clerical personnel; interest expense; bank service charges; audit fees; and depreciation."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3 to said bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REED. I submit a conference report on House bill 6829, making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN WAR CLAIMS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 4044, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, and I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The conference report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PENSACOLA NATIONAL MONUMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument, and I submit a report (No. 1771) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill and report will be received, and the report will be printed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is at the desk House bill 3416, which is a bill unanimously approved by the Armed Services Committee. It seeks to create a national monument at Pensacola, Fla. It requires the addition of some amendments. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 3416, so that it may be sent to the House as proposed to be amended. I am confident that there will be no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after "authorized" to strike out "and directed to acquire on" and to insert "to receive on"; in line 4, after "United States", to strike out "by transfer, gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise"; in line 8, to strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."; in line 9, after "Navy Department", to insert "and transferred in accordance with existing law."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

THE HOUSING ACT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles housing matters. I have been through the housing question for approximately 3 years. I do not wish to argue the merits of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I do not wish to argue the merits of the House bill, but I do wish to make one observation, and I make it because I feel that we should do something here tonight in respect to housing.

It seems to me that some of us in the Senate are taking the same position that we accuse certain Members of the House of taking. We accuse certain Members in the House of denying the House the right to vote upon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It seems to me that tonight we are likewise denying the Senate the right to consider the housing bill, knowing that any Senator can offer the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as a complete substitute for the House bill. I do not know whether the chairman of the House

Banking and Currency Committee would take the bill to conference or not. I have no way of knowing. But we are acting in the same way that we are accusing the chairman of the Housing Banking and Currency Committee of acting. That is, we are bowing our necks and saying, "Unless we can have our way we will not take anything."

I believe in all fairness that we should permit the unanimous-consent agreement, and if some Senator wishes to offer the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as a complete substitute, put it up to the Senate and let the Senate vote on it and send it back to the House. If the House does not care to consider it, it seems to me that the responsibility will be upon the House, and not upon us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe that we have exhausted the patience of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He has been very patient about withholding his objection. I should like to ask him once again, in the light of what has been said, the mechanical situation, and the parliamentary procedure through which we must go, if he does not feel that we might take up the House bill, let the Senate do what it pleases so far as amendments are concerned, and send it back to the House for consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I renew my objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6959; that all of that bill after the enacting clause be stricken out and that there be inserted the provisions of Senate bill 866, heretofore passed by the Senate; that the Senate insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. President, we passed a housing bill. It was considered for months in the House. Instead of taking that bill, as the House should have done, and substituting what it wished and sending it to conference, it refused to consider the Senate bill. It put the Senate bill aside and wrote a bill of its own and now sends it over here on the last day of the session.

I have not been able to read all of the provisions of the House bill. As we know, if we debate the question of whether or not to adopt a substitute for the House bill, and the various provisions of the bill, it will require another week, as it did before. It seems to me that the proper way to do is to say, "We passed a bill. We will substitute that bill for the House bill and send it to conference." Then we shall have an opportunity, for example, to correct the provision which was pointed out by the FHA, in which the GI-loan provision does not cover 80 percent of the GI loans in the secondary market. I believe that the most important single thing we can do to keep up the flow of housing is to provide that secondary market. A small committee can consider the two bills and try to reconcile them in some way that may be satisfactory to both Houses.

The suggestion I have made, to take up the bill in one unanimous request, substitute the Senate bill and send it to conference, is the reasonable thing to do at this time.

It has been said that the chairman of the House committee will not agree to a conference. I cannot believe that any such arbitrary position could be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think the record should be absolutely clear at this time, in the closing hours of the session, as to just who is blocking housing.

First, I thank the Senator from Ohio for the attitude he has taken and congratulate him. He is always a reasonable man. He has demonstrated it again.

The only way we can get housing legislation of any kind—and the Senator from Louisiana, who is blocking this housing legislation, knows it—is by taking up the House bill in the manner suggested by the Senator from Ohio. We all know that there are many things about the bill which the Senate has passed that we do not like. There is also much debris in the House bill. But the only way we can get sensible housing legislation is to have the conferees get together tonight and reconcile the differences.

I know that the Senator from Louisiana is not worried for fear that the Senate conference committee will be loaded with men who take a position opposite to that which he takes. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who takes the same position on public housing that the Senator from Louisiana does, would have the job of selecting the conferees. So there is no conceivable possibility of having the conference loaded with Senators who are opposed to public housing.

Again, Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be absolutely clear—and I know this matter will be brought up again and again this year—let me say that the Senator from Louisiana, by exercising a privilege which unfortunately is his tonight, is doing several things. First, he is making it impossible for the veterans to get the 100-percent guaranteed loans which the entire Congress has decided the veterans have a right to have. If the Senator from Louisiana persists in his objection, that will mean that he will have absolutely vetoed the right of nearly 15,000,000 young Americans to take advantage of the type of loans which the Congress has decided they have a right to have.

If the Senator from Louisiana persists in his one-man veto, which is of a type which we have seen all too often, not only in the Congress but in the Presidency, it will mean that we shall not have liberal loan guaranties for low-cost housing, and that will be particularly at the expense of the young men who have been in the service, and who have large families, families who really need low-cost housing. If the Senator from Louisiana persists in his objection—and this matter is of tremendous importance; we held hearings on it, all the way from San Francisco to New York, and from New Orleans to St. Paul; and every veterans' organization which came before us urged that we pass some workable and sensible veterans' cooperative housing legislation—so if the Senator persists in his one-man veto, that will mean that he will have vetoed the desires of all the veterans' organizations and the desires of the entire Senate and House to give the veterans who fought the war a right to get together and build some cheap housing. It will also mean that the Senator from Louisiana will have stopped cold the operations of a great number of prefabricated-housing manufacturers.

Mr. President, I do not desire to take up any more of the time of the Senate tonight, for there are a number of other measures which must be passed before we adjourn; but I think the RECORD should be clear that tonight we have seen the unintelligent exercise of a veto privilege which one man should not have. During the past 2 years we have seen the veto privilege abused by the President, and six times the measures have been passed over his vetoes by a majority of the Congress. Mr. President, the only other President of the United States who had thus abused this veto power and had so many vetoes overridden was Andrew Johnson—and Andrew Johnson was impeached.

But tonight we see the use of a veto by a Member of the Senate to prevent the veterans from getting reasonably priced housing this year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, has a ruling been made to the effect that objection is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO ALASKA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 219, Calendar 1817, relating to ocean transportation to Alaska, and I ask that the joint resolution be read by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection temporarily, to permit an explanation and a statement? I should like to call attention to a certain matter.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

Mr. CAIN. I wish to call the attention of the Senate, in the presence of the Senator from North Dakota, to the fact that yesterday when this measure was reached during the call of the calendar, the Senator from North Dakota was moved to object for the reason, as he said, that he had been advised that the

Governor of Alaska was in opposition to this proposed legislation. The Senator from North Dakota told me and my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]—that subcommittee having jurisdiction over the proposed legislation—that he would endeavor to get in touch by telephone with the Governor of Alaska.

I do not know whether the Senator from North Dakota has had opportunity to do so; but I was able to contact the Governor of Alaska late yesterday afternoon at Oakland, Calif., and I was authorized and encouraged by the Governor of Alaska to say to the Senate and to say to individual Senators—I refer particularly to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who objected to the consideration of this measure yesterday during the call of the calendar—that in the considered opinion of the Governor of Alaska, the very best interests of the citizens of that great Territory would be adversely affected and prejudiced unless this proposed legislation is passed.

Inasmuch as yesterday my very good friend the Senator from North Dakota said that his only objection to the measure was that the Governor of Alaska was opposed to it, and inasmuch as the Senator now knows, as I was able to advise him last night, that the Governor of Alaska no longer objects, therefore I hope that the Senator from North Dakota will find it convenient to go along with the desire to have the Senate pass this proposed piece of legislation, which will properly protect the interests of a great Territory belonging to this country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] will agree to an amendment changing the date from December 31, 1949, to October 1, 1948.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to accept that amendment, if it is agreeable to the author of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from North Dakota that this measure proposes an extension of the public law here involved for the short period of 8 months, according to a proposed change in the date. The chairman of the House committee, whose committee is waiting to see what action the Senate will take, tells me that he will accept the Senate joint resolution word for word as it is, with its present date.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if objection has been made——

Mr. LANGER. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, this is a very very bad measure. Under its provisions the Government will lease a ship for $1 to three private companies, and then will pay a subsidy of $3,500,000.

In view of the fact that Alaska may be hurt, I am perfectly willing, if the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment I have proposed—making the date October 1, 1948—not to object, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, all we propose to do here is to extend a law which the Congress passed a year ago. The law expires on June 30. Many of us feel that we should not continue the law except for a limited period of time. We picked the date February 28, 1949—that is the present proposal, under an amendment to the date appearing on the face of the joint resolution as printed, which is December 31, 1949—in order to give the operators of the ship and the Maritime Commission time to get together and work out a new arrangement.

I am fearful that a hardship would be worked upon the people of Alaska if this measure were killed tonight, because then there would be only the time between the present and June 30 in which to work out the new arrangement, and possibly that would not provide sufficient time for the new arrangement to be worked out and for the problem to be handled.

For that reason, if the Senator from North Dakota will not go along with the February 28, 1949 date—which I believe the Senator from North Dakota should do in all fairness to the people of Alaska and the Maritime Commission and the ship operators—I shall accept the October 1, 1948 date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota, who, of course, not only wishes to have good legislation enacted, but wishes to be of as much assistance as he can to the people of Alaska in their problems and troubles. The measure, as we would have it considered, would call for the date to be March 1, 1949, but the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota is October, I believe.

Mr. LANGER. October 1, 1948.

Mr. CAIN. And the date under the committee recommendation is March 1, 1949.

I should like to request the serious consideration of the Senator from North Dakota of this matter, because we think the latter date is important. Yet we recognize the seriousness and sincerity of the Senator's opposition.

Would the Senator consider splitting the difference between the two dates?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have made it a habit never to split the difference. I do not believe in compromises.

The Senator from Indiana said that the October 1, 1948, date would be satisfactory, so that is my position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, does the Senator refer to October of this year?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will split the difference, as it were.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is splitting it, all right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I have the attention of the Senator from North Dakota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object. On February 28 next year, all the maritime authority will expire, all the wartime authority previously given to the Maritime Commission. We moved the Alaskan contracts up to that time. At that time it will be necessary to review the whole maritime situation. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will agree to February 28, and then we will review the maritime situation, including the Alaskan situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I say that my distinguished friend, the author of the bill, has said October 1 is entirely agreeable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Whether it is February 28, March 28, or October 1, what is the difference.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has already said he would agree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why does not the Senator agree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest that if Senators cannot agree, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. CAIN. That is the very worst thing we could do, Mr. President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Washington has the floor. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am sorry this is Saturday night and we have to have this preliminary discussion on the floor. The Senator from New York, who is now in the chair, understands these situations, I hope.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has a good idea.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, may I ask what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is the unanimous-consent request to take up Calendar No. 1817, the joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 219.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understood the objection had been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection has not been withdrawn.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1817, the joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 219.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, what is Calendar 1817?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title has been read. The clerk will again read the title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make

provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until December 31, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "in", to strike out "securing effective, efficient, and reasonably competitive ocean transportation services, by common carriers so far as may be practicable, for Alaska, to encourage the economic development of the Territory and growth of its population, and to increase the Territory's civilian strength and services in support of the national defense" and insert "providing essential water transportation service for the Territory of Alaska pending the determination of a long-range policy with respect to such transportation"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "vessels", to insert "made available to the Commission for such purposes and vessels"; in line 18, strike out "December 31, 1949" and insert "March 1, 1949"; on page 5, line 13, strike out "(1)"; in line 19, after the word "determination", strike out "and (2) the unconditional right to cancel any such contract, charter, or other arrangement, effective as of April 1 of any year, provided written notice of such cancellation be given to the Commission on or before January 1 of such year"; on page 6, after line 14, strike out "SEC. 4. All agencies of the Federal Government shall cooperate to the end that, to the maximum extent practicable, traffic by water to, from, and within Alaska, which such agencies control, either directly or as a contracting agency or otherwise, be transported on vessels of the common carriers operating in the Alaska service"; in line 21, strike out "5" and insert "4"; and in line 23, after the word "vessels", strike out "tugs and barges to be employed in combined operation" and insert "tugs, barges", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution of March 7, 1947, entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes", is amended to read as follows: "That it is the intention of the Congress to assist in providing essential water transportation service for the Territory of Alaska pending the determination of a long-range policy with respect to such transportation.

"SEC. 2. (a) The United States Maritime Commission is authorized to enter into contracts, charters, and other arrangements deemed by it to be appropriate, with American citizens, deemed by the Commission to be qualified, to supply ocean transportation service with American-flag vessels to, from, and within Alaska. Such contracts, charters, or arrangements may include provisions for making available to such operators Government-owned vessels made available to the Commission for such purposes and vessels under the control or jurisdiction of the Commission for operation on voyages commencing not later than March 1, 1949. Such provisions may include (1) charter hire at a nominal rate; (2) such marine insurance to be provided by the Commission, as the Commission may determine to be necessary or appropriate as to vessels made available by the Commission and other vessels operated in the Alaska service under contracts, charters, or arrangements with the Commission; (3) requirements that the operators shall operate such vessels to secure the most economical transportation adequate for the Alaska service; and (4) such other requirements, terms, and conditions as the Commission may deem appropriate.

"(b) Each such contract, charter, or arrangement shall provide that, as of the end of each accounting period, the cumulative gross profit, before overhead expenses, from the operation of vessels thereunder, as approved by the Commission, shall be allocated as follows and in the following order:

"(1) To provide for the operator's proportionate share of the expenses of all operators of maintaining a survey of Alaska ocean transportation services and of the costs and methods of operation of operators in said services, in accordance with a program approved by the Commission;

"(2) To allow compensation to the operator for working capital, use of facilities other than operator-owned vessels, and overhead expenses, on such bases as the Commission may determine; and such bases may be fixed in terms of a percentage or percentages, deemed by the Commission to be reasonable, of vessel operating revenues;

"(3) To allow the operator a return at the rate of 10 percent per annum, before Federal income taxes, on the fair value of operator-owned vessels used in the Alaska service;

"(4) Any profit remaining thereafter, at the conclusion of each accounting period, shall be held in a special account. At the end of the second and each succeeding accounting period, if any, such account shall be available for paying any then cumulative deficiency (covering the period from the commencement of operations hereunder) with respect to any amounts which, if earned, would have theretofore been allocated pursuant to the previous paragraphs of this subsection;

"(5) At the conclusion of operations under any such contract, charter, or other arrangement, any balance in said special account shall be promptly divided and paid 75 percent to the Commission and 25 percent to the operator.

"(c) The Commission may incorporate in each such contract, charter, or arrangement such definitions and formulas for the determinations of vessel-operating revenue, gross profit before overhead expenses, overhead expenses, accounting periods, fair value, and depreciation, as it may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the other provisions of this subsection and of this joint resolution. The Commission's determination of the value of operator-owned vessels, for the purposes of such contract, charter, or other arrangement, shall be for the purposes of this joint resolution only and shall not be relevant evidence in any regulatory proceeding before the Commission.

"SEC. 3. (a) Every contract, charter, or arrangement made under this joint resolution shall expressly reserve to the Commission, after reasonable notice to the operator and affording him opportunity for hearing if the Commission determines that it is in the public interest so to do, the right to cancel the same upon reasonable notice of such cancellation but not less than 90 days. Such contract, charter, or arrangement shall also reserve to the operator the right to request the Commission to modify or cancel the same for good cause shown, and if the Commission shall determine that the operator's claim is justified, it may make such modification or shall permit such cancellation at such time thereafter as it may consider reasonable but not more than 90 days after such determination.

"(b) Whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President, the Commission may terminate any contract, charter, or arrangement hereunder, without cost to the United States, upon such notice to the operator as the President shall determine.

"(c) Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to limit the right of the Commission to enter into other contracts, charters, or arrangements with new or other operators, if after such notice, investigation, or consultation as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate in the particular case, but without the necessity of hearings, the Commission shall determine such action to be in the interest of the economy of the Territory of Alaska or of the national defense.

"SEC. 4. The word 'vessels' as used in the joint resolution shall include such passenger vessels, freight vessels, combination freight and passenger vessels, tugs, barges, and other watercraft, as shall, in the discretion of the Commission, be deemed suitable for us in ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska.

"SEC. 5. The provisions of this joint resolution, as amended, shall not, prior to July 1, 1948, affect the operation of contracts, charters, or other arrangements in accordance with their terms in effect on the date of enactment of this amendatory section, unless superseded before July 1, 1948, by contracts, charters, or arrangements entered into under this joint resolution, as amended."

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the United States Maritime Commission under date of June 18, 1948, referring to the joint resolution which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, June 18, 1948.

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: This is in reference to your telephone conversations this afternoon with Commissioner Mellen and Commissioner Carson. You related that Senator LANGER interposed, through Senator JOHNSTON, an objection to consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 219 on the ground that someone representing himself to be an attorney informed Senator LANGER that the United States Maritime Commission was opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 219.

The representation to Senator LANGER was false. It was without authority from the Maritime Commission.

Senate Joint Resolution 219 is obviously a temporary expedient to authorize operations on a preferable basis than under Public Law 12 and to afford an opportunity to effect a transition to another and better form of operation.

Failure to pass this legislation now will result in an abrupt and drastic disruption

of transportation to and from Alaska for at least 90 days following the 30th of this month. This disruption will take place during the very peak of the Alaskan shipping season. If adequate transportation can thereafter be restored it necessarily will be at substantially higher costs with resulting substantial increases in freight rates.

The Maritime Commission unanimously favors the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 219 as reported by Mr. CAPEHART, with amendments, on June 17 (legislative day June 15), 1948, as a temporary measure to facilitate developing a sounder transportation system for the Territory of Alaska.

Sincerely,

GRENVILLE MELLEN,
Commissioner.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, would the Senator from Nebraska be willing to yield to me for a statement which would require about 8 or 10 minutes, on an important matter?

Mr. WHERRY. I would suggest to the Senator that we first proceed to the consideration of the next business on the Calendar.

Mr. DONNELL. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up for immediate consideration Calendar No. 1421, joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska which had been reported from the Committee on Interior with amendments.

LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield for the purpose indicated?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement with respect to an important subject and to present information concerning certain hearings.

On May 24, 1948, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] introduced, and on the same day there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill S. 2728.

Lines 1 to 9, both inclusive, of page 1, of the printed copy of said bill, read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no court of the United States or of any State shall have jurisdiction of any action or proceeding, whether instituted prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this act, to enforce liability or impose punishment for or on account of the failure of the employer to pay an employee overtime compensation for which the employer is not liable under this act.

Section 2 of said bill reads:

SEC. 2. No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under any law of the United States, in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this act, on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee overtime compensation on any claim therefor that is inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary on May 25, 1948, appointed to consider said bill a subcommittee consisting of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the last named being designated chairman of subcommittee.

In the case of Bay Ridge Operating Co., Inc., petitioner, against James Aaron and others, who were respondents, to wit, case No. 366, and in the case of Huron Stevedoring Corp., petitioner, against Leo Blue and others, who were respondents, to wit, case No. 367, each of said cases being in the October term, 1947, of the Supreme Court of the United States, said Court considered what it characterized as—

Another aspect of the perplexing problem of what constitutes the regular rate of pay which the Fair Labor Standards Act requires to be used in computing the proper payment for work in excess of 40 hours.

Those two cases were decided by the Court on June 7, 1948.

To quote the Court further:

The problem posed is the method of computing the regular rate of pay for longshoremen who work in foreign and interstate commerce varying and irregular hours throughout the workweek under a collective-bargaining agreement for handling cargo which provides contract straight time hourly rates for work done within a prescribed 44-hour time schedule and contract overtime rates for all work done outside the straight time hours.

The agreement, in the two cases mentioned, established, to quote again the Court:

A basic working day of 8 hours and a basic working week, that is, workweek, of 44 hours.

Further, the Court said:

Hourly rates for different types of cargo were specified for work between 8 a. m. and 12 noon and between 1 p. m. and 5 p. m. during five working days of the week, Monday through Friday, and from 8 a. m. to 12 noon on Saturday, and a different schedule of rates for work during all other hours in the workweek.

Continuing, the Court said:

The first schedule was called straight-time rates, and the second schedule was entitled overtime rates.

The opinion of the Court designated these rates as contract straight time and contract overtime.

The court, referring to section 7 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act as section 7 (a), stated the respective claims of the parties to the suits as follows, namely:

Respondents claim that their regular rate of pay under the contract for any workweek, within the meaning of section 7 (a), is the average hourly rate computed by dividing the total number of hours worked in any workweek for any single employer into the total compensation received from that employer during that week; and that in those workweeks in which they worked more than 40 hours for any one employer they were entitled by section 7 (a) to statutory excess compensation for all such excess hours computed on the basis of that rate. The petitioners claim that the straight-time rates are the regular rates, and that they have, therefore, with minor exceptions not presented by this review, complied with the requirements of section 7 (a). That is, no rates except straight-time rates are to be taken into consideration in computing the regular rate.

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which reversed the judgment of the district court had held—to quote again the Supreme Court—"that the regular rate must be determined as an 'actual fact' and could not be arranged through a collective-bargaining agreement." Said Circuit Court of Appeals, so the Supreme Court said, "therefore concluded that on the basis of the findings below the regular rate must be computed by dividing the total number of hours worked into the total compensation received."

The Supreme Court agreed with the conclusion reached by said Circuit Court of Appeals. Three Justices of the Supreme Court dissented. One Justice of said Court took no part in the consideration or decision of the case. Said cases, Nos. 363 and 367, had been consolidated for trial.

On June 8, 1948, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] introduced, and on the same day there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill No. S. 2832, the printed copy of which bill is, except as to one punctuation, identical with S. 2728.

On June 9, 1948, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary appointed, to consider said S. 2832, a subcommittee, the members of which are the Senators who constitute the subcommittee which said chairman appointed, as aforesaid, to consider said Senate bill 2728.

Excerpt from the minutes of June 14, 1948, of the Committee on the Judiciary, reads as quoted by me as follows:

S. 2728, Document 1386 was discussed before the full committee. After further discussion on the bill which involves overtime on overtime payments, it was ordered that the subcommittee on the bill, consisting of Senator DONNELL, chairman, Senator COOPER, and Senator EASTLAND, be authorized to hold hearings during the recess period between adjournment and January 1949, with a view to preparing a record for use in the Eighty-first Congress.

Said last-mentioned subcommittee will, accordingly, at times and place or places to be hereafter determined, hold said hearings if funds therefor be provided. Persons who shall have the desire to be informed of such times and place or places should promptly communicate that desire to Robert Barnes Young, clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary, 424 Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Said last-mentioned subcommittee will, in my opinion, reserve the right to limit the number of witnesses to such number as it shall deem reasonable and to accept or call as witnesses only such persons as, in order that said subcommittee may obtain a clear and fair understanding of the facts, it shall deem advisable to hear.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) to

rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, before proceeding to make a few brief remarks regarding the pending joint resolution, which I consider one of the important resolutions to be discussed this evening, let me say that I am sorry that the proponents of the resolution had to wait until the last minute to discuss the rights of American people. Senate Joint Resolution 162 affects the very lives and the livelihood of Indians who cannot defend themselves and are at the mercy of those who exploit them.

Mr. President, only today this body and the House of Representatives have agreed on an appropriation which has for its purpose an attempt to bring relief in Europe and elsewhere. We are sorry for the people of Europe. We try to show the world that we are charitable. But when it comes to a question of doing what is right by those we actually control we would by law in the last minute of the Congress take away the basic rights of poor people who cannot defend themselves.

Mr. President, it would be a calamity if Congress passed this joint resolution at this time. It is true the committee held hearings, but the hearings and the witnesses were confined to those who would deprive the Indian of Alaska of what belongs to him. Are we proud of our history in dealing with the Indians? Are we proud of the way we have treated them? Are we proud of the action we are about to take tonight so that without having his day in court or coming before a committee and expressing his views, in the last minute of the session of Congress this body, without consideration of what is involved, would pass a law which would deprive innocent people, fine people, harmless people, people who cannot defend themselves, out of what belongs to them?

What is the hurry? I ask any Senator within the hearing of my voice what he knows about the purport of the resolution, what effect it will have on the Indians of Alaska, what effect it will have on our so-called good will, what effect it will have on our doing what is right for the suffering people throughout the world?

Mr. President, the Senate can pass this resolution, but it will go down in history as being one of the greatest exploitations of harmless and inoffensive people in the history of this body. The Indians and the natives of Alaska will be the ones who will suffer as a consequence of the enactment of the resolution, if it becomes law.

In all sincerity, I ask those here who took an oath to support the Constitution, and who are so desirous and anxious to help people, to consider this case carefully. I know that about a year ago today I submitted finally to the passing of another law which was supposed to help the Indians of Alaska. It was going to develop the pulp of Alaska. The law was passed, but to this day nothing has been done, not an Indian has been given a bit of work, and he has not got his property. That is all that is happening.

When we are taking care of all the peoples of the world, why is it not fair to wait 6 or 7 months so that a real investigation can be made of the basic rights involved, and not let a group of exploiters from continental United States go there and deprive those poor people out of their property and their rights? The joint resolution can be passed, but it is indecent, to say the least, to take from the Indians of Alaska what little they have without an investigation of the matter. Oh, yes, we brag about how good we are, we brag about what we do about communism. We want to save the Jews, the Greeks, the Chinese, and everybody else, but can we here in the last minutes of the Congress, with clear consciences, deprive Indians, for whom we assumed the responsibility, who canont defend themselves, of some of their property rights.

Mr. President, in my opinion this resolution as reported is inadequate to the needs of Alaska, and extremely unfair to the Indians and the Eskimos. It would withdraw from the Interior Department authority granted in 1936 to create reservations in Alaska, except for village sites, smokehouses, and things of that sort. It would extinguish claims of the Indians and other natives, taking away their right to seek redress in court, wiping away completely whatever rights the Indians may have, without their having their day in court, without their being allowed to at least defend themselves, in their ignorant, meek, humble way.

The Indians of Alaska and the Eskimos will suffer what the Indian in continental United States has suffered throughout the years. They will be done away with as were the Cherokees, they will be done away with as were the Indians of New York, New England, and the other States. I ask in all sincerity that this terrible exploitation be stopped.

The President, in his Alaska message, suggested that negotiations be undertaken with the natives by the Interior Department to provide the Indians and the Eskimos with sufficient lands for their livelihood, and that their claims to the other lands be extinguished.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what is the Senator reading from?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am reading from some notes I made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is a great difference between provisions of sufficient land for their livelihood and the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 162.

There has been submitted to the Congress a very carefully worked out suggestion with regard to the settlement of native claims in Alaska. I understand this suggestion reached the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate yesterday. I am certain that it should be considered by the Congress before any action is taken. This suggestion has exactly the same objective as is proclaimed by Senate Resolution 162, and it would fill the needs of the President, the Senate committee, and others for correction of the present situation with regard to the occupation of lands in Alaska.

If it is practicable to substitute the language which has been suggested in the letter from the Acting Secretary, which I understand has been received by the Senate and by the House of Representatives, I should have no objection to action now on this question; but it is impracticable.

Mr. President, it is a terrible thing to take away from a human being basic rights because we have the power to do it. Action is up to the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the joint resolution, I think the Senator from New Mexico, who has spoken so feelingly and so sincerely, has nonetheless very sadly misjudged the intent and the effect and the result of the proposed legislation. So far as I know, there is not any intention on the part of anyone who hopes that this legislation will pass tonight to usurp or take away or destroy or abuse the right of any Indian in the Territory of Alaska to any property or human right which the Indian may possess.

On the other hand, Mr. President, a good many of us who hope that Alaska will develop at an accelerated pace in the next few years are of the considered opinion that the time has come when we must no longer take it for granted that people possess large rights to which, on examination, they may not be entitled. All the joint resolution does is to instruct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the individual rights of Indians, and of groups and tribes of Indians, and once his determination has been established, if he can secure concurrence from the Secretary of Agriculture the wish and the decision and the determination of the Secretary of the Interior shall become fact.

Admittedly this is by no means an easy problem to solve. Certainly we might hope that it were possible for every Indian claiming a right in Alaska to have a full opportunity to have his day in court or to be heard in that field. But outside the realm of the law, if we cannot in this Congress place our reliance for the doing of a good and fair and competent job in two of the Cabinet positions of the Government, I for one do not know where we could place any reliance or any faith.

Congress during the closing hours of the last session passed a bill which was intended to make available some of the excess surplus forests of Alaska for the production of pulp out of which there might come an industry so progressive and so healthy that the very Indians to whom the Senator from New Mexico has rightfully given his support and allegiance might be the better qualified to make livings and become other than public charges.

One last word about this measure, Mr. President. It says in no uncertain language that the Secretary of the Interior shall make it his business to protect and save for the Indians the lands which they actually possess and areas which are presently used or occupied for town sites. That takes in quite a good deal of territory which they use for villages, smokehouses, gardens, burial grounds or missionary stations. It seems very clear to me if the Indians claim rights to such facilities and such areas, that everyone will be protected, and no one will be tak-

ing an unfair advantage of the Indians in the Territory called Alaska.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope that in the closing hours of the session we will not be unduly alarmed about this joint resolution. As a matter of fact, it does but two things. There are Indian reservations in Alaska, and I am more cognizant of them, I know more about them than perhaps any other Senator, and I am just as considerate of them as any other Member of this body. There are some reservations that have a square mile per Indian. At the most, there are only 35,000 natives in Alaska. There are more Indian reservations in Alaska per capita and per square mile than any place in the whole of the United States. This measure does not affect them at all. All it provides is that we shall keep these reservations with which Indians in Alaska are happy, but with which I am not so sure some Indian lawyers downtown are happy. They make their living off these Indians. They have an Indian bar association downtown. They meet about every month and discuss what the next move is to be to make a charge against Indians. I am quite tired of that.

The measure does nothing but maintain the Indian reservation in Alaska and provides that no Secretary of the Interior shall extend those Indian reservations for somebody who would make an investment.

As I said the other day on the floor, the joint resolution involves the economy of Alaska. It does not hurt the Indians at all But every time a bill is brought up in Congress and the word "Indian" is mentioned, Members of Congress will hear from some Indian lawyers downtown who make their living by exploiting the Indians. They tell us why the bill should not pass, or why we should amend it, or something else.

I know as much about Alaska as any other man on this floor, and I am as appreciative of the rights of the Indian as any other man on this floor. The measure does not hurt the Alaska Indians one single bit. It would allow Alaska to progress. It would allow somebody to go up there and make an investment in pulp and papers, in mines or in salmon or any other industry. No one is going to make an investment if he thinks the Secretary of the Interior can extend an Indian reservation over the land in which he has invested.

One thing more. I do not like to talk about Indian lawyers, but it is high time someone did.

Let me mention the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior. They have had an opportunity, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] will say, to testify and present their case. They have been before the committee and said all they had to say, and the committee unanimously said they were wrong. So when the bill comes up in the Senate under unanimous consent they write to everyone in the Senate. They get some Senator to object after they have had their day in court.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not mean the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield to me anyway?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I dislike the Indian lawyers as much as does the Senator from Washington, and I know what he is talking about.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New Mexico knows more about the Indian lawyers than I do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not worrying about the Indian lawyers, but I am concerned about the Indians in Alaska who do not have any lawyers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am very much concerned about the Indians in Alaska. As a matter of fact, if the joint resolution is passed the Indians in Alaska will be better off than they have ever been in their whole history. I believe that sincerely.

Mr. President, I say again as I said the other day, that this measure means the economy of Alaska. Its adoption will mean that men can go up there and develop pulp and paper, salmon, and minerals.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska knows that everyone has had his day in court, that everyone has had an opportunity to testify, but the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior, even after its representatives have been in court, after they have testified, write letters to Senators to object to bills. This is a good measure. It will help Alaska. If it would not help Alaska I would not be standing on the floor advocating it, and neither would my junior colleague.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not certain whether my good friend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] was directing his remarks against the original bill which was introduced. Much of his comment was more or less applicable to the bill as originally introduced. The bill as now proposed will be of benefit, to the people of Alaska, including the natives as well as the whites.

Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 after the resolving clause it is proposed to strike out the following:

That the orders of the Secretary of the Interior issued under authority of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), establishing the Akutan, Kariuk, Wales, Unalakleet, and Venetie, or any other Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska, are hereby rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 8, to strike out "SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act of May 1, 1936, is hereby repealed" and insert "that section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), is hereby repealed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3 to insert a new section 2 as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, in the Territory of Alaska, is authorized to issue patents to the appropriate native tribes and villages or individuals for the lands actually possessed, used or occupied for town sites, villages, smoke houses, gardens, burial grounds, or missionary stations: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the Interior, prior to issuing patents to any such lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest, shall obtain the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the measure does not take away from any single Indian reservation one single foot of land that has been declared an Indian reservation today. It does place some limit upon the creation of additional reservations in the future.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was stricken out.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate

of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand 3d;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Krause, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4881. An act for relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 4982. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes, approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6818. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; and

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the final edition of the RECORD a statement which I am preparing, on the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO FILE INTERIM REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT PERIOD

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or the full committee, be authorized to file interim reports during the adjourned period of the Eightieth Congress, and that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMISSION FOR INSERTION OF MATERIAL IN APPENDIX

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Eightieth Congress certain material which I now have in the process of preparation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 264, which corrects an error in a date in the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 81, of the Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 17, 1947, authorizing an investigation of the appointment of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 264) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 17, 1947 (authorizing an investigation of the appointment of postmasters) is hereby further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 15, 1949."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is obvious that no investigation could be made and a report received as early as June 30, 1948. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES IMPORTED TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the House has passed House Joint Resolution 433, permitting the free entry of certain articles to promote international good will, and for other purposes. Normally it would be referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. Obviously there is no time to process the joint resolution. I have a message from the executive department of the Government urging that the joint resolution be acted upon, if that is at all possible. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 433) permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any articles, including approximately 48 railroad cars and incidental equipment, certified by the Secretary of State as being donated in promotion of international good will by the people or Government of the Republic of France for sale for charitable purposes in the United States or for presentation, in the case of the railroad equipment, to noncommercial organizations in the United States may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption free of customs duties, fees, or charges, internal-revenue taxes, and marking or other import requirements or restrictions.

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of its enactment and prior to the close of December 31, 1948.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Colorado if he knows of any objection to the joint resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I know of no objection to it. If there is objection, I shall immediately withdraw the request.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to permit the Republic of France to send some railroad equipment into this country and some incidental equipment which ultimately will either be given away or sold for charity in this country as a gesture of good will from the Republic of France to this country. I know of no objection to the joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVOLVING FUND FOR PURCHASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND RAW MATERIALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2376) for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold, which were, on page 1, to strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive, and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed in the aggregate outstanding at any time $150,000,000. Each such note shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the note. Payment of the purchase price of such notes and repayments thereof by the Secretary of the Army shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. The proceeds of these notes shall be used by the Secretary of the Army, or his duly authorized representatives, as a revolving fund for the purpose of (a) purchasing natural fibers (including"; on page 3, line 18, after "report", to insert "to the Congress", and on the same page, line 21, after "Congress", to insert "by concurrent resolution."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the House amendment provides a different means by which the Treasury will furnish the Army the money which is called for in the bill. I understand that the amendment will not permit the Army to secure this money at less than the actual cost to the United States. Therefore I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is this the bill about which the Senator spoke to me?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; this is the revolving fund for the purchase of fibers within the United States to be sold in Japan and other occupied countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from Vermont that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked to have it held a little while this morning until I could get the opinion of the Comptroller General, but the amendment seems to be satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's action.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, are hides included in the amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. No. The bill is not changed otherwise than as indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1515, Senate bill 843, being a bill concerning the revenue of the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have made a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is in order.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 843) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will now consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is a bill imposing a 2-percent sales tax on the people of the District of Columbia. It also exempts from income taxes the first $8,000 of income. In addition, there are personal exemptions. I want Senators to know that this is a Republican bill, out and out, for the big man. The little fellow pays the price. That is it, in a nutshell.

Let us see what is going to happen when we impose a sales tax in a congested district such as the District of Columbia. I know what I would do if I owned a store like Hecht's in the District. I would move over to Virginia, and sell over there, and save 2 percent on everything I sold. Hecht's now has a store in Maryland.

The main question is, Is it right in principle? It is claimed that additional revenue is needed for the District of Columbia. I intend to read the entire bill. I want Senators to know just what is in it, and I shall read it all. Then I shall read the report, to let Senators know what they are facing.

Mr. President, I will yield to no one, even for a question. Senators can sit here and listen. I now read from the bill:

That this act divided into titles and sections may be cited as the "District of Columbia Sales and Compensating Use Tax of 1948."

TITLE I—SALES TAX

SEC. 1. Definitions.—When used in this title the following terms shall mean or include:

(a) "Person".—Includes an individual, partnership, society, association, joint-stock company, corporation, estate, receiver, trustee, assignee, referee, or any other person acting in a fiduciary or representative capacity, whether appointed by a court or otherwise, and any combination of individuals.

(b) "Vendor".—Includes a person selling property or rendering services upon the receipts from which a tax is imposed under section 2 of this title.

(c) "Purchaser".—Includes a person who purchases property or to whom are rendered services, receipts from which are taxable under section 2 of this title.

(d) "Receipt".—The amount of the sale price of any property or the charge for any service specified in section 2 of this title, valued in money, whether received in money or otherwise, including all receipts, cash, credits and property of any kind or nature, and also any amount for which credit is allowed by the vendor to the purchaser, without any deduction therefrom on account of the cost of the property sold, the cost of materials used, labor, transportation or service cost, interest or discount paid, taxes paid, or any other expense whatsoever.

(e) "Sale" or "selling".—Any transfer of title or possession or both, exchange or barter, license to use, license to consume, conditional or otherwise, in any manner or by any means whatsoever for a consideration, or any agreement therefor, and shall include the rendering of any service specified in section 2 of this title.

(f) "Tangible personal property".—Corporeal personal property of any nature.

(g) "Retail sale" or "sale at retail".—A sale to any person for any purpose other than for resale in the form of tangible personal property. A "sale or purchase at retail of tangible personal property" shall also be deemed to include the sale of the services of producing, fabricating, processing, printing, or imprinting tangible personal property, to a person who directly or indirectly furnishes the tangible personal property, not purchased by him for resale, upon which such services are performed; other than the rendering of services in connection with the repair, alteration, or reconditioning of tangible personal property on behalf of the owner thereof to refit it for the use for which it was originally produced.

Mr. President, I am reading this bill because I want the people here tonight to know just what it is, and because it

has so many details that will affect the people within the District of Columbia. The people will find that this bill will tax the little fellow every time. On small sales the proposed sales tax will sometimes run very high—not just 2 percent, but probably it will run as high as 8 or 10 percent, on small sales, catching the little fellow at every turn more and more, but letting out the big taxpayers. Of course, it will make no difference how big they are; they will get the $8,000 exemption to begin with. That is the Republican way of doing things.

I continue to read from the bill:

(h) "Semipublic institution".—Those charitable, educational, and religious institutions which are supported principally by public subscriptions or endowment or by appropriation made by the Congress of the United States and are not organized or operated for private gain.

(i) "Return".—Includes any return filed or required to be filed as herein provided.

(j) "District".—The District of Columbia.

(k) "Commissioners".—The Commissioners of the District or their duly authorized representatives.

(l) "Assessor".—The Assessor of the District or his duly authorized representatives.

(m) "Collector".—The Collector of Taxes of the District or his duly authorized representatives.

(n) "Food".—Cereals and cereal products; milk and milk products; candy and confectionery; ice cream and ice-cream products; meat and meat products; fish and fish products; eggs and egg products; vegetables and vegetable products; fruits, fruit products, and fruit juices; flavoring extracts, condiments, spices, and salt; sugar and sugar products; coffee and coffee substitutes; tea, cocoa and cocoa products; and ice when used for household consumption. "Food" shall not include spiritous or malt liquors, beer, soft drinks, and sodas and beverages such as are ordinarily dispensed at bars and soda fountains or in connection therewith, other than coffee, coffee substitutes, tea and cocoa.

Mr. President, I notice that something is said about whisky here. I wonder if Senators know that in the District of Columbia there is a tax of only 50 cents a gallon on whisky and 50 cents a barrel on beer. Still we are told that it is impossible to find any way by which to raise additional revenue for the District of Columbia, except by placing this proposed sales tax on the people who go out to buy clothes and shoes for little babies.

I continue to read:

SEC. 2. Imposition of tax.—Beginning 60 days after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, for the privilege of selling certain tangible personal property at retail as defined in this title and for the privilege of dispensing certain services as defined in this title, there is hereby imposed and there shall be paid a tax upon the amount of receipts from every sale of tangible personal property sold at retail in the District, including services rendered in connection therewith, computed as follows:

(a) On each sale where the price is from 14 cents to 50 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent;

(b) On each sale where the price is from 51 cents to $1, both inclusive, 2 cents;

(c) On each 50 cents of price or fraction thereof in excess of $1, 1 cent.

The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the purchaser.

The man who collects the tax should be prepared for an emergency. He should get a little box and put it by the cash register, so that every time he collects the tax he can put in in a box. He is going to have to pay that to the city. He must pay to the city the same amount he collects, otherwise he might be accused of taking something that does not belong to him.

SEC. 3. Exemptions.—Receipts from sales of the following and services rendered in connection therewith shall be exempt from the taxes imposed by this title:

(a) Sales to the United States or the District or any instrumentality thereof.

(b) Sales to a State or any of its political subdivisions if such State grants a similar exemption to the District. As used in this subsection, the term "State" means the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(c) Sales to a semipublic institution.

(d) Sales of food for human consumption in the home or residence. It is not intended by this subsection to exempt from the tax sales of food for human consumption in restaurants, cafes, hotel dining rooms, taverns, night clubs, and similar establishments.

(e) Sales of drugs and medicines.

(f) Sales of motor-vehicle fuels upon the sale of which a tax is imposed by the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended or as may be hereafter amended.

(g) Sales of tickets for admission to places of amusements and sports.

(h) Sales of gas and electricity and services rendered incident therto: *Provided*, That the receipts from such sales and services are subject to a gross-receipts tax in force in the District during or for the period of time covered by any return required to be filed by the provisions of this title.

(i) Sales of transportation and telephone and telegraph service.

(j) Sales of property purchased by a utility or public-service company for use or consumption in furnishing a commodity or service: *Provided*, That the receipts from furnishing such commodity or service are subject to a gross-receipts tax in force in the District during or for the period of time covered by any return required to be filed by the provisions of this title.

(k) Sales of newspapers and magazines.

(l) Casual and isolated sales by a vendor who is not regularly engaged in the business of selling tangible personal property.

(m) Sales of livestock, poultry, seeds, feeds for livestock and poultry, fertilizers, lime, and land plaster used for agricultural purposes.

(n) Sales of advertising space and sales of radio advertising.

(o) Sales of food or beverages of any nature if made in any car composing a part of any train or in any aircraft or boat operating within the District in the course of interstate commerce.

(p) Sales of goods made pursuant to bona fide contracts entered into before the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That there is a contract in writing signed by the buyer and seller which imposes an unconditional liability on the part of the buyer to purchase goods covered thereby, and an unconditional liability on the part of the seller to deliver a definite quantity of such goods at the contract price.

(q) Sales of natural or artificial gas, oil, electricity, solid fuel, or steam, to any purchaser for use in manufacturing, assembling, processing, or refining.

(r) Sales which the States would be without power to tax under the limitations of the Constitution of the United States.

(s) Sales of motor vehicles and trailers.

SEC. 4. Upon each taxable sale or service the tax to be collected shall be stated and charged separately from the sale price or charge for service and shown separately on any record thereof—

Just imagine what a time they are going to have keeping records—

at the time when the sale is made or evidence of sale issued or employed by the vendor and shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor as trustee for and on account of the District, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection thereof and for the tax. The vendor shall be personally liable for the tax collected or required to be collected under this title, and the vendor shall have the same right in respect to collecting the tax from the purchaser, or in respect to nonpayment of the tax by the purchaser, as if the tax were a part of the purchase price of the property or service and payable at the time of the sale: *Provided, however*, That the Collector shall be joined as a party plaintiff in any action or proceeding brought by the vendor to collect the tax.

SEC. 5. The tax imposed by this title shall be paid upon all sales made and services rendered beginning 60 days after approval of this act but not prior to July 1, 1948, although made or rendered under a contract dated prior thereto. Where a service is billed on either a monthly or other term basis, the payment of such bill for such month or other period of time shall be a receipt subject to the tax herein imposed. The Commissioners may provide by regulation that the tax upon receipts from sales on the installment plan may be paid in full at the time the agreement therefor is made or on the account of each installment and upon the date when such installment is due.

Poor little fellows. The tax is collected before they get paid. This is a regular Republican bill. I think the Republicans should write it into their platform. I imagine they will do that. How well I remember when we were debating the income-tax bill. We had a hard time getting any exemptions for the little fellows. But the big boys got some reductions in their taxes. There will be much said about the income taxes after the conventions. That shows definitely the principles of the two parties. One looks after the rich, and other looks after the poor, the people who are struggling to make a living. I predict that if the Republicans capture the Presidency of the United States, we shall have a new kind of tax throughout the United States—a sales tax, something that will hit all the little people, and then the Republicans will take the income taxes off entirely.

The Commissioners may provide by regulation for the exclusion of amounts representing sales where the contract of sales has been canceled, or the property returned, or the receipt has been ascertained to be worthless or, in case the tax has been paid upon such receipt, for a credit or refund of the amount of the tax upon such receipt upon application therefor as provided in section 13 of this title.

SEC. 6. Presumptions.—For the purpose of the proper administration of this title and to prevent evasion of the tax hereby imposed, it shall be presumed that all receipts for property and services mentioned in this title are subject to tax until the contrary is established, and the burden of proving that a receipt is not taxable hereunder shall be upon the vendor or the purchaser. Unless the vendor shall have taken from the purchaser a certificate signed by and bearing the name and address of the purchaser and the number of his registration certificate to the effect that the property or service was purchased for resale, the sale shall be deemed to be a taxable sale at retail.

SEC. 7. No person engaged in the business of selling property or services the receipts from which are subject to tax under this title shall advertise or hold out to the public in any manner directly or indirectly that the tax imposed by this title is not considered as an element in the price to the purchaser.

SEC. 8. Collection of tax from purchaser.—The tax shall be paid by the purchaser to the vendor as trustee for and on account of the District, and the vendor shall be liable for the collection thereof for and on account of the District.

SEC. 9. Every vendor shall keep records of receipts and of the tax payable thereon in such form as the Commissioners may by regulation require. Such records shall be offered for inspection and examination at any time upon demand by the Assessor and shall be preserved for a period of 3 years.

SEC. 10. Returns.—(a) Every vendor shall file with the Assessor a return of his receipts and of the taxes payable thereon for monthly, quarterly, or other periods as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe, or as the Assessor may require as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Such returns shall be filed within 20 days from the expiration of the period covered thereby. The Assessor may permit or require returns to be made by other periods and upon such dates as he may specify: *Provided*, That the receipts during any year shall be included in returns covering such year and no other. If the Assessor deems it necessary in order to insure the payment of the tax imposed by this title, he may require returns to be made for shorter periods than those prescribed pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section, and upon such dates as he may specify.

(c) The form of returns shall be prescribed by the Assessor and shall contain such information as he may deem necessary for the proper administration of this title. The Assessor may require amended returns to be filed within 20 days after notice and to contain the information specified in the notice.

SEC. 11. Payment of tax.—(a) At the time of filing a return of receipts each vendor shall pay to the Collector the taxes imposed by this title upon the receipts required to be included in such return, as well as all other moneys collected by the vendor acting or purporting to act under the provisions of this title even though it be judicially determined that the tax collected is invalidly imposed. All the taxes for the period for which a return is required to be filed shall be due from the vendor and payable to the Collector on the date limited for the filing of the return for such period, without regard to whether a return is filed or whether the return which is filed shows correctly the amount of receipts and the taxes due thereon.

(b) The vendor shall be entitled to apply and credit against the amount of tax payable by him an amount equal to 3 percent of the gross tax to the remitted by him to the Collector in payment for the vendor's expense in the collection and remittance of said tax: *Provided, however*, That the credit allowed by this subsection shall be denied to any vendor who shall fail or refuse to file his return within the time prescribed by regulation or as required by the Assessor as provided in section 10 of this title.

Some of these people will have to employ a bookkeeper to keep their accounts in some little business in which they are engaged in order to keep them correctly. If they do not do that they will probably lose their 3 percent, and also they will be penalized by heavy fines. I will read the penalty provision in a little while.

SEC. 12. Determination of tax.—If a return required by this title is not filed, or if a return when filed is incorrect or insufficient, the amount of tax due shall be determined by the Assessor from such information as may be obtainable. Notice of such determination shall be given to the person liable for the collection of the tax from the purchaser and payment thereof to the Collector. Such determination shall finally and irrevocably fix the tax unless the person against whom it is assessed, within 30 days after the giving of notice of such determination, shall apply in writing to the Assessor for a hearing, or unless the Assessor of his own motion shall redetermine the same. After such hearing or redetermination the Assessor shall give notice of his final determination to the person against whom the tax is assessed.

SEC. 13. Refunds.—(a) Except as to any tax finally determined as provided in section 12, where any tax has been erroneously or illegally collected the tax shall be refunded if application is filed with the Assessor for such refund within 1 year from the payment thereof. For like cause and within the same period a refund may be made upon the certificates of the Assessor and the Collector. Whenever a refund is made upon the certificates of the Assessor and the Collector, the Assessor and Collector shall state their reasons therefor in writing. Such application may be made by the person upon whom such tax was imposed and who has actually paid the tax. Such application may also be made by a vendor who has collected and paid such tax to the Collector: *Provided*, That the application is made within 1 year of the payment by the purchaser to the vendor, but no actual refund of moneys shall be made to such vendor until he shall first establish to the satisfaction of the Assessor, under such regulations as the Commissioners may prescribe, that the vendor has repaid to the purchaser the amount for which the application for refund is made. In lieu of any refund required to be made, a credit may be allowed therefor on payment due from the applicant.

(b) Application for a refund or credit made as herein provided shall be deemed an application for a revision of any tax, penalty, or interest complained of and the Assessor may receive evidence with respect thereto. After making his determination of whether any refund shall be made, the Assessor shall give notice thereof to the applicant.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, provided it does not count on my time.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator as to how long he expects to speak on the tax bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know how long it is going to take me to speak. I am going to try to speak long enough so that there will not be a sales tax in the District. That is my object. I think one of the most outrageous things would be to put this tax on under the circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. I am against the sales tax. I was just making inquiry of the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will do anything to keep this bill from becoming a law.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Provided it does not take me off the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. It has been rumored that there are some people who have in mind the adoption of a sales tax for the District of Columbia with a view to making that the spearhead for the national sales tax. Would the Senator from South Carolina care to comment on that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator from Florida brought that subject up. This is our Capital City, the Capital of the Government of the United States, and the object now, as I understand it, is that if they can get a sales tax here within the District of Columbia within the Capital of the United States, then the Federal Government, the Republican Party, if they capture the Presidency and also the Congress——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not expect them to do that, does he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not expect them to do that, but they have in view, as I understand, to use this as a spearhead to put on a sales tax in the entire Nation. That is one reason why I am fighting this so hard. I do not want it in the District, although I live right over in Maryland. I do not live in the District at the present time, but I do sympathize with the people who live in the District, and will have to purchase things in the District, especially the little man who earns probably $2,000 or $2,500 a year.

As will be seen from a reading of the bill it is proposed to give an $8,000 exemption from the income tax. An individual making from $4,000 to $8,000 would not pay any income tax, but he may have a house full of children, and every time he bought his children shoes he would have to pay a sales tax. Every time he bought a pair of socks at 15 cents he would have to pay 1 cent more to cover the sales tax. If one were to count up all the purchases large and small it would be found that they would amount to about 6½ cents on every dollar—more than 6 percent. It is expected that in all there would be collected $17,000,000 by the imposition of the sales tax. I cannot see any fairness in such a tax. Show me one who favors the tax and I will immediately say that he must be a Republican, because only Republicans would believe in such taxation.

I begin to read section 14:

SEC. 14. Any person aggrieved by a final determination of tax as provided in section 12 or denial of an application for refund of any tax under section 13 may, within 90 days from the date of the final determination of the tax or from the date of the denial of an application for refund, as the case may be, appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of title IX of the act entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes", approved May 16, 1938, as amended, and as the same may hereafter be amended. The remedy provided in this section shall not be deemed to take away from the taxpayer any remedy which he might have under any other provision of law, but no suit by the taxpayer for the recovery of any part of any tax shall be instituted in any court if the taxpayer has elected to file an appeal with respect to such tax with the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 15. The taxes imposed by this title and penalties and interest thereon may be collected by the Collector——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will yield for a question, provided I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be understood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree to that condition. My question is whether the Senator from South Carolina would yield to permit the Senator from Illinois to make a few remarks, with the understanding that if the motion is again brought up the Senator from South Carolina will have the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not want my yielding, even with the understanding that I may regain the floor, to count against me as one of the speeches which I am entitled to make. I want that understood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from South Carolina is speaking on a motion to take up a bill. He has not yet made one speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion should prevail, the Senator would be entitled to about four speeches in all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I realize that, Mr. President. The reason I secured the floor now was so I could make two speeches on each motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, if I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I make my parliamentary inquiry with the understanding that it will in no way change the present position of the Senator from South Carolina respecting his rights or position on the floor with regard to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair may not be the occupant of the chair when the matter arises again, and the present occupant of the chair, therefore, is unable to make any guaranty respecting the matter.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will yield, providing I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PEPPER. Would it not be possible to accomplish the purpose by unanimous-consent agreement, which would be binding upon any occupant of the chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; assuming the unanimous consent is forthcoming.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the acting majority leader might propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina may yield the floor for the time being in order that the Senator from Illinois may make a few remarks, and that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois the Senator from South Carolina may regain the floor without losing any rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that agreeable to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. In order that we may understand what the situation may be, I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Carolina how long he proposes to discuss the motion.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know how long I may be able to continue. I was in the same clothes I now have on all of last night. I did not get to bed last night. I wish I was fresh; then the Senator from Washington would be here until Monday morning, when the convention opens in Philadelphia.

Mr. CAIN. One further question, so I may try to reconcile my right to object. Is the Senator from Washington to understand that the Senator from South Carolina, who in my considered opinion is a very healthy, strong person, is going to speak for as long as he has strength to stand on his feet?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is my purpose to attempt to explain the bill in every detail before I finish. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will proceed with that understanding.

CARL A. HATCH, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to express my deep sense of appreciation for the kindness on the part of the acting majority leader, as well as my appreciation to my dear friend from South Carolina for yielding to me. He will not lose any rights by doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois suspend while we have a little order for this very important speech?

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair for obtaining order, and for his compliment.

Before I begin reading the manuscript and making a few remarks as I go along, I wish at this time to pay my respects to an individual Member of this body who is about to say farewell.

I speak, of course, of the distinguished and able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], whom we all know. He will not be with us next year because some time ago he issued a statement in which he told the people of his State that he would not be a candidate for reelection. In my service in the United States Senate I have learned to know the distinguished Senator from New Mexico very well. I say without fear of successful contradiction that the Senator from New Mexico has proved himself to be one of the most constructive, able, sincere, and trustworthy legislators I have ever had the good fortune to serve with in my 13 years in Congress. I regret, as I am sure all other Senators do, that he is leaving the service of the United States Senate. I wish for him every success in his new undertaking, whatever it may be. I am sure I speak for all Members of the Senate when I pay this inadequate tribute to our beloved colleague and friend.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am happy to hear the comments of the senior Senator from Illinois in regard to our distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, with the utmost regret I realize that when we reconvene next January 3, we shall not have with us one of our most able and respected Members, who has highly distinguished himself while in the Senate.

He has stood unswervingly for the rights and welfare of the mass of our people; he has fought for the purity of our governmental processes and of the practices of politics. The act which bears his name was his major tangible effort to foster and assure fair and honest elections. He has established an enviable reputation as a student and practitioner of the constitutional operations of government.

It has been my pleasure to serve with him on the floor, in committees, and elsewhere. I have observed him under the wide variety of acid tests which bring out the true character, spirit, and honor of a man. I know from personal knowledge of his ability, his energy, his continuing desire to be helpful, and his willingness to understand and to work with others.

He has elsewhere distinguished himself as assistant attorney general of his State, as collector of internal revenue, and as district judge. His proved ability as lawyer and jurist has been repeatedly recognized by all who worked with him, whether members of the bench, bar, or laity.

Mr. President, I shall miss my close friend and colleague from my neighboring State, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I very sincerely join with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] in his remarks commending the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] for the exceptional and outstanding service he has rendered as ranking member of the minority group on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As chairman of the committee I wish to state that it has been a very pleasant and memorable experience to serve with the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. I can say the same about each member of this committee. Not once do I recall that personal or partisan matters were permitted to mar the hearings or discussions of the committee. The Senator, Mr. HATCH, is voluntarily not a candidate for reelection, a rather unusual situation, especially with one in his physical and mental prime, as is the case with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, each member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs joins with me, as I am sure do all other Members of the Senate, in expressing our appreciation of his friendly

association and cooperation in the work of this great legislative body. Mr. President, likewise, we all join in wishing him health and happiness on through the many years of useful service we see ahead for him.

ILLINOIS POSTMASTERS—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, these are the closing hours of this Republican-controlled Congress, which has distinguished itself, not only by its inept handling of its heavy legislative responsibilities, but also by its shabby and insolent treatment of individuals who have had the misfortune to become the subject of its abuse.

It is most distasteful to me to be forced to reply to vicious and malicious charges made by one of the less eminent Members of this body on the floor of the Senate in the early hours of this day. Yet, I cannot under any circumstances permit the record to stand as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has left it. In order to justify and defend his dictatorial and partisan handling of postmasters' nominations in the State of Illinois, the senior Senator from North Dakota saw fit to attack me through the members of my family. How characteristic the action, and how typical the reaction.

The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has seen fit, after his committee reported the nominations in question, to take it upon himself to hold up these nominations in defiance of the will of his committee.

Mr. President, I seriously contend that the time has arrived when a rule must be adopted in the United States Senate making it mandatory that any clerk of any committee report to the Senate the favorable action of that committee upon any bill, resolution, or appointment, and that there should be a penalty on the clerk for failure to do so, thereby enjoining dictatorial and totalitarian methods of chairmen of committees who have no regard for proper and orderly procedure.

Mr. President, because I would not stoop to the tactics used by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I followed parliamentary procedure and filed resolutions for the purpose of discharging the committee from the further consideration of some 40 nominations, 28 of them being veterans of World War I and World War II, hoping to achieve by regular and parliamentary procedure what the committee had tried to accomplish and failed because of the pocket veto of the chairman of the committee.

It is apparent, Mr. President, that this parliamentary procedure antagonized the Senator from North Dakota when he was confronted with the necessity of obeying the rules of the Senate instead of following his own rules. The Senator from North Dakota descended to a cheap, partisan, low, and personal attack on two members of my family who had been appointed postmasters in Illinois in 1943 and 1946 and duly confirmed by the Senate.

He charges in one of the statements, "dirty politics in the appointment of postmasters in Illinois," thereby, through innuendo, condemning the Senator from Illinois and defaming the good name of that great State. If I were the Senator from North Dakota, I believe I would be the last man in the Senate to talk about dirty politics anywhere, at any time.

The Senator from North Dakota chose not to discuss the nominations of the veterans from whom he is withholding employment, and whose cause is the point at issue. He did not mention one disabled veteran after another who had placed as No. 1 on the eligible register, and are still waiting for an opportunity to serve their communities. But, in order to throw up a smoke screen and in order to make a personal attack on me, the Senator went back into history for the subject of his challenge.

Mr. President, I recall Senate Resolution 81, under which the Senator from North Dakota got $35,000 to make an investigation as to political activities in civil service; to determine whether any postmasters, under threat of losing their positions, were forced to contribute to political funds; whether there was any attempt to compel civil-service employees to violate the Hatch Act; but I never understood that the spirit or the letter of that resolution permitted the Senator from North Dakota to send his political, partisan, prejudicial snoopers to investigate members of the family of a United States Senator serving in the same body with him. I never realized that the Senator from North Dakota was setting up a little gestapo to spy and snoop on cases that were settled long before the Republicans came into power.

In his discussion of my brother-in-law and brother, respectively holding post offices in Illinois, he made many queer, unsupported, and outrageous statements.

In connection with the appointment of Hardy E. Altig as postmaster at Cullom, Ill., the chairman stated flatly that he tried to get the files but could not get them; then he proceeded to quote facts and figures, and grades which, from his own admission, must have been made up from some other source than the official files on the case. He made specific charges of upgrading and downgrading of applicants at Cullom, and quoted numerical ratings in his harangue, and, yet, from his own admission, he was unable to obtain any files on this case from the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department, and the query is—How did the political snoopers of Senator LANGER get this information? Where did it come from? I have my own ideas, Mr. President.

But, this so-called upgrading and downgrading is an amazing and amusing thing. The records of the Cullom post office show that the Commission certified an eligible register from an examination held February 15, 1941. The register shows that Jerome W. Kiley had 80.63; LaVern Floyd Haag had 78.75; J. Virgil Fraher, 78.13; Sylvester J. Kiley was given a rating of 77.38; H. E. Altig, present postmaster, had a grade of 76.25; Grover C. Stucker, veteran, had a grade of 75.

In other words, when the list was established, there were four applicants with a higher grade than Mr. Altig. Is it not a rather strange phenomenon that if someone manipulated the rating of Mr. Altig, as the Senator from North Dakota would want the Senate to believe, that manipulator would place Mr. Altig fifth on the eligible register when, under the law, only the first three on the eligible register are within reach for appointment? The so-called manipulators were certainly poor manipulators if they could not get Mr. Altig above the fifth spot on the register.

But, Mr. President, this is all tommyrot, balderdash, and utterly without any foundation. Today I communicated with the Civil Service Commission, and they advised me that Mr. Altig was rated 80 on experience and was rated 72.50 on the written examination. These two ratings, added together, gave him a gross rating of 152.50, which when divided by two gave him a final rating of 76.25. This was the original, the final, and the only rating ever given him by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission advised that there was absolutely no juggling of his rating. It was never changed from beginning to end. Mr. President, I am sure that the majority of the United States Senate believe the word of the Civil Service Commission on this so-called fantastic juggling of ratings as disclosed by the Senator from North Dakota. It appears that the snoopers of the Civil Service Committee were the real jugglers in this case.

The Senator from North Dakota stated that while Mr. Altig was upgraded, the Commission downgraded the veteran, Mr. Stucker, 10 points. I checked that also, and this is what the Civil Service Commission said: Mr. Stucker received a grade of 70 on the written examination, and a grade of 70 on experience. These, added together, gave him a gross rating of 140, which, when divided by two, gave him a general average of 70, barely a passing grade. However, his 5 points for veteran's preference brought him up to 75. They state emphatically that there never was any attempt to downgrade him; 75 was his first, final, and only rating. Again, Mr. President, can it be the snoopers of the Civil Service Committee who are doing the juggling?

It may be interesting to know how Mr. Altig became postmaster, since he was fifth on the list. The facts are these: Sylvester J. Kiley, the postmaster, was disqualified after a long investigation by the Civil Service Commission; Mr. Haag went into the military service, and Mr. Fraher withdrew, placing Mr. Altig second on the list. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois was very, very happy to appoint his brother-in-law; but he was appointed honestly; he was appointed fairly, notwithstanding the inferences and the innuendoes of the Senator from North Dakota to the contrary. Of course, I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota has never at any time shown the slightest partiality in the selection of members of his family for a political appointment under any political office that he has held throughout his stormy political career.

Mr. President, let us see what kind of a postmaster Mr. Altig has been, in view of the scurrilous and scandalous statements made about a man whom the Senator from North Dakota does not even know.

On March 20, 1945, the Post Office Department rated Mr. Hardy E. Altig 84.4. In July 1946, they gave him a rating of 94.5. On the last inspection of his office, he was rated 98. That was on May 19, 1948. He has shown consistent improvement, and all of the inspector's reports show that he is an excellent postmaster, giving satisfactory service. There have been no complaints from the patrons of the office. The only complaints—political, prejudicial, partisan, captious, and cheap—come from the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, in discussing the appointment of a postmaster at Abingdon, where my brother, Dr. J. Wiley Lucas, serves, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service resorted to the worst kind of double-talk and trickery in order to confuse United States Senators. I quote him as follows:

> Now we come to another post office in the town of Abingdon, Ill. The postmaster is J. Wiley Lucas, I believe his name is. In this case, an examination for postmaster, second-class office, was held in December 1944. There being no eligible, a second examination was held in March 1946. Only one eligible was secured, the acting postmaster, with a rating of 81.70, including 10 points for being a veteran's widow. She was appointed in that town, which was not Abingdon; but in Abingdon an examination for postmaster, second-class office, was held in August 1945.

In that language of utter confusion and chaos, the Senator from North Dakota left the impression that somehow a veteran's widow had been mistreated in this case. Mr. President, no examination for postmaster at Abingdon was held in December 1944. No veteran's widow ever took an examination at that time in Abingdon for postmaster. In the examination for postmaster at Abingdon in August of 1945, no veteran's widow made application for the position, and no failure on the part of my brother to pass the examination appears in any of the official documents in my files on this case. The Senator from North Dakota indirectly charged in his speech this morning that Dr. Lucas' grades were rerated. I called the Civil Service Commission on that matter, and this is what they told me: Dr. Lucas took a civil-service examination on August 23, 1945. It was the only examination he was ever given. He made a grade of 70.23, which was passing. That was the only rating and the final rating he was assigned, and it was never changed upwards or downwards. Let me give a few more facts: In 1939, I recommended to the Post Office Department that Arthur L. Knable, who had been serving as postmaster there, be reappointed when his term expired. Mr. Knable continued to serve until the time of his death in 1945.

After Knable's death, Dr. J. Wiley Lucas was installed as acting postmaster at Abingdon on April 1, 1945. On August 23, 1945, the Civil Service Commission held an examination, and Dr. Lucas was the only applicant who had filed and who took the examination. On February 12, 1946, the Civil Service Commission certified Dr. Lucas as the only eligible for that position, and he was appointed permanent postmaster at Abingdon.

Since the Senator from North Dakota insulted the intelligence of my good brother, I think the record should show the ratings assigned to Dr. Lucas by the post-office inspectors since the beginning of his service as postmaster in Abingdon:

June 1, 1945 (2 months after installation as acting postmaster)	86.8
Oct. 17, 1946	91.5
Oct. 7 and 8, 1947	98.0

His ratings have shown consistent improvement, and all of the inspector's reports indicate that he is a good postmaster, conversant with his duties, and pleasing to the public. There have been no complaints whatever about his services as postmaster.

Mr. President, Mr. Altig and Dr. Lucas are honorable men. They are honest men. There are no ugly scars on their records. They are efficient postmasters. They are a credit to the communities in which they reside.

They have not been hurt by this attack, because they are guilty of nothing for which they could be attacked. But let me remind the Senator from North Dakota of the wise old adage that he who lives in a glass house should not throw stones.

Mr. President, let us get back to the postmaster nominations the Senate should be discussing—the postmaster nominations that should be on the calendar now, instead of in the pocket of the Senator from North Dakota. These are the ones certain Senators do not want to talk about, because it does not make a very pretty picture.

I realize that the matter I discuss is only one small defect among the mass of faults which comprise the record by which this Republican Congress will be known—a record on domestic issues that is so clumsy and reactionary that it would be ludicrous, were it not for the fact that it dealt with critical national problems, the solution of which are indispensable to a successful foreign policy.

It is indeed tragic that among those who have suffered at the hands of the Eightieth Congress is a group of American citizens, the majority of them veterans or their widows, who have done nothing to deserve the ill-treatment they have received. They have engaged in no activities for which they could be called on the carpet and persecuted for political reasons, as was Howard Hughes. There is nothing in their records which would justify their being dragged before the Un-American Activities Committee. No; their exposure to the misuse this Republican Congress is capable of applying to individuals is indeed an anomaly, for it came about because of their sincere desire to serve their Government. One and all, they aspired to become employees of the Government, and, what is more, they proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that they were fully qualified and competent to discharge the duties sought. The only crime of these good American citizens, who are conscientious, useful members of their communities, hundreds of miles from the whirlpool of Washington politics, is that they wanted to become postmasters under a Democratic administration.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I heard the colloquy on the floor this afternoon, learning what happened to good men in the Senator's State.

Many of these unfortunate citizens of my State, and of other States, have had prior service with the Government—in uniform. But let it be said they had no such difficulties in getting into uniform as they are now experiencing in going to work for Uncle Sam as civilians. One applicant after another, wounded and disabled in fighting for the Stars and Stripes, fighting for freedom and independence, fighting for the continuation of a free and untrammeled Senate, finds his rights as a free American citizen jeopardized, and even nullified, by the dictatorial and totalitarian methods of the Republican chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Will it be the purpose of the Senator to press his motion tonight to discharge the committee, which motion was filed last night?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my able friend, I do not know what the parliamentary situation is. I doubt that it could be done tonight. There has not been another legislative day or another executive session since I filed the motion to discharge, and unless it is done by unanimous consent, I doubt that it could be done, if we adjourn tonight.

Others in this group have been serving the Government as civil-service employees, and the question now is whether or not they are to be promoted in the service. All of them have met the high standards set by the Federal Government as prerequisites for entering its service. They have taken and passed examinations, and in this open competition many of them have proved themselves better qualified than all other applicants by placing first on the eligible register.

But, strange as it may seem, all this has been ignored by the Republican-controlled Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which theoretically is the guardian of civil service, and protector of the merit system. What a travesty on justice. What a mockery of civil service under the leadership of the Senator from North Dakota.

Stranger still, this action has been taken after the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service conducted an investigation through its own highly paid and partisan employees into the lives, the records, and the qualifications of these nominees I am discussing. Mr. President, this is the first time in the history of the Congress that a committee handling nominations of this type has sent out its own private snoopers, and acted on their partisan, prejudiced recommendations, rather than on the recommendations of the Civil Service Com-

mission and of the citizens of the communities in which the applicants reside. But, despite this political witch hunt, the committee itself says it can find nothing wrong with the background, the education, the patriotism, or the ability of more than 40 Illinois men and women whose economic future it would like to destroy, solely for political pelf and gain. Shame on you, my Republican brethren.

What can be the reason for this unconventional action on the part of a committee whose duty it is to see to it that the Federal Government obtains the very best in the way of personnel? Thereby hangs a tale. I have been informed, and on the reliable authority of the membership of the committee, that at a meeting some days ago these postmaster nominations were reported out by vote of the committee. What happened after that is obscure. The nominations failed to appear on the Senate Calendar. I made inquiry and ran into a maze of political chicanery which would challenge the ingenuity of even the best investigators of this notoriously famous investigating Congress. Out of the labyrinth through which the nominations have traveled since the committee action, I have been able to trace only a few definite paths. I am told that subsequent to the committee action of which I have spoken, the committee met again and voted to report out all postmaster nominations to which no objection has been made. Up to that point I had been able to ascertain definitely that no objection had been made to the postmaster nominees of whom I speak. No objection, that is, from their communities, or from the committee itself.

Casting about for what possible objections could prevent these patriotic and splendid Illinoisans from having their nominations placed on the Executive Calendar, I asked my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] on the floor of the Senate if he had objected. His reply was, "I do not know who they are and to that extent I have not approved them."

Mr. President, I had every reason to believe that all of these applicants for postmaster jobs would be confirmed when they were passed by the committee. Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, a member of the committee, called and gave me the names of those that had been favorably reported. Obviously, I was very happy. Later when these applicants failed to reach the Executive Calendar I again interviewed Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina to determine what was wrong. He advised me that Senator LANGER told him that Senator BROOKS, of Illinois, was objecting. I did, however, take the matter up with Senator LANGER and the statement of Senator JOHNSTON was corroborated by him. However, on the next evening the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service completely reversed himself and took the full and complete responsibility for their failure to be reported from the committee.

I should like to ask my friend from South Carolina whether the statement I made is true and correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The statement is entirely correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that from the eligible lists of the departments and information spread upon the records about these applicants that my colleague will join me in protesting the obvious discrimination being practiced against our Illinois veterans and comrades by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the Senator that I am glad at this late hour to have him ask for my cooperation. In 8 years in the Senate this is the first time I have heard even an intimation of his asking or offering to cooperate with the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a very lovely speech. I yielded for a question only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may still retain the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I know I can retain the floor, and I thank the Chair for that information. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. President, of course the Senator from Illinois can either cooperate or not cooperate on these postmaster appointments. He has given me an indication in the answer which he made that he does not want to cooperate at this late hour in getting these postmasters out of the pocket of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, so that their nominations may be confirmed and they can go on their way.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield for any more speeches. The Senator has told me that he does not want to cooperate.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I did not say that I did not want to cooperate. I said I was pleased that my colleague had asked me at last to cooperate on something.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have been getting evasive answers like that for years from my colleague. I sincerely hope that with the information spread upon the record the confirmations can be made.

Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois said what he did, because in view of the evidence which has been presented here, after the statement he made, the senior Senator from Illinois and the veterans who are eligible for these positions will know exactly where to place the responsibility for their failure to achieve confirmation, notwithstanding the statement of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] last night to the contrary, in which he assumed all responsibility.

Veterans and others are being flagrantly discriminated against by not being permitted to receive the Federal appointments for which they qualified.

Every responsible, thinking citizen of Illinois will recognize that, although there is no good reason from the standpoint of qualifications, or of good character, that these nominees should not be commissioned in the Federal posts they seek, they are being deprived for political reasons of the opportunity of Federal employment offered without discrimination to all American citizens. And, what is even more repelling, veterans who have fought overseas and come back disabled are being deprived of the preferential treatment given them by law enacted when the Democrats were in control of the Congress.

It is impossible for me to understand what purpose the Republicans could have in doing this, since a veteran on an eligible register cannot be passed over for any reason under existing law. They can gain nothing by holding up these appointments. Even though the Republicans may hope to come into control of the executive branch next year, they must know that they cannot appoint as postmasters anyone but the veterans whose nominations are now pending unless it is their intention to change the law to such an extent that a disabled veteran who is No. 1 on the eligible register can be passed over for political reasons.

Mr. President, it would be amusing if it were not so tragic to watch the performance of the Republicans in control of the United States Senate who pay loud and voluble lip service to the interests of the men who defended this country in her hour of need, and of their widows, when they have an opportunity to reward these heroes with a small Government position. Nothing is too good for the veterans, they proclaim. They can bandy words at great length about what members of the armed services have done for their country, wax loquacious on their sacrifices, their wounds, and their sufferings, proclaim to the world that veterans are entitled to every consideration it is within the power of the Federal Government to give, and that they must never be discriminated against—oh, never!

But, Mr. President, 28 veterans in Illinois are being discriminated against. Five of them are disabled, wounded veterans from World War II, but their nominations cannot get through the United States Senate because of sordid Republican politics. They stand No. 1 on the list.

What happens when a disabled veteran in Illinois asks for appointment as a postmaster in his community in order that he may take care of himself and his family and lead a peaceful life among his friends and neighbors after his soul-racking experiences away from them? He finds himself in another fight, face to face, this time, with a political enemy.

Mr. President, these Illinois soldiers and sailors and marines whose cause I have been championing alone—I say again, alone—are still fighting for their rights in peace as they did in war. I know that if the majority, or certain members of it, have decided that these good citizens of Illinois are not to be given the Federal positions they seek, and to which they are entitled, that settles it for the moment. But those responsible for blocking these nominations have not administered a final defeat to these postmaster nominees who have never known what it was to be licked in a fight. I have done my best to give them what they deserve. I shall continue the fight even after this Congress adjourns. These political casualties may not be skilled in the devious ways of political battles, but, Mr. President, this insult to

their patriotism will not impair their fighting ability. They will some day serve their communities as permanent postmasters, and that time will come when a Democratic Senate takes control in 1949.

That time will come next January, when we inaugurate a Democratic President of the United States and a Democratic Congress.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina this question. If I withdraw my motion to bring up the sales tax for the District of Columbia, will he yield the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly will.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

CARL A. HATCH, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it now appears that the Eightieth Congress will come to an end this evening. Several of the present Members will not be with us when the Congress is again assembled. Of course we shall miss their advice and sound judgment. Our association with Senators who are leaving the Senate has been most pleasant and profitable.

I should like to say a word or two about my personal friend and colleague, Senator CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico. My colleague, by his great patriotism, intelligence, and diligence, has reached national and international greatness, with honor to himself and the Nation. He has also earned the great respect of this body.

I have known Senator HATCH and his family for many years. I have been his colleague since 1935. Our association has been one of mutual respect and consideration. In many instances we have differed on legislation and official votes, but never an unkind word has escaped the lips of either one of us. I shall miss him. The Senate will miss him. New Mexico will miss him. The country and the world will miss his advice and counsel. I know that in the future he and his fine family will be the recipients of that happiness which comes only to those who have lived well and have done their duty well. I wish him only the best.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not want this session to close without expressing deep regret that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is leaving the Senate.

Those of us who have been privileged to associate with him in intimate contact and to know him well know how fine he is. We know the loss to his State and to the Nation in his departure from this body. Diligent and able in the performance of his duties in committees and on this floor, gifted of speech, and with an understanding heart, possessing the vision to see and the will to act, he has played a yeoman's part in the important matters that have come before the Senate during the epic years that he has served here.

We shall miss him. We shall miss him as a friend and an associate. We shall miss the wisdom of his counsel, the example of his high purpose, the courage, the character, the distinction of his service. No matter how powerful the lobby, how overwhelming the propaganda, how strong the pressure, he has held fast to his convictions and has served all the people. He has kept the faith. He has been the captain of his soul.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I would not want these words of commendation concerning our colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] to go without a word on my part. I suppose that no two Senators have been closer personally or officially than have the Senator from New Mexico and I. I have learned not only to feel a very high personal regard for him as a friend but to have the utmost confidence in his sound judgment and his integrity, morally, mentally, and politically. Among all the Members of the Senate, I have the greatest pain, sorrow, and regret that the Senator from New Mexico has decided to relinquish his seat here in the Senate. I wish for him, in whatever he does hereafter, the greatest possible success, long life, and happiness.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR HATCH

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, during the day several of my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, in private conversations, and some on the floor of the Senate, have been most kind and generous in their expressions concerning my proposed retirement from the Senate. I do not wish to appear ungrateful. I am not ungrateful. Their remarks were greatly to my surprise, and somewhat to my embarrassment. I want all of them to know that I deeply appreciate the generous things they have said.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to make a farewell address, now or at any other time. I rise now merely to say, in these brief words, "Thank you; I am grateful."

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., OF MAINE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a word at this time concerning another distinguished friend with whom I have served longer, I think, than I have with the Senator from New Mexico—a friend who likewise is relinquishing his seat here in the Senate. He is doing so to retire to private life. I served with him for many years in the House of Representatives, and I have served with him for many years in the Senate.

As I have often said, both here and elsewhere, there is no man for whose ability, honor, integrity, and personality I have a higher regard than I have for the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] who is leaving the Senate at the end of his present term.

Not only have I served with Senator WHITE in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, but I have visited him in his home in Maine, and I have been charmed by his dignity and his attitude, not only on national matters and international matters, but also on matters regarding the State of Maine where he lives.

I wish for him the most pleasant retirement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am quite sure I express the feelings of my colleague from Maine in appreciation to the minority leader, with whom he has been so long associated here in the Senate of the United States. It has been a matter of profound regret that the senior Senator from Maine, the majority leader, has not been able to be more active here on the floor of the Senate in his last year in the Senate, as his service comes to a close; and it is even more of a source of regret to him that in these closing days of the session, his strength did not seem to make it wise for him to stay longer. I think it was more the overwhelming emotion of the last day, perhaps, when he might be in the Senate that prevented him from coming to the Senate tonight. It was suggested that perhaps he would make the final motion to adjourn—as a graceful gesture and tribute to his position here and his many years of service; but he said he was afraid that his emotions would be too keen in that matter.

I have often said that I felt that no Member of the Senate was more fortunate in his colleague than was the junior Senator from Maine in his association with the distinguished majority leader, Senator WHITE, with his vast knowledge and understanding of the procedure of our Government and the kind sweetness of character with which he has cooperated in every matter concerning both Maine and his country. His is a rather remarkable record of service.

What the senior Senator from Kentucky has said about the others who have served here for so long is almost equally true of Senator WHITE, who came here as a young man, serving first as a clerk to a committee, and then as assistant President pro tempore of the Senate, and finally rising to the position of Senator, and then to the position which he has graced in recent years, that of majority leader of the Senate, when rounding out more than a quarter of a century of service here; and also being recognized as an outstanding authority in the field of shipping, where the "White bill" was the name of one of our most important pieces of merchant-marine legislation; and in a rapidly expanding field of radio legislation, as well, where he was recognized in an almost unique manner when the President of the United States, heading another political party, asked him, when he was merely a member of the minority, and not chairman of a committee, to serve as chairman of the United States delegation to one of the great international radio conferences; and the invitation was repeated in more recent years, recognizing his vast authority in this field, as well as the devotion he brought to every field of service into which he entered.

I know I express the profound regret of the citizens of Maine that he has determined to terminate his long career of public service at this time, when he still has before him many years of activity, in which I know all of us wish for him the very happy days to which his dis-

tinguished service so abundantly entitles him.

JAMES W. MURPHY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I should like to call attention to a rather remarkable record on the part of a family which has long been associated with the official work of the Senate. We have one of our reporters, in the person of Mr. James W. Murphy, who has been reporter of the debates of the United States Senate for 52 years without interruption. His father before him was a reporter of the debates of the Senate, and his uncle also.

His uncle began his service here as a reporter in 1848; and when the 4th of December arrives, the family of Murphy—father and son and uncle—will have served a solid century as reporters of the debates of the United States Senate. I think that is a remarkable and outstanding record, and I imagine it is an exclusive record, as made by the Murphy family.

Of course, they have rendered their service in this capacity unobtrusively and quietly. Their names never appeared in the headlines, because their position and their work did not call for any publicity. But it would be difficult to estimate the contribution that family has made to the legislative history of the United States Senate, and I imagine it would also be difficult to enumerate the number of times when, through their reportorial work and their knowledge of language, they have dressed up our speeches, which otherwise would have looked somewhat crude.

I wish to pay tribute to the Murphy family for their century of service to the Senate of the United States; and I wish for our present reporter, Mr. James W. Murphy, who has already served 52 years, great happiness, long life, and useful service here for many years more as a reporter of the debates of the United States Senate.

I thought that while we were paying these tributes to our departing colleagues, it was most appropriate to pay this tribute to a member of our official family.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1801, Senate bill 2756, the strategic materials bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense, and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a mine incentive payments division, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator in charge of this legislation is the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An objection is out of order on a motion. If the Senator wishes to speak, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. For what purpose?

Mr. MILLIKIN. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is it appropriate at this time to move the consideration of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion has been made. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the Senator makes his argument against the motion, there is a bill on the calendar, order No. 1340, Senate bill 2688, to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency. I am told by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that there is no controversy involved. I am also told by the distinguished Senator that he would like to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1340, Senate bill 2688, and that if it becomes controversial, he will ask for the regular order, and proceed upon the motion which has been made.

I ask the Senator from Missouri if he will not yield for that purpose, if the unanimous consent request is made.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should be glad to yield with the understanding that it will be without prejudice.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. KEM. And will not be considered to affect my right to the floor, or as one of my speeches.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1340, Senate bill 2688.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2688) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have only a few remarks to make.

The purpose of the bill is to grant to the Central Intelligence Agency the authorities necessary for its proper administration. The bill deals with procurement, travel allowances, and related expenses, general authorities, and methods of expenditures of appropriated funds. Further, it protects the confidential nature of the Agency's functions and makes provisions for the internal administration of the Agency. In almost all instances, the powers and authorities contained in the bill already exist for some other branch of the Government, and the bill merely extends similar authorities to the Central Intelligence Agency.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Hearings on the matter were conducted in executive session because the confidential nature of the Agency's functions were deemed to be such as to require the discussions to be so held. The committee carefully considered all sections of the bill, and, after such consideration, is satisfied that all provisions of the proposal are justified and necessary to the efficient operation of the intelligence service of the United States.

The bill has the unanimous approval of the committee, and I ask for its immediate adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance that I rise to object. I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to section (b) of the bill, on page 12, which reads as follows:

(b) The sums made available to the Agency may be expended without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds; and for objects of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature, such expenditures to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Director and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified.

Mr. President, it is with reluctance that I would move to strike this section from the bill. Representations have been made by Senators for whom I have a very high regard that this is a most necessary provision for the successful operation of the Agency. I must say that I am slightly Scotch about it, and I have my doubts. I would suggest that the chairman accept the amendment to strike out this section, and at least that we try for a period of 6 months or so, until Congress returns, to see whether or not this Agency cannot get along with that section out of the act.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in view of my promise to the Senator from Missouri that I would not delay debate, I am compelled to accept the amendment, in the hope that we can get the bill over to the House and secure its passage in the House tonight, where a similar bill is on the calendar. I, therefore, accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, after line 7, it is proposed to strike out subdivision (b) as follows:

(b) The sums made available to the Agency may be expended without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds; and for objects of a confidential, extraordinary, or emergency nature, such expenditures to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Director and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. That when used in this act, the term—

(a) "Agency" means the Central Intelligence Agency;

(b) "Director" means the Director of Central Intelligence;

(c) "Government agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government; and

(d) "Continental United States" means the States and the District of Columbia.

SEAL OF OFFICE

SEC. 2. The Director of Central Intelligence shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Central Intelligence Agency, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

PROCUREMENT AUTHORITIES

SEC. 3. (a) In the performance of its functions the Central Intelligence Agency is authorized to exercise the authorities contained in sections 2 (c) (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (10), (12), (15), (17), and sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, Eightieth Congress, second session).

(b) In the exercise of the authorities granted in subsection (a) of this section, the term "Agency head" shall mean the Director, the Deputy Director, or the Executive Director of the Agency.

(c) The determinations and decisions provided in subsection (a) of this section to be made by the Agency head may be made with respect to individual purchases and contracts or with respect to classes of purchases or contracts, and shall be final. Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the Agency head is authorized to delegate his powers provided in this section, including the making of such determinations and decisions, in his discretion and subject to his direction, to any other officer or officers or officials of the Agency.

(d) The power of the Agency head to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraphs (12) and (15) of section 2 (c) and section 5 (a) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 shall not be delegable. Each determination or decision required by paragraphs (12) and (15) of section 2 (c), by section 4 or by section 5 (a) of the Armed Service Procurement Act of 1947, shall be based upon written findings made by the official making such determinations, which findings shall be final and shall be available within the Agency for a period of at least 6 years following the date of the determination.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

SEC. 4. (a) Any officer or employee of the Agency may be assigned or detailed for special instruction, research, or training, at or with domestic or foreign public or private institutions; trade, labor, agricultural, or scientific associations; courses or training programs under the National Military Establishment; or commercial firms.

(b) The Agency shall, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, pay the tuition and other expenses of officers and employees of the Agency assigned or detailed in accordance with provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in addition to the pay and allowances to which such officers and employees may be otherwise entitled.

TRAVEL, ALLOWANCES, AND RELATED EXPENSES

SEC. 5. (A) Under such regulations as the Director may prescribe, the Agency, with respect to its officers and employees assigned to permanent-duty stations outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, shall—

(1) (a) pay the travel expenses of officers and employees of the Agency, including expenses incurred while traveling pursuant to orders issued by the Director in accordance with the provisions of section 5 (A) (2) with regard to the granting of home leave;

(b) pay the travel expenses of the members of the family of an officer or employee of the Agency when proceeding to or returning from his post of duty; accompanying him on authorized home leave; or otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other act;

(c) pay the cost of transporting the furniture and household and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency to his successive posts of duty and, on the termination of his services, to the place where he will reside;

(d) pay the cost of storing the furniture and houshold and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency who is absent under orders from his usual post of duty, or who is assigned to a post to which, because of emergency conditions, he cannot take or at which he is unable to use his furniture and household and personal effects;

(e) pay the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an officer or employee of the Agency on first arrival at a post for a period not in excess of 3 months after such first arrival at such post or until the establishment of residence quarters, whichever shall be shorter;

(f) pay the travel expenses and transportation costs incident to the removal of the members of the family of an officer or employee of the Agency and his furniture and household and personal effects, including automobiles, from a post at which, because of the prevalence of disturbed conditions, there is imminent danger to life and property, and the return of such persons, furniture, and effects to such post upon the cessation of such conditions; or to such other post as may in the meantime have become the post to which such officer or employee has been assigned.

(2) Order to the continental United States on leave provided for in 5 United States Code 30, 30a, 30b, or as such sections may hereafter be amended, every officer and employee of the Agency who is a citizen of the United States, upon completion of 2 years' continuous service abroad, or as soon as possible thereafter: *Provided*, That such officer or employee has accrued to his credit at the time of such order annual leave sufficient to carry him in a pay status while in the United States for at least a 30-day period.

(a) While in the continental United States on leave, the service of any officer or employee shall be available for work or duties in the Agency or elsewhere, but the time of such work or duties shall not be counted as leave.

(b) Where an officer or employee on leave returns to the continental United States, leave of absence granted shall be exclusive of the time actually and necessarily occupied in going to and from the continental United States, and such time as may be necessarily occupied in awaiting transportation.

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, transport for or on behalf of an officer or employee of the Agency, a privately owned automobile in any case where the Agency head shall determine that water, rail, or air transportation of the automobile is necessary, or expedient for any part or of all the distance between points of origin and destination.

(4) (a) In the event of illness or injury requiring the hospitalization of an officer or employee of the Agency who is a citizen of the United States, not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, incurred while on assignment abroad, in a locality where there does not exist a suitable hospital or clinic, pay the travel expenses of such officer or employee by whatever means he shall deem appropriate and without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1516; 5 U. S. C. 73b), to the nearest locality where a suitable hospital or clinic exists and on his recovery pay for the travel expenses of his return to his post of duty. If the officer or employee is too ill to travel unattended, the Director may also pay the travel expenses of an attendant;

(b) Establish a first-aid station and provide for the services of a nurse at a post at which, in his opinion, sufficient personnel is employed to warrant such a station;

(c) In the event of illness or injury requiring hospitalization of an officer or employee of the Agency who is a citizen of the United States, not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, incurred in the line of duty while such person is assigned abroad, pay for the cost of the treatment of such illness or injury at a suitable hospital or clinic.

(d) Provide for the periodic physical examination of officers and employees of the Agency and for the cost of administering inoculations or vaccinations to such officers or employees.

(B) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 70), the Director is authorized to grant to any officer or employee of the Agency who is a citizen of the United States allowances in accordance with the provisions of sections 901 (1) and 901 (2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

GENERAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 6. In the performance of its functions, the Central Intelligence Agency is authorized to—

(a) transfer to and receive from other Government agencies such sums as may have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and appropriated, for the performance of any of the functions or activities authorized under sections 102 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong.), and any other Government agency is authorized to transfer to or receive from the Agency such sums without regard to any provisions of law limiting or prohibiting transfers between appropriations. Sums transferred to the Agency in accordance with this paragraph may be expended for the purposes and under the authority of this act without regard to limitations of appropriations from which transferred;

(b) exchange funds without regard to section 3651, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543);

(c) reimburse other Government agencies for services of personnel assigned to the Agency, and such other Government agencies are hereby authorized, without regard to provisions of law to the contrary, so to assign or detail any officer or employee for duty with the Agency;

(d) authorize couriers designated by the Director to carry firearms when engaged in transportation of confidential documents and materials affecting the national defense and security;

(e) make alterations, improvements, and repairs on premises rented by the Agency and pay rent therefor without regard to limitations on expenditures contained in the act of June 30, 1932, as amended: *Provided*, That in each case the Director shall certify that

exception from such limitations is necessary to the successful performance of the Agency's functions or to the security of its activities;

(f) in the interests of the security of the foreign intelligence activities of the United States and in order further to implement the proviso of section 102 (d) (3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, 80th Cong., 1st sess.) that the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure, the Agency shall be exempted from the provisions of sections 1 and 2, chapter 795, of the act of August 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 956, 957; 5 U. S. C. A. 654), and the provisions of any other law which require the publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency: *Provided*, That in furtherance of this section, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall make no reports to the Congress in connection with the Agency under section 607, title VI, chapter 212, of the act of June 30, 1945, as amended (5 U. S. C. A. 947 (b)).

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, sums made available to the Agency by appropriation or otherwise may be expended for purposes necessary to carry out its functions, including—

(1) personal services, including personal services without regard to limitations on types of persons to be employed, and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; preparation and transportation of the remains of officers and employees who die aboard or in transit, while in performance of their official duties, to their former homes in this country or to a place not more distant for interment, and for ordinary expenses of such interment; penalty mail; health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); rental of news-reporting services; purchase or rental and operation of photographic, reproduction, cryptographic, duplication and printing machines, equipment and devices, and radio-receiving and radio-sending equipment and devices, including telegraph and teletype equipment; purchase, maintenance, operation, repair, and hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, and vessels of all kinds; printing and binding; purchase, maintenance, and cleaning of firearms; subject to policies established by the Director, expenses of travel in connection with, and expenses incident to attendance at meetings of professional, technical, scientific, and other similar organizations when such atttendance would be of benefit in the conduct of the work of the Agency; association and library dues; payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 843; 28 U. S. C. 921); repair, rental, operation, and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held intral Intelligence Agency Act of 1948."

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1948."

Mr. McMAHON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Senate bill 2688, Calendar No. 1340, which was passed a short while ago.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this is the bill providing for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency. The Senator from Connecticut is about to ask that the section stricken out be put back in the bill. I hope the Senator will not object. It will require only a minute.

Mr. McMAHON. It will not take more than 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the votes by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] was agreed to and the bill ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, are reconsidered, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I had moved to strike from the bill subsection (b) on page 12, because I am constitutionally rather averse to giving agencies a great deal of money with nonaccountability provisions. However, the Senator from Connecticut is not dogmatically certain that he is right in this instance. After conferring with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for whom I have the highest regard, as well as with some of my colleagues on the committee, and with officials of the Agency, I have resolved that the thing to do is to withdraw the objection to subsection (b) on page 12 and ask that it be reinstated in the bill. I do so with the clear notice that when we return in January it may be a very good idea to reexamine the subject to find out whether or not this provision of the bill is working as those who have passed upon it in the Armed Services Committee think it should work. I therefore ask unanimous consent that section (b) on page 12 be reinstated in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2688) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRODUCTION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. WHERRY's motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1801, Senate bill 2756, to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask that the pending business be laid aside and that Calendar No. 1253 be taken up.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. KEM. I believe I have the floor, and I yield only with the understanding I have previously had, that it be without prejudice, and that it will not be considered that I have made one speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair having just taken the chair, and not being familiar with the prior understanding, would like to have it repeated.

Mr. KEM. I can state the prior understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed the Senator from Missouri has the floor. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana on the understanding that I yield without prejudice, that I will regain the floor when he has completed the business he has in mind, and that the interlude will not be considered as in any way affecting my right to the floor or my right to discuss the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair's understanding that the Senator from Indiana has made a unanimous-consent request which has been objected to by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. I had the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the distinguished Senator from Missouri have the right to establish the conditions on which he will yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has, to this extent, that the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent. The Senator from Colorado or any other Senator can object to the Senator from Missouri yielding the floor for such a purpose, and under a strict interpretation of the rules of the Senate the Senator of course has the right to yield only for a question or privileged business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I object to any yielding of the floor at this time by the Senator from Missouri. The motion before the Senate, the pending business, is to take up a certain bill. I shall object to any attempt to set it aside until it is disposed of.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 595. An act (S. 595) to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war; and

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., and Atkinson-Kier Co.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2730) to

credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LECOMPTE, Mr. LEFEVRE, Mr. FERNANDEZ, and Mr. ENGLE of California were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. VURSELL, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, and Mr. LYLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes";

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents;

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Mossman Construction Co.;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5716. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz;

H. R. 5888. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.; and

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 129, agreed to June 18, 1948, appointed the following Senators as the members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee To Investigate the Trust Territory of the Pacific:

From the Committee on Foreign Relations: The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

From the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 19, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

S. 2501. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2895. A bill to promote the general welfare by scrapping the unsound and ruinous monetary policy which is wrecking our domestic economy and creating chaos throughout the world, and replacing it with a sound monetary system in strict accordance with article I, section 8, clause 5 of the Constitution of the United States and the act of Congress of November 1, 1893 (sec. 311, U. S. C. A. (ch. 8, 28, Stat. 4)), which will stabilize the currency; prevent economic collapse in the United States; and give economic stability to the rest of the world; stop communism and other forms of absolutism; insure peace by eliminating the causes of war; save for the American taxpayers most of the billions of dollars proposed to be spent under the European recovery program; reduce taxes; protect our national sovereignty; preserve the American way of life; raise the American standard of living; quadruple the recoverable mineral wealth of America; make possible the profitable production here at home of 99 percent of our mineral requirements, including strategic minerals; and usher in an era of the greatest prosperity the United States has ever known, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HILL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 2896. A bill to establish a Federal commission on services for the physically handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MALONE introduced Senate bill 2897, to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Exchange Act of 1934, to provide an incentive for the exploration and development of minerals for national defense, and I request that an explanatory statement by me of the bill together with some tables and other data in connection therewith be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanatory statement, tables, and data presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2897) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement, tables, and data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MALONE

No nation on the face of the earth has ever achieved the high level of income and general prosperity as that enjoyed by the United States. This unequaled achievement has come about as a result of our rich natural resources in combination with a set of political and economic principles and institutions which has encouraged private enterprise and the maximum amount of economic and political freedom.

Our high level of prosperity and free-enterprise system is seriously threatened by the New Deal policies which have been adopted by the Government during the past 15 years. These policies have reversed, in many ways, the policies in effect for the past century and one-half which made this Nation great.

During the past 15 years, increasing controls have been placed upon industry, taxes have increased by leaps and bounds, thereby reducing the amount of savings available for the investment in new enterprises, and protective tariffs have been progressively lowered so that today few American producers have any protection whatever from the low-wage competition of foreign countries.

Mr. President, the bill which I am introducing, calling for specific amendments to the Security Act of 1933 and the Exchange Act of 1934, is designed to curb the abuses which have arisen in the administering of the securities acts and to encourage the investment of private venture capital in new enterprises, particularly new mining enterprises.

The alarming decline in the investment of private venture capital in the United States, as a result of the New Deal policies, is shown in the statistics recently furnished me by the Treasury Department. During the 5-year period from 1925–29, new capital issues of common and preferred stocks in the United States totaled $12,600,000,000. Under the New Deal, for the 5-year period from 1935–39, new capital issues of common and preferred stocks amounted to only $199,000,000, or less than 10 percent of the amount 10 years earlier. For the five most recent years ending with 1947, such new issues have totaled $3,660,000,000, or less than 30 percent of the level attained in the 1920's.

This tremendous decline in investment of private venture capital in the United States during the past 15 years is partly the result of restrictive policies practiced by the Securities and Exchange Commission under its rules and regulations and partly the result of other New Deal policies, including the policy of tremendous increases in taxation of the American people.

GROWING BURDEN OF TAXATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The increase in taxation of the American people during the past 15 years has become so burdensome that it threatens to destroy the American system of free private enterprise. The per capita cost of government in the United States has grown from $89.76 in 1930 to $350 per person in 1947. In 1932, the revenue of the Federal Government amounted to 4 percent of the income of the American people; last year, Federal receipts totaled 21 percent of the income of the American people. This, however, does not measure the total burden of taxation of the American people, but only the part paid to the Federal Government. If we add payments made by American citizens to the State and local governments, we find that in 1947 the American people paid approximately $57,000,000,000 to their Government, or approximately 28 percent of their total income.

It should be emphasized that during the 15-year period of the administration from 1932 to 1947, Federal taxes increased five times as much as the percentage of the national income of the American people, rising from 4 to 21 percent.

This tremendous increase in taxation has discouraged private enterprise and investment of new venture capital by destroying the source from which private venture capital comes, as people have to pay an increasing percentage of their income for taxes they have less and less left over for investment in corporate securities and other forms of business saving.

The further expansion of prosperity in the United States and the progressive utilization and development of our rich natural resources can only be achieved by reversing the restrictive burdensome policies of the past 15 years and substituting therefor a policy for the encouragement of private enterprise and of encouragement for the exploration and development of all of our basic natural resources.

TABLE I.—*New capital issues in the United States, 1919–47, of common and preferred stocks*

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Amount	Year	Amount	Year	Amount
1919	1,436	1929	5,924	1939	97
1920	1,002	1930	1,503	1940	135
1921	265	1931	311	1941	173
1922	570	1932	20	1942	118
1923	659	1933	120	1943	92
1924	829	1934	34	1944	224
1925	1,152	1935	69	1945	657
1926	1,087	1936	352	1946	1,472
1927	1,474	1937	408	1947	1,215
1928	2,951	1938	67		

Source: U. S. Treasury Department.

TABLE II.—*Increases in taxes, 1922–47*

Fiscal year	Federal net receipts	Total Government revenue—Federal, State, local	Federal receipts as percent of national income	Total Government receipts as percent of national income [1]
	Millions	*Millions*		
1922	$3,554	$7,569	6	13
1927	3,346	9,068	4	12
1932	1,792	8,150	4	20
1937	4,765	11,892	6	16
1942	12,288	20,859	9	15
1947	43,038	[2] 57,000	21	[2] 28

[1] This percentage indicates roughly the part of income which is taken by taxes.
[2] Approximately.

Compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress from the following sources: Publications of the National Industrial Conference Board, United States Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 AND THE EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 TO PROVIDE AN INCENTIVE FOR THE EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

PARAGRAPH 12, SUBSECTION (A) OF SECTION 3

Section 3 of the original act deals with securities exempt from registration. There are 11 classes or groups not required to be registered in the original act. This new section places the securities of issuers engaged in the exploration and development of mineral resources under special statutory regulation. The filing of limited information on such issues, leaves the Securities Commission with full power to administer its other provisions. It takes away the necessity to go through the difficulties of registration where the Commission undertakes to apply the material-fact formula or otherwise evaluate the mining property, consider its feasibility or delay the public offering by stop orders and deficiency citations as now take place under the present law. This amendment, however, requires the issuer to file certain essential statutory information with the Commission, disclosing all material facts.

(NOTE.—The wording of this proposed amendment follows the text of certain rules issued by the Commission in respect to stock offerings under the Vandenberg amendment, and its application has been found apparently satisfactory and in the public interest.)

This amendment adds a new section to the law and all other provisions of the original Securities Act are retained, including civil liability, criminal responsibility, and the fraud sections. This new section 3 takes nothing away from the present power of the Commission.

The purpose of this proposal is to offer an incentive for the development of our mineral resources by making it easier for free enterprise and venture capital to participate in the development of our mineral resources in this critical period, and such efforts should be encouraged so as to make it unnecessary to appropriate such large sums of money for the Bureau of Mines and other Government agencies to do this same type of important exploratory work.

As a matter of fact, the Federal Government is now spending large sums of money in the search for new domestic sources of copper, lead, and zinc. Stock piles of critical metal and minerals are to be built up more rapidly in months ahead. The big stock-piling program approved by Congress in 1946 has been falling behind schedule. To obtain these strategic materials, it is evident that someone will have to reopen mines and find new ones. This all takes time, money, trained men, and equipment, yet the effort is vital to our national defense. However, we should supplement a Government program by encouraging private industry, free enterprise, and venture capital to engage in this important program.

In most cases, the average mining stock buyer wants only an honest run for his money, a chance to risk a small portion of his surplus earnings in something he hopes will be a profitable venture, like the hundreds of others that have enriched the casual venture in the past. He is more interested in his chances than in statistical facts, balance-sheet items, or a complicated engineering analysis. With this in mind, the proposed change in the present law does not require such detail to be first set forth. There is little to be gained by such information, and there is a limit to what the average prospector seeking venture capital can or should be required to do in the preparation of an issue of stock for public sale.

SUBSECTION (B) OF SECTION 19 AND SUBSECTION (A) OF SECTION 20

The following proposed amendments are designed to limit the Securities and Exchange Commission in its power to conduct

roving, inquisitorial, compulsory investigations without following rules of legal procedure or of evidence and subjecting the private affairs of an individual person or company to a searching investigation with the object of looking for something as a basis for a civil or criminal sanction against such citizen.

It is a well-established policy of the Commission under its subpena power to order books, records, and other papers to be brought before it for examination, where such private records are inspected and the accompanying witnesses are subjected to incriminating, misleading, and suggestive questions. This process is conducted behind closed doors where the parties are without benefit of counsel, and is one of the most tyrannical methods ever developed in American administrative procedure. It is clearly an abuse of the power granted by Congress, and must be corrected.

The testimony of the witness is not available to him, and it may be used as a basis for a civil or criminal action in the courts. This practice was positively condemned by the Supreme Court of the United States, but it is, nevertheless, being followed because the courts have held that such is the will of Congress; otherwise, Congress would change the law. (See the following Supreme Court case.)

"A general, roving, offensive, inquisitorial, compulsory investigation conducted by the Commission without any allegations, upon no fixed principles, and governed by no rules of law or evidence and no restrictions, except its own will or caprice, is unknown to our Constitution and laws and such an inquisition would be destructive of the rights of a citizen and an intolerable tyranny. Let the power once be established and there is no knowing where the practice under it would end" (*Boyd* v. *U. S.* (116 U. S. 616)).

How closely allied in principle are the three protective rights of the individual, that against compulsory self-accusation; that against unlawful search and seizure; and that against unlawful inquisitorial investigation. (Reversed (80 L. ed. 1015).)

The Department has consistently taken the position that the information gathered in its investigation is not open to the public. It has refused to give copies of testimony to individuals who have been required to appear and testify.

The following United States court decision is also of interest:

"Denial to defendants of copies of testimony given by them during investigation carried on upon instructions from the Securities and Exchange Commission by one of its representatives was not a deprivation of due process" (*Exchange Commission* v. *Torr* (15 Supp. Fed. (2d) 144)).

The harshness of the present law is seen in the language of the following case where the Court is called upon to construe the provisions of the Securities Act now in force, which clearly justifies the proposed amendment.

"The Securities and Exchange Commission, as a fact-finding body, performs functions similar to that of a grand jury, the scope of whose inquiries should not be limited narrowly by questions of propriety or forecasts of the probable result of the investigation. And it's not constrained by technical rules of admissibility of evidence or by doubts whether any particular individual will be properly subject to accusation of crime. As has been said before, the identity of the defender and the precise nature of the offense, if there be one, are developed at the conclusion of the grand jury's labors and not at the beginning" (*Boehm* v. *U. S.* (123 Fed. (2d) 791; 97 Fed. (2d) 704)).

If the Commission is in possession of facts affording reasonable grounds for belief that a violation of the act has occurred, or is threatened, it may order an investigation. The form of the investigation, or its source, is not material (*Consolidated Mines* v. *SEC* (79 S2 705)).

Such practice can hardly be said to be in the interest of new business ventures. On the contrary, it has a definite restrictive and oppressive effect.

AMENDMENT TO EXCHANGE ACT 1934—SECTION 3, ADDING NEW SUBSECTION

This amendment provides a trading post for the sale of mining and oil securities wherever brokers care to auction them off in secondary distribution between buyers and sellers, using the same plan for the sale of such securities as adopted for the sale of first-grade industrial issues. At the present time, all open bidding in over-the-counter mining stocks is prohibited. They may not be auctioned off to the highest bidder on the same basis as registered securities are sold on registered exchanges.

A substitute procedure is followed in some western markets which requires each broker handling mining securities and desiring to participate in the over-the-counter transactions for his customers, to first submit his written bids and offering in writing on all shares in each category in which he may be interested in the beginning of the day's business. These quotations are then assembled in a private room to which no broker is allowed, and the highest bid and the lowest offering is matched together and posted for that stock on that day, and used as a basis for trading. These are mere formal quotations and have nothing to do with the volume of business or the closing figures that may take place. This procedure brings out errors and mistakes and has cost the general public money. There is no drawing together the buyer and the seller as occurs in an auction sale, and, consequently, a wide spread exists between bids and offerings in such securities. The public has no true market for over-the-counter natural-resource stocks—it has only a makeshift system. The trouble is caused because the original law limits an exchange, first (a) the definition of an exchange; (b) the right of those to do business on the exchange; and (c) the quality of the shares to be traded thereon. Such law took away the trading privileges to about 90 percent of the mining securities being bought and sold by the public in the Western States. It unfortunately deprives the public of the basis for arriving at a true value for over-the-counter mining stocks in secondary distribution.

The purpose of this bill is to reestablish the right of the brokers to trade in second-grade, unlisted, over-the-counter stocks of all categories upon the basis of the bid and asked prices arrived at in open competition among buyers and sellers.

This amendment will allow such procedure without violating the Exchange Act. It is a supplement to present arrangements. The public is amply protected under section 15. Sections (1), (2), and (3) of the Exchange Act which govern the conduct of over-the-counter brokers and dealers in such stocks.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6657. An act to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6800. An act to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6958. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the custody of the Navy Department certain property at the United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6501. An act to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF CERTAIN HOUSE COMMITTEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate two concurrent resolutions providing for the printing of certain hearings before a House committee. The Chair is advised by the chairman of the subcommittee on Rules and Administration under the rule of comity existing between the two Houses, is desirous that the Senate agree to these two resolutions and, without objection, that action will be taken.

There being no objection, the Senate agreed to the following House concurrent resolutions:

House Concurrent Resolution 199

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an Advocate of Overthrow of Government by Force and Violence, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the House document room.

House Concurrent Resolution 213

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,500 copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee during current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (S. DOC. NO. 197)

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated April 15, 1948, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, with a view to ascertaining as near as can be estimated the exact damages that may be caused at Clinton, Iowa, by the creation of pool No. 14, and I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works and printed as a Senate document with illustration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive L, Eightieth Congress, second session, a convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, signed at Geneva on March 6, 1948, by the respective plen-

ipotentiaries of the United States of America and other states concerned. Without objection the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the message from the President, together with the convention will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, signed at Geneva on March 6, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and other states concerned.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention and a copy of the English text of the final act of the United Nations Maritime Conference, held at Geneva, February 19 to March 6, 1948.

For the reasons outlined in the report of the Secretary of State, I recommend that the Senate approve the convention with the appropriate reservation in regard to article 4, as recommended in the report of the Secretary of State, to insure that ratification of the Convention will not have the effect of altering the antitrust statutes. Upon becoming a party to the convention the United States of America, as a leading maritime nation, may participate in the work of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1948.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, signed at Geneva March 6, 1948 (certified copy); (3) final act of the United Nations Maritime Conference (English text).)

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2730) to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 25 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 25. Allowable service under the provisions of this act shall be only such continuous active service as has been rendered and shall not include previous periods or terms of employment, except that in the case of employees who have been separated or shall hereafter be separated from the field service of the Post Office Department for military duty, or to comply with a war transfer as defined by the Civil Service Commission, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding entry into military service or immediately preceding such transfer, as well as the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer, shall be construed as allowable service, and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer for each year of such service."

SEC. 2. Any person who prior to the enactment of this act received any amounts the payment of which is authorized for the first time by this act is hereby relieved of all liability to refund such amounts to the United States; and in the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster, or of any other designed disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the payment of such amounts shall be considered to have been authorized. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to repay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated pursuant to the authority of this act, any amounts heretofore credited to the employee or refunded by him to the United States on account of such receipt by him of unauthorized payments.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The amendment made by the first section of this act to section 25 of the act of July 6, 1945, shall take effect as of July 1, 1945.

And to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire, What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The pending question is the motion by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to consider Senate bill 2756. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has the floor on that motion. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it seems apparent from the course of the business of the Senate recently that all one has to do if one is opposed to a motion on the floor is to talk at considerable length and to indicate a desire and intention to talk further. However, I do not intend to avail myself of that precedent. I do want to speak, however, at some length upon the motion. My reason is that I regard the bill which it is proposed by motion to bring before the Senate as one that involves an exceedingly important principle. It goes to our very American way of life, and is one that involves a tremendous, inestimable, uncounted amount of money.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. During the course of his remarks on the motion will the Senator explain the degree of similarity between this bill and the bill which Congress passed a year or so ago and the President vetoed?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to. One of the principal differences between the two bills is that the bill vetoed by the President last year was for a comparatively modest project. It provided for the sum of $35,000,000 a year for a period of 2 years. The proponents of this bill have much larger ideas. I will not say they have delusions of grandeur, but their imagination has certainly run rife.

The proposition here tonight is to spend $80,000,000 a year in subsidies, or so-called price premiums, for two purposes: To encourage production and to encourage exploration. Then the bill provides for commitments in connection with the carrying out of the project, which amount to not more than an additional $80,000,000 a year. Then, in addition to the premiums or subsidies which are paid to encourage production and conservation and exploration, it is provided that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be compelled to purchase at the market price all ore and metal produced as a result of these incentives.

Of course, it is impossible to tell the amount of ore or metal which will be produced as the result of these incentives, but whatever it may be, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is compelled to buy under the terms of the bill.

Nor is that all. There is a very considerable administrative expense connected with the carrying out of the project.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT I did not hear the Senator's statement. Did he give an estimate of what he thought the bill might cost in that connection?

Mr. KEM. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that it is impossible to estimate the amount the bill will cost because of the intangible factors involved. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed—it is made mandatory upon it—to buy all the ores and metals and minerals that may be produced as the result of the incentives from the distribution of this $80,000,000 a year or $160,000,000, as the case may be.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN Is it not expressly provided that the total shall be $80,000,000 a year?

Mr. KEM. It is not so expressly provided. I will read the provision in that respect for the enlightment of the Senate. It is the contention of the Senator from Colorado, for whom I have great respect, and for whose opinion I have great respect, that the total amount involved in the bill is $80,000,000 a year. But I will undertake to demonstrate to the Senate beyond any vestige of a doubt that that contention is not correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I will yield when I have answered the Senator's previous question. I think the bill has been distributed and is on the desks of all Senators, and if Senators will be kind enough to follow

as I read, I think the discussion may be more intelligent.

Section 7 on page 9 of the bill provides:

SEC. 7. (a) All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any one year—

Then the bill continues—

nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year.

I know that it is the contention of the Senator from Colorado that those two phrases run along with each other, and that the total amount is $80,000,000 in any one year. But if the Senate will observe the provision is that:

All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments * * * shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any one year.

And then further that the commitments shall not exceed that amount. In other words, it is perfectly plain that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can disburse $80,000,000 a year and can make additional commitments for the same amount.

Nor is that all. If the Senate will refer to subparagraph (b) on page 8 this sentence may be read:

(b) All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield until I have answered the Senator's previous question, then I will yield for another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield at this time.

Mr. KEM. Then further, at the bottom of the page, is this provision:

(c) The Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the current market price for all metals, minerals, and ores placed in the national security stock pile under this section.

In other words, Mr. President, regardless of the construction placed upon section 7, it is perfectly clear that the duty, the obligation, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy the ores and metals is independent and in addition to the obligation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make subsidy or production encouragement payments.

That is not all. This really is a very remarkable bill. If Senators will refer to page 3, at the middle of the page, the following language appears:

The Director—

The Director is a very interesting person. Before I get through I shall undertake to show that if the bill is passed the Director, under the price-premium plan, will be one of the most powerful men in the United States. The Director is not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director is appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Senate has not one word to say about it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he finishes his answer to this particular interrogatory?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator know on what assumption the bill carries the mandatory provision that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall buy these ores? The Senator from Maryland would assume that in time of short supply they would be purchased in the open market anyway. Can the Senator give me any information on that point?

Mr. KEM. Perhaps the idea is to create a market for all the ore that may be developed as a result of these incentive payments. As I shall undertake to show, under the provisions of the bill every man who wants to go into the mining business will be guaranteed a market out of the treasury of the RFC, at a price that will will make him a profit, no matter whether he is a marginal producer, or under what conditions he is operating. It is mandatory to afford him a profit.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Senator from Maryland is puzzled about is this: If the RFC is going to purchase these minerals at the market price, why could not the producer sell them in commercial channels at the market price, without burdening the Government with the operation of purchasing?

Mr. KEM. I do not know what is in the mind of the draftsman of the bill, but it seems to me that his purpose is to have the RFC constantly in the market as a purchaser of these metals at the expense, of course, of the Government.

I was discussing this very remarkable person, the Director of the price-premium plan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether he has answered the question I asked him about the $80,000,000?

Mr. KEM. Not quite yet. I am still on the matter of the expenses. I have just covered some items.

This is a remarkable bill in that it covers a large amount of expense, and provides for a number of different kinds of payments to be made out of the Treasury.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield at this time.

Mr. KEM. The Senator was so gracious and kind in objecting a minute ago that I feel under no particular compulsion to yield to him, although in view of our long friendship I shall be glad to yield in a few minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I was just discussing the remarkable powers which are placed in the Director. He is to be employed at a salary of $12,000 a year. That provision is found at the top of page 3. The bill does not specifically say by whom he is to be appointed, but, in view of the fact that he is an administrative officer of the Incentive Payments Division, which is made a division of the Department of the Interior, I think it is a fair inference or assumption that he is to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. No confirmation by the Senate is required.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. Not quite yet.

Let us see what the Director may do.

The Director may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923 and shall employ such other staff as he may deem necessary.

I do not hold any brief for the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923; but as Senators know, there is a very elaborate provision as to the employment of professional and scientific persons. That law establishes nine grades. Grade 1 is the junior professional grade; grade 2, the assistant professional grade; grade 3, the associate professional grade; grade 4, the full professional grade; grade 5, the senior professional grade; grade 6, the principal professional grade; grade 7, the head professional grade; grade 8, the chief professional grade; and grade 9, the special professional grade. The salaries of all those grades are fixed by law.

The draftsman of this bill has cut right through those provisions, and he has given the Director, the $12,000 a year man, the right to employ as many people as he sees fit, at whatever salary his imagination dictates. I have searched the statutes with some care, and I cannot find any limitation at all upon the unbridled discretion of the Director in employing personnel under the language of this act.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. STEWART. Where would the money come from?

Mr. KEM. I will get to that in a moment. There has been no appropriation. There has been a very devious method of going around the Appropriations Committee. Payments for the premiums or the subsidies are to be made by the RFC. They do not have to go to the Appropriations Committee. The purchase price for the ores produced under the plan comes from the RFC.

Mr. STEWART. Is there a limitation on the amount?

Mr. KEM. None whatever.

When the plan was presented to the Congress in the closing hours of the last session, an appropriation of $300,000 was made in the second deficiency bill for the Department of Commerce; but no such provision is made this year, so I take it that the Director would merely set up housekeeping, employ an unlimited number of people at unlimited rates of pay, and then depend on deficiency appropriations at the next Congress, or perhaps juggle some other funds in the Department of the Interior. But to answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee directly, there is no appropriation to implement this work. The only limitation on the compensation of these employees of the Director, if this bill be-

comes law, will be a provision in the statute to the effect that a limitation of $10,000 a year or $50 a day is placed upon all so-called experts.

So I think it is fair to say that the persons employed by the Director, under the first provision, could not be paid more than $10,000 a year or $50 a day; but a subsequent provision provides that the Director shall employ such other staff as he may deem necessary. In other words, he can employ the experts, who are limited as to salary; but he can employ other staff without any limitation at all as to salary; and if he needs a manager or someone of that sort, I take it that under the provisions of this bill there would be no limitation at all on the salary which that person might be paid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's feeling that even though section 7 is limited to $80,000,000 in any one year, there could be an unlimited amount for the purchase of metals, up to $500,000,000, if that were available?

Mr. KEM. There can be no doubt about that.

What is limited to $80,000,000 is set forth in section 7, namely—

> All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall yield in just a moment. First I wish to demonstrate what this bill will cost.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not clear as to what "conservation payments" meant, until the Senator gave his explanation. I thought that included the bonus.

Mr. KEM. No; those are premiums or incentives given for production and exploration.

In addition to these payments, as I read the section, commitments can be made for an additional $80,000,000; and then in the middle of page 8 the additional ores are required to be purchased; and then on page 3 the Director is authorized to employ these experts as members of his staff.

In answer to the question as to the cost of the bill, I have to say that after considerable study I cannot tell, and I do not think any Member of the Senate can tell.

There are to be payments for exploration and development and conservation, not exceeding $80,000,000 a year. There are commitments to be made by any officer or employee of the United States, not exceeding $80,000,000 a year.

Then there is to be the purchase of—

> All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments—

As set forth on page 8.

And then there are the expenses, upon which there is no limit, as set forth in the middle of page 3.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the really dangerous provision, it would seem from what the Senator has said, is subparagraph (b) on page 8. We really cannot estimate a limit on that, it seems.

Mr. KEM. Yes; but it seems to me it is a rather dangerous precedent to have a man appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, without advice or consent on the part of the Senate, and to have him authorized to employ any number of persons whom he sees fit to employ, at any salary his imagination may dictate.

Having discussed at some length the cost of the plan, from my point of view, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado for a further question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what is his interpretation of the language in italics, beginning in line 22, on page 9, and running down to line 3 on page 10.

Mr. KEM. I construe that to be a limitation on commitments to be made by any officer of the United States Government in carrying on this plan. My construction is that that is an additional limitation to the proviso in the previous phrase.

In other words, the disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments are limited to $80,000,000 a year; but, in addition, there may be commitments by an officer or employee of the United States, who may obligate the United States Government to the extent of $80,000,000 a year.

To be more specific, I take it that that paragraph involves the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in this amount of money, namely, twice $80,000,000 a year, or $160,000,000 a year, for 4 years, or a total of $640,000,000.

In addition to that, we have the items of what it will cost to buy all the ore, the production of which is stimulated by these incentive payments, plus the cost of operating the plan, for all of which there has been no appropriation, and no appropriation is presently contemplated from the United States Treasury.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the Senator what disbursements are to be made under the bill except those to be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I am speaking as to ores and minerals.

Mr. KEM. Evidently other disbursements are contemplated, because subparagraph (e) on page 10, provides:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the administration of this act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not true, of course, that there is the purchase of the ores, which involves one sum of money; and there is also the necessary administration to carry on the purchase of the ores, which would involve another sum of money.

Mr. KEM. I understood the question of the Senator from Colorado to be as to what sums, in addition to those to be paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, are involved. Is that the question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. The answer is the cost of administration, which is referred to in subparagraph (e) on page 10; and it involves the rather unique situation of having this Director, appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, without the advice and consent of the Senate, employing an unlimited number of persons at unlimited compensation, except in another statute what he can pay the experts is limited.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator be more comfortable about it if it were made subject to the advice and consent of the Senate?

Mr. KEM. I certainly think the Senate would feel more comfortable about it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator feel more comfortable about it if the salaries were made subject to the usual salary ranges?

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Missouri would feel more comfortable about it, because he feels——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, over on this side of the aisle it is difficult to hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators will please speak more loudly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my request was not addressed to the Senator from Missouri, but to the Senator from Colorado.

If the Senator will be kind enough to yield to me now, let me say that the objection I made a moment ago was not directed to anything the Senator from Missouri was doing. I was merely anxious that this bill be taken up, and that the Senator from Missouri have an opportunity to explain. Therefore, I was objecting to interruptions of the Senator's criticism of the measure.

I may say further that the amendment in italics was placed in the bill at my suggestion. It was not drafted by me, and I recognize that there is a great deal of virtue in what the Senator has said about the interpretation of that amendment. But I think I can say to the Senator that the purpose of the committee was to make an over-all limitation. So may I inquire of the Senator whether the criticism which he makes of the amendment and of this section with respect to the expense involved would be cured if the amendment in italics at the bottom of page 9 and on the top of page 10 should be changed so as to read, as follows:

> Nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government, including all departments and agencies thereof, to make any disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments or for administrative expense as authorized by this act, nor shall any such disbursement be made in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year.

The purpose of these changes would be to eliminate any difference between disbursements and commitments and to make the administrative expenses inclusive in the over-all limitation.

Mr. KEM. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that of course I understand the purpose of his objection and it is perfectly clear, and that I hope that my palate will cleave to the roof of my mouth if I am about to say anything that is unkind or discourteous to my old friend of 25 years standing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure it would.

Mr. KEM. As to the Senator's amendment, in studying the bill I gave serious consideration to whether or not I should offer certain amendments to the language of the bill, but I came to the conclusion that there were so many vices in the bill that it was beyond repair. It could not well be amended in such a way

that it could be acceptable to any careful, right-minded Senator. And so I decided not to offer any amendments. And whether the Senator decides to offer any, of course, depends on the Senator's own judgment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator, of course this measure comes under the general criticism that may be leveled against working under the tremendous pressure under which the Senate is now working. Of course, there is not an opportunity to give thorough consideration to every bill that is presented, but I assure the Senator that every effort was made in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make the bill a measure which would be definitely limited and therefore which would be free of the criticisms which resulted in the veto a year ago.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the intentions of the Committee on Insular Affairs were good and entirely right. But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that no hearings were held on this particular bill.

The chronology on the bill seems to be this: It was introduced on May 26, 1948. No hearings on the bill were held, and on June 16, 1948, the bill was reported. Two days later, on June 18, it appeared on the Consent Calendar and on June 19 an effort is being made at a quarter of twelve at night to pass the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator that the bill as he sees it here is the result of at least a year's effort on the part of Members of the Senate. Members of various committees of the Senate and Members of the House and members of committees of the House, the officials of the Bureau of Mines and of the RFC have been in constant conference with respect to the measure. Hearings were held last year, and every effort has been made to bring out a workable bill which leads me to another question I desire to propound to my good friend from Missouri, namely, whether in his view an amendment which would limit the operation of the bill say to 2 years would tend to relieve the criticism and the objection which he makes?

Mr. KEM. Before answering that question I want to refer briefly to the comment made by the Senator from Wyoming. He said that hearings were held. Now it is quite true that hearings were held by the committee upon the general question of stimulating the production of lead, zinc, and other metals in the United States. The point I make and which cannot be successfully controverted is that no hearings were held on this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. After the bill was introduced, no producer in Joplin, Mo., or St. Francois County, Mo., or Galena, Ill., or elsewhere in the United States had an opportunity to come here and present his views. Before the discussion is completed on the bill, I think the Senator from Wyoming will admit that it would have been wise to have conducted hearings and given those interested an opportunity to test the bill in the crucible of public discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I, without impairing the Senator's right to the floor, say that I quite agree with that view? I quite agree that that would have been a desirable procedure. But we were operating under an understanding that this session of the Congress was to adjourn on the 19th of June, and to many of us it seemed highly desirable that authority should be granted by the Congress of the United States to make certain that the United States was building up a stock pile of domestic minerals, because we knew that the Government of Russia was leaving nothing undone to promote the exploration and the development of minerals within that domain.

Mr. KEM. That brings me, Mr. President, to the very interesting history of this legislation. The bill is what may be fairly called a Johnny Come Lately. It was rushed through the last session of the Senate, the third day before adjournment. In this session it was introduced in the House. The House committee declined to grant a rule on it, but no effort was made to bring it to the Senate until May 26, at which time it was introduced. It was not brought to the Senate floor until June 16, when it was reported by the committee.

The question I raise, Mr. President, is whether important legislation such as this—and certainly no Senator within the sound of my voice will say that legislation which goes to the very foundation of the American way of life and the American free-enterprise and free-competitive system, and which involves an uncounted amount of money is not important. The question is whether it is proper, whether it is orderly, for legislation of this kind to be rushed through the Senate on the last day of the session and then taken over to the House, and, I suppose, passed over there under suspension of the rules.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has not this bill been introduced in the House?

Mr. KEM. It was introduced, but the Rules Committee declined to grant a rule on it. The strategy is, I believe, to rush it through the Senate tonight, then rush it over to the House by special messenger, and try to get it through.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Wyoming. I was interested to hear the statement of the Senator from Wyoming that the RFC was cooperating in the matter. I do not know at first-hand the present position of the RFC on this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said that the RFC was consulted about the matter. I know that a year ago the RFC raised objections to some of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KEM. I will say, for my part, that I have no reason to believe that the position of the RFC regarding the proposed legislation has changed. If the Senator from Wyoming has more recent information I shall be glad to have him make it available to the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My recollection is that the objection of the RFC a year ago—and I personally consulted the officials of the RFC—was based upon the fact that the terms of the bill authorized commitments against the Government in excess of the authorized amount. That is precisely the objection which was sought to be eliminated by the amendment which is in the bill and some changes which I discussed a moment ago.

Mr. KEM. I believe the memory of the Senator from Wyoming, which is usually good, has played him a trick. The criticisms of the RFC went to further points, much further than the statement of the Senator from Wyoming indicates. I shall be glad to read a letter from Mr. John D. Goodloe, if the Senator has any doubt about the fact. Would the Senator like to have it read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very glad to have it read if the Senator cares to read it.

Mr. KEM. Very well. It is as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1947.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: Reference is made to H. R. 1602, which provides for the continuation of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc for an additional 2-year period beyond June 30, 1947, and which, as passed by the House of Representatives on July 22, 1947, adds manganese as an additional material on which premiums are to be paid.

We were not requested to submit a report to the House Public Lands Committee or to testify concerning the bill. However, inasmuch as it provides that the RFC shall disburse the premium payments, we consider it expedient to point out that, in the light of 5½ years of experience with the plan for copper, lead, and zinc, the amount of money authorized will be insufficient to accomplish the desired purposes.

In other words, the first complaint made by the RFC was that they were directed to do things that the estimate of $35,000,000 a year would not by any means cover.

I continue reading from the letter:

The bill authorizes a maximum expenditure of $70,000,000, with not more than $35,000,000 to be expended during the year ending June 30, 1948. Other provisions make it quite plain that the premium-price plan as operated during fiscal 1947 is not to be curtailed as respects benefits to producers, but is to be expanded, particularly with regard to premiums for exploration projects. The present rate of disbursements on copper, lead, and zinc, based on available figures for March and April 1947, is in excess of $3,500,000 a month, and our estimate is that between $3,500,000 and $4,000,000 would be needed monthly for such metals during fiscal 1948 if the bill becomes law. This does not take into account premium payments on manganese, which has not heretofore been embodied in the plan and for which no procedure has been set up. Likewise, it makes no provision in the case of the fou. materials for a declining market. It should be borne in mind that if the prevailing high prices for the subsidized materials should decline, the amount of the subsidy paid will proportionately increase. During fiscal 1947, when price controls were eased and then gradually abandoned, we will have disbursed approximately $60,000,000 on copper, lead, and zinc premiums.

Under the terms of the bill we would feel obligated to discontinue disbursements when the $35,000,000 ceiling had been reached. However, we have reason to believe that producers will insist that the bill gives them a 2-year guaranty of operations and that they are entitled to payment for any eligible production derived during such period. Thus the question of a deficiency appropriation to

pay off such accrued amounts would be presented. Further, a difficult administrative situation is created, which we believe might give rise to claims and possibly litigation against the Government for reimbursement of expenditures allegedly made in reliance on the statute.

If the present dollar limitation is to be retained, we feel that the Congress should indicate clearly that this is a limited program, to be tailored within the exact sums authorized. The Department of Commerce, which will certify the premiums to RFC for payment, would be able to project its quotas on a definite basis, and the producers could likewise raise no questions as to the exact amount of funds available.

We have not had an opportunity to give much thought to the question of the inclusion of manganese within this plan since the matter was first brought to our attention today. However, it is desired to point out that manganese is marketed in an entirely different manner than copper, lead, and zinc and that the existing procedures for copper, lead, and zinc could not apply to manganese.

We express no opinion as to the merits of the bill. Should further comments be desired, we shall be glad to supply same.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. GOODLOE,
Chairman.

In other words, Mr. President, the RFC was not concerned about the limitation in the bill which was placed at $35,000,000, but it was concerned about the fact that it could not do what it was required to do, under the provisions of the bill, for $35,000,000.

I believe I agreed to yield to the Senator from Colorado for some questions.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator, but I shall ask the questions later on.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is not a question of whether the RFC approves this bill. I think it is quite interesting to note that it is apparently not approved by any of the departments of Government which would legitimately deal with the situation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it approved by the National Resources Board?

Mr. KEM. No; it is not. I made inquiry of the National Resources Board from Colonel Allen. Mr. Kenneth Johnson, general counsel of the Board, called me and gave me the following statement, which he said had been authorized by Mr. Hall, the Chairman of the Board:

The Board approved legislation which provides for incentive payments to stimulate the exploration for strategic and critical materials. Long-range contracts should be used wherever practicable to bring about increases in current production for stock-pile purposes. Legislation which authorizes payments to be made in advance of delivery of materials procured under the Stock-Piling Act has the approval of the Board.

The statement of Mr. Hall, the Chairman of the Resources Board, continues as follows:

The Board presently is not in a position to approve legislation which provides for the payment of premiums on current production.

I assume the Senator from Colorado will agree that this report does provide for figures of current production. If there is any doubt about that, I shall be glad to point out the provision.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. KEM. I prefer that the Senator take that up in his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, since we are discussing the position of the various departments of the Government having to do with this matter, I should like to read a letter from Mr. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, dated May 26, 1948. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. WELCH: This is in response to your recent request by telephone for an immediate report on H. R. 6623, "a bill to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals, and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes."

This Department cannot support H. R. 6623 in its present form, not because this Department does not advocate the expressed purposes of the bill, but because the bill is not properly devised to accomplish those purposes. Stimulation of the production of strategic and critical metals and minerals for national defense and domestic economy is obviously desirable, but it is no simple matter. This Department now has under consideration a draft of a bill for the purposes expressed in H. R. 6623, which is designed to overcome the objections here expressed to that bill.

In other words, if I may interject, the Secretary of the Interior says that he has under consideration a bill which will accomplish the express objectives of the bill we are discussing, but he does not approve of this bill because he does not think it will properly accomplish its objectives.

I continue the letter of Secretary Krug:

The intention of H. R. 6623 is to provide for incentive payments to producers of strategic and critical metals and minerals, in addition to the money received by them from sales. The idea is that the mere increase in the money returns to producers will result in bringing about the desired increase in production. Assuming that the bill makes adequate provisions for such payments, this Department does not believe that such payments would accomplish the purpose. The present economic conditions and prevailing high prices for the metals and minerals in question do not indicate that a mere general increase in the money returns to domestic producers would result in a significant increase in production. To be effective, any such incentive payments should be tied to and limited to the actual increase in production.

The bill does not indicate whether the incentive payments are to be made with reference to the production from particular mines or properties or with reference to the total production from all mines and properties of a particular producer. It seems plain to this Department that not only should such incentive payments be tied to and limited to actual increase in production, but that such payments should be made with reference to the total production of a producer rather than with reference to individual mines or properties of a producer. Unless such payments refer to the total production of the producer the tendency would be to divert facilities and labor from low-cost production to marginal and high-cost production in order to get the fullest benefit from incentive payments while they were obtainable. This might bring into production some marginal and high-cost properties, but would be just as likely to decrease the total national production as to increase it.

Lack of definitions in the bill makes it impossible to ascertain just how it is intended to operate. The bill provides that the incentive payments "shall be made hereunder for all ores, metals, and minerals determined to be strategic or critical" under the Stock-Piling Act (60 Stat. 596). No specification whatever is made with respect to eligibility for such payments. For all that is contained in the bill the payments might be claimed by a mere broker or dealer in the metals or minerals in question.

The bill provides for two types of incentive payments. Payments for production are termed "development and conservation payments." The bill purports to make provision for another type of payment termed "exploration payments." The sole provision for these "exploration payments" is the following: "Exploration payments shall be made in addition to development and conservation payments without regard to payment limitations provided in this act, and not in excess of a total maximum to be determined by the Director." No definition of "exploration" nor any sort of guide is provided as to what is intended to be accomplished by these "exploration payments," as to whom the payments are to be made, or as to the amounts in which they should be made or their relation to the "development and conservation payments."

This Department believes that any program for incentive payments to the producers of strategic and critical metals and minerals can be justified under present conditions only for purposes of national defense and for building up the national stock pile under the Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 596).

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would the Senator be in favor of a bill which followed the recommendations of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. KEM. I should not care to commit myself to the bill until I saw it, but generally speaking I believe in the American way of free enterprise and free competition, and the producers of these metals in my own State—and it is an important industry, employing thousands of people there, many small companies and some large ones—in the long run would be better off under the system of free enterprise and free competition because anything else leads inevitably to governmental control.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator does not think that those mines in his State which are closed down today would be better off, does he?

Mr. KEM. I think those mines in the long run would be better off than if they were opened today under artificial Government stimulation under an uneconomic situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I may make an observation to the Senator I will say I have talked to a great many people of his State and I do not believe he can convince them of that.

Mr. KEM. When I come to it I will be glad to show the Senator the widespread opinion among the people of my State upon that subject. I can read a

large number of letters and telegrams, and we can be here all night, if the Senator desires, on that subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to stay here just as long as the Senator wants to stay.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Now to continue to read from Secretary Krug's letter:

H. R. 6623 is not sufficiently coordinated with this proper purpose either in language or intent. The bill recites (section 6 (b)): "All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," for transfer to the national stock pile. But the bill does not define what is meant by "additional ores, metals, and minerals" nor does it lay down any standard for determining which ores, metals, and minerals are to be considered as resulting from incentive payments. Moreover, as previously pointed out, the bill does not provide that incentive payments are to be tied to or limited to increased production. It would be impossible to determine by any means afforded by the bill what metals or minerals are to be available for the national stock pile.

To be sure the bill does provide (section 3 (c)) that the Director shall "prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner." The bill does not, however, provide a sufficiently clear and unambiguous course of action within which the Director is required to function and which the rules and regulations would be intended to implement. In order to administer the bill as now framed, the rules and regulations would have to supply the inadequacies and clarify the ambiguities in the bill.

The bill provides (section 5 (a)) that the incentive payments "* * * shall include a reasonable profit to the producer * * *." The term "reasonable profit" is not defined. This Department believes that profit is not a suitable measure for incentive payments in the mining industry to increase production. What may be a reasonable profit in such a speculative and uncertain business as mining—particularly with reference to bringing in new or marginal production—would be a highly controversial subject. It may be doubted, moreover, if changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price index of all commodities is a suitable standard for escalation of incentive payments under the act. The prices of the very metals and minerals in question are an important element of the index, with the apparent result that one increase in the price of those metals and minerals calls for another increase, ad infinitum.

Finally, estimates based upon mineral production during World War II do not indicate that any such over-all subsidy to producers as is provided in this bill will sufficiently stimulate domestic production of the strategic and critical metals and minerals that are most needed for the national stock pile.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I have here another interesting opinion on this bill from the Director of the Budget. The letter from the Director of the Budget, which is written on the letterhead of "Executive Office of the President's Bureau of the Budget, Washington 25, D. C.," dated June 3, 1948, and addressed to "The honorable the Secretary of the Interior," reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to the draft of bill designed to stimulate the production of and exploration for strategic and critical materials, which draft bill was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on May 4 by the Department of the Interior in accordance with established procedure.

The draft bill has been referred to various Government agencies concerned with this matter and has been the subject of extensive conferences. Information developed in these discussions appears to indicate that, while major administrative improvements have been made in the draft bill over H. R. 1602, vetoed by the President in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, production subsidy provisions of the draft bill are subject to the same difficulties which impelled the veto of H. R. 1602. Accordingly that feature of the proposed bill would not be in accord with the program of the President.

You are further advised that there would be no objection to the submission to the Congress for its consideration of draft legislation in respect of exploration payments along the lines of the attached draft which has been developed as a result of interagency discussions on this matter. It is believed that contracts with private producers under which the Government would pay not to exceed 50 percent of the cost of authorized exploration, would result in increased production of strategic and critical materials required for the stock pile.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. WEBB, *Director.*

So, Mr. President, we have here statements from three important public officials who have examined this bill and have expressed an opinion upon it: The Chairman of the National Resources Board, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director of the Budget. And the opinion of all these gentlemen is adverse.

Surely the Senate of the United States, in the face of evidence such as that, at a quarter after 12 Sunday morning, is not going to rush through to final passage a bill of this importance and involving such a large amount of money with that kind of expert opinion urging caution.

I know my friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is chafing at the bit, and my friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] as well, but before I sit down I want to discuss the circumstances and conditions under which the payments will be made by this very powerful individual, the Director of the premium-price plan, over whom we would have no control.

The Director is authorized to make two kinds of payments. They are known as development and conservation payments and exploration payments. Of course, from the name, it is clear the class of cases involved. Development and conservation payments go to those who are already engaged in business. The exploration payments go to those who want to engage in business. But, Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that there is an inconsistency in the very statement of development and conservation payments because, if the properties are going to be developed, if there is to be an incentive given to develop the property, by the same token the minerals will not be conserved in the ground. The method of calculation is provided for at the bottom of page 4:

Such payments shall be calculated at such rates within the limitations defined in this act so as to encourage exploration and development, increase production, and effect conservation and make reasonable allowances for depreciation and depletion and afford opportunity for a reasonable profit to the producer based upon the values of the recoverable metals and strategic and critical minerals contained in the ores.

In other words, this paragon of executive ability is given the difficult task of fixing payments that will encourage development and also effect conservation. In addition, he is told that he shall guarantee a reasonable profit to the producer based upon the values of the recoverable metals and strategical and critical minerals contained in the ore. In addition, he is told to make a reasonable allowance for depreciation and depletion. That language could be discussed at great length, but I should like to ask this question: Upon what basis is the depreciation and depletion of a submarginal mine to be calculated? If it cannot be operated at a profit today, how are we to figure depreciation and depletion on it?

But the provision for exploration payments is the most remarkable of all. That appears at the middle of page 6, and reads as follows:

Exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c).

Let us turn to section 3 (c). Section 3 (c) provides that—

(c) It shall be the duty of the Director, and he is hereby authorized and directed, (1) to perform the functions hereinafter specifically authorized, and (2) to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner.

In other words, he is directed to make these exploration payments under rules which he himself prescribes, and which he can change from time to time. Suppose John Smith comes to him and says, "I have a yen to discover a lead mine, or a zinc mine, or a manganese mine." The Director, under rules which he himself prescribes and can change to suit that particular case, can, as I see it, give John Smith any amount of money he thinks proper to use in exploration.

Mr. President, I have taken up more time than I should, but I wished to answer the question of the Senator from Arizona. I do not see him in the Chamber at the moment. He asked me about the position of the people engaged in this industry in my own State. I should like to read to him a short paragraph from a statement made by Mr. Andrew Fletcher.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to have the Senator from Arizona called into the Chamber?

Mr. KEM. I should be very glad to have him here. He raised a question as to how the producers in my own State felt about this plan. I wanted to read him short excerpts from statements which I thought would answer his question fully and completely. I could read him a large number of letters and statements about that matter, but I shall not take time to do so.

I wish to pick out some typical instances which I think will express fully and completely what I consider to be the best informed opinion on the subject in my State.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I was moved

to make that statement by reason of the fact that I have received many telephone calls from persons in the Senator's State, and some of them have called on me personally, expressing an interest in this proposed legislation. So I was at a loss to understand why the Senator from Missouri would be opposing a bill which his own constituents regard as so important to their welfare.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey in his very eloquent address this afternoon quoted Mr. James A. Farley, who said, "Willingness to sacrifice office, rather than to compromise with principle, is something we all must keep in mind."

I know that there are a great many people in my State, many of whom are personal friends of mine of many years' standing, who think that if this bill is passed and largess is distributed by the Director of the premium-price plan, some of the manna will fall on them and the members of their families. I know that full well; I am apprised of that, just as well as the Senator from Arizona.

I desire to point out to the Senator from Arizona what I think is the best informed and most intelligent, the most farsighted opinion on the subject held by the people of my State. The first man I want to quote pays the price of success. He is president of the largest operation in my State. I am sure that before the debate is completed it will be said of him, "He is a big operator, do not pay any attention to what he says. He is a big operator." But let me read something he said on March 13 of this year when he appeared at a meeting of his employees in the lead belt in Missouri.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator mind giving us the man's name?

Mr. KEM. The man is Mr. Andrew Fletcher, president of the St. Joseph Lead Co., who came from New York for the purpose of delivering an address to his employees, which address I have here in full. I am going to refer to it, though I am not going to read all of it. He began by paying a tribute to the wives of the men, whom he had invited to be there, and then talked about teamwork and earnings and the future. He said this, and I invite the attention of every Member to it:

> The dark cloud on the metal horizon is the present hysteria for the reinstatement of Government subsidies on metal production, which if adopted by Congress in a form similar to the wartime premium-price plan, can only result in Government controls of profits, wages, salaries, metal allocations—and decreased efficiency. Every member of the St. Joseph Lead management is definitely opposed to Government subsidies on metal production, as no nation has yet succeeded in regimenting an economy, without eventually regimenting the individuals and the companies, whom the economy was supposed to benefit. Our country has been built up by encouraging the individual to build for himself, and so to create wealth. We have built a society that is unique in the world. For the first time in history, hundreds of thousands of enterprises, big and small, competitively operated, and individually managed, are effectively creating wealth in terms of a better living standard for all. Yet we seem to have lost ground in effort to make this basic idea of our society understood. The philosophy that man and his affairs must be managed by the government is certainly a reactionary doctrine. We must do our part to defeat this belief, because only as long as the means of livelihood of a people remain unrestricted, can they as individuals remain free.
>
> Today in the world around us, millions of people suffer from hunger, are without adequate clothes and housing. They live in fear and terror—never knowing whether tomorrow will bring them imprisonment or death. Freedom has been lost. We today are living in a happy contrast to the unfortunate peoples of other lands, as we have freedom of religion, of the press, and we have our competitive free-enterprise system, which is directly responsible for our prosperity, and for the great opportunities which lie before us and our children.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator consider the stock piling of lead important to the defense of the Nation?

Mr. KEM. I do not think the stock piling is of great necessity under present conditions, as I shall show in a few minutes. As soon as we got back to the free-enterprise system last June, the production of the country began to increase. So long as we piddle along with price premiums and that sort of thing we are not going to get the full production of which the industry is capable.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator does regard a stock piling of lead as important, does he not?

Mr. KEM. Yes. We have done some stock piling. I think that is all well and good. I would not criticize it, and I would not criticize further stock piling if authorized or requested by those charged with our national defense.

Let me make this clear. In the discussions with people from my State who have come to my office to talk about this matter, who have urged the necessity of providing for the national defense, I have said to them, "Go over to the Pentagon Building and get from the officials there charged with the national defense a statement that this bill is necessary, and I will not oppose the bill on the floor, but I shall become one of its protagonists." Such a statement has never come from the Pentagon Building.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I may ask the Senator another question, has Mr. Fletcher any lead to sell the United States Government for stock piling?

Mr. KEM. That, of course, is the line of argument that I knew, when I read Mr. Fletcher's statement, would be advanced. He is president of the largest operation in our State, and, as I said before, he pays the price of success. In certain quarters, however, anything he says may be discounted.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; the Senator misunderstands me. I merely asked whether Mr. Fletcher has any lead to sell the United States Government for stock piling. It was not to discount anything he says. If Mr. Fletcher says he has the lead, then he has it; but he does not say it, because he does not have it.

Mr. KEM. The Senator may be surprised to hear me say it, but I do not have the pleasure of Mr. Fletcher's personal acquaintance. I know a large number of his employees in Missouri, many of whom are personal friends of mine, but I do not know Mr. Fletcher. I cannot answer for his plans or his purposes or the extent of his operations, but I shall have to direct the Senator to Mr. Fletcher himself.

Something was said about Members of Congress being willing to sacrifice office rather than compromise their principles. Businessmen are willing to do the same thing. There is in St. Louis a businessman, Mr. Howard I. Young, active for many years in the civic life of that city. Whenever there are civic and charitable enterprises under way, one is very apt to find Howard Young not only generously contributing but also doing much of the spade work necessary to make the thing a success. He is one of the most public-spirited men I know. He happens to be the president of a comparatively small concern known as the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., whose headquarters are in St. Louis. I quote from the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1947. Mr. Young, as the president of the company, says this:

> Government subsidies continued under the premium-price plan until June 30, 1947. The plan was renewed by the Congress as the Allen bill in August, and later was vetoed by President Truman.
>
> Our total receipts for the year 1947 under the premium-price plan amounted to $623,931, which compares with our subsidy receipts during 1946 of $1,418,938. In 1947 receipts represent an amount equal to 27.17 percent of our net operating income before depreciation and taxes.

Mr. President, in order that we may have the situation of the company clearly in mind, 2 years before he drew out approximately $623,000 and $1,418,000, respectively. He says that in 1947 it amounted to 27 percent of the net operating income before depreciation and taxes. Under those conditions one would imagine he would think pretty well of the premium-price plan and would want it put back into effect, but one would be exactly wrong.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, is the Senator personally acquainted with Mr. Young?

Mr. KEM. I know him well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has he any lead to sell to the United States Government for stock piling?

Mr. KEM. He is in the lead and zinc business, and I dare say he would be glad to have the Government's business. I suppose he is conducting business with the Government now.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is not the Senator informed about the lead business in his State?

Mr. KEM. I did not understand that to be the question. I understood the question was whether or not Mr. Andrew Young had any lead to sell.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does not the Senator know whether there is a surplus of lead in his State, or whether there is a scarcity of it, or what the mines are doing in his State?

Mr. KEM. I will show the Senator that when the premium plan ceased to operate production increased.

I want to read Mr. Young's comments about the price premium plan,

notwithstanding his own personal interest in it. I am reading from the report:

It is our judgment that subsidies on metal production in peacetime are not justified unless the metals are required for permanent stockpiling by those responsible for national defense.

In other words, it seems that Mr. Young is willing to sacrifice his own personal interest rather than compromise with principle.

Mr. President, someone made the comment, "You are reading what the big men say. Let us hear what the little fellows have to say about it." I have a letter from Mr. Tom J. Rightly, of Joplin, Mo., under date of March 2, 1948. He is a mining engineer. He addressed me as follows:

JOPLIN, MO., *March 2, 1948.*

HON. JAMES P. KEM,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEM: I trust it is in order to avail myself of the privilege of requesting you to continue your opposition to any bill that may be presented in Congress concerning a subsidy for zinc.

At the termination of the emergency a group of zinc producers began a lobby and propaganda campaign for the continuation of the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc, under the Allen bill (H. R. 1602).

That is the companion bill in the House. I continue reading from the letter:

The proposed subsidy was so unnecessary and wasteful of taxpayers' money that even New Deal President Truman felt called upon to veto the measure. The lesson of the past 8 months without a zinc premium has clearly demonstrated the justification and correctness of the action.

Now again appears the "give me" producers in the zinc-mining industry attempting again to lobby and propagandize through Congress a dole for zinc, under any misnomer CAUSE.

The same old gravy train, on another similar track, carrying the same load, but under new camouflage, and still fired and oiled by the same give-me group.

Many statements were misleading in the propaganda brochure put out last June by the Tri-State Zinc & Lead Ore Producers Association. Likewise many statements and assertions by some of our Republican friends who cuss out the New Deal but work for and have their hands out for New Deal give-me money from taxpayers' funds. It is surprising who some of these so-called Republicans are.

Contrary to the chiselers' wail of no subsidy, no production, the zinc production, with the subsidy ended in June, in the United States increased 9 percent during 1947 over 1946, when the subsidy was in full blast. This information was recently furnished by the Bureau of Mines. This production was made in contrast to the propaganda that mines would close, become flooded and worthless.

Some mines in this district and in other districts did close when the former subsidy terminated. They should remain closed until a price for zinc on a supply-and-demand basis in a free market will justify operations.

The Engineering and Mining Journal of February 1948 issue, considered by all mining men an authoritative and authentic source, states, "Most of the advocates want subsidies because their own operations will be helped." These advocates stand to make large profits at the expense of the taxpayer by an unwarranted subsidy. The recent subsidy gave them large profits and they can well afford to gamble large sums for propaganda and lobby in their new effort and let the taxpayer cry and be damned.

Zinc mines have operated for 8 months without a bonus. Supply and demand is in good position. Even with the large demand during the past 16 months a considerable tonnage of zinc has been diverted to Government stock pile.

There is no justifiable cause or reason at this time to warrant the unnecessary spending of taxpayers' money for a subsidy for zinc except that a privileged few may win large profits at taxpayers' expense.

I trust that your opposition to subsidies has not changed since last March and I respectfully and earnestly request that you oppose any effort to revive a subsidy for zinc. The taxpayer will welcome and appreciate such an action by you.

Sincerely yours,

TOM J. RIGHTLY.

Mr. President, the question has been raised concerning the production of lead and zinc under present conditions. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] was curious to know about whether I had any information as to the present condition of the industry. I shall be glad to answer that question. I have in my hand a statistical history of United States lead production. I believe the Senator's question was directed to lead production, was it not?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I am interested in all of the metals and minerals.

Mr. KEM. This is a statistical history of United States lead production for 1945 to 1947, inclusive, and it carries through year by year. It shows the price in cents per pound; domestic mine production; domestic secondary production; imports of ores and concentrates; imports in bullion and refined lead; exports of refined lead, and so forth. The source is the United States Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and the Engineering and Mining Journal. It shows, Mr. President, that the domestic mine production in 1946, when the price-premium plan was in effect, was 332,500 short tons. In 1947, the amount increased to 400,000 short tons. The domestic secondary supply in 1946 was 392,800 short tons. In 1947 it increased to 425,000 short tons. Imports of ores and concentrates in 1946 were 44,500 short tons. In 1947 the amount increased to 50,000 short tons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the table as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A statistical history of United States lead production and foreign trade, 1925 to 1947, inclusive

[In short tons]

Year	New York price (cents per pound)	Domestic mine production	Domestic secondary production	Imports in ores and concentrates	Imports in bullion	Imports of refined lead	Total imports	Exports of refined lead	Drawback in manufactures
1925	9.02	684,400	226,900	44,500	70,600	7,000	122,100	103,500	----------
1926	8.42	684,000	277,300	58,100	78,300	11,200	147,600	71,900	----------
1927	6.76	665,500	276,000	40,600	118,300	2,500	161,400	125,300	----------
1928	6.30	627,200	308,000	25,900	128,500	700	155,100	116,300	13,400
1929	6.83	648,000	311,000	31,300	83,100	1,700	116,100	73,300	13,100
1930	5.52	558,300	255,800	39,400	38,600	200	78,200	48,300	12,200
1931	4.24	404,600	234,700	20,900	32,300	----------	53,200	21,700	10,500
1932	3.18	293,000	198,300	21,000	13,500	----------	34,500	23,500	7,200
1933	3.87	272,700	224,500	6,000	1,600	100	7,600	22,800	6,500
1934	3.86	287,400	206,400	10,600	2,500	300	13,300	5,700	7,500
1935	4.07	331,100	270,400	20,000	2,700	1,300	24,000	7,000	8,900
1936	4.71	372,900	262,900	20,700	300	2,600	23,600	18,300	8,305
1937	6.01	464,900	275,100	34,100	1,800	5,000	40,800	20,100	8,700
1938	4.74	369,700	224,900	45,400	15,300	2,000	63,900	45,900	9,100
1939	5.05	414,000	241,500	30,800	48,900	5,400	86,900	74,400	10,400
1940	5.18	457,400	260,300	111,300	19,600	151,600	282,500	23,800	15,600
1941	5.79	461,400	397,400	82,100	24,700	274,200	381,200	14,400	22,000
1942	[1] 6.48	496,200	323,000	79,400	43,900	366,500	492,500	1,900	26,300
1943	[1] 6.50	453,300	342,100	70,000	4,600	244,000	319,100	2,600	15,900
1944	[1] 6.50	416,900	331,400	93,600	60	222,800	321,300	15,500	20,200
1945	[1] 6.50	390,800	363,000	70,000	----------	227,500	299,700	1,400	5,400
1946	[2] 8.11	332,500	392,800	44,500	125	112,200	160,900	600	----------
1947 estimate	14.67	400,000	425,000	50,000	2,000	150,000	202,000	1,800	----------

[1] Premium payments by U. S. Government not included.
[2] Free market restored on Nov. 12, 1946.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of Mines; Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; Engineering and Mining Journal.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it is rather interesting that as soon as the price premium plan was discontinued the efficiency of our southeast Missouri lead belt operations increased. Under the operation of the price premium plan they dropped from around 16 tons per man-shift to 10.6 tons per man-shift. When the price premium plan went off they bounded back again. In other words, there seems to be a peculiar quirk in human nature that when the Government is paying for things and subsidizing there is not the efficiency, there is not the morale, there is not the production that is evident when the employer is on his own and the employees are on their own.

Mr. President, I have talked too long. My position in this matter may be inexplicable to some, but I think I can probably explain it.

I know very well that when Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany the main instrument he used to undermine the independence and self-reliance of the German people was subsidies. He paid subsidies right and left. He made the people generally apply to the Fuehrer as the source from which all blessings came. So it was not long before 40,000,000 Germans were goose-stepping and crying "Heil Hitler," and we know what a chain of human suffering followed. So, for my part, I want to stick to the American way of life, the free-enterprise system of free competition that has served us so well, that has given us in America the highest standards of life the world has ever seen.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to answer some of the questions raised by the Senator from Missouri, for whom I have the highest regard, and I pay tribute to his sincerity and honesty, and I know that what he says comes from his heart.

I wish to say in all seriousness that the Senator from Missouri must know, as, indeed, anyone from a mining State must know, that for 30 years after the return of our Army from France in 1919 many committees of Congress began holding hearings to try to find out how to meet the serious emergency affecting metals.

I was in France with the field artillery during the First World War and we got nice new shiny 4.7 guns just a few weeks before the Armistice. Because of the lack of metals and other materials, we never got an American plane in the air over there. There was no timber or metals in stock piles.

During World War II, I was a special consultant for the Armed Services Committee, and we sat and sweated blood while the submarines of the Germans were sinking American ships carrying manganese and trying to bring goods from foreign countries because we did not have a stock pile.

I know that my colleague did not mean to approach this question in a facetious frame of mind. This is a desperate situation. When he says "Johnny Come Lately," I reply that these conditions have existed for 30 years. In the last 2 years the House committee has been holding hearings almost continuously, and on my desk are 28 volumes of transcripts of hearings we have held during the past 2 years as part of the investigation conducted by the Senate National Resources Economics Subcommittee, and two-thirds of the hearings were devoted to minerals.

We published a 300-page statement showing the mineral position of the United States. There is not time tonight, I agree with the Senator, to go into this matter, but this is a good report. It comes largely from the Bureau of Mines, and it shows the mineral position of the United States, and how pitifully inadequate many of our known mineral resources are. I submit the report for the consideration of Members of the Senate.

Let me read a letter, only one letter, because I am not going to take much of the Senate's time. Mr. Krug made certain objections to the Russell bill, so to meet these objections we made the necessary changes in the bill after we had had 2 years of hearings. Nearly every mining man in the United States engaged in operations of any magnitude appeared before one of the congressional committees, and every mining association in the United States joined in a resolution asking for just such legislation as we are seeking to have passed by the Senate tonight. Here is a letter from Mr. Krug:

MY DEAR MR. RUSSELL: In your letter of May 5 you inquire as to the position of the Department of the Interior on incentive payments to domestic mine operators.

I do not feel that incentive production payments in excess of market prices are normally economically justified for minerals in times of peace. If it should appear, however, that a particular mineral is in such short supply that it cannot be stock-piled in quantities adequate for the national defense and if it appears that incentive payments to the marginal and submarginal producers of such a mineral would result in increasing the total national production of that mineral, the Department would not be opposed to incentive payments in such circumstances. The Department would not be inclined, however, to support a proposal for incentive payments where the mineral involved can be otherwise sufficiently stock-piled or where it appears that the incentive payment would produce such a displacement of labor from low-cost to marginal and submarginal mines as to reduce the total national production of the mineral involved.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is there any difference between the Malone bill in the Senate and the Allen bill in the House?

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator mean the Russell bill?

Mr. KEM. It is called the Allen bill by Mr. Krug.

Mr. MALONE. No. I am a little shocked. The Allen bill last year was a premium-price plan, which was a war baby. Neither the Russell bill nor the bill which, with nine other Senators, I joined in introducing, has any relation whatever to the price premium payment plan.

Mr. KEM. I am talking about the bill pending in the House.

Mr. MALONE. The Russell bill?

Mr. KEM. Is that identical with the Malone bill?

Mr. MALONE. No. There are five or six vital differences.

Mr. KEM. Between that and the House bill?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. The caption of the bill is the same, is it not? I read the caption from Mr. Krug's letter.

Mr. MALONE. The caption is the same, and that is about all the similarity there is between them.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. I submit a conference report on House bill 6801, making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 7, 12, 22, 32, 40 and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34 and 35; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "June 30, 1949: *Provided*, That the entire amount may be apportioned for obligation or may be obligated and expended, if the President, after recommendation by the Administrator, deems such action necessary to carry out the purposes of said Act, during the period ending April 2"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the amount inserted in said amendment, insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number inserted by said amendment, insert "fifty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "hire of aircraft"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not less than 5 per centum of each special local currency account established pursuant to section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for strategic materials where available or for other local currency requirements of the United States of America"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $58,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses including not to exceed $12,000,000 for direct administration and not to exceed $6,000,000 for technical assistance authorized under section 111 (a) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 117 (c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, or otherwise, shall not exceed $10,000,000 in the first year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That there shall be included within the local currency administrative expenditures of the United States such sums as may be necessary to meet expenditures of members and staff of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation in the course of performance of committee functions within respective participating countries"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$225,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "$400,000,000, of which not to exceed $1,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses and of which $125,000,000 shall be available exclusively as provided in subsection 404 (b) of said Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished, and such supplies, commoditi s, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $1,300,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "*Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the Secretary of the Army shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan, Korea, or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed 60 per centum of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for contribution to the International Refugee Organization until such time as there are effected agreements providing for a caloric diet for the occupants of refugee camps in Europe that is no higher than that prevailing in the country in which such camps are located"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 202. No funds made available under the authority of this Act shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended), at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment: *Provided*, That no funds available under this act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 203. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to purchase farm machinery, including tractors, in the United States in an amount which will bring the total exports of such machinery and tractors during the period for which this appropriation is made, from the United States, by or for the benefit of the countries participating in the European recovery program, to more than $75,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Whenever an export license for a commodity, the production or shipment of which to a nonparticipating country was contracted for in good faith prior to March 1, 1948, is denied or cannot be obtained under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, the Administrator shall provide for the procurement of such commodity to transfer to a participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, at not less than the contract price of such commodity to the producer or exporter, as the case may be, including any cost incurred in converting the commodity to meet the requirements of the participating country."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 205. Not less than 50 per centum of the United States export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) for nonoccupied areas shall come from production of plants operated by or for the Department of the Army.

"In addition, the Department of the Army shall make available, for the commercial production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for domestic use, ten per centum of the total anhydrous ammonia produced in the United States in plants operated by or for the Department of the Army, said anhydrous ammonia to be distributed as directed by the Department of Commerce, which shall give preference, in distributing said anhydrous ammonia, to producers of ammonium sulphate who were producing ammonium sulphate during the six months preceding the enactment of this Act or who shall have ceased to produce, or shall be faced with an imminent shutdown in the production of, ammonium sulphate for want of anhydrous ammonia, to the extent necessary to permit such producers to operate. The Department of the Army is hereby authorized to produce and sell, in addition to its production for occupied areas, such nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) required for United States exports to nonoccupied areas or for the production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for domestic use and to credit the proceeds of such sales to the appropriation for Government and Relief in Occupied Areas to the extent of the cost of such production for such sales and any balance to miscellaneous receips of the Treasury."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The House agrees to the title of the bill as amended by the Senate.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. In general, let me say, that after many long hours of conferences extending over a period of days, the Senate conferees were able to reach an agreement with the House conferees. I think the agreement reached will be generally satisfactory to the Senate, because the major points in controversy, so far as the Senate is concerned, were settled along the lines of action taken by the Senate.

The total amount of the bill as finally agreed upon in conference, is $6,030,710,228.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. How does the figure $6,030,000,000 compare with the figure in the original Senate bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. The $6,030,710,228 is broken down as follows:

Four billion dollars for the Economic Cooperation Administration, which is the part which goes for economic recovery and relief in Europe.

Four hundred million dollars for China.

One billion three hundred million dollars for government and relief in the occupied areas, which include the recovery items for Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus.

Two hundred and twenty-five million dollars for Greek-Turkish relief.

Thirty-five million dollars for the International Emergency Children's Fund.

And there is $70,710,228 for the International Refugee Organization.

Making a total of $6,030,710,228.

The total amount recommended by the conferees is $408,000,000 below the amount that was approved in the Senate bill.

The final figure on all items is $503,000,000 under the amount authorized.

The amount for ECA is unchanged. It is $4,000,000,000. The conferees put it back on a 12-month basis, for all practical purposes.

I might say to the Senator that the main disagreement between the House and the Senate was on the time element; whether it should apply to a 15-month period as the House voted, or a 12-month period as the Senate decided. We arrived at an agreement, finally, which makes the following provision:

The money is available "until June 30, 1949," which is the 15-month figure; "provided, that the entire amount may be appropriated for obligation or may be obligated and expended if the President, after recommendation by the Administrator, deems such action necessary to carry out the purposes of said act during the period ending April 2, 1949."

In other words, if the Administrator makes a recommendation and the President accepts the recommendation, the full amount may be available within the 12-month period, as was originally planned under the authorization act.

Mr. HAWKES. Has the distinguished Senator any doubt that the President and the Economic Administrator will make such a recommendation?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would assume, if the estimates and the recommendations and the testimony which were given before the committee were correct, that with the cuts which we have made, a reexamination or resurvey would probably result in a somewhat similar recommendation on the use of the fund.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not need to suggest to the Senate my deep interest in this report and the extent of my belief that it is fundamentally related to the peace of the earth and the destiny of free America in a free world of free men.

I do not even hesitate long enough to express dissent from any of the reductions made by the committee, because I want to say without reservation that I think the conferees have done a splendid piece of constructive work which maintains the full spirit of this great enterprise.

I want to express my own sense of personal gratitude, Mr. President, not only to the conferees in general, but particularly, and with emphasis, to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, for what I know has been his stalwart loyalty to a great ideal.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I thank very much the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I think that generally speaking we have met the objective of the Senate, and that the bill, as reported, will carry out the objectives which this country seeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this connection I should like to make a brief explanation of one of the items which we have considered, so that it will be clarified as a part of the report. I refer to the item relative to fertilizer.

The bill, as it now stands, would permit the Army to get the highest amount of production out of its fertilizer plants. The language in the report directs them to lease their plants to free enterprise wherever possible and to get out of cost-plus contracts as soon as feasible. The report is open to the interpretation that the Army cannot expand its facilities at all and such is not the intent of the committee. It is our intent that they shall let private enterprise make the investment for expansion in all possible instances. It seems reasonable that the expansion of the Army plant at Morgantown, W. Va., and the movement of fertilizer trains from the Missouri ordnance plant, where the Bureau of Mines is now experimenting on synthetic fuel, should be done out of such funds as are legally available to get the maximum fertilizer production. Otherwise, I think the report makes it very clear that the Members of this Congress want the Army to lease out facilities on a competitive basis and not to use Government funds for expenditures which private enterprise is willing to make on an investment basis.

In connection with these remarks, I submit a letter addressed to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and ask that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 16, 1948.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: Senator MORSE's amendment requiring that a percentage of Army nitrogen production must be used to supply domestic needs, added to the previous requirement in Public Law 606 that the Army must meet 50 percent of the export requirements from the United States to non-occupied countries, makes it even more critically necessary to increase production as rapidly as possible.

The Army accepts without reservation the decision of your committee that the Cactus plant should be promptly leased and that the lessee should bear the cost of the capital improvements to create increased capacity there. It is our understanding that paragraph 6 (p. 15) of your committee's report referred primarily to the Cactus plant.

There are two other plants, however, in which more production can be obtained promptly at relatively small capital cost. While we believe that the proposed statutory language of section 204, as the Senate passed it, would, standing alone, be sufficient to authorize us to proceed with such increased production in these plants, utilization of GARIOA funds for this purpose would not be in accordance with paragraph 6 (p. 15) of your committee's report, unless its wording is clarified. We request such clarification to permit the expenditure of a total of about $4,000,000 in connection with the Morgantown and Missouri ordnance plants.

The Morgantown, W. Va., plant requires relatively small modifications, estimated to cost only $750,000, which would bring its facilities into better balance and so step up production by about 15,000 tons of nitrogen per year. It would not be practical at this time to lease this plant, and the added production can only be obtained promptly by utilization of Army funds.

At the Missouri ordnance plant, 60 percent of which is now being utilized by the Bureau of Mines, and which is not now an Army plant, there are two so-called trains which are not being utilized and which are capable of producing 24,000 tons of nitrogen per year. Because of lack of an assured gas supply at the present location, and also because of interference with the Bureau of Mines' program, it is necessary to move this equipment to a location at which an assured gas supply is available. The total estimated cost for this is $3,200,000. It is possible that such installation could later be leased, and we will do so if possible, but we cannot be assured of achieving the production promptly without being in a position to make the initial expenditure ourselves.

These two measures to step up production would decrease the severe deficit which the occupied areas will have because of the new demands which have recently been made upon its production. Such steps will save at least several times their cost, in avoiding exports of food which would otherwise be required.

If we could merely have some expression from the floor indicating that the course here proposed is acceptable to the Senate Appropriations Committee, we should feel free to proceed at once. Such expenditures have previously been discussed informally with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, who indicated that he was not opposed to such use.

We would, of course, still follow the policy set forth in paragraph 6 (p. 15) of your committee's report, of leasing these plants in appropriate cases in which it can be done with profit to the Government. The Department of the Army is in full accord with the policy expressed by the committee of having such plants, wherever it is practicable and profitable to do so, commercially operated under lease rather than under cost-plus contracts.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator from New Hampshire to say that the committee report recommended that the Army dispose of these plants?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it recommended leasing them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the report make it quite clear that if they are leased they are still to be operated for the purpose of manufacturing fertilizer?

Mr. BRIDGES. It does, very clearly. That is the intent of the provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly want that statement in the RECORD.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]?

Mr. MALONE. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Having adopted the conference report on the appropriation for foreign reconstruction and relief, what is there now awaiting action by the Senate, if anything, before the session is ended? Many Senators are interested. We have been in continuous session for 38 hours without intermission. In order that Senators may understand what is to be taken up between now and the time when we are supposed to adjourn, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska what the program is from now on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that all Senators will be interested in the explanation of the acting majority leader relative to the remainder of the program prior to adjournment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the suggestion of the minority leader. I shall be glad to give Senators an idea of our present plans. We shall be glad to inform Members of the Senate as to the probable length of the session.

It is true that we have been in session for nearly 38 hours. I just had the Parliamentarian look up the record. The longest continuous session of the United States Senate was in 1915, I believe, in connection with a shipping bill. That session ended on February 18, after 54 hours. We have already reached second place, and I am not sure how much longer we shall have to operate, but there are some things we shall have to do.

I appreciate the fine cooperation and the spirit which is being shown in getting our work done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want the Senator to understand that I am not complaining about the length of this session.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are operating under the legislative day of June 15, which is 5 days ago; but my anatomy tells me that it is Sunday, the 20th of June. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator's anatomy is about right.

At this particular time, of course, the unfinished business is the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1801, Senate bill 2756, which motion is now being debated. We have had to break in on that debate several times to take up privileged matters.

We have just concluded action on the conference report on ECA. Shortly, I hope, we shall have before us action on the conference report on the second deficiency bill. I understand that the conferees have agreed. The report has gone to the House for consideration. As I understand, between 40 and 45 minutes are required to obtain a vote in the House. That conference report will be coming over here, I should say, within an hour.

There are also some other conferees working on other legislation. One such measure is the farm bill. I understand that some headway is being made on that measure, and that there is likely to be an agreement on some basis. We shall have to wait for that.

In the meantime, while we are debating and waiting for conference reports, several suggestions have been made by Members on both sides of the aisle as to bills which they would like to bring up for consideration at this time.

After Calendar No. 1801, Senate bill 2756, is disposed of, we have the civil transport aircraft legislation, Calendar No. 1507, Senate bill 2644, in which Members on both sides of the aisle are very much interested.

There is also Calendar No. 1480, Senate bill 2680, which should come up for consideration.

There is Calendar No. 1457, Senate bill 2754, which several Senators would like to bring up for consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, can a Senator make a brief statement as to what the various bills involve?

Mr. WHERRY. I have only the figures. The civil transport aircraft bill is Calendar No. 1507.

The next calendar number is 1480. These are not in order. This is a list.

The next number is Calendar No. 1457.

The next calendar number is 1436.

We passed Calendar No. 1421, Senate Joint Resolution 162, in which the senior and junior Senators from Washington were both interested.

We have passed Calendar No. 1340, Senate bill 2688.

Several Senators would like very much to have a vote on the equal-rights amendment, if we can possibly reach it before the session is concluded.

Also one or two Members would like to bring up, by unanimous consent, the antilynching bill which was recently reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator has already indicated enough business to prevent us from adjourning today.

Mr. WHERRY. I have great hopes of getting away today.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a bill which has been on the calendar for some time, waiving the provisions of the law with respect to an appointment for Hon. Dean Acheson, who for a long time was Under Secretary of State. Is that on the list of bills?

Mr. WHERRY. It is not on the list I have.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is on the list, but it has been crossed out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who crossed it out?

Mr. WHERRY. Calendar No. 1436, House bill 5708 is the very bill. That is one of the requests which the minority leader made, and we wish to accommodate him if possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is contemplated with respect to an executive session?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the minority leader that we have not crossed that hurdle yet.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have not crossed these other hurdles either.

Mr. WHERRY. We did not wish to take up the Executive Calendar until we had reached conference reports which we are awaiting and got them out of the way, if possible, as well as much of the legislation to which I have referred.

I should not be a bit surprised if before this session is over the Executive Calendar will probably be called.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would not be surprised if it is probably called? That is a very elusive statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I wanted to make it as elusive as I could. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall, I am sure, that day before yesterday when he asked unanimous consent that we call the calendar for consideration of executive nominations, with the exception of that of Frieda B. Hennock, who was nominated to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, I agreed that the nomination might go over, with the understanding that there would be another call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I told the Senate that so far as I was concerned, I thought there would be another call of the Executive Calendar, but I could not guarantee it. But I am quite satisfied that if we take these hurdles as we go along, everything will work out satisfactorily.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the Senator from Nebraska is willing to state that before the adjournment occurs, there will be another call of the Executive Calendar; is he?

Mr. WHERRY. I think before the work is concluded, there will be a call of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the suggestion of the minority leader, on behalf of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who reported this nomination, and on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the chairman of the committee, who has discussed this matter with the acting majority leader and with others associated with it; and the committee indicated by its vote that it hoped this matter might receive the consideration of the Senate before the adjournment.

Do I correctly understand that it is settled that there will be an executive session? I simply felt that Senators should understand how we felt about this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator to mean favorable consideration.

Mr. BREWSTER. The committee voted 8 to 0. There were six Republicans in the list.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am delighted to find Republicans who were right.

Mr. BREWSTER. We hope there will be many more.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am happy to acknowledge that.

But it was a unanimous report of the committee, was it?

Mr. BREWSTER. There was one who voted "present," but at least he did not vote in the negative.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am indebted to the minority leader for this opportunity to announce the program for the next few hours. If all of us just keep our sweet dispositions, I am quite satisfied that we shall adjourn before the time mentioned for the end of this session.

AVIATION LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a summary of the aviation legislation considered by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the Eightieth Congress, second session. It is a compilation prepared by me of the legislation with which we have dealt.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AVIATION LEGISLATION CONSIDERED BY THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Attached hereto is a list of 15 bills which the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee considered for action. Of these 15 bills, 12 have passed both the Senate and the House and have been signed by the President or are at the White House awaiting action. At this writing one of the bills, namely, S. 2644, to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft, has passed the House and is on the table of the Senate awaiting legislative action.

Half the bills referred to the White House by this Congress developed from the recommendations of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board of which the Senator from Maine was chairman and Congressman CARL HINSHAW, of California, was vice chairman.

The work of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with regard to aviation may be viewed as a milestone in passing vital legislation necessary for the administration and regulation of the airline industry as well as contributing greatly to the safety and certainty of air transportation. The aircraft manufacturing industry has been revitalized in behalf of national security by enacting into legislation recommendations of the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

While we, here in the Senate, may be justly proud of these accomplishments, I believe it is only fair and just to give due credit to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for their time and devotion to these same problems. I cannot overemphasize the cooperation that has been received from the House committee in passing this legislation.

The remaining recommendations of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board will be in order for consideration at the next session of the Congress.

Bill	Title	Action
S. 3. Introduced by Senator McCARRAN.	To provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators	Passed both Houses of Congress. At White House for signature.
S. 1853. Introduced by Senator WHITE.	To authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House awaiting signature.
S. 2122. Introduced by Senator TOBEY.	To authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations	Do.
H. R. 3510. Introduced by Senator CAIN.	To authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska.	May 28, 1948—Signed by the President (Public Law 562).
S. 2449. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of interstate contract carriers by air, and for other purposes.	Bill still in committee.
S. 2451. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House awaiting signature.
S. 2452. Introduced by Senators BREWSTER and HAWKES.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to local enforcement of safety regulations of civil aviation, and for other purposes.	Hearings held by subcommittee. Bill still in committee.
S. 2454. Introduced by Senator CAPEHART.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House awaiting signature.
S. 2455. Introduced by Senator CAPEHART.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by limiting the liability of certain persons not in possession of aircraft.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House awaiting signature. (Signed.)
S. 2456. Introduced by Senator CAPEHART.	To provide safety in aviation and to direct an investigation of the causes and characteristics of thunderstorms.	Do.
S. 2460. Introduced by Senators BREWSTER and HAWKES.	To exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees overtime services, and for other purposes.	Passed both Houses of Congress. Awaiting action by President.
S. 2464. Introduced by Senators BREWSTER and HAWKES.	To authorize the U. S. Maritime Commission to provide for the development of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use.	Do.
S. 2466. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, and for other purposes.	Do.
S. 2644. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.	On calendar of both Houses of Congress. (Passed House.)
S. 2841. Introduced by Senator BREWSTER.	To amend the Federal Airport Act	Passed both Houses of Congress. Bill at White House for signature.

PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate now recurs to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756, to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the letter I read from Secretary Krug, addressed to Mr. WELCH, chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, under date of May 26, 1948, made certain criticisms of House bill 6623, pending in the House, which has the same caption as this Senate bill.

As I understand the Senator from Nevada, the House bill and the Senate bill differ in certain material respects.

Mr. MALONE. They differ in vital respects.

Mr. KEM. Then I ask the Senator if in his opinion the Senate bill meets the criticism made in Secretary Krug's letter.

Mr. MALONE. I think it does. Certainly it meets the suggestion of the letter from Secretary Krug which I read.

Mr. President, let me make an observation. This is not to be taken as in any way derogatory of any public official, but I must say that the letter just put into the RECORD by the Senator from Missouri is full of excuses and groundless objections and is a remarkable illustration of the lengths to which resort may be had in presenting a myriad of unsound excuses in an attempt to defeat a vital proposal.

In this connection, Mr. President, let me read from an article appearing in the United States News and World Report for April 9, 1948:

Only way to insure large enough future supplies of these and certain other minerals and fibers is through stock piling.

It already has mentioned tungsten, tin, lead, copper, cobalt, and others. Everything is included except rubber, in this bill.

I read further from the article:

A big stock-piling program approved by Congress in July 1946, has been falling behind schedule from the start.

Mr. President, I shall undertake, briefly, to demonstrate the correctness of that statement. I shall not attempt to read statistics, because it would be tiresome at this time of night, but the chief reason for stock piling falling behind is shown on page 6479 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, at which time I introduced this bill at the request of nine other Senators.

Much has been said about lead. In 1938, 369,726 tons were produced in the United States, and we imported 112,371 tons. In 1947, 10 years later, 346,210 tons were produced in the United States, a considerably less amount than in 1938. Almost twice the 1938 amount was imported, or 211,773 tons. I could go on. The entire record is exactly to the same effect. It is a failing program, because the mines cannot operate to produce an

adequate supply of minerals, with inflation and increased costs of production of minerals, in competition with the low-cost labor of Asia and Europe, where these minerals can be obtained. As I say, Mr. President, I have no time to go into all the figures, and I would not tire the Senate with it tonight. We find here the record of chrome and manganese coming from Russia. There are other potential foreign sources of chrome and manganese. It can also be obtained here, but it is not profitable to pay $9 a day to a miner in the United States, in competition with the 40 cents a day a Chinese receives. I know nothing of the details, but the President says there is an emergency impending. He asked for the draft, and we have only today finally agreed upon a draft bill. We voted a 70-group air program, to cost nearly $17,000,000,000, though there is nothing in the stock pile with which to build the planes. I shall read another paragraph.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I understand the position of the Senator from Nevada is that the premium-price plan might increase domestic production of these critical minerals.

Mr. MALONE. It certainly is, and if the Senator will bear with me a minute, I will get into that. I regret taking the time of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. I would ask the Senator to direct his attention to this point before he completes his remarks: If the premium-price plan is so efficacious in increasing production, why is it that production increased as soon as the premium-price plan terminated?

Mr. MALONE. Production increased in the larger mines. No new materials are being discovered. As a matter of fact, I just read the figures of production over the last 10 years, also figures showing increased imports. As a matter of fact, over the years, increased production has not resulted from the termination of the premium-price plan.

From the article in United States News and World Report, referred to previously, I quote further:

> Schedules called for delivery of about 40 percent of the total amount of materials involved by June 1948. Actually, only about 20 percent will be on hand. In some important materials, the amount obtained is only 5 percent of the amount required. Details of stocks and buying plans are guarded secrets. Stock piles now are stored at 55 military reservations.

I shall read only one short paragraph from Mr. Webb's letter. It seems we have quoted nearly everyone tonight, and I shall not bore Senators by reading the whole letter. In a letter dated June 3, 1948, and referring to the House bill, Mr. Webb says, among other things:

> You are further advised that there would be no objection to the submission to Congress, for its consideration, of draft legislation in respect to exploration payments.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the letter refer to the House bill, which the Senator says differs in material respects from the Senate bill?

Mr. MALONE. It refers to the same bill.

Mr. KEM. It refers to the House bill, and not to the bill now under consideration.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. Of course, it does not apply at all to the pending bill.

Now, Mr. President, I shall read a resolution that has been adopted by practically every mining organization in the United States. In the resolution it is stated:

> That the production of minerals is preeminent in insuring our national safety and well being, and that present conditions warrant an incentive program designed to foster exploration for the development of resources and to provide incentives to the marginal segment of the mining industry.

All western mine organizations, as well as middle-western, southern, and eastern organizations, with the exception of American Lead Industry Association, have adopted similar resolutions.

I have one more quotation, which is from Mr. Hill, of the National Resources Board. Senators will remember Mr. Hill from last year, when, in consolidating the military forces, we created the National Resources Board. Mr. Arthur Hill has since become chairman and is building up the organization. I called him, had a conversation, and very carefully asked if he could be quoted. This is what he said:

> The Board approves legislation which will provide for incentive payments to stimulate the production of strategic and critical materials.

There are various reasons why he could not write a long letter of detailed instructions to anyone; one of the reasons being that the President was not here, and Mr. Hill works directly under the President.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. KEM. Has the Senator completed the reading of the statement Mr. Hill made to him?

Mr. MALONE. I read all I intended to read, but if the Senator wants the rest of it read, I shall read it. I have it here.

Mr. KEM. The Senator need not read it all. I will ask the Senator if Mr. Hill's statement contained, at the end, this sentence: "The Board at present is not in a position to approve legislation which provides for the payment of premiums on current production"?

Mr. MALONE. He told me he was not in position to approve any legislation. I shall come to that however.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator, first, does the Malone bill now under consideration provide for the payment of premiums on current production?

Mr. MALONE. It does provide a payment on current production, but it is very carefully guarded, as the Senator will notice. I may say it is very carefully guarded by the wording that there is an opportunity to make a reasonable profit, but there is no guaranty. But after the Board's deduction of 2 cents a pound, which is guaranteed to go into development and for which receipts must be tendered to supervisors of the Department before payment is made they can further reduce the price. It is doubly guarded.

Mr. KEM. If I understand the Senator correctly, Mr. Hill, in his conversation with the Senator, indicated disapproval of the Senator's bill.

Mr. MALONE. He did not at all indicate disapproval of the bill. He said he was not in position to analyze any bill. I would ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether he, at this late hour, is going to take the word of every Government official as to how to produce minerals? As a matter of fact, the one we are now quoting has had no experience in mining.

I think the record speaks for itself. The stock piles are low; everything is gone. We are, perhaps, about to get into war for the third time, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri and if we do not produce some materials, we shall murder our youths a third time as we murdered them twice before.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator to refer to Mr. Hill as an authority on the subject.

Mr. MALONE. Then you misunderstood me. I referred to him as a man holding a very powerful position, but not possessing a profound knowledge of mining and mining problems.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, without pressing the point further, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if this language was not used:

> The Board presently is not in a position to approve legislation which provides for the payment of premiums——

Mr. MALONE. No; he did not use that language. He used the language which I read. He said that was as far as he could go without further consultation, and he had not reviewed the bill.

I refer the Senator to a 30 years' record of empty stock piles, and two wars, without anything to fight with.

I want to read just one more thing, and then I am through. It is unbelievable, to me, that this Congress could adjourn without some legislation, after we have appropriated fifteen or sixteen billion dollars on military and naval preparedness, and when the President says an emergency is coming up. We hear hints that there will be a special session because of an emergency, practically before we reach home. I, for one, after voting for the draft bill and for the 70 air-group force, want some legislation along this line. I have seen boys go into action without equipment. I have seen them, at Port Moresby and in New Guinea, soar aloft to drop their bombs. We knew some of them would not come back, but we did not know which ones. I was with General Kenny. He was trying to keep 50 percent of the airplanes ready to fly. Thirty percent is a good record. We are arguing tonight about $80,000,000. We have several amendments to offer. If I had succeeded in getting the floor first I was going to offer an amendment to cut the amount to $60-

000,000 annually for 3 years, or maybe 2 years. The important consideration is to get the program started. Here we are, in the same position for the third time, with an emergency confronting us, nothing to fight with, and talking big to every nation in the world. To me it is unbelievable that we cannot take a position tonight, instead of haggling over whether we are going to pay a stenographer $125 or $235.

I want to read a short article with reference to chromium:

Chromium is another essential material coming from Soviet Russia. American industry has enough chromium for 5 months, at current rates of consumption. The Munitions Board has a stock pile. Chromium is required for hard steels for oil drills, chemical plants, armor plate.

The United States imported 466,290 tons of metallurgical-grade chromite in 1947. Russia provided 47½ percent of that. About 13 percent came from Turkey.

Mr. President, I wanted to offer some amendments, but I should like to make this closing statement. The stock piles are nearly empty. We have made provision for a 70 air group, and for a draft army. We should not go home without having done something to stimulate domestic production of minerals. We hear reports that there are more and better submarines in the hands of Russia, nearly twice or three times as many as Germany had when the world war started. If we do not pass this legislation, the blood is on our own hands.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to compliment the Senator from Nevada for his splendid statement. I hope the bill may be speedily enacted into law.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Arizona that if I had the time I should be glad to discuss each strategic mineral, but time does not permit. I say to my colleague from Arizona, and to my other colleagues on the Senate floor, that if we do not have production in the next few months, there will be a stringent rationing of metals.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada a few questions regarding the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] seemed to believe that it is possible, under this bill, to multiply several times the $80,000,000 which is authorized. Without disrespect to him, I could not follow his argument. Is it not the intention of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, by the language in italics, commencing on line 22, page 9, and running through line 3, on page 10, to make it completely clear that both expenditure and committal cannot exceed, in the aggregate, $80,000,000?

Mr. MALONE. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Colorado that we at first had it worded that disbursements authorized by the bill should be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and should not exceed $80,000,000 in any one year. In committee we spent 4 hours trying to iron out all difficulties. The chairman was the distinguished Senator from Colorado. We thought we could make it doubly clear by reinforcing it and adding the words "nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee," and so forth. We wanted to make it doubly clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did not the language in italics result from the suggestion that they can disburse a lot of money, but, at the same time, they can also be obligating a lot of money, and was it not the intention by the language used in section 7 (a) that disbursements and obligations should not exceed $80,000,000?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Except for the administrative expense, is there any authorization for the expenditure of any additional money?

Mr. MALONE. There is not, to my knowledge. If we could make it more air-tight, we would do it in a minute.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the distinguished Senator offer an amendment which will identify the source of the money for the payment of administrative expense, assuming that the motion to consider the bill is accepted and that we enter upon the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. We have amendments prepared for that very purpose, and it was the intention to offer amendments at the appropriate time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it the Senator's intention, responsive to the suggestion of several Senators, that the amount of $80,000,000 a year be reduced to $60,000,000 a year?

Mr. MALONE. That is absolutely true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And an amendment will be offered to that effect?

Mr. MALONE. An amendment will be offered to that effect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it also true that an amendment will be offered reducing the expiration of the term from June 30, 1952, to June 30, 1951?

Mr. MALONE. That is true. Such an amendment has already been prepared.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it the Senator's intention to offer an amendment, if the motion to consider is adopted, striking out the words "exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on products approved by him under rules as presented in section 3 (c)"?

Mr. MALONE. That has already been printed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That, I take it, is pursuant to the suggestion which has been made that we might give the Director additional authority over the specific directions which are given to him in the act. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. That was the sense of the conversation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And that is by way of further emphasis?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national defense incurred, enrollments.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.; and

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code entitled "The President."

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. I submit a conference report on House bill 6935, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 17, 29, 40, 50, 51, 58, 74, 75, 85, and 86.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 48, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68,

70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, and 83, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the citation "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", appearing in the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d)"; and in lieu of the sum of "$3,500,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"National Institute of Health, operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for 'National Institute of Health, operating expenses', $500,000: *Provided*, That appropriations under said head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for carrying out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Before the words "passenger motor vehicles" in said amendment, strike out the word "ten" and insert the following: "five"; and in lieu of the sum of "$10,000,000" named twice in said amendment insert in each instance the following: "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$5,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$3,000,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the provisions of H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress, establishing the Selective Service System, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when specifically authorized by the Director; purchase (not to exceed 94) of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); and purchase of typewriters; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the word "available" where it appears in said amendment, insert the following: "until June 30, 1949"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the words "administrative expenses" where they appear in said amendment, insert "(not to exceed four per centum of the total amount of loans made)"; and at the end of the paragraph before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That no such loan shall be made unless no other source of public or private credit is available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$450,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the citation "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", appearing in said amendment and following the semicolon, strike out the following: "health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150)"; and in lieu of the sum of "$2,480,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$150,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$100,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$194,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$192,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "or quantity"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the sum of "$60,000" named in said amendment and the comma, insert the following: "to be reimbursable and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$400,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: $300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed, whenever in his judgment the best interests of the United States so require, to direct the insertion of a clause incorporating the Renegotiation Act of 1948 in any contracts for the procurement of ships, aircraft, aircraft parts, and the construction of facilities or installations outside continental United States entered into by or in behalf of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force which obligates any funds made available for obligation in the fiscal year 1949."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 25.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6935, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 19, 1948.

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I move that the Senate recede from amendment No. 25.

The amount involved in the item was about $35,000,000. The Senate insisted, and after long hours the House conferees refused to agree, and the item remained in disagreement. The House conferees took the matter to the floor of the House, and they had two votes on it, in both instances refusing to agree to the amendment. So I think the only thing left is for the Senate to recede.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What was the House figure?

Mr. BRIDGES. On the House vote?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, the amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. An item of $35,000,000, which the Senate inserted, was in dispute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House knocked it all out?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. They refused to appropriate anything for this item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Refused anything for the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. BRIDGES. There were several other items in the bill for flood relief. All the other items, like the provision for loans to farmers, the Coast Guard item, and provision for improvements on the Columbia River, four or five separate items having to do with relief from floods, were agreed to. The only one rejected was this amendment 25, which provided grants to local agencies for public works.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I deeply appreciate the fine work the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senate conferees did in insisting upon this item. I looked into this matter. I discussed it with my senior colleague, and there is no question that the record is perfectly clear that, so far as the Senate side is concerned, everything possible was done to save the item, and the responsibility is very clear on the face of things. It is going to be shocking news to the people of Washington and Oregon, of course, but I sincerely trust and hope that when we reconvene we will have additional facts available which I am sure will, if the House will give the consideration which the facts warrant, convince the House that an appropriation should be made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, like the Senator from Oregon, I am greatly shocked at the fact that this appropriation was stricken from the bill. I appreciate the position of the Senator from New Hampshire who insisted on the amendment, and of course there are some other amendments in the bill which give us some relief. I appreciate his work. Like the Senator from Oregon, we had hoped we would get the full amount. So long as the House position is what it is, I merely want the RECORD to show what they did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recede from amendment 25.

The motion was agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I notice on page 2 the statement of purposes seems to override the subsequent contents of the bill. I refer to the language commencing on line 10, page 2. I quote:

> To coordinate the programs now provided for or to be provided for by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence; the development, mining preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same.

I remind the distinguished Senator from Nevada that that particular statement of purposes is not implemented in the later provisions of the bill, and might be confusing, and I am delighted to know that the Senator will later accept an amendment to strike out that provision.

Mr. MALONE. In earlier conversation we had arranged to offer an amendment to strike out beginning at line 7 to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada what he estimates will be the annual cost of the bill as now drawn. Not as it will be subsequently amended, but as now before the Senate. What will be the annual cost of the bill, in his opinion, as now before the Senate?

Mr. MALONE. We have an amendment drawn to cover that. We estimated $350,000 annually.

Mr. KEM. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars annually?

Mr. MALONE. That would be a maximum for administrative cost.

Mr. KEM. I did not ask the Senator that. The Senator failed to understand my question. And then I think he failed to answer it as he understood it.

Mr. MALONE. I beg pardon. I am answering it as I understood it, and I want that distinctly understood. I thought we had already covered it, and I am happy to listen to the Senator if he has another question.

Mr. KEM. I think the Senator understood my question: What will be the cost of the bill as amended? I did not ask him about the cost of administrative expenses. I asked him what the total over-all cost to the Government would be per annum of the bill now pending before the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. The over-all cost, including the stock-pile cost, by this bill is $80,000,000 per year.

Mr. KEM. If that is so, I should like to ask the Senator what amount of money he figures will be necessary to do this—and I refer to page 8 of the bill:

> All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Section 7 of the bill provides for disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments, not to exceed $80,000,000 a year.

Now, I should like to ask the Senator at what amount he estimates the cost of the additional ores, metals, and minerals that are to be purchased as the result of these incentive payments?

Mr. MALONE. I should be very happy to explain the bill to the distinguished Senator from Missouri. As a matter of fact, I offered to do it today. Under the Stock-Piling Act of 1946, there is remaining $660,000,000, and we have a stock pile as low as 5 percent on some of the minerals. It will be impossible to secure the needed minerals either from foreign sources or domestic sources. The stock pile is practically bare. If we could buy the ores at the current market price, the $660,000,000 would pay for all of the materials contemplated by the original 1946 bill. But all of the evidence—and I have much evidence here that I will not bother to go into, newspaper clippings and letters—shows that all the public officials are on record to the effect that the ores are not available. So the $80,000,000 asked for is to be used to pay the additional premium price which will induce the production of the additional ore, and that is in addition to the price that would be normally paid, but at which the minerals needed cannot be found.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. KEM. How can the Senator estimate the amount of metals and ores that will be produced in any 1 year as a result of these incentive payments?

Mr. MALONE. That is impossible, of course, and the Senator should know that. But we would know within a year or two; and the appropriation is limited to the $80,000,000, so the Government cannot be hurt. Furthermore, no money is expended by the Government whatever until the ore is mined and offered to the Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope the Senator will emphasize that feature again; that no money is paid except for the delivery of ore resulting from the program provided and initiated under this bill.

Mr. MALONE. That is absolutely true. Furthermore, no producer need come under this bill unless by his own request.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I cannot follow the suggestion that the limitation of $80,000,000 a year is a limitation on the language at the middle of page 8. If the Members of the Senate will refer to the bill on their desks——

Mr. MALONE. I will be happy to yield for a question. I am on my own time now.

Mr. KEM. Yes. I am trying to frame my question. At the middle of page 8 we find this language:

> All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stockpile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

My question is: Is it not true that by the language on page 8, the RFC is directed to purchase all the ores, metals, and minerals resulting from incentive payments?

Mr. MILLIKIN. All the additional ores.

Mr. KEM. Yes, all the additional ores. And is it not true that the limitation on page 9 is, "All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments"? In other words, is it not true that the language on page 8 applies to the purchase of these additional ores, metals and minerals; that is the acquisition of titles to them; whereas, section 7 on page 9, in which the limitation of $80,000,000 appears, is an entirely different thing, namely, "disbursements for exploration and development and conservation"?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I see no conflict at all. The paragraph to which the distinguished Senator refers in the middle of page 8 states that "all additional ores," that is, those ores which result from this incentive program, shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That is a mandate to purchase. There is another half of the proposition. They have to have authority to pay for what they buy, and that is found in section 7. One is an authority to purchase; the other an offer to pay.

Mr. KEM. I will ask the able and distinguished Senator if section 7 does not specifically say "disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments," whereas section (b) on page 8 says ores and metals shall be purchased? In other words, is there not a distinction between the purchase and acquisition of a title to these ores and metals and the disbursement of the incentive payments?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think I have already answered the Senator to the best of my ability. One is a mandate to buy. The other that payment is to be made.

Mr. KEM. Where does the Senator find any limitation on the amount to be paid in acquiring title to the minerals?

Mr. MILLIKIN. In section 7. We will go through it again: "All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments", and there are no other kinds provided in the act.

Mr. KEM. The acquisition of title is provided for in the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is what is paid for.

Mr. KEM. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is why the disbursement is made.

Mr. KEM. No, the "disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payment" in the bill are a bonus, they are something for nothing. The Government does not get anything for them. They are premiums. They are bonuses. What I am asking the Senator about is the purchase price for the ores and metals which are acquired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is a definite formula for the purchase price which the Senator will observe on page 7. It is a very definite formula for the purchase price.

Mr. KEM. Where is it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall quote. I read from page 7:

Section 6 (a). Exploration, development, and conservation payments for any particular metals or minerals shall be in addition to the amount received per unit from other sources by the producer.

Mr. KEM. Well——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Be patient, please. I respectfully suggest and with great respect, that the Senator has turned this into a subject of complete confusion. I am not the author of this language. I have no author's pride in it. It seems to me to be clear as a bell. But since the Senator finished with it and left it in complete confusion, I would now like the privilege of trying to untangle it, which the Senator would not afford me when he was making his own speech.

Section 6 (a). Exploration, development, and conservation payments for any particular metals or minerals shall be in addition to the amount received per unit from other sources by the producer of the metal or mineral.

That is the extra he gets.

The sum of such payments per unit of production—

That is all he is going to get—

The sum of such payments per unit of production shall not exceed the difference between the current market price and (1) in the case of metals produced under the premium-price plan, an amount equal to the highest market price plus the production premiums—

And so forth. It sets out a complete formula of price to be paid. That is the answer to the Senator's question. That is the question he asked me. It is perfectly clear in the bill. I challenge the Senator to show any place in the bill where there is any authority to spend more than $80,000,000 altogether, with the exception of administrative expense—for actual disbursements plus obligations, if any are made.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will not the Senator admit that there is a distinction between disbursements for exploration and development and conservation and disbursements for the purpose of acquiring title to ores and metals?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course there is a distinction between paying and acquiring title. Title is acquired and then it is paid for.

Mr. KEM. Will not the Senator admit that the limitation of $80,000,000 in any 1 year appearing in section 7 is distinctly a limitation on disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments and in no manner refers to a limitation on disbursements for the acquisition of title?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let us go back again to the middle of page 8. What are we talking about there?

All additional ores, metals, and minerals, or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments—

That means put the plant in operation, and those ores which result from the operation of the plant, which is to say, the additional ores, are the ores which shall be produced. They have been produced. How are we going to pay for them? Section 7 (a) tells how they are to be paid for.

Mr. KEM. That is not what I asked the Senator. The Senator is pointing out something entirely different from what I asked him.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, may I answer the question?

Mr. KEM. Let me make myself clear.

Mr. MALONE. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. It is evident that I failed to make myself clear. What I am asking the Senator is this: Is there any limitation on the amounts that may be paid for purchase of ores and metals, and if so, where is the language to be found? Let me say that I am not at all impressed by the Senator's citation of section 7 (a), because that applies to the premium payments. That applies to disbursements for exploration and development and conservation, and does not apply in any respect to the disbursements by way of purchase price of the ores and metals.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Colorado for a moment, I believe I can clear this up for the Senator from Missouri, because I am not sure that he has had time to explore the entire bill. If he will turn to page 5, starting about line 11 or 12, he will find the limitation provided for exploration payments. This bill provides only for the payment of exploration payments in this connection. So it specifically sets out that it is paying for exploration payments. Then it goes over to what the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, in paragraph 7, which relates to the 7 cent, 6 cent, and 5 cent payments. As production goes up the amounts go down. Then after that paragraph the distinguished Senator from Colorado has pointed out the connection.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I relinquish the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in discussing strategic critical materials I read from an article from Dun's Review, this month's issue, which has this to say about the subject——

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a conference report?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on Senate bill 1322, the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322)

to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.'

"SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'agricultural commodities'), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation'), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

"SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

"SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

"(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

"(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit by or against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within four years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress) shall be applicable to the Corporation. Any suit by or against the United States as the real party in interest based upon any claim by or against the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this subsection (c) to the same extent as though such suit were by or against the Corporation.

"(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

"(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

"(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

"(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

"(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real propery or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases or entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

"(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

"(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

"(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

"(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

"SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

"(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

"(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

"(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

"(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

"(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

"(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

"In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

"SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the Act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, 713 (a)).

"SEC. 7. Capital stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this Act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a–4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

"SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint an interim Board consisting of five members, including the Secretary, who shall serve until October 1, 1948.

"SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of five years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than three of the members of the Board.

"SEC. 10. The executive staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a

staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 661).

"SEC. 11. Cooperation with other governmental agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

"SEC. 12. Utilization of associations and trade facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

"SEC. 13. Records; annual report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

"SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the Act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

"SEC. 15. Crimes and offenses.—

"FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

"(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, or under any other Act applicable to the Corporation shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than five years, or both.

"EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"LARCENCY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

"(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

"(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

"GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

"(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

"SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall limit or extend any period of limitation otherwise applicable to such claims against the Corporation.

"SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

"SEC. 18. Effective date: This Act shall take effect as of mignight, June 30, 1948."

And the House agree to the same.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Vermont on bringing in a conference report, but I am a little curious to know for how long it extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. This conference report gives perpetual existence to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The principal change from the Senate bill is this: The Senate bill provided for a board of five members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The House bill provided for a board of five members, three of whom must be outside the Department of Agriculture. The conference committee report provides for a board of five members to be appointed by the President, two of whom shall not be employees of the Department of Agriculture, leaving the Board comprised of three who may be employees of the Department of Agriculture and two chosen from outside the Department.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Secretary of Agriculture a member of the Board?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, indeed. I am sure he is a member of the Board.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator believe that this Board, as constituted under the terms of the conference report, will be closely integrated with the work of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The Senator from Vermont is satisfied that probably three members chosen out of the five will be within the Department of Agriculture. The Senator from Vermont is not satisfied that the Board of five is large enough, but has hope that the next Congress may see fit to enlarge the Board if the five members prove to be inadequate.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I express the final hope that Congress will not recess or adjourn for a little while, because we may have a long-range farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe that there seems to be some ground for that hope.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument.

The message notified the Senate that Mr. GILLIE had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, vice Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, excused.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 6527, to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the House bill and agree to the bill as originally passed by the House.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
WAYNE MORSE,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
WALTER E. BREHM,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
WINGATE H. LUCAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there is objection to this conference report.

This is a bill continuing for 3 years after the end of the war Federal assistance to local school districts to educate the children in areas where there have been war plants or war installations.

The bill came over from the House authorizing $6,000,000 a year of this assistance. Mind you, this is 3 years after the end of the war. There was never any authority of law during the war. It was done under the war powers.

The bill which came over from the House proposed not only to provide approximately $5,000,000 of assistance to those school districts in which there were located war plants which had not yet been turned back to private ownership, and the Senate decided it could go along with that, but the House bill also provided an additional $1,000,000 to start this program all over again, for assistance to school districts which may incur increased enrollments because of new defense or military installations resulting from the present national defense program.

The wisdom of any assistance to these school districts is somewhat doubtful. I may point out that according to the figures furnished to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, about three-fourths of this assistance goes to three States—Oregon, Washington, and Texas, all three of which have received hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal contracts. Those States and their industries and their Representatives in Congress were extremely active in seeking those Federal appropriations, and those appropriations undoubtedly have increased tremendously the wealth and income of those States. Then they have the gall to come to Congress and ask for Federal assistance to carry on the local function of education.

I grant that in various cases the local school districts are in trouble because the Federal Government has taken title to much of their land, with the result that it does not pay taxes, and the local school districts are in difficulty.

But in every one of those situations the income of the State, which is their basis for taxation, has been increased tremendously by the Federal expenditures which have been sought by those States; and yet they are asking the taxpayers of all the other 45 States to help them bear that little additional expense.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I shall finish my statement, if the Senator does not mind.

This, mind you, is 3 years after the end of the war. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, after looking at all the facts, decided that we were perhaps justified—it was doubtful—in going on for one more year with a program, insofar as it concerned the school districts that were helped during the war. During the war we did a lot of things which are a little difficult to cut off immediately after the end of the war. But we decided that it would be a serious mistake to start adding new districts.

After all, we in the Senate know very well that these increased expenditures—and they are tremendous this year—are the cause of considerable rivalry among the States as to which shall get them. The States which get them, I think, have no right to come to the Congress and ask for help to the extent of $10,000, $20,000, $50,000, $100,000, or, in the case of one State almost a million dollars, to educate children of the workers who will be migrating into those States because of the increased activities arising from Federal appropriations, as a result of which the States derive increased income.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare therefore eliminated the provision, which permitted the addition of new school districts to receive assistance under this program. We cut the amount, in accordance with the estimates furnished us, from $6,000,000 to $5,000,000.

Mr. President, that decision of the committee, I may say, was sustained by the Senate; it was challenged and was sustained here on the floor. Yet the Senate conferees went into conference with the conferees on the part of the House, and yielded everything.

I am just a little bit tired of having the Senate always take the position of increasing the contributions and the expenditures of the Federal Government every time it gets a chance.

The taxpayers of the forty-odd States that have not participated to the extent of hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in these Federal expenditures and have not had their incomes increased to that extent, are being called upon not only to pay the taxes necessary to support those expenditures in the first place, but also to help those States maintain and operate their purely local functions of government. That strikes me as not only getting to the trough, but climbing into it with all four feet.

So I hope the Senate will reject this conference report, and will say, "Let us have an end to this running to the Federal Treasury every time any small local community gets into the least little bit of trouble." If we do not call a halt to it pretty soon, we might as well abolish all local and State governments.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I realize the difficulties referred to by the Senator from Minnesota. I regret that there should be any difference of opinion between us.

As I stated, in the committee we felt that we should eliminate such assistance in the case of future installations, and should let the States take care of the educational problem. The committee composed of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Montana

[Mr. MURRAY], and myself met this afternon with the House conferees, and we had presented to us the record of the hearings that had been taken by the House, as well as the evidence we had before our own committee.

The effect of such Government installations is to take taxable property from the States, as the properties are tax exempt.

Frankly, I am not prepared to see established a policy whereby federally-held property should be taxed in order to take care of these problems, rather than to have special arrangements made for the schools.

But the fact remains that, for the coming year, the conferees on the part of the Senate felt that we should not reduce the program as proposed by the Senate; and in considering the evidence they presented to us, we believed that at least we should take care of the program that was taken care of last year, with the insistence that our staff study this matter and see whether we could deal more equitably with these cases in which, because of the expansion of our Military Establishment, we are taking from the State areas formerly taxable.

Therefore we have presented the conference report in the form in which we have.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that we are making the contributions in peacetime because the war plants are being expanded?

Mr. SMITH. The plants are being expanded, and the property is being turned over to the Government.

I agree that I think this is a wrong principle; but if we cut it off this year, I think many school children will suffer.

So we had to weigh the problem of the school children as against the principle the Senator from Minnesota has been discussing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is there a general provision, or are specific locations mentioned in the authorization?

Mr. SMITH. They are in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to know whether the areas which are to receive the benefits are stated in the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a lump-sum appropriation, and there are certain communities to which it will go. They were enumerated—about 15 or 20.

Mr. SMITH. The House had evidence of the communities to which it would go.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the Senator if he knows the different areas and different States where this lump sum is to be distributed. Is there a chart?

Mr. TAFT. There is a House report.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask whether there are any in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. SMITH. That is a very relevant question from the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly is.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; there are three in Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator tell me where they are located in Nebraska? Can he give me the names?

Mr. SMITH. I cannot give the Senator the names from this table. The House committee had the break-down. The clerk of our committee, I think, has all those documents. I do not have them before me.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will look a page or two further on he will see that the list of towns in each State appears in the pamphlet.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Missouri is correct, and I shall be very glad to give the Senator from Nebraska the list of places in his State where the plants are located. They are at Glenville, Cairo, and Sidney.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there are other schools in a similar situation. Those are the ones the Senator named in my own State that are now getting any relief. I should like to know how the distribution is made.

Mr. SMITH. There is a table in the report showing each State and the places in each State where distribution is made, and another table is shown which sums up the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that. I should like to have the Senator answer the question. Who makes the determination as to where aid is to be given? I am satisfied there are other school districts in my own State corresponding to those mentioned in the observations of the distinguished Senator that are not receiving relief.

Mr. SMITH. Is it the Senator's statement then that he feels that not less relief should be given, but more, in the case of Nebraska? Is that his position?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I am not asking that. I am asking who makes the distribution, and on what basis.

Mr. SMITH. It is made by the Federal Works Administrator. He is authorized to make it, the same as he is authorized to make decisions as to the location of Federal works.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think we can clear up the subject referred to in the questions asked by the Senator from Nebraska by asking the distinguished Senator handling the bill if it is not a fact that all the Federal Government is doing is paying an amount which would otherwise be paid in taxes if private enterprise were operating the factories.

Mr. SMITH. I assume that is the case, because the table is broken down, and the appropriation is simply based on the deficit in each case. Each one of the States takes care of the great bulk of the funds. The amount appropriated is merely the deficit.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If the Government did not own the properties, the taxes would be paid into the State and into the school districts to take care of the subject, would they not?

Mr. SMITH. I assume that is so.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Inasmuch as the Federal Government owns those properties, the situation is different.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I would say it has no relation whatever to the taxes that might be paid on the property. The school districts are selected. They have a deficit because there happens to be a plant there, and because there happened to be more children coming in. There is property in the district on which taxes are paid, and the Federal Government pays the deficit.

I think it is absolutely unjustifiable for us to begin again to increase the program of the Federal Government paying for local school expenses. Last year we spent $4,500,000 on something left over from the war, which was strictly a war proposition. Now, for the first time this year, we are asked to expand the relief. We are asked to expand it from an authorization of $5,000,000 to one of $7,000,000. We are starting on a new program which calls on the Federal Government whenever a plant is located in a community to pay the expenses of the school districts because children are brought into the community. The Federal Government pays for the education of the children of contractors who are actually brought in to build the building. It starts paying for children of the Navy personnel and Army personnel, and now we are asked to pay for a great many children of people to come in to establish stores or to engage in other activities in the neighborhood. It seems to me the program should not be enlarged. I think the conference report should be rejected.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Ohio I agree with him that the program should not be enlarged. But we have a problem before us in regard to the children, and I think we have to meet the problem. We have got to study the problem to see how it can be taken care of. Perhaps it can be taken care of out of the taxable assets of the communities.

Mr. TAFT. The States seek the plants; they seek the Government installations. They make the argument that we should locate them in their States. There is a responsibility. There is no reason why the State should not bear the expense. The moral justification probably is that if the local school district is unable to pay, then the State government ought to pay it. There is not the slightest ground that I can see for the Federal Government being asked to pay the expenses of local school districts.

We undertook the program during the war, when we suddenly had vast numbers of people moving in overnight. We continued the program, greatly increasing it from year to year, until finally this year we inserted a new provision that it shall include not only war plants but any new installation the Federal Government has recently made. The State of Washington already gets $1,000,000 out of the $5,000,000. The new provision will give the State of Washington $800,000 more, so that $1,800,000 will go to

the State of Washington alone out of the proposed contribution of $7,000,000. I see no reason for the Federal Government's paying $1,800,000 toward the support of schools in the State of Washington.

Mr. SMITH. I ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio, having in mind the plans dealing with expansion of the National Military Establishment, which is bound to come with the advent of our Air Force expansion, and so forth, does he propose to take care of the situation by letting the States handle the increased obligations, or does he have some plan whereby the property which the Federal Government takes over is to become subject to State taxation? What is the Senator's plan?

Mr. TAFT. Every plant that comes into a locality brings more wealth and more income into the State than it had before, perhaps two or three times what was there before. The State government can certainly find some way to get the money from that additional income to pay for the schools. There are certain problems where a local school district is so situated that it cannot get its usual revenue from real estate, but in the State of Ohio a large part of the school money comes from the sales tax which the State collects and redistributes to the school districts according to their need.

I think the Federal program is very undesirable. What I object to is a new beginning of the expansion of the program. Last year it was $5,000,000. This year, I assume it was reduced. Did the conference report reduce it to $3,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. The House asked for $5,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Last year the authorization was $5,000,000, and they spent about $4,500,000, as I remember. We tried to hold it down at least to the same figure.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that Ohio gets out of this $163,352.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, referring specifically to one city in Texas, Grand Prairie, it is my understanding that one branch of the Federal Government owning property in that locality has been paying in lieu of taxes about $74,000. That Federal property has been turned over to the Navy Department, and unless the pending bill is passed as amended, the Navy Department claims it will be unable to make the contribution which was made when the property was under the control of another branch of the Federal Government. It means nothing new to Grand Prairie; it only means continuing the payment of the same amount which has been paid heretofore.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I want to point out one thing in connection with this item. The Senate has approved a $5 000,000 item. The conference report adds to that $1,000,000. In the last few moments of the session it seems to me that if this report is not accepted there is a great chance for killing the entire bill. I am familiar with one school at Pascagoula, Miss. There were erected there during the war a huge shipping plant and an enormous Government housing project. The plant is still in operation. The school is still there. That little city was absolutely overwhelmed. They did not have a chance to take care of the children. If this conference report is rejected it leaves them uncared for.

I know of another situation where a plant was erected out in the country, against the wishes of the people. It absolutely overwhelmed the local district. I respectfully submit that under those circumstances and at this late hour we almost have to approve the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES). If there is going to be a debate, the Chair will recognize a privileged matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this matter is privileged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has a privileged matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we cannot lay aside one conference report and take up another conference report without unanimous consent.

Does the Chair mean to rule that the Chair can select which conference report shall be before the Senate for consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that one conference report coming on the floor can be placed ahead of another one which may be under consideration at the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is the most unusual ruling I have ever heard. The Senate is proceeding to the consideration of a conference report, in due order. It has just as much sanctity, under the rules, and just as much priority under the rules as any other conference report, except a conference report in connection with an appropriation bill. I submit that the Chair, while he presides over the Senate, does not direct the Senate's activities. The Senate decides which report shall be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order to expedite the work of the Senate, the Chair would suggest that the Senator from New Jersey continue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with the desire to bring the program to a close, but here is the situation in regard to this particular conference report: The Senate conferees went to the conference fully intending to support the Senate bill. We proceeded to discuss the facts which were brought out in conference. We read a report which had not been made available to us before, in the form of a letter received from George Field, in whom we all have confidence. We got a representative of his office on the telephone and asked a series of questions on problems which bothered all the conferees. We became satisfied that for the next year, until the whole subject can be taken up for consideration and study, we could not justify failing to pass the House bill, or recommending the passage of the House bill without change. Therefore the Senate conferees unanimously voted to recede from the Senate's position.

I think that when a report is received from conference, after the consideration we gave to the subject, we should be backed up on the floor of the Senate when our report is unanimous. That is all I shall say about it, because I am satisfied that we must have the money to keep the schools in operation. I do not think we ought to make a choice at 3 o'clock in the morning that we are going to deny what I am satisfied will be decent education for thousands of youngsters, by a failure, at 3 o'clock in the morning, to accept the conference report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. What agency of the Government allocates this amount?

Mr. SMITH. The Federal Works Administration.

Mr. BYRD. On what basis is it allocated?

Mr. SMITH. On the basis of the location of the plants and the problems presented.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Federal Works Administrator the sole arbiter? Does he have any program to guide him?

Mr. SMITH. So far as I am advised—and I take my evidence from the House hearings and what the House conferees advised us—the Federal Works Administrator bases his allocations on the needs of the school districts in the areas where the work is going on.

Mr. BYRD. Why is it that there is an increase of $2,000,000 over last year?

Mr. SMITH. I do not see that there is an increase of $2,000,000 over last year. I think the amount is practically the same as last year.

Mr. BYRD. I understood that there was an increase from $5,000,000 to $7,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The figures clearly show that the plants included under the original category called for approximately $5,000,000.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. While the plants included in the new category called for about $2,000,000 more. Under the act the Federal Works Administrator could buy all kinds of things, with no basis of allocation, except as the program proceeded one district got one amount and some other district another amount. That is one reason the program ought to be closed up and not be operated in such manner that a bureau can exercise such wide discretion.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it happens that I am one of the members of the conference committee which considered this particular bill. In going to the conference, I went with the full realization that my knowledge of the subject was extremely limited. There is one phase of it with which I was not entirely satisfied. As I see it, Mr. President, we have here a situation in which the bill applies to two things: First, to the maintenance of school facilities in local school agencies which are still overburdened with school enrollments caused by war activities and the transition from war to peacetime conditions. That is one category. The second category is not one in which there is to be a reactivation in the future, a building up of plants in the future, and a charge upon the Federal Government for the maintenance of school facilities where they are. The second category is one in which the facilities have already become overburdened with defense establishments, encouraging school enrollments as a result of the reactivation or expansion of any defense establishment or the operation of any new defense establishment. Here we have a number of school districts in which there has already been this activation, as it is termed in the bill. It is another way of saying the rebuilding or the reopening of these plants. We have in those particular communities the need to make up the various deficits which are listed in the committee report.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the wise course of precdure is for us to approve this conference report, but at some time, that is, between now and the meeting of the Eighty-first Congress, I think there should be made a careful, detailed study of this entire situation.

I may say that tonight, in the conference committee's session, that course of action was determined upon, and it is contemplated that the staff of both the House committee and the Senate committee will, in the interim between now and the meeting of the Eighty-first Congress, make such investigation, so that in the future we may be better able to decide as to what we should do. I am in favor of the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I know it is 3 o'clock in the morning——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sunday morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, Sunday morning, and I recall that there used to be a song entitled "Three O'Clock in the Morning." I wish to say just a few words in thorough endorsement of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

In my section of the country the authorities came to Charleston and built schools, and brought thousands of people to work in the navy yard and the ordnance plant. The schools needed Government aid, as they needed it from 1942 through 1947. While I do not intend to delay the Senate, because it is 3 o'clock in the morning, I hope the Senate will agree to the provisions that were placed in the bill by the House of Representatives, and vote down the other suggestions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not know about all the different projects, but I do know of one particular project in my own State which during the war was engaged in manufacturing airplanes under the direction of the Army. That plant now has been turned over to the Navy, is engaged in the same activity which occupied it during the war, and it is now going to manufacture jet planes, all for preparedness, along the lines of the legislation sponsored by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. Its work is still war work, it is not new, it is simply revived and going into this line.

In that school district the Government has acquired real estate on which formerly taxes were paid, and now the community does not receive a cent of taxes toward the support of the schools.

What is the result? The school district has levied taxes to the limit. They are limited by the constitution of my State as to the amount they can levy, but they have levied all they could. Some of the Senators say, let the State pay them, but it would take an amendment to the constitution, and that would require time and a meeting of the legislature. What are they to do with regard to the present school year? What are we going to do with the children of the people who work in those plants? I am not concerned with the places from which the children come. The Government needs their parents, the Government wants them, the Government tells them to come and engage in this war work, to manufacture planes for the defense of everybody in the United States, and they come and bring their children with them. Their children are entitled to an education, as every other child is.

I know that in the particular locality in my State to which I am referring the authorities are doing everything humanly possible. There has been no change in the status, except for short interruptions. The same war activity in which the plant was engaged while hostilities were going on is now being followed in preparing guns, renewing preparations so that if the need should come, our Government will be able to defend itself and resist the aggressor against the liberties of the United States.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri. This matter must be worked out along on the basis of a satisfactory plan between now and next year.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I emphasize the point which the Senator from Texas has made with respect to the necessity for taking time to do a thing like this. In that connection, I bring out the fact which was mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, that in the district where these plants exist the communities prosper and have much more in the way of receipts by reason of the fact that the plants are there. That may well be true, yet if the school district is supported by an ad valorem tax on real estate, and the real estate has been taken by the Government, it may be quite a problem to devise some other tax plan in view of the increased prosperity. I agree with the views stated by the Senator from Texas that we cannot work out this problem immediately. We are confronted with a situation in which we have already reactivated some of these plants, and we ought to take care of the educational needs of the children for this year.

Mr. CONNALLY. The school year will soon begin, and we cannot arrange for it instantly. It will take time to work out the formula and plan, I agree, but what are we going to do for the child who goes to school on the first of September? There is no school now. Some of the districts, it is said, will not be able, without the help here provided, to maintain the schools more than 4 or 5 months out of the entire year.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. If the Senator has no objection to the Federal Government contributing to the support of schools in Texas, I wonder what his position would be if the Federal Government stepped into the State of Texas and told them that they must have no segregation in their public schools.

Mr. CONNALLY. I refuse to reply to that sort of an argument.

Mr. BALL. The Senator is all for State aid when it suits his purposes, but he does not want the States to take any responsibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is on a par with what those associated with the Senator from Minnesota have been doing before on this floor. I refuse to go into the question of segregation. The colored schools in my State get the same amount of money the white schools get, and we have recently appropriated $3,000,000 to provide a colored university in the city of Houston.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Missouri suggests that it is hard to work out a system since communities cannot get the ad valorem taxes with which to provide the school districts with money. They can come to Congress and demand the money and get it from here, but they do not go to the State legislature, they do not go to Austin, Tex., and ask the State of Texas for the money. It is just as easy for them to work this out by revenues from the State as it is to work it out by revenues from Washington and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Ohio knows that this matter cannot be taken care of instantly. The new school year is approaching. Something has to be done to take care of the children in the coming school year. I do not fear having a plan worked out, a long-range plan, and the establishing of some standard, but I do think we now face an emer-

gency which we should meet courageously and firmly, and I appeal to Senators to vote for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the conference report which was just approved on the deficiency appropriation bill, carries an appropriation for this purpose. That appropriation is predicated upon the passage of this measure, which is the basis of authorization for that appropriation, because it continues this type of authorization for another year.

I am not entering into the argument as to whether the base for payments of taxes should be broadened to take in future Government plants or not. That portion of the bill which has to do with the existing status of things, however, is the portion for which appropriation has been made, and this report should be adopted, because it is the basis for the appropriation itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

REPORTS OF CONFEREES—STATEMENT BY PRESIDING OFFICER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before turning to the next order of business, in line with the ruling of the Chair made in order to expedite the business of the Senate a short time ago, the Chair would like to read a very short paragraph from Senate rule XXVII, dealing with the reports of conferees. It deals with the presentation of such reports. I read paragraph 1 as follows:

> The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read or a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing; and when received the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate.

In this connection the Chair observes that when the request was made to consider a conference report while another was in order the Chair was in error because he did not put the question, but he could see no purpose in doing so under the circumstances.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to state that there was no difference between my position and that of the Chair, expressed in the reading of the rule. I recognize, of course, that on a motion to proceed immediately another conference report was in order, but I understood the Chair had by a ruling indicated that he could select one report over another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's position is that one report could supersede another unless a question was raised. The Chair did not put the question to a vote because he was trying to expedite business.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL AND OTHER GOVERNMENT WORKERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FLANDERS. I submit a conference report on House bill 6916, to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see House proceedings in the RECORD, p. 9314.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the conference report was considered and agreed to.

INCORPORATION OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. BUTLER. I submit a conference report on House bill 5904, to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same.
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.
>
> HUGH BUTLER,
> CARL A. HATCH,
> GUY CORDON,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> F. L. CRAWFORD,
> K. M. LECOMPTE,
> JAY LEFEVRE,
> A. M. FERNANDEZ,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senate to the fact that the pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to consider Senate bill 2756.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest that there are other conference reports to be considered. It is hoped that they can be considered in a comparatively short time. I hope the Senate will be patient.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand, in the first place, because of the long continuous session, that the reporters are having a very difficult time to keep up with the proceedings.

There are two matters of importance with which the Senate should deal, and only two that are essential, before the Senate adjourns. The first is the so-called Jenner bill (S. 2790), which is in the House, which deals with the secondary market for GI loans. The House is acting on an amendment to that bill, which it is expected will be returned to the Senate shortly, and I hope the Senate will concur in the House amendment.

The bill dealing with the long-range agricultural program is in conference. The conferees are meeting again for about the third time. There is some hope of their reaching an agreement. I was just in the conference. I think agreement on that measure may take some little time, but there is a hope of an agreement being reached. The bill deals with a matter of prime importance. So we would like to ask the Senate to remain in session, but I think it might be desirable that the Senate take a recess for 15 or 20 minutes at least and let the reporters catch up.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio has made the statement I had intended to make, so it is unnecessary for me to make it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make a very brief comment on the situation and the spectacle which the Senate is presenting. I have been here a good many years, but I have never seen any session of this body come to a conclusion or approach a conclusion with such utter chaos, confusion, and impotence as we observe here now. It is now nearly 4 o'clock on Sunday morning, after 41 hours of confused session. We do not know what we are going to act upon yet before we adjourn. I am willing to stay here all night tonight, and all night tomorrow if we can get through.

We have been tossed back and forth between promises that conference reports will be presented. We have been told that conferees on various measures would soon be ready to report. The conferees have met and held sessions, which have been broken up and collapsed. Then we are apparently on the verge of doing something, but we find that a report is not ready. Then someone rushes in and announces that if we wait a few more minutes there will be something for us to do. In one room there is a committee which is attempting to give birth to a farm bill. In a room at the other end of the Capitol, in an obstetrical ward over there they are trying to give birth to a conference report on a House bill. Nobody knows what it will be when the birth takes place. It will be a monstrosity, I am sure.

At the end of this most important session two of the most important matters that ever came before Congress are still suspended in midair. I understand hope has been abandoned of getting a housing bill, but I have been told tonight that the Republican moguls in Philadelphia have sent word down here that we are not to adjourn until a housing bill is passed—just anything that has got a house in it.

Senators recall having read that one of the great English kings on a historic occasion shouted, "A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!" And so the Senator from Ohio, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the majority leader of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House are shouting, "A house! a house! my candidacy for a house!" [Laughter.]

Mr. President, we ought to know something about what we are going to do here. I am perfectly willing to stay here indefinitely. I am as wide awake as anyone here. But it is rather ridiculous that every time we get a conference report in the Senate it should be necessary to go around and wake up sleeping Senators and ask them to come in to vote. Those just awakened have to ask, "On what are we going to vote? On what is it we are going to vote?" And each conference report must be explained to them in their yet sleepy condition.

If the Senator wants the Senate to recess for a few minutes, so that it may be seen what may come out of these "birthday" wards, very well, but we ought to make up our minds what we are going to do; whether we are going to pass a farm bill. We have not even voted whether we are going to take up the mining bill. Debate is being had on the motion to take it up. Surely we ought to be able to vote on the motion.

In all this confusion I am reminded of an expression which has come down to us from the great Roman orator, Cicero, who shouted, "O tempora! O mores! O hell!" [Laughter.]

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the remarks of the minority leader. He certainly woke us up.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest that we proceed with the business before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Johnston, S.C.
Baldwin	Ecton	Kem
Ball	Ellender	Kilgore
Barkley	Feazel	Knowland
Brewster	Ferguson	Langer
Bricker	Flanders	Lucas
Bridges	Fulbright	McCarthy
Brooks	Green	McClellan
Butler	Gurney	McFarland
Byrd	Hatch	McGrath
Cain	Hawkes	McKellar
Capehart	Hayden	McMahon
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Connally	Hill	Malone
Cooper	Hoey	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Donnell	Ives	Millikin
Downey	Jenner	Morse
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Myers	Smith	Umstead
O'Conor	Sparkman	Vandenberg
O'Daniel	Stennis	Watkins
O'Mahoney	Stewart	Wherry
Pepper	Taft	Wiley
Revercomb	Taylor	Williams
Robertson, Va.	Thomas, Okla.	Young
Russell	Thye	
Saltonstall	Tydings	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am not going to delay the vote, except for a few minutes. I merely wish to reply very briefly——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the rule on speaking twice in one day on the same subject?

Mr. KEM. This is my second speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule still holds, but the present occupant of the Chair, not having been here all the time during this debate, is unable to say whether this is the second or tenth time the Senator from Missouri has spoken.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it an abiding rule in the Senate that when the occupant of the Chair comes in a new day and a new deal commences, without any knowledge of what preceded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not the ideal way to proceed, but unfortunately the Chair does not keep record as perhaps he should keep them. So far as the Chair has been able to observe, however, the Senator from Missouri has been speaking, with the exception of one speech which the Chair has noted, in reply to questions which have been raised, or in other cases, where he has asked a Senator in the debate to yield. In that case that would not be a speech.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There has been a distinct interval between the point where the Senator from Missouri left off before and his start at the present time. I respectfully suggest that we have not been engaged in a running fire of debate. The Senator yielded the floor, took his seat, and now he takes the floor again.

Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has already spoken twice on the same subject on the same day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a question of fact. The Chair cannot answer that because the Chair has not been presiding all during this debate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What are the procedures by which the Chair may advise himself as to the fact?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. None seem to have been created for a case of this sort.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, this is my second speech. I put certain questions to the Senator from Nevada; but I spoke but once before this time.

This is the second time I have addressed myself to the motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be read back, to determine how many speeches the Senator has made. That is a way to find that out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. However, the Chair believes the Senator from Missouri to be an honest man; and if he says he has spoken only once in his own right, the Chair will accept his word for it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall accept the Senator's word for it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I say to the Chair that certainly is my recollection, although I realize that I may be in error.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I withdraw my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been withdrawn.

The Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to answer briefly the points made by the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Colorado. I understand there are two points.

First, they say this program is required for the national defense; they say additional supplies of these metals are required for the national defense.

In the second place they say the price-premium plan will increase the production.

As to whether additional metals are required for the national defense, it seems to me to be clear that the best evidence comes from the officials of our Government who are charged with responsibility for the national defense. I have never observed that where the national defense is concerned, there has been any hesitancy on the part of the officials in charge of the national defense to tell the Congress the facts or to address letters to the chairman of congressional committees, when they think the national defense is involved. Being the fine, patriotic men that they are, they could not do otherwise.

So, Mr. President, where are the statements from those who are charged with the national defense? On the contrary, they are conspicuous by their absence.

But we do have statements from the Chairman of the National Resources Board, from the Secretary of the Interior, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. All those statements are to one effect—and that is, that they do not agree with the principles of this bill, and that they do not believe this bill will accomplish what its proponents expect it to do.

In the second place, we do not have to speculate as to whether these price-premium plans increase production. We know they get money into the hands of some people who otherwise would not have it, but we also know by the records

that these price-premium plans do not increase production.

I hold in my hand a statement of the monthly lead and zinc production, by States, as prepared by the United States Bureau of Mines. The figures are given in pounds, for the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Idaho, Arizona, Washington, and California, and also for the Central States and the Eastern States. I ask unanimous consent that these figures may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monthly lead and zinc production by States, U. S. Bureau of Mines

COLORADO

[In pounds]

	Lead		Zinc	
	1946	1947	1946	1947
	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	2,426,000	2,420,000	5,726,000	5,920,000
Feb.	2,990,000	2,200,000	6,262,000	5,714,000
Mar.	2,908,000	2,680,000	6,896,000	6,404,000
Apr.	2,524,000	2,900,000	5,516,000	6,178,000
May	3,160,000	2,940,000	6,110,000	5,960,000
June	3,262,000	3,350,000	5,934,000	6,900,000
	17,270,000	16,490,000	36,444,000	37,076,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	2,966,000	2,500,000	4,968,000	5,900,000
Aug.	3,142,000	3,255,000	5,360,000	6,000,000
Sept.	2,228,000	3,465,000	5,174,000	6,378,000
Oct.	2,480,000	3,660,000	5,510,000	7,030,000
Nov.	2,960,000	3,600,000	5,180,000	6,540,000
Dec.	2,700,000	3,350,000	5,000,000	6,220,000
	16,476,000	19,830,000	31,192,000	38,068,000
Total	33,746,000	36,320,000	67,636,000	75,144,000

NEW MEXICO

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	1,104,000	764,000	5,566,000	7,202,000
Feb.	1,050,000	748,000	5,908,000	6,834,000
Mar.	768,000	716,000	5,306,000	7,038,000
Apr.	776,000	798,000	4,980,000	7,104,000
May	688,000	988,000	5,358,000	7,424,000
June	782,000	920,000	5,108,000	7,060,000
	5,168,000	4,934,000	32,226,000	42,662,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	912,000	1,000,000	6,454,000	6,096,000
Aug.	732,000	1,092,000	7,046,000	7,086,000
Sept.	692,000	1,222,000	6,300,000	7,598,000
Oct.	820,000	1,348,000	6,800,000	8,218,000
Nov.	900,000	1,300,000	7,000,000	7,524,000
Dec.	800,000	1,320,000	6,900,000	7,300,000
	4,856,000	7,282,000	40,500,000	43,822,000
Total	10,024,000	12,216,000	72,726,000	86,484,000

UTAH

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	5,400,000	7,360,000	4,950,000	6,840,000
Feb.	2,950,000	7,480,000	3,200,000	6,730,000
Mar.	3,400,000	8,040,000	3,730,000	7,470,000
Apr.	3,250,000	8,800,000	3,540,000	8,340,000
May	3,400,000	9,900,000	3,300,000	8,500,000
June	3,020,000	8,920,000	3,160,000	8,400,000
	21,420,000	50,500,000	21,880,000	46,280,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	4,980,000	6,480,000	3,800,000	6,020,000
Aug.	5,880,000	7,960,000	4,660,000	6,740,000
Sept.	5,600,000	8,090,000	4,800,000	6,120,000
Oct.	5,690,000	7,480,000	5,100,000	6,370,000
Nov.	5,400,000	7,600,000	5,060,000	6,340,000
Dec.	5,800,000	8,090,000	5,200,000	6,330,000
	33,180,000	45,700,000	28,620,000	37,920,000
Total	54,600,000	96,200,000	50,500,000	84,200,000

Monthly lead and zinc production by States, U. S. Bureau of Mines—Continued

IDAHO

[In pounds]

	Lead		Zinc	
	1946	1947	1946	1947
	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,700,000	13,400,000
Feb.	11,500,000	11,170,000	12,400,000	11,700,000
Mar.	12,000,000	11,700,000	13,700,000	12,600,000
Apr.	11,200,000	12,400,000	12,000,000	13,200,000
May	9,600,000	12,000,000	11,200,000	14,750,000
June	8,800,000	13,250,000	11,300,000	15,370,000
	65,100,000	72,520,000	73,300,000	81,020,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	8,600,000	12,300,000	10,300,000	12,890,000
Aug.	9,200,000	13,000,000	10,800,000	12,800,000
Sept.	9,200,000	12,640,000	10,700,000	11,800,000
Oct.	9,200,000	13,740,000	11,350,000	12,730,000
Nov.	9,200,000	13,800,000	11,100,000	13,160,000
Dec.	9,200,000	13,500,000	11,200,000	13,300,000
	54,600,000	78,980,000	65,450,000	76,680,000
Total	119,700,000	151,500,000	138,750,000	157,700,000

ARIZONA

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	4,460,000	4,690,000	8,100,000	9,200,000
Feb.	4,710,000	4,200,000	7,700,000	8,840,000
Mar.	3,480,000	4,460,000	5,900,000	9,420,000
Apr.	2,060,000	4,820,000	3,730,000	9,580,000
May	1,950,000	4,600,000	3,940,000	8,860,000
June	1,970,000	4,960,000	3,380,000	9,600,000
	18,630,000	27,700,000	32,750,000	55,500,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	4,670,000	4,600,000	7,600,000	8,900,000
Aug.	5,400,000	4,440,000	9,100,000	8,150,000
Sept.	4,700,000	4,360,000	8,700,000	7,720,000
Oct.	4,800,000	4,760,000	9,250,000	8,740,000
Nov.	4,500,000	4,540,000	8,600,000	8,370,000
Dec.	4,800,000	4,600,000	9,000,000	8,420,000
	28,870,000	27,300,000	52,250,000	50,300,000
Total	47,500,000	55,000,000	85,000,000	105,800,000

WASHINGTON

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	530,000	650,000	1,710,000	2,120,000
Feb.	520,000	670,000	1,920,000	2,126,000
Mar.	600,000	950,000	2,110,000	2,090,000
Apr.	580,000	880,000	1,950,000	1,954,000
May	560,000	750,000	2,250,000	1,670,000
June	400,000	730,000	2,050,000	2,350,000
	3,190,000	4,630,000	11,990,000	12,310,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	240,000	810,000	1,130,000	2,050,000
Aug.	230,000	830,000	1,300,000	2,530,000
Sept.	540,000	870,000	2,200,000	2,560,000
Oct.	600,000	700,000	2,330,000	2,720,000
Nov.	600,000	680,000	2,100,000	2,546,000
Dec.	600,000	680,000	2,250,000	2,550,000
	2,810,000	4,570,000	11,310,000	14,956,000
Total	6,000,000	9,200,000	23,300,000	27,266,000

CALIFORNIA

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	2,200,000	1,960,000	1,520,000	880,000
Feb.	1,400,000	2,180,000	1,050,000	1,020,000
Mar.	1,880,000	2,820,000	1,130,000	1,320,000
Apr.	1,900,000	2,600,000	1,540,000	1,780,000
May	1,480,000	1,960,000	1,440,000	1,560,000
June	1,400,000	1,700,000	1,430,000	1,440,000
	10,260,000	13,220,000	8,110,000	8,000,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	1,500,000	1,240,000	1,120,000	980,000
Aug.	1,400,000	1,280,000	1,060,000	620,000
Sept.	1,460,000	1,520,000	920,000	600,000
Oct.	1,660,000	1,020,000	1,000,000	200,000
Nov.	1,900,000	1,100,000	1,000,000	150,000
Dec.	1,950,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	50,000
	9,870,000	7,160,000	6,100,000	2,600,000
Total	20,130,000	20,380,000	14,210,000	10,600,000

Monthly lead and zinc production by States, U. S. Bureau of Mines—Continued

CENTRAL STATES

[In pounds]

	Lead		Zinc	
	1946	1947	1946	1947
		Premium		*Premium*
Jan.	(1)	672,000	(1)	28,000,000
Feb.	(1)	768,000	(1)	25,018,000
Mar.	(1)	870,000	(1)	23,946,000
Apr.	(1)	938,000	(1)	27,074,000
May	(1)	876,000	(1)	26,650,000
June	(1)	840,000	(1)	27,858,000
	(1)	4,964,000	(1)	160,546,000
		No premium		*No premium*
July	(1)	914,000	(1)	27,830,000
Aug.	(1)	818,000	(1)	25,616,000
Sept.	(1)	910,000	(1)	25,056,000
Oct.	(1)	890,000	(1)	27,308,000
Nov.	(1)	788,000	(1)	25,398,000
Dec.	(1)	796,000	(1)	25,446,000
	(1)	5,116,000	(1)	156,654,000
Total	11,158,000	10,080,000	276,976,000	317,200,000

EASTERN STATES

	Premium	*Premium*	*Premium*	*Premium*
Jan.	994,000	672,000	26,966,000	28,000,000
Feb.	1,136,000	768,000	22,676,000	25,018,000
Mar.	1,342,000	870,000	25,214,000	25,946,000
Apr.	1,368,000	938,000	25,126,000	27,074,000
May	528,000	876,000	25,546,000	26,650,000
June	1,044,000	840,000	18,404,000	27,858,000
	6,412,000	4,964,000	143,932,000	160,546,000
	Premium	*No premium*	*Premium*	*No premium*
July	876,000	914,000	14,084,000	27,830,000
Aug.	974,000	818,000	18,110,000	25,616,000
Sept.	810,000	910,000	24,140,000	25,056,000
Oct.	804,000	890,000	26,620,000	27,308,000
Nov.	618,000	788,000	24,602,000	25,398,000
Dec.	606,000	796,000	25,142,000	25,446,000
	4,688,000	5,116,000	132,698,000	156,654,000
Total	11,100,000	10,080,000	276,630,000	317,200,000

[1] Not available.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, those figures show the production of each of those metals in each of the States and districts named, for 1946, and the corresponding production by months for the year 1947. Six months in 1947 were without price premium stimulation. Two other periods of 6 months were under the premium plans.

I shall not go into detail as to what these figures show; I shall simply summarize them briefly:

For Colorado, both lead and zinc production have risen since the termination of the premium-price plan. I invite the attention of the Senator from Colorado to that fact.

New Mexico: There was an increase in production of lead after the termination of subsidies. That increase is startling. Zinc products more than held their own.

Utah: Lead production has increased fairly steadily throughout the year, but in zinc there was a slight decline.

Idaho: The record shows that production increased as subsidies vanished.

Arizona: Very little change in production over the entire year.

Washington: Both lead and zinc products have increased.

California: Both lead and zinc products have shown a drop.

Central States: Lead production maintained. Zinc output off about 40 percent.

Eastern States: No marked change in lead or zinc production.

In other words, Mr. President, if we wish to give some Government money to a lot of people in this industry, that is one thing. If we are really seriously interested in increasing the production of these metals, that is another thing.

There is no reason to believe, judging from the record, that the price-premium plan similar to this will effect that result.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that if it does not produce, if it does not have an incentive effect, and if there is not additional ore, it will not cost anything.

Mr. KEM. Oh, yes it will. The Senator was never more wrong in his life.

I invite the Senator's attention to the provision about exploration payments. When such payments are made, we do not know whether anything will be produced or not. Probably all of us have had an opportunity to observe that; I know I have.

On page 6 it is provided:

Exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c).

Section 3 (c) provides:

(c) It shall be the duty of the Director, and he is hereby authorized and directed, (1) to perform the functions hereinafter specifically authorized, and (2) to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner.

In other words, the exploration payments will be made by the Director to anyone to whom he sees fit to make them, on whatever projects he sees fit to make them, according to the rules he himself prescribes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator from Nevada said he would offer an amendment to delete the language to which the Senator from Missouri refers, on page 6. In a moment I shall read from page 6.

Let me read what page 5 says on the subject of exploration payments:

Exploration payments shall be made in addition to development and conservation payments within the limitations provided in section 6 of this act, upon application of any mine operator upon either of the following bases (1): Maximum exploration payments shall be based on production of recoverable metal produced from each mine operation at the rate of 7 cents per pound for the first 250 tons.

And so forth and so on, scaling down to a maximum of 2,000 tons.

I repeat that no payment is made unless the incentive plan works.

Mr. KEM. I respectfully submit that payment is made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator challenges that statement; does he?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But I have just read it; that is what the bill says.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Colorado is referring to some other amendment which may or may not be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I have read from the bill which the Senator has in front of him. I prefaced my remarks by saying that I would read a portion of the bill, on page 6—reading as follows:

(2) Exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c).

I stated as a preface to my subsequent remarks that the sponsor of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, offer an amendment to eliminate that. I have been reading from what remains in the bill after that is done.

Mr. KEM. The point I have in mind is that the bill we are voting on now is not the bill as subsequently amended, but the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the consideration of a very difficult situation?

Mr. KEM. I yield, without prejudice.

CONTINUANCE OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar 1484, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197), and I shall explain my reasons for so doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I object.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator let me explain?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will, reserving the right to object.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the Hon. RALPH A. GAMBLE, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Housing, was liable and has paid from his own pocket $1,700 in expenses to the staff of his committee. In order to relieve him of that expense, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I offer no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will read the concurrent resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution to continue the Joint Committee on Housing beyond March 15, 1948, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197), which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "continue" to strike out "until July 15, 1948" and insert "from May 15, 1948, until July 1, 1948."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I would waive the amendment if I may be allowed to do so, because it is no longer necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was on my feet before the Chair ruled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not rule.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair said the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair said "without objection." The Senator raises objection, so that annuls what the Chair said.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to raise a question as to whether the Senator from Vermont has authority to waive an amendment reported by a committee. I do not know what the amendment is or what the resolution is. It is merely another example of the chaotic condition into which we find ourselves plunged. I feel that before unanimous consent is granted on a matter of this kind we ought to know what kind of amendment is being considered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, after the word "continue", it is proposed to strike out "until July 15, 1948" and insert "from May 15, 1948, until July 1, 1948."

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say for the information of the Senator from Wyoming that I wrote the amendment myself and put it in the concurrent resolution, but I do not blame the Senator for not knowing that. I shall ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania intend to speak on the amendment?

Mr. MYERS. Might I ask the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the purpose is to curtail the operations of the committee. They have already been curtailed, as I understand.

Mr. MYERS. But I am asking the purpose of the amendment that was just read.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is to shorten the time.

Mr. MYERS. So as to run up to July 1?

Mr. FLANDERS. Until July 1.

Mr. MYERS. Why is it necessary to extend the life of the committee until July 1?

Mr. FLANDERS. According to the chairman of the committee, there is quite a bit of detailed work to be cleaned up, and it involves one female clerk.

Mr. MYERS. Again reserving the right to object, it was my understanding the committee had been continued.

Mr. FLANDERS. I suggest the Senator from Pennsylvania continue.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask whether the amendment which the Senator is describing has anything to do with the housing bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. The resolution has something to do with the reports of the Joint Committee on Housing, on which the housing bill was presumably based.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the life of the committee had been extended for a period of a month or two, the reason given at the time for the extension being that there was some work still to be finished. A resolution was then introduced to continue the life of the committee again for a month or two. I understand that primarily the chairman of the committee has himself expended considerable sums of money in order to pay the two employees. I understand the employees

have been engaged in sending out 15,000 or 16,000 copies of a staff report, whereas only 1,500 or 1,600 copies of the committee report were printed. Of course the staff report is not at all in accord with the views contained in the committee report. I do not desire to prevent Representative GAMBLE from being reimbursed for moneys he has expended, but the two employees have been sending throughout the country propaganda against the findings of the committee itself and I see no reason to continue the committee until July 1. Would it not sufficiently protect Mr. GAMBLE if the life of the committee were extended only until July 15, or until June 15?

Mr. FLANDERS. I was about to say to the Senator that his arithmetic puzzled me a little bit.

Mr. MYERS. Until June 15.

Mr. FLANDERS. Until June 15. Let us see; when does that happen?

Mr. MYERS. It has already occurred.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is all right. Why not make a motion to that effect.

Mr. MYERS. Why not strike out the amendment? What is the concurrent resolution? What does it provide? Mr. President, I move to strike out the date "July 1" and substitute "June 15, 1948."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. Perfectly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania raised a very interesting question, it seems to me. Do I correctly understand that the staff report to which he refers is that report which has been described in the newspapers as the report prepared by the real-estate lobby to defeat the purposes of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is a most unfair description of the report. If I may give my own impression of what has been going on, the staff has been running away with the chairman.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can hardly understand.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I am constrained to think that is a very interesting but strange suggestion of the Senator, in view of the fact that the Senator from Vermont——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have made no suggestion, I may say to the Senator. I was merely raising the question. I know from what I have read in the newspapers that charges have been made that the real-estate lobby had succeeded in inducing the staff of one of the committees to prepare a propaganda release, which has been broadcast throughout the country. Whether that is true or not, I have no information.

The remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania have certainly raised a question. Does the Senator from Washington know whether or not this staff report is in fact a report which is contradictory of the position of the committee?

Mr. CAIN. I think not, sir, particularly for the reason that the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who believes sincerely in public housing and is asking for the adoption of the resolution, simply could not ask for its consideration if there were truth in the question which the Senator has raised.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not in the question; it is in the report. I am only asking a question. May I say that I have a great deal of confidence in the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CAIN. Both of us have.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am in complete harmony with the point of view he has expressed. These reports have been in circulation with reference to the public-housing section of the bill to which the Senator from Washington has been very vigorously opposed.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has been pigeonholed in the Rules Committee of the House. I know that the Jenner bill which passed the Senate today and to which the Senator from Ohio alluded a few moments ago is now in the House of Representatives, and there is a rumor that it is now being subjected to a process of having attached to it those portions of the housing bill which the real-estate lobby has been supporting, and there will be eliminated the portions which have been defended by the Senator from Vermont. So in this chaos I want to be sure that the Members of the Senate know exactly what is being done, and I certainly want to know, myself.

Mr. CAIN. I can see no connection between the pigeonhole to which the Senator refers and the housing report to which the Senator from Vermont has addressed himself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt that is true. But the situation is such that Members of the Senate, unless they ask questions, will not know what is being done. I happened to go into the lobby a few moments ago and there I met some very estimable ladies whom I have known for many years. They represent the Woman's Party. The ladies told me that responsible Republican Senators had informed them that the equal rights amendment was on the agenda of the majority for disposal at this session, before we adjourn. I wonder if that is true. I wonder what we are going to do. The Senator from Ohio a moment ago said there were only two matters which are left for consideration. One is the farm bill and one is the Jenner bill. The Jenner bill deals with housing. This resolution deals with housing. But I am sure the plan which is now given to us is that the extension of the life of the committee has nothing to do with the compensation to those who may have prepared a propaganda report which was circulated throughout the country to defeat the recommendations of the committee itself.

Mr. CAIN. It is certainly my understanding, sir, as a member of the joint committee, that the purpose of the resolution in question is to pay the salaries and wages of three of the members of the clerical staff, who had nothing whatsoever to do with the molding of the policy that went into the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the title will be appropriately modified.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments on the subject, and also on some of the speeches which have been made.

I listened a few moments ago to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] for whom I have as much affection, I think, as I have for any other Member of this body. I heard him comment on the chaotic situation which prevails as the Senate tries to dispose of its business before adjourning. I must admit I was somewhat disturbed. Usually I find myself pretty much in agreement with statements on policy made by the Senator from Kentucky. But I cannot quite go along with the statement made this time, because it seemed to me to be not in accord with the facts.

I have attended several closing sessions of Congress, and it seems to me that every one I have ever attended has wound up in pretty much the present situation. I do not see anything particularly unusual about it, nor is there anything unusual in the fact that several measures for which there is strong pressure from various groups did not happen to become law. That happens at every session of Congress.

I think that during this session, more than in any other that I can remember in 8 years, Congress has tried to handle more issues than any legislative body could possibly handle, consider, and give really intelligent consideration to in one 6-months session. I recognize that there is a philosophy, an ideology, abroad in the world that concentrates on the weaknesses and the evils in the present system and insists that overnight we should make over our whole system of economy. I simply cannot go along with that kind of philosophy. It seems to me, from my reading of history, that every time a free people have succumbed to the idea and plea that they should make their society over, overnight, and cure all its problems overnight, they have wound up with a dictatorship under which the people have been slaves.

Under the rules of the Senate, which permit unlimited debate—and while I think it is sometimes abused, there is much to be said for it—there is a limit to how many major controversial issues this body can intelligently consider in one session.

Mr. President, I think the Congress in recent years has succumbed to the pressure of a great many groups who are not interested in preserving in this country a free parliamentary system of government. One of their techniques for destroying that system is continually to upbraid Congress as a do-nothing body dominated by pressure groups and lobbyists, and all that sort of thing, which never gets anything done for the people, and the impression is sought to be given that somehow the people all would be the beneficiaries of what this or that particular pressure group seeks to put over. So every session we are loaded down with literally dozens of major controversial measures—housing, agriculture, national defense, legislation for compulsory health insurance, and I could go on almost indefinitely enumerating them. Each session when the Congress does not pass all these measures it is a do-nothing Congress.

Mr. President, I think a Congress which in one session has passed the European recovery program, passed a tax-reduction bill, passed a national defense program, including a 70-group Air Force and a selective-service-in-peacetime bill, has disposed of about as many major controversial issues in 6 months as would be possible in any legislative body which really considered the issues on their merits, with due regard to their long-range implications in a free system of enterprise.

I think it ill befits those who profess to believe in democracy and a free system continually to upbraid and criticize, not individual Members of the Congress for the positions they take on various issues, but the institution of Congress because it does not remake the world overnight. The only way it is possible to remake the world overnight is by granting complete, arbitrary, and absolute power to one individual to do the job, and that is dictatorship. If it is left to a parliamentary system, where something over 500 men and women have to act by a majority and reach agreement on a given position on a major controversial issue, it is not possible to resolve such issues overnight, and it is about time that the Congress of the United States and the American people recognized that fact, and quit demanding that Congress do everything in one session, because it cannot be done, freedom retained, and a parliamentary system in the United States of America kept intact.

Mr. President, what I have said is apart from the presently pending business, which is the motion to take up the bill to authorize Federal subsidies totaling $80,000,000 a year for certain mineral producers in the United States; but I think it is pertinent to the motion, at 4 a. m. on Sunday morning, June 20, for the Senate to take up and consider such a measure.

Mr. President, I am a strong believer in the system of free enterprise. I think it has been abused, I grant it has been abused, but I think that over the years the freedom we have granted to individuals, whether they are workers who have only the skill and the labor of their hands and their brains to sell, or the individuals who have capital to invest, has paid tremendous dividends to all the people of America. I believe in the free system.

Mr. President, I do not believe in subsidies. As I read this bill, it authorizes $80,000,000 for subsidies to private corporations in the United States who take national resources out of the soil and sell them for what they can get. I was under the impression—and it is intensified by the speeches I have heard from the other side of the aisle—that we are in sort of a boom in this country, and that we are particularly short of various minerals. If the free enterprise system is as good as I think it is, I cannot understand for the life of me why at this late hour in the morning the United States Senate should be asked to consider a measure proposing an $80,000,000 subsidy to that free enterprise in order to induce it to produce the minerals we need for our economy.

Mr. President, if our production of the minerals which we need to support our economy is in such a sad state that private enterprise owners have to come to Washington begging for a subsidy of $80,000,000, then I am gravely disturbed. If we really need that kind of a subsidy to make the free-enterprise system produce what the American economy needs in order to achieve prosperity and abundance, then I think we are confronted with a further consideration, namely, if that is the case, then perhaps we had better question whether we want free enterprise and the exploitation of these natural resources, or whether we want to adopt the socialist system, and turn the whole ownership and operation and exploitation of these natural resources over to the state.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not think this time is quite appropriate to consider that kind of a fundamental question, and it seems to me it is inevitably involved in this subsidy proposition.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does not the Senator think that the hands of the clock keep going around and that this country will be jeopardized if we do not have stock piles?

Mr. BALL. I rather think the stock piles are there whether they are in the ground or whether on top. I have sufficient confidence in the free people of America to make me feel that if they confront an emergency they will get what they need one way or another. I do not think we have to subsidize private corporations to build up stock piles of materials we need for the defense of America. If we have come to that point in the United States of America, then I am really disturbed about where we are going.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Have we now stock piles adequate to our defense needs?

Mr. BALL. Frankly, I doubt if we do. I do not think we had stock piles adequate to our needs when we got into World War II on December 7, 1941.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator knows, does he not, that within the past year we have taken the tariff off copper, we have taken the tariff off zinc, we have taken the tariff off lead? Yet our stock piles are empty, and we cannot import enough to fill our stock piles and to meet our domestic needs. Many factories are running half time because they cannot secure enough lead. Does not that, in the opinion of the Senator, present some sort of an emergency?

Mr. BALL. If we are so tremendously short of these minerals, if industries are closing down because they cannot secure them, I wonder why the law of supply and demand, which I always thought operated regardless of what kind of laws we pass here, have not operated to fix a price on these minerals which would result in the increasing production we need in the United States or that is needed anywhere else in the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator that the American stock piles are empty, though there is no tariff at all on lead, copper, and zinc. If we cannot fill our stock piles with lead, copper, and zinc we cannot keep our economy going. That leads us to one of two things: We will either build up those stock piles by increasing our production, or we will have allocation, and allocation does not square with a free-enterprise system.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator completely. I am not in favor of allocation, I am not in favor of price fixing, and I am not in favor of subsidies. If we are going to go Socialist, then I think we ought to face the issue squarely and go all the way. I do not believe in socializing only a part of the economy, and doing it only to the extent of subsidizing a few private producers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator favor filling the stock piles?

Mr. BALL. I am in favor of doing that, but I am not in favor of a few private producers holding a club over the head of the United States, and saying, "We will not produce what you need unless you give us a subsidy." That does not make sense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. How can the United States get these vital strategic materials? It is proposed to take boys into the service through the draft to protect our American system, to protect the private enterprise system.

Mr. BALL. The Senator has raised the question of the draft. Freedom implies responsibility. It implies the responsibility, if necessary, to defend that very system and the freedom which is guaranteed by the laws and the Constitution of this country against all its enemies if the representatives of the

people consider that necessary. Freedom carries with it responsibilities, and the draft is the freest way of providing for the defense of the Nation of which I can conceive. That is much different, I may say to the Senator, from the Government dishing out subsidies to—I do not know how many producers of these minerals there are—dishing out subsidies to them of $80,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator was not in the Chamber—and if he had heard the statement it would perhaps not make any difference so far as his argument is concerned—when the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] said he was going to offer an amendment to make the amount $60,000,000, and to lessen the term from 4 years to 3 years.

Mr. BALL. I do not like subsidies—period. I do not care whether the amount is $35,000,000 or $80,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not care to confuse the two subjects.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I think I have stated my position. I hope the Senate will defeat the motion to consider a bill of this nature involving a subsidy of $80,000,000 a year, which in my opinion is completely repugnant. I am not impressed by the idea that a lot of presidents of corporations want subsidies. I recognize that many business executives in this country do not really believe in a free system. They are always coming here looking for special privilege just like many other groups.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I submit that at this hour of the morning, on the closing day of the session of Congress, is not the time to bring up a question involving the fundamental issues involved in this measure.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator aware that four or five times in the last 12 months the Secretary of the Interior has asked for very large sums of money for exploration, and to increase the production of minerals? I think his first suggestion, 2 or 3 years ago, was that there be an appropriation of $20,000,000,000 for exploration and all. Now he comes down to about one billion.

Mr. BALL. Did the Senator say twenty billion?

Mr. MALONE. I did for a fact.

Mr. BALL. What Secretary of the Interior was that—Mr. Krug?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. Krug.

Mr. BALL. He must be having hallucinations. Twenty billion dollars.

Mr. MALONE. The record is clear, and I would get it and show it to the Senator if the hour were not so late. I want to bring to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota the fact that we have not given him the money, but that we have a choice to make. This plan would put the money into the hands, not of corporations—that does sound very bad. Very few of the large ones would get this particular aid. But the small ones would. Those are the ones it is designed to aid.

Mr. BALL. May I ask the Senator, what is the difference between a large and a small corporation in the United States of America? I do not believe in discrimination.

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the Senator that I am just as much a private-ownership man as he is, as the record will show. But the purpose of giving a Government official $1,000,000,000—and that, I think, was the last request—or any greater amount is to put metal in the stock piles, so as to implement the thing the Senator and I voted for a very few days ago, which is to put the drafted boys on the front line when the shooting starts. We have now seen it happen twice that we have entered into a war with practically bare hands, and now it is proposed to send the drafted boys into the front lines again, if a war should come, without an adequate stock pile of minerals which will be so desperately needed to provide the boys with the necessary munitions.

Perhaps there will not be an emergency tonight, or very soon—we hope there will not be—but if this opportunity is passed up it will mean that we have nearly empty stock piles and we will not produce from present existing facilities needed to fill up the stock piles. If war should come it would be impossible to produce from present existing facilities sufficient minerals to conduct a war. Properly to conduct a war it is necessary that we have a stock pile ready. It is necessary that we have mines operating in this country when the submarines cut off supplies from abroad.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator from Nevada has made an admirable argument in favor of the Government taking over the whole industry. If private enterprise cannot produce the minerals essential to prosperity and a prosperous, abundant economy in the United States, and the needs of our national defense, then I will say it has failed, and we should adopt socialism in that field, but I am not willing to do it by way of a subsidy to a group of private corporations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I approach this question briefly, from another point of view, a little different, perhaps, than that expressed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

I hope very much that this motion will not prevail, and that we shall not take up this bill in the closing hours of this session. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I recall that Mr. Hill appeared before us on several occasions. I think I was present at all of them. At none of them that I can remember did Mr. Hill mention a subject of this character. Subsequently Mr. Kramer, his assistant, came before us in connection with the problem of building up our resources, but Mr. Kramer came before us to preserve, at the cost of several million dollars—not as many as this bill would require, but if I remember rightly, about $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 a year—certain factories and plants which we had built up during the war, and which we were keeping in a mothball condition. Those factories were going to pieces because the machinery was deteriorating and because the conditions under which we kept them were not adequate. So we passed a bill at this session of Congress to make it possible for those factories to be kept in a more active condition, in case we needed more resources in a time of emergency; but at no time, so far as I can remember, did he mention a matter of this character.

More recently I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, which has considered appropriations for the Army and Navy, and ordnance in connection therewith. Certainly so far as the Navy ordnance is concerned, no question was raised as to the building of a stock pile. They asked for very substantial increases for increased ordnance, but they did not mention a subject of this character.

I remember very clearly a speech which was made in this body by my colleague [Mr. LODGE] before he went into the Army in 1943. Whether it was after Pearl Harbor or just before, I cannot remember, but at that time he spoke of the fact that this country was no longer a self-supporting country, and that it never would be again entirely a self-supporting country in the matter of its natural resources. At that time, 8 years ago, he raised this same question of how self-supporting we could be, and how much we could build our supplies of natural resources. So it seems to me that if we are going to consider the question of stock piling there are natural resources which should be given a very complete study before we go into the question of subsidizing, at a very substantial amount each year in the form of Government aid to some of our more marginal production mines.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I merely wish to invite the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that this subject has received repeated study. It has been before the House in extensive hearings several times. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has held lengthy and elaborate hearings on the subject. So far as congressional knowledge is concerned, it is not a subject of complete novelty.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my friend from Colorado that I realize that it is not a complete novelty in any way. What I was trying to bring out was that the question of undertaking a new subsidy on the last night of a session, when there is a very substantial cost involved, should be given very complete debate and thorough study and discussion of what we have and what we have not. I know that my colleague from Colorado is on the committee which has to do with atomic energy. I do not begin to know that subject, but I believe from what I know that there again is a question of some of the resources which perhaps will not always be entirely in this country.

All those questions enter into the picture. But the point I wish to make particularly is that in my personal discussions with Mr. Hill I have never heard this subject mentioned by him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. One of the astonishing things in connection with all these reports and expert opinions is that the experts never come forth with a constructive plan, and they never come forth with a stock pile. Our stock piles are empty, and we do not have enough of these materials for our domestic industry. Here is an affirmative measure to produce additional supplies of strategic materials. We do not pay for anything that is not produced.

What is the alternative? I suggest to the distinguished Senator that the alternative is that which was developed in the colloquy between the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and myself, namely, allocation. Allocation will not fill the stock piles, nor will it fill the bins of our manufacturers who, in many instances, are shut down or partially shut down because they do not have these materials. We must have an affirmative method of increasing the supply of materials. We have removed the tariffs, and the material has not come in, because the needs of other countries are somewhat similar to our own. We are getting some, but still our supply taken from all sources, with no tariff, and free importation, is completely inadequate. We neither supply our domestic peacetime needs nor are we supplying our military stock piles.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me briefly reply to the Senator from Colorado.

My reply to my distinguished colleague is that, as a result of the war, the whole economy of the world today, and our economy in this country are unbalanced. We have the largest peacetime productive income today in the history of our Nation—probably in the history of the world. The Senator knows the figures much better than I do; but if my memory serves me aright, our productive income is running at the rate of $241,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. These statistical inquiries and these interesting philosophical facets of the subject do not put strategic materials in the stock piles, and that is where we need them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there is another reason that appeals to me enormously against adopting this motion at this time, and that is the very fundamental question of the cost. There are some of us in this body who voted against TVA. We may have so voted for several reasons. I know the two reasons why I voted against it. One was the question of cost, ultimately running up to some $84,000,000 in the coming years. The other was, of course, the very deep and fundamental question of the extension of public power in our economy.

This is another bill that would enter a new field and cost approximately $80,000,000 a year running over a period of 4 or 5 years. Eighty million dollars would be the minimum that would be spent. I wish to correct myself because I see the Senator approaching me. The $80,000,000 is a possibility; and there is the administrative cost, in addition to the uncertainty in connection with various other sections of the bill, which may involve a substantial amount over $80,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. By this time all the arguments as to uncertainty have been dispelled, I believe, because the sponsor of the bill has agreed to take out of it one paragraph which I believe was the cause of the uncertainty. He has also agreed to reduce the amount of money involved to $60,000,000 a year and to reduce the term from 4 years to 3 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask if there is not necessarily an intangible amount of ore and metals to be produced, and to be purchased by the RFC, as a result of the incentive payments.

I invite attention to page 8, subparagraph (b), reading, in part, as follows:

(b) All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

So far as I know, no one who has examined this bill has undertaken seriously to estimate what the expenditure there would be. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. I heard the Senator's discussion on that point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The maximum expenditure under the suggested amendment would be $60,000,000 a year.

I think the distinguished Senator from Missouri is overlooking the fact that when the ores are bought, certain reimbursements come back to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which leaves the $60,000,000 available for paying the premium, and the $60,000,000 takes care of the market price, independently of the premium.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether that reimbursement is not provided for at the bottom of page 8. I read:

(c) The Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the current market price for all metals, minerals, and ores placed in the national security stock pile under this section.

In other words, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, is not that just taking the money out of one pocket and putting it in another, and in the last analysis, is not the outlay an outlay by the Government?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood that under the bill the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would put up the money; and then when the goods were purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, they would be taken over into another account.

Mr. KEM. Is not that a payment on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not assume that the Federal Government could stock pile without paying for it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Bureau of Federal Supply is the agency of the Treasury which operates under the appropriation for stock-pile purposes, which already has been made by the Congress. Speaking very roughly, I think they have half a billion dollars available for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope this measure will not be taken up for consideration, because it is a new subject, at a very late hour, so far as most of us are concerned, and it is going to be an expensive subject, and it goes into a whole new form of assistance to our economy.

Mr. President, I ask that the motion be defeated.

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, during this long debate I have noticed that it has been stated over and over again that there is a limitation on the amount which it might cost the Government, that limitation being stated as $80,000,000. That sum is mentioned twice in section 7 of the bill, but it is not a limitation on the amount which this bill would cost the Government.

I draw my colleague's attention to that by reading the words of section 7, which comprises two paragraphs. One is that:

All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any 1 year—

That is one provision. Then there is another provision—

nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any 1 year.

So that is another provision of $80,000,000. Together, those made $160,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. Not yet; I have not finished the sentence.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is a rather long sentence.

Mr. GREEN. Well, I have the floor. I think many Senators who have asked questions have made much longer speeches and have not had them counted against them as their two speeches on this question, and I am not sure but that the Senator who interrupted me is guilty of that himself.

I say that these two limitations of $80,000,000 each make a total of $160,000,000; but that is not all, because that counts only as the disbursements by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and commitments may be made by officers and employees of the United States.

In addition to those two, commitments are to be made by the Bureau itself. That provision has just been read:

All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In other words, there is a third element. That is merely one example of the commitments made by the bill. They do not come under the head of either of the others, and that is an indefinite amount.

So, instead of being $160,000,000, it may be $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 or $500,000,000.

If it is plain, as I have no doubt the Senator who is sitting on the edge of his chair, waiting to ask me a question, will claim, that such commitments are covered by one or the other of the paragraphs previously mentioned, I may say it is very poor drafting, because the words do not bear out the idea.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, let me ask if that is all the objection the Senator from Rhode Island has to the bill? If we cure that, so as to provide for a maximum of $160,000,000, is the Senator willing to vote for this bill then? Is that all the objection the Senator has to it?

Mr. GREEN. It certainly is not.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then I ask the Senator to state the other objection. We should like to have the bill brought up for consideration.

Mr. GREEN. The way to have it brought up for early consideration is not to ask me to restate all the objections which have been stated during the last few hours. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. But I want to find out what the Senator's objection is. He has stated one, and we can cure that one easily enough, if that is his only objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the argument is as illogical as the phasing of the bill is irregular.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I want to know whether the Senator thinks perfecting a bill is an illogical argument.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I think there have been too many so-called questions allowed by the Presiding Officer as questions, when in reality they have been speeches. They really should be counted against the questioner as the first of the two speeches to which he is entitled. I regret the necessity for a ruling of that kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be taken up when the rules are revised.

Mr. GREEN. But I think the Chair has been very lenient in allowing many Senators to make speeches at length in the guise of questions, and long colloquies to be drawn out under the guise of a question and an answer. I thought it my duty to call my colleague's attention to the fact there is no limitation on the number of millions of dollars or, theoretically, billions of dollars, to which the United States Government might be committed if the bill were passed in its present form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to consideration of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a national delegate by the President to the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, meeting in San Francisco, Calif.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Hill	Myers
Baldwin	Ives	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Butler	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Langer	Russell
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
Hatch	Millikin	Young
Hayden	Morse	
Hickenlooper	Murray	

NAYS—28

Ball	Capehart	Green
Barkley	Donnell	Gurney
Bricker	Ellender	Hoey
Brooks	Feazel	Holland
Byrd	Fulbright	Jenner
Kem	O'Daniel	Tydings
Kilgore	Saltonstall	Umstead
McGrath	Smith	Williams
McMahon	Stennis	
Martin	Thye	

NOT VOTING—28

Bridges	Knowland	Stewart
Buck	Lodge	Taylor
Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cain	McClellan	Tobey
Capper	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	Moore	White
Downey	O'Conor	Wiley
Eastland	Reed	Wilson
George	Revercomb	
Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.	

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "and", to insert "maximum"; on page 4, line 16, after the word "after", to strike out "six months" and insert "one year"; and in line 24, after the word "be", to strike out "made" and insert "calculated"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "shall include" and insert "afford opportunity for"; in line 5, after the word "and", to insert "strategic and critical"; in line 13, after the word "payments", to strike out "without regard to payment" and insert "within the"; in line 14, after the word "in", to insert "section 6 of"; and after the word "act", to strike out "on the following basis, namely" and to insert "upon application of any mine operator upon either of the following bases (1)"; on page 6, line 7, after the word "tons", to insert "on (2) exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c)"; in line 13, after the word "accrue", to strike out: "Exploration payments received by an operator shall be deemed gross income within the meaning of section 22, Internal Revenue Code, and all expenditures by such operator for exploration work for which exploration payments are received under this act shall be allowable as deductions under section 23, Internal Revenue Code"; on page 7, line 4, after "(a)", to strike out "Development" and insert "Exploration, development"; in line 7, after the word "mineral", to strike out "such" and insert "The sum of such"; in line 8, after the word "payments", to insert "per unit of production"; and in line 23, after the word "paid", to strike out: "Hereafter all maximum development and conservation payment, limitations provided in this section shall be adjusted by the Director in proportion to each five-point change in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale commodity price index of all commodities (1926 equals 100). These maximum limitations shall apply unless in the opinion of the Director special consideration is necessary for further stimulation of development or production of a particular metal or mineral";

on page 9, line 4, after the word "section", to strike out "and such credits may be expended for purchases and development and conservation payments over and above the limitations imposed in section 7 (a) hereof"; and after line 21, to insert "nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year"; and on page 10, line 7, after the word "provisions", to insert "administration", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Minerals Development and Conservation Act of 1948."

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, and maximum production of strategic and critical metals and minerals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States by providing for the development and conservation of these materials in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials. To this end it is the further policy of the Congress that every effort be made to stimulate, stabilize, and maintain a sound and active mining industry within the United States and to coordinate the programs now provided for or to be provided for by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence; the development, mining preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created within the Department of the Interior a Mine Incentive Payments Division, hereinafter called the "Division."

(b) The administrative officers of the Division shall be a Director, suitably qualified in actual administrative and mining experience, and an Assistant Director. The salaries of the Director and Assistant Director shall be $12,000 per annum and $10,000 per annum, respectively. In the absence of the Director his duties shall be performed by the Assistant Director.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Director, and he is hereby authorized and directed, (1) to perform the functions hereinafter specifically authorized, and (2) to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act in the simplest manner.

(d) The Director may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923 and shall employ such other staff as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 4. All of the functions of the Office of Premium Price Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc, pertaining to the administration of said plan are hereby transferred to the Division, together with all pertinent records and equipment.

SEC. 5. (a) To carry out the purposes of this act, development and conservation payments shall be made hereunder for all ores, metals, and minerals determined to be strategic or critical, pursuant to section 2 (a), Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.), and included in group A of the Munitions Board list of strategic and critical materials, dated January 1948, together with any minerals or metals that subsequently may be added thereto, produced from ores, dumps, tailings, slag piles, and residues (excluding scrap materials), except that in the event that the Munitions Board shall find that further purchases of particular ores, metals, or minerals for national security stock-pile purposes are no longer necessary or shall within 1 year of the date of finding cease to be necessary, then (1) if such finding is made within 30 days after the effective date of this act, no payments shall be made under the authority of this act, except in cases of small mines as hereinafter provided, with respect to such ores, metals, or minerals, and (2) if such finding is made more than 30 days after the effective date of this act, no payments under the authority of this act shall be made with respect to such ores, metals, or minerals, produced after 1 year from the date of such finding except in cases of small mines as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That in the event any such findings are amended by the Munitions Board to the effect that purchases of such ores, metals, or minerals have again become necessary for national security stock-pile purposes the payment provisions of this act shall again become applicable subject to the limitations of this paragraph. Such payments shall be calculated at such rates within the limitations defined in this act so as to encourage exploration and development, increase production, and effect conservation and make reasonable allowances for depreciation and depletion and afford opportunity for a reasonable profit to the producer based upon the values of the recoverable metals and strategic and critical minerals contained in the ores. And in cases of small mines where production in any calendar year is less than 300 tons of recoverable metal, maximum payments shall be made on total production therefrom on application and none of the restrictions other than those of maximum payment limitations shall govern in such cases. Exploration payments shall be made in addition to development and conservation payments within the limitations provided in section 6 of this act, upon application of any mine operator upon either of the following bases: (1) Maximum exploration payments shall be based on production of recoverable metal produced from each mine operation at the rate of 7 cents per pound for the first 250 tons or fraction thereof of metal produced during any calendar year; at the rate of 6 cents per pound for the second 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 5 cents per pound for the third 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 4 cents per pound for the fourth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 3 cents per pound for the fifth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; 2 cents per pound for the sixth 250 tons of metal or fraction thereof; and 1½ cents per pound for all metals produced during any calendar year in excess of 1,500 tons and less than 2,000 tons; on (2) exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c). Exploration payments shall be made monthly, provided expenditures for such work are made prior to the end of the calendar year following the year in which such allowances accrue. It shall be a condition of the making of all such payments that recipients thereof shall pay no royalties on exploration payments or on such portion of the amount received by the producer as is in excess of market prices, except where landowners share in the expense of transportation, milling, and smelting of ores.

(b) In addition to the other powers and duties created by this act, the Director may authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to enter into such contracts as would aid in effectuating the policies of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Exploration, development, and conservation payments for any particular metals or minerals shall be in addition to the amount received per unit from other sources by the producer of the metal or mineral. The sum of such payments per unit of production shall not exceed the difference between the current market price and (1) in the case of metals produced under the premium-price plan, an amount equal to the highest market price plus the production premiums received by any domestic producer during the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive, and (2) in the case of other ores, metals, and minerals an amount equal to the highest amount paid any domestic producer for such metals and minerals during the years 1942 to 1946, inclusive, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its subsidiaries or by other Government departments or agencies, such amounts specified in clauses (1) and (2) hereof to be adjusted by the Director in proportion to the changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price index of all commodities (1926 equals 100) since such highest sums or amounts were first offered or paid. All ores, concentrates, metals, and minerals on which payments are made shall meet previously established minimum industrial specifications or minimum specifications determined by the Munitions Board for the national security stock pile.

(b) All additional ores, metals, and minerals or the equivalent thereof resulting from incentive payments and which comply with Munitions Board minimum stock-pile specifications shall be purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall transfer such ores, metals, and minerals to the national security stock pile established pursuant to Public Law 520 (79th Cong., ch. 590, 2d sess.): *Provided*, That any producer may deliver an equivalent quantity of recoverable metal in form and grade satisfactory to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in lieu of the particular metal or mineral resulting from payments hereunder.

(c) The Bureau of Federal Supply of the Treasury Department shall reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the extent of the current market price for all metals, minerals, and ores placed in the national security stock pile under this section.

(d) Each producer shall at all times have access to a complete file of all copies of all calculations and analyses and all other information or determinations used as a basis for his individual assignment, revision, or denial of development and conservation payments or prices and exploration premiums.

(e) Copies of all rules, regulations, and policies and changes therein shall be furnished to each producer registered with the Division and shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 7. (a) All disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and shall not exceed $80,000,000 in any 1 year, nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments as authorized by this act in excess of $80,000,000 in the aggregate in any 1 year.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this section shall expire June 30, 1952.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the administration of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to submit three amendments, and I ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 10, it is proposed to insert a period after "States" and strike out the remainder of the section, as follows: "and to coordinate the programs now provided for or to be provided for by law for making scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence; the development, mining preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States; and to stimulate the commercial extraction and production of the same"; on page 6, line 7, insert a period in place of the semicolon after the word "tons" and strike out "on (2) exploration payments shall be made at the discretion of the Director in amounts and on projects approved by him under rules as prescribed in section 3 (c)."; on page 7, line 10, after the word "metals", insert the words "that were"; on the same page, line 1, strike the comma after the word "act" and insert "and subject to the limitations of section 7 (a) of this act"; on page 9, line 21, it is proposed to change "$80,000,000" to "$60,000,000"; on page 10, line 3, to change "$80,000,000" to "$60,000,000"; on the same page, line 5, to change "1952" to "1951"; on page 10, line 3, after the word "year" and following the period, insert a new sentence reading, as follows: "During the fiscal year 1949, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of the Interior not to exceed $350,000 for the administration of this act."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall not take much time, except to make a very short statement of a few sentences with regard to this bill. Any bill which looks ahead to the acquisition of critical and rare minerals or other essential war materials is worthy of consideration. Under normal circumstances, a bill coming before the Senate with the recommendation of the committee would receive more consideration from me, at least, than I could give to this measure, for the reason that no one in the Government service and no one connected with the business of national defense has recommended a bill. If it were supported by someone charged with the duty of national defense, such as the Chairman of the Natural Resources Board, and this were a scheme devised to build stock piles which are needed as a matter of defense, I should be delighted to support it; but the truth of the matter is that the bill comes here without any evidence, so far as I know, from anyone except those who are interested in the measure and who come primarily from mining States. This bill, in its last analysis, will cost a great many million dollars; indeed, it could cost several hundred million dollars, even if it were prudently administered. Here at 5 o'clock in the morning, as the sun comes up, it is a pretty large undertaking to commit the Government to a policy calling for an expenditure of more than a quarter of a billion dollars a year for a period of 4 years, without the slightest recommendation of anyone in America connected with or having the prime responsibility for the acquisition and stock piling of resources as a matter of national defense.

We may be very short on many critical materials, and it is our duty as the Congress to repair the shortage as speedily as we can. But there is certainly not the type of bill here, supported by expert testimony, to carry such a project to a conclusion. While I am normally in favor of stock piling of critical and rare minerals, I cannot give my support to this particular bill, for the reasons I have indicated.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, and I direct my request to the proponents of this measure, that, because of the fact that it has become almost a physical impossibility for the reporters, in view of the long period of duty to which they have been subjected, to take the remarks of the Members of the Senate, the Senate recess for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will recess until 5:20 a. m.

On the expiration of the recess, at 5:20 o'clock a. m., the Senate assembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. IVES in the chair).

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if I may ask unanimous consent for a further recess——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, before the Senator does so, will he yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

EXCHANGE OF LAND ALONG MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Public Works, Senate bill 2694, to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes, and to submit a report (No. 1772) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have discussed this bill with the acting majority leader, and I am quite sure there would be no controversy over it. It is unanimously approved by the Public Works Committee. It merely involves an exchange of land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway. A similar bill has been passed by the House. I am advised by those in charge of the highways that the exchange would be very advantageous to the Government. I will say to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that the land involved is in his State. The bill has been urged upon us. The committee has unanimously reported the bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I am sure that it will not involve discussion. If it does, I shall withdraw the request.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senators in charge of the bill which has been under discussion are the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. It is up to them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let me suggest that the Senator be patient so that we can get ahead with the amendments on which we are working.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have been patient for hours. I brought the bill to the attention of the acting majority leader some time ago. I am sure that it will not delay anything. It is more or less a perfunctory matter. If we do not pass the bill now, it will probably die with the Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator agree that if there is any controversy over the bill he will withdraw his request?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I certainly agree to that. If there is any controversy or objection whatsoever, I shall withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The bill is reported by unanimous vote of the committee. It is not on the printed calendar, but it can be considered by the Senate if the Senate will give consent for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2694) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to protect more adequately the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, and to add further to its memorial character, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to carry out the following transactions with the Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp.:

(a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire certain lands in exchange for certain dredging and other rights on land already owned by the United States on the east side of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in Fairfax County, Va., extending from approximately station 426 to station 516 plus 50, shown as areas "A," "B," "C," and "D" on plan No. 105.22 minus 415 in the files of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and more particularly set forth as follows:

(1) To accept on behalf of the United States of America a good and sufficient title in fee simple, free of all encumbrances, to that piece of land lying on the east side of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and extending from approximately opposite station 459 to station 516 plus 50, approximately 5,750 feet in length and averaging approximately 800 feet in width, and containing 110 acres, more or less, and as further shown as area "A" on said plan.

(2) To accept on behalf of the United States of America a good and sufficient title in fee simple, free of all encumbrances, to area "D" lying between area "A" and the Potomac River, and containing 150 acres, more or less; the Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp.

reserving unto itself, its successors and assigns, the right to remove sand and gravel therefrom for a period of 30 years, and for the same period reserving such riparian rights as may exist in area "D."

(3) To permit the Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp., its successors and assigns, to remove sand and gravel from that part of United States property lying east of area "B" and opposite stations 426 to 459, to the extent of 25 acres, more or less, of the total 110 acres in area "C," as shown on said plan, for a period of 20 years, and for the same period granting such riparian rights as may exist in this area.

(4) To require that the scope of dredging operations necessary to remove the sand and gravel in areas "C" and "D" be so limited and conducted as not to undermine the adjacent shores of areas "A" and "B" and to provide that the Government shall have the right of ingress and egress from the Potomac River to the lands marked on the plan as areas "A" and "B" for the purpose of depositing dredged material in those areas; and to allow the workmen employed in the dredging operations at the locations described above to have access to the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway for the purpose of going to and from work, and to park their cars at designated places.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of War are hereby further authorized to prescribe in any contract or contracts entered into pursuant hereto any other terms and conditions deemed necessary to protect the interests of the United States in the above transactions.

(c) All lands acquired by the United States pursuant to this act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service as a part of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and shall be subject to all laws and rules and regulations applicable thereto.

(d) All dredging shall be performed in accordance with plans recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War as provided in section 10 of River and Harbor Act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 U. S. C. 403), as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2790) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT — HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House to Senate bill 2790.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2790) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"CREATION AND POWERS OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 301. (a) The Administrator is further authorized and empowered to provide for the establishment of a Federal National Mortgage Association (hereinafter referred to as the "Association") which shall be authorized, subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Association—

"(1) to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided, however,* That—

"(A) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by, or if it covers property held by, Federal, State, or municipal instrumentalities;

"(B) no mortgage may be purchased for an amount exceeding the unpaid principal balance thereof, plus accrued interest, at the time of purchase;

"(C) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan;

"(D) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase unless offered by the original mortgagee prior to any other sale thereof;

"(E) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by any one mortgagee (1) unless such mortgage is secured by property used, or designed to be used, for residential purposes and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all mortgages purchased by the Association from such mortgagee pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 25 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee which, except for this subparagraph (E), meet the requirements of this section.

"(F) no mortgage shall be purchased by the Association unless the mortgagee certifies that the housing with respect to which the mortgage was made meets the construction standards prescribed for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the National Housing Act, as amended.

"(2) to borrow money for any of the foregoing purposes through the issuance of notes or other such obligations as hereinafter provided.

"(b) The Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and established pursuant to the provisions of this title as in effect prior to June 1, 1948, shall be the Association referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Board of Directors of the Association shall consist of not less than five persons to be appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the Acting Chairman in the case of a vacancy in the office of Chairman, from the Directors, officers, or employees of such Corporation and the officers shall be appointed by the Board of Directors from the Directors, officers, or employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(c) The Association created under this section shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by order of the Administrator as hereinafter provided, or by act of Congress, and shall have power—

"(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) to make contracts;

"(3) to sue and be sued; complain and defend, in any court of law or equity, State or Federal;

"(4) to conduct its business in any State of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, and to have one or more offices in such State, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, one of which offices shall be designated at the time of organization as its principal office;

"(5) to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(d) The Association may have a capital stock of not to exceed $20,000,000 and paid-in surplus of $1,000,000, subscribed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(e) The Association, for the purpose of all actions by or against it, real, personal, or mixed, and all suits in equity, shall be deemed a citizen of the place in which its principal office is located.

"(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation, except the association organized under this section, shall hereafter use the words 'Federal National Mortgage Association' or any combination of such words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days, or both, for each day during which such violation is committed or repeated. The provisions of section 5243 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the association created under this title.

"OBLIGATIONS

"SEC. 302. The Association is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time notes or other obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed (1) 40 times the amount of its capital and surplus, and in no event to exceed (2) the current unpaid principal of mortgages held by it and insured under the provisions of titles II and VI of this act and guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, plus the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit and the amortized value of its investments in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 303. Moneys of the Association not invested in mortgages or in operating facilities shall be kept in cash on hand or on deposit, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that the Association shall keep and maintain such reserves as it may deem necessary.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 304. The Association, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, mortgage loans, income, and stock, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Association shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

"SEC. 305. The Association shall have power to deal with, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash, with a view to assuring a maximum financial return to the association, any property acquired by it as a result of foreclosure proceedings or otherwise.

"LIQUIDATION

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall have power to terminate the existence of the Association and order its liquidation and the winding up of its affairs whenever the Administrator determines, in his judgment, that the need therefor no longer exists. The Association shall make a report of its activities to the Administrator in January and July of each year for the preceding 6 months' period,

which report shall be transmitted to the Congress, together with the Administrator's recommendations thereon."

SEC. 2. Nothing in the amendment made by the first section of this act shall limit the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to service or sell any mortgage purchased prior to the date of the enactment of his act, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgage with respect to which a commitment to purchase was made prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$1,500,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(h) The Corporation may subscribe for the nonassessable stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association: *Provided*, That the total face amount of stock so subscribed for and held by the Corporation shall not exceed at any one time $20,000,000."

SEC. 5. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 207 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of paragraph numbered (2), inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following new proviso: *"And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph (2), a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members, may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may we have some explanation of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I intend to explain it.

The Senate passed a bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], which provided for a secondary market for GI loans. The bill has been rewritten in the House. I have consulted with the author of the bill, and with other Senators who are interested.

In effect, the bill continues the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association to buy and take off the hands of banks mortgages which are insured under section 203 or section 603 of the FHA Act, and also those guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the GI Act. The bill provides approximately $800,000,000 in capital with which such loans may be purchased from banks. The capital is provided by the RFC, which for that purpose is given an increase from one and a half to $2,000,000,000.

In addition to the power given to discount GI loans, one or two other small provisions have been inserted in the bill, relating to veterans, one providing for the incontestability of veterans' loans, similar to the incontestability clause for FHA loans; and another provides for special 95 percent loans on nonprofit cooperative housing corporations whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II. Those provisions relate to another feature, and are strictly provisions for the benefit of veterans.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Ohio advise the Senate in what manner the Senate bill was rewritten in the House, with respect to the issuance or purchase of the GI loans?

Mr. TAFT. The text of the Senate bill was stricken out. The Senate bill provided the capital to the Veterans' Administration. This bill gives it to the Federal National Mortgage Association. It is a complete substitute for the Senate bill, but it does exactly the same thing in a somewhat more restricted way. The original bill provided, I think, for the purchase of something like 60 percent of the loans of any bank. This provides for only 25 percent.

The distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House took the position that there are now approximately $7,000,000,000 of loans outstanding, and that unless we were somewhat restrictive in taking such loans off the hands of banks we might be flooded with billions of dollars worth of such mortgages. So it is provided that a bank may have only 25 percent of its loans rediscounted. I think that is somewhat small, but it is sufficient to last until next spring, when we may deal further with the problem.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What standards are provided for the exercise of this authority by the purchasing agency?

Mr. TAFT. There is no provision, except that it is required that the GI loans must meet the construction standards provided for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the FHA Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the purchasing agency free to decline to purchase such loans?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes. They are not bound to purchase any loans at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I feel that there are a great many amendments which should be made to the bill. While it is not a good bill, it is better than nothing. That is about all we can say about it.

There is one amendment which I should like to offer, but I do not think it would be wise to offer it if it would mean that because of the lateness of the time we would get nothing.

I do not know whether or not Senators generally realize that if we adjourn and merely pass this bill, we shall have continued a freeze in public housing of all the over-income groups. There is now a tremendous demand for the few public-housing units by those who really need them. We cannot blame the public-housing officials for keeping in public housing men receiving $10,000, $12,000, or $20,000 a year, because we have frozen those over-income groups in public housing. If there were any possibility of adding the amendment, to which I am sure the Senate would agree, again placing upon the Public Housing Authority the duty to remove over-income groups and make way for those who really need those units, I should like to offer the amendment. But if the Senator from Ohio believes that by so doing and sending it back to conference it would mean that we would get nothing, I shall refrain from doing so.

Mr. TAFT. I have no hesitation in advising the Senator from Wisconsin that I think it would be exceedingly unwise to attempt to amend the House amendment. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, who wrote this amendment, is a very particular gentleman. He has written it exactly as he wishes it to be. I have no means of knowing whether he would reject the amendment which might be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin or not at this late hour. We hope to adjourn very shortly, as soon as we agree to the conference report on the farm bill.

I think it would be very dangerous, indeed, to attempt to add an amendment and send the bill back to a further conference.

So I feel that if the Senator wants the bill to be enacted into law, he had better not offer an amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think it is inexcusable that we have come up to this late hour with nothing except the little that we have before us. I think it is almost entirely due to the emotional approach which so many of us have made to the housing problem, the insistence that we tie what is known as public housing with everything else we think should be done in a housing bill. Now we wind up with practically nothing at all.

The reason why I am not going to offer the amendment and other amendments which I think should be adopted is that I think the Senator from Ohio is correct, and that if we added some badly needed amendments, perhaps we would get nothing at all; and I think this is slightly better than nothing at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only this to say about a secondary market for

GI loans: The lack of such a market is a serious handicap to building today. In general, the market is very liberal. Certainly the financing of housing is not the bottleneck, except where banks have filled themselves up with this type of loan, and do not propose to take any more loans of this character. There are many regions in the country where the banks will not take any more GI loans. So this bill meets that particular phase of the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio to concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

GOP POLITICS AND THE VETERAN

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relative to 37 Pennsylvania veterans who have been nominated to the position of postmaster in the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

GOP POLITICS AND THE VETERAN

Mr. President, a month or so ago the Senate passed a bill which pleased just about everyone and brought us much praise. The bill provided that over and above present civil-service preferences for veterans and disabled veterans, the Civil Service Commission must exert its efforts toward filling as many jobs in the Government as possible with disabled veterans. Where a nonveteran or even a veteran who is not disabled is selected for a job over a disabled veteran, the Civil Service Commission would be required to file a written explanation for its action in not picking the disabled veteran applicant.

And so the newspapers came out that day with headlines—I have one here from the Philadelphia Bulletin—stating, "Senate seeks more jobs for disabled veterans."

The Senate is always, either collectively or via statements of individual Senators, going on record as favoring the veteran, as recognizing our obligations to our veterans, as being determined to carry out our wartime pledges to these boys.

Memories aren't that short that all of us, Mr. President, cannot remember that flowery accolades streaming up to these iron rafters over our heads during the war for the men who were, a short while ago—4 years ago this month—hitting the beaches of Normandy; for the men battling the weary, steaming path up through the jungles which led to Japan. Three years ago when the Nazis yelled quits and gave in, and when Japan surrendered, pledges were made here—solemn pledges—as to what we would do for these brave men when they came home.

Homes? Why sure, there would be homes—modern American homes—for our soldiers when they came back to the families they had left, when they picked up again the home life that they had interrupted.

Oh well, perhaps the veterans should have realized that when we pledged them homes on their return, homes to replace the ones they left, homes to shelter newly established families, that we made a slight exaggeration and meant homes for those veterans who can afford $15,000 or $20,000 accommodations. Such veterans are getting homes.

And how about those good-paying jobs we promised—jobs which would enable our veterans to enjoy the conveniences of life and to buy the products of our expanding economy? Well, it's true there are jobs for nearly all of our veterans. But the poor fellows are learning, much to their amazement and regret, that the pay checks which would have looked so fancy to them before the war will hardly, today, cover the cost of feeding and sheltering their families—in many cases, not even that. It might be interesting to find out how many of those millions of American families which have had to cash out their war bonds completely, which have so gone into debt that consumer credit today is at the highest level it has ever been in our history—it might be interesting to know how many of these families are the families of veterans who accumulated their war bonds out of meager Army pay and allowances and by sacrifices and hard work on the part of the wives while their husbands were overseas.

The inflation which has been let loose on this country by the selfish action of the Congress 2 years ago in tearing the roof off the price level, in killing price control, has hit hardest at the very fellow we were pledging ourselves three short years ago to show our gratitude—that is, the veteran. The shortage of homes, due to the selfish ignorance of those who have refused to allow the Federal Government to carry through on a gigantic housing program—a private industry housing program—has hit hardest the same fellow, the veteran.

Oh, Mr. President, we sure love the veteran. But it appears that the Congress of the United States seems to feel that the veteran went through so much travail and inconvenience and hardship during the war that he is tough by now and can take the consequences of congressional cruelty.

I would like to address myself for a few minutes to one group of veterans from my State who happen to have been kicked around by the Senate of the United States not just in the same way the Congress has kicked nearly all veterans around in these past 2 years, but kicked around personally, directly, individually.

They happen to be Pennsylvania veterans who took examinations for postmasterships, and they happen to have been selected by the President of the United States for jobs as postmasters on the basis of those examinations, on the basis of their war records, on the basis of their Americanism and their ability.

These men apparently made the mistake of believing that if they were qualified for a position, if they could obtain appointment to a position within the purview of their Government to grant, if their characters were commendable and if they were found not to be disloyal to our country, if they appeared able and willing to do the job for which they were selected, then they could expect the Senate of the United States to say—"All right, fellows, you've earned these jobs; they're yours."

As I said, they apparently made the mistake of believing that things work out here in that fashion. After all, it is the Soviet Union we generally think of these days when we speak of obstructionists, of apple-cart upsetters, when we think of the veto.

The Soviet Union has exercised her veto in the United Nations in order to prevent the UN from taking certain particular actions which the Soviet Union alone—or the Soviet Union and her satellites—thought to be against their interests.

The Senate of the United States—the Republican leadership of this Senate—has used the veto as ruthlessly, as spitefully, as maliciously as the Soviets have used it in the UN. The Republican leadership of the Senate, for purposes of raw political greed, has vetoed the chances of 30 American war veterans of becoming postmasters in Pennsylvania.

After sitting on nomination to postmasterships for months and months and months, the Senate Post Office Committee finally, on Wednesday, let out a dribble of nominations, sent a handful of nominations to the floor for possible action before adjournment of this session of Congress.

Among these were four Pennsylvania war veterans, and the widow of a fifth. The committee sat on these nominations interminably and finally let them out of committee at the very end of the last session of this Congress. I appreciate the committee's action in finally letting these nominations come out. It was, shall I say, decent of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to let four veterans and the widow of a fifth Pennsylvania war veteran come before the Senate for final approval for jobs for which they happen to be fully qualified, for jobs they have earned on their merit, and on their records.

We should all sing hosannahs, Mr. President, to the patriotism of this committee and of the Republican leadership of the Senate for letting these five nominations come out after all these months of refrigeration.

One of these nominations is that of a man who entered the Army as a private in the First World War, qualified eventually for an officership, a second lieutenant, was discharged in 1918, remained active from then on in the Reserve Corps, attended camp nearly every summer, became chairman of his county's Citizens Military Training Corps and stuck with it and went back to active service nearly a year before Pearl Harbor and rose to the rank of colonel; a man who served in steaming India; a man who twice served as commander of an American Legion post.

Isn't it nice, Mr. President, isn't it decent of the Senate Committee finally to give its O. K. to this man, William McCurdy, whom the President selected to be a postmaster at Pitcairn, Pa., a man who happened to be at the very top of the register.

The veterans of America owe the committee and the Senate's Republican leadership the most generous praise and gratitude for finally—finally—after months and months and months of delay—letting this man take his rightful job as postmaster in his home town.

In all the delay in the committee's action on this man's nomination—in all the long months of delay since January 26—there was not, Mr. President, a single word, a single shred of evidence against Colonel McCurdy and his qualifications for the postmastership. Then what held up action, Mr. President?

Now there's another the committee finally let out of its deep-freeze cabinet. He is Walter A. Hilsbos, Jr. He was nominated much more than a year ago, on April 7, 1947, to be postmaster of Oakford, Bucks County. He was naive enough to believe when he was nominated that if he gave the Senate committee a few facts about himself, that the Senate confirmation would be prompt. In May of 1947, he expressed the belief to me in a letter that if I asked the Senate Post Office Committee to do so, it would certainly confirm the nomination of a marine who met all the requirements when our flag was to be put on Mount Suribachi and also met all the requirements of the Civil Service Commission. Well, he was right. The committee would approve him. All he had to do was wait more than a year, however. This was a young fellow who had served 28 days and 28 nights on Iwo Jima. He, too, should bend his knee, I presume, in grateful obeisance for the magnanimous action of the Senate Post Office Committee and the Republican leadership of the Senate in allowing his nomination finally to come before us.

Another of four Pennsylvania war-veteran nominations finally to come out of cold storage is of a Navy man, who served in the Pacific. He is Charles W. Brader, nominated for postmaster at Tannersville, Pa., in Monroe County. He is now acting postmaster. He was nominated January 30, 1948—a long time ago; a long time to wait and wait for the Senate of the United States to say he is a fit citizen—for on what grounds can these nominations be rejected?

Another nomination reported out was that of disabled First World War veteran, Albert Howe, wounded by shrapnel at Verdun in 1918. A combat engineer, he was nominated for postmaster at Vanport in Beaver County. First on the register, he is the father of a boy who flew 39 missions out of Italy in this last war. No protest had been received against his nomination. The committee has no reason we know of to suspect wounded veteran Howe would not make a gocd postmaster. Yet, Mr. President, it has taken since February 7, 1947—16 months—since his nomination was first submitted, for the Post Office Committee of the Senate and for the Republican leadership of the Senate to satisfy themselves that this disabled veteran should be allowed to be a postmaster. Wasn't that nice of them?

A fifth nomination from Pennsylvania reported out was that of Pearl Chappell, widow of a First World War veteran. Her husband died in 1938. She subsequently took an examination for postmaster of Barnesville, in Schuylkill County, and was first on the register. She was nominated last January. Now, finally, she is approved by the committee.

Mrs. Chappell and the four veterans—and I—all thank the committee for these generous favors, for this speedy—shall we say, almost hasty?—action in their behalf. But we rather wonder, Mr. President, what took so long?

Further, Mr. President, I wonder—and so do a lot of other Pennsylvanians wonder—what has happened to the nominations of 31 other Pennsylvania war veterans which are still frozen up in that deep-freeze cabinet in the Senate Post Office Committee.

The 31 ignored veterans are, by and large, no less patriotic, no less honorable Americans than are the 4 whose nominations got out of committee. What happened, Mr. President? What are the measuring rods—the measures of value? What are the criteria?

Let us take one case, for instance. Let's take the case of veteran Woodrow W. S. Lehr of a little town in Pennsylvania called Fogelsville, in Lehigh County. Woodrow Lehr is acting postmaster. He was nominated for the permanent position last March, after having been the only man to qualify by examination. Woodrow Lehr is a veteran. Woodrow Lehr has 14 holes in his body from mortar shrapnel. Woodrow Lehr had nine bones broken. The nerve in Woodrow Lehr's left arm was cut. Woodrow Lehr's nomination to be postmaster at Fogelsville, Pa., is pigeonholed in the Senate Post Office Committee. The Republican Party is keeping it there. The Republican Party seems to feel that Woodrow Lehr doesn't deserve to be postmaster of Fogelsville, Pa.

Why not, Mr. President? Why not? Who shall say he is not deserving or qualified? Who has the gall to say so?

Weren't enough of his bones broken to suit the Republican Party's conception of wounded deserving veteran? Doesn't Woodrow Lehr carry enough shrapnel wounds? Don't his two Battle Stars and his Combat Infantry Badge, his Purple Heart, and the 14 mortar holes and nine bone fractures mean anything to the Republican leadership of this Senate? Are such wounds liabilities to a man seeking an office to which he was properly appointed?

What is the reason, Mr. President, that this nomination is still in committee? I would gladly yield to the chairman of the Senate committee long enough for him to explain to me why this nomination has not come out. I will gladly yield to any Senator who can explain who opposes Woodrow Lehr.

Woodrow Lehr served in France and Belgium and Holland and up to the Siegfried line with the Thirtieth Division. His division lost 1,800 men in a 6-day engagement in Lehr's first battle. When they hit the Siegfried line he was sent back to practice taking pill boxes. On October 2, 1944, the division attacked; all but six men in Lehr's company were either wounded or killed. Lehr was one of those wounded. He was shifted from one hospital to another until November 30, 1946. Both legs and an arm were in a cast for 5 months.

That's quite a record. We were pretty impressed with records like that a few short years ago. Today, a man with a record like that can't be postmaster of Fogelsville, Pa., because the Republican Senate won't let him.

Or, Mr. President, how about Herbert C. Klinger who was nominated by the President for the postmastership at Herndon, Pa., in Northumberland County. Like young Lehr from neighboring Lehigh County, Klinger is now acting postmaster. He was first on his register. The Republican Party serves notice on men like these two that if the GOP wins in November, these veterans lose their post-office positions—positions they have qualified for, have earned.

Klinger enlisted as a volunteer in the Glider Corps. He has ability. He was trained in various enlisted men's schools and finally became a second lieutenant and a navigator. He was a lead navigator-bombardier on a B-17. He was wounded in action over Ludwigshafen, Germany, while bombing a chemical plant. After recovering, he was promoted to first lieutenant. He completed 30 combat missions—30 of them. He won the Distinguished Flying Cross for participating in 25 lead missions over Germany in the command bomber of the groups.

What do you think, Mr. President? This young veteran has the audacity—the gall—the nerve—to think that the Republican Senate would consider confirming him for postmaster of Herndon, Pa. What impudence. What naivete. What complete lack of understanding of the American politics as practiced here by this Republican Senate.

Personally, I am puzzled. I just can't figure what is holding up his nomination. Could it be the proveteran attitude of the Republican Party in the Senate of the United States?

Perhaps the Republican leadership of the Senate believes, despite his 30 missions over Germany, despite his wounds, despite his medal, his DFC, Postmaster-nominee Herbert Klinger, of Herndon, Pa., shouldn't be confirmed because he wasn't in the service long enough to deserve such a great concession from this Republican Senate. After all, he was only in the service for 3½ years.

Well, then, Mr. President, if that is the criterion—and I admit I just don't have any idea what the criterion might be in the Republican leadership's designation of which nominations are to be confirmed and which are to be ignored—what about the case of Wiley C. Hamby, of Salona, Pa.? Salona is in Clinton County. Hamby hasn't had too much opportunity to spend too much time in Salona these past 26 years because he has spent about 24 of them in the Navy. He enlisted in 1922. He stayed in. He was commissioned during the war. He was discharged in August 1946 as a lieutenant, senior grade, and a few months later took the postmaster examination. He was notified that he stood first on the register. He was nominated in January. But has he been confirmed? Has his nomination been approved by the Senate Post Office Committee? It has not.

During the war this man served on the staff of the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet. He was senior communication watch officer in charge of code room and radio communication. He was top secret cipher officer for the Flagship. He was awarded a commendation by Admiral Ingersoll and a Bronze Star by Admiral Jonas Ingram.

But he can't be postmaster at Salona, Pa., because the Republican leadership of the Senate won't let him.

Why, Mr. President? Why?

Mr. President, do you remember the praise we used to heap here on the Navy's famous and courageous Seabees? Well, Eugene William Collins of Altglen, Pa., in Chester County, was a Seabee. He served in New Guinea, in Manus, in Leyte, Luzon, Mendora. He knows everybody in Altglen, Pa. He has a wife and four children. He considers a postmastership a job which carries with it security in return for faithful service. He was nominated months ago—in March. The Republican Party now says he cannot be postmaster. Was his war record bad? It was not. It was spotless. But that doesn't seem to matter here.

George Hawkins Davis of Saxonburg, Pa., in Butler County, served 3 years and 2 days overseas in World War II. Does that carry any weight with a Republican United States Senate? Apparently not. The Senate says, in effect, that unless the Democrats win so that this nomination can be re-submitted, 3 years and 2 days of overseas service do not qualify, or influence in any way, the qualifications of George Hawkins Davis, who is now the acting postmaster, to be postmaster of Saxonburg, Pa.

Nothing, Mr. President, is too good for the veterans of America where this Congress is concerned. Nothing, that is. Just nothing. Nothing is what they get. We make our Flag Day speeches and our Armistice Day speeches and our Memorial Day speeches and we wave the flag all over the place and we shed the biggest crocodile tears you ever saw, and we shed them for the veterans. But when it comes down to the simple matter of letting a veteran take a position which he has earned, this Senate cannot be bothered.

Shame, Mr. President. Shame.

Perhaps the Republican leadership of the Senate believes that these postmaster nominees are not really qualified—that the Civil Service Commission just gave them high ratings for the pure, patriotic fun of it.

Here's Leonard Devilbiss, acting postmaster of Fawn Grove in York County. He was nominated last January. A veteran, yes. Top man on his register, yes. A man with a number of years of business experience before entering the Army. A man who was employed by the War Department as a civilian before entering the service, and was in charge of all procurement in the automotive testing section of the Aberdeen Proving Ground. A man who entered the Army as a private, rose to second lieutenant, and organized and directed, as postal officer, the Army post office in the Army service forces separation center at Camp Atterbury, Ind., supervising the setting up of the physical requirements of the post office, as well as the planning and determination of mailing schedules for incoming and outgoing official and personal mail. Who was also responsible for supervising military personnel in the operation of this post office activity. Doesn't it appear, Mr. President, that such a man would make a fine postmaster for Fawn Grove, York County, and its third-class post office? Wouldn't he, Mr. President, as a veteran, be entitled at least to the courtesy of an explanation from

the Senate Post Office Committee and the Senate Republican leadership for their action in delaying and killing his nomination, in serving notice on him that if the Republicans win in November he is out as postmaster?

Joseph W. Petrovich, acting postmaster of Wilburton, Pa., in Columbia County, served overseas for 28 months of the 3 years he was in the Army. He has had business experience. He has had governmental experience. In the Army, one of his jobs was as supervising clerk of a service shop, in which he supervised 12 workers. The Senate committee, despite Petrovich's standing at the top of the civil-service register, won't let him be confirmed as postmaster. His nomination has been kicking around here since January.

Raymond Stuckey, a World War II veteran and a career employee of the postal service in Newport, Pa., post office in Perry County, was nominated July 12, 1947, nearly a year ago, to be postmaster. His nomination recognized the desire I think all of us share to see career men who are qualified rise in the Government service. We applauded the appointment of a career man—for the first time—to be postmaster general. We have had, in this case, an opportunity to encourage that trend. But Stuckey's nomination died in committee last year and is dying in committee again this year. This is the Republican Senate's method of encouraging career people and encouraging veterans in the Government service.

Steve Vrotny stands first on the register for postmaster at Natrona Heights in Allegheny County. He is a veteran. He was nominated by President Truman on June 27, 1947. No action was taken by the committee. He was renominated last January Again no action. Why?

Robert A. McNaul, nominated to be postmaster of Curwensville in Clearfield County, served both in the Navy and in the Army in the past 10 years. He enlisted in the Navy in 1937, served and was injured in line of duty aboard the USS *Cuyama* a year or so later, was hospitalized and then went back aboard ship and was finally given a medical discharge in August 1949. The Veterans' Administration gave him, at that time, a 10-percent disability rating. He had served 2 years and 19 days in the Navy.

In 1942 McNaul entered the Army and served 3½ years, including overseas service in Belgium and France with a hospital unit, and participated in a major engagement and earned a Battle Star. He was discharged as a technician, 3d grade. He still suffers from his Navy injuries, although his rating is not up to the minimum 10 percent to qualify him for disability preference.

He stands No. 1 on a register of three for this postmastership. He is the only veteran on the register.

Navy service, Army service, a service injury, overseas service, and civil service standing—all of these he has. Yet, he can't be postmaster of Curwensville, Pa., because the Senate won't let him. For all of his service, he is receiving from this Senate dishonorable disservice.

Mr. President, let me tell you about Thurlow C. Brenneman, the acting postmaster of York Haven in York County, Pa. Mr. Brenneman is a veteran. Mr. Brenneman is a disabled veteran. He served with the 90th Division in the European theater and there are two Bronze Stars on his European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign ribbon. He has the Purple Heart. He got it in the Battle of the Bulge. He lost six toes. He is married and has two children. He is a man of good character. He has been acting postmaster at York Haven for more than 2 years. He was a good soldier. He earned the Combat Infantry Badge. He participated in the Ardennes and Rhineland campaigns. This man was nominated to be postmaster of York Haven on March 26, 1947, nearly 15 months ago. The Senate Post Office Committee a year ago allowed the nomination to die in committee. The first session of the Eightieth Congress ended with no action on this nomination. President Truman resubmitted the nomination on January 26, 1948. Again, it is to die in committee. Again, Thurlow Brenneman, disabled war veteran and acting postmaster is to be told by the United States Senate, in effect, that he is not the sort of man they think should be postmaster of York Haven, Pa. Why?

How about Capt. Chester J. Kukleski, now on temporary active duty with the Reserves, assigned as a unit instructor for the training of Reserve officers at Baltimore, Md.? He was nominated about 6 months ago to be postmaster at Braddock, Pa. He was the only veteran to qualify among the top three in the civil-service register. He entered the Army 9 months before Pearl Harbor and worked his way up through the ranks to an officership. He was traffic regulating officer for an ammunition depot on Omaha Beach in 1944. He later was put in command of an ammunition company and had the responsibility for operating an ammunition depot and railhead. He participated in the Normandy, northern France, southern France, and Rhineland campaigns, winning four Battle Stars. He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. The Senate of the United States says, in effect, that despite the fact that he is the only veteran on this register, despite his impressive war record, and despite the responsible work he is now doing for the Army in training officers, in preparing training bulletins, directives, manuals, and handbooks for distribution to units of command and supervising administration and assignment of Reserve officers and enlisted men in training units, he may not be postmaster of Braddock, Pa.

Frank Coughanour, Jr., acting postmaster of Hopwood, Pa., in Fayette County, is another veteran whose nomination for permanent appointment has been strangled to death in committee. Let me, Mr. President, tell you something about Frank Coughanour, Jr. Three weeks after Pearl Harbor, at the age of 17, Frank Coughanour enlisted in the Navy. He served on the USS *Tuscaloosa* and the USS *Guest*. He has two Battle Stars for engagements in the European-African theater and seven Battle Stars for engagements in the Pacific. He was discharged as a seaman, first class. The Senate Post Office Committee and the Senate's Republican leadership, so vocal in their appreciation for the veteran in the abstract, doesn't seem at all impressed when it comes to acting on deserving veterans individually. Is there anything lacking in the qualifications of Frank Coughanour, Jr., to bar his promotion from acting postmaster to postmaster at Hopwood, Pa.? Is it politics? What politics? Whose politics? He is the only eligible for this job.

Kenneth Eugene McQuiston came out of the war a corporal in the marines. He was in the marines for nearly 3 years. He took a civil-service examination to be postmaster of Home, Pa., in Indiana County. He was the only person to qualify. He was nominated last January, but it appears as if he is not going to be confirmed. Marine Corporal McQuiston doesn't fit the Republican leadership of the Senate's idea of fitness for a postmaster. That is the only inference that can be taken for the failure to act on this nomination. He well suited Marine Corps ideas of a good American. Apparently, the marines have different standards from the standards of the Senate Post Office Committee and the Republican Party.

Walter F. Walsh, of Spangler, Pa., in Cambria County, finds it advisable not to tell me or anyone else exactly what it was he did in the Army. The reason for that is that Mr. Walsh, who was nominated to be postmaster of Spangler, had orders from his commanding officer in the Signal Corps not to discuss it with anyone, even prospective employers. This is what Maj. James H. Frier, Jr., wrote to Mr. Walsh at the time this nominee was honorably discharged as a technician, fourth grade:

"It is a pleasure to inform you that the War Department recognizes officially your contribution to the war effort by your faithful service with the Second Signal Service Battalion.

"The confidential nature of your work here prevents you from discussing it with anyone, even prospective employers. You may say that your position here was of a confidential nature. You may also present this letter showing that your work was entirely satisfactory and your average efficiency rating was excellent. Anyone desiring further information may contact this office."

Now here is a man who could be trusted with work so confidential that even after the end of the war, he was under instructions not to discuss it with anyone. Being a mature man of 36 at the time he went into the Army, a family man, it would appear that he was selected for confidential work for which his maturity and judgment suited him. The Civil Service Commission says he qualified to be postmaster of Spangler, Pa. Who says he isn't? Who, Mr. President, will come forward and say that this man is not the right type of American for the postmastership of Spangler, Pa.?

Here is a very interesting case. It is the nomination of Louis J. DePaul, now acting postmaster, to be postmaster of Mount Pocono, Pa., in Monroe County. For some reason, for some mysterious, unfathomable reason, Mr. DePaul's nomination has rigor mortis in committee. It is dead. It won't come out. Since the Senate committee won't approve him, are we to understand that he is not a fit person for the job? Mr. DePaul, a lieutenant in the Naval Reserve, served 3 years, 8 months, and 14 days on active duty. Thirty-two months of that time was spent continuously in overseas service. He was on LST 344. He participated in the initial amphibious assaults and follow-up operations at Gela, Sicily, at Salerno, and the Normandy invasion. He participated in the North African campaign. In the first three campaigns he and his LST were on enemy beaches on D-day. He is a college graduate. In addition to serving as acting postmaster of Mount Pocono, he is the volunteer recruiting officer for the United States Naval Reserve in his district. Before the war he had a year's experience in the Post Office Department here in Washington. All in all, I would say Lieutenant DePaul well earned this postmastership and would make a good postmaster. What does the Senate Post Office Committee say?

Willis C. Latshaw has been acting postmaster of Spring City, Pa., in Chester County since April 16, 1948. In an open competitive examination for the postmastership, he placed first on the register, and he is the only veteran on the register. Mr. Latshaw served in World War I. In the 2 years that he has been acting postmaster he has had every right to look forward to promotion to the permanent postmastership on the basis of his efficiency, ability, and veteran's preference. Yet, the Republican Party, as it operates through the leadership of the Senate, has bottled up Mr. Latshaw's nomination and has taken the position that war service, veteran's preference, civil-service standing—all of these considerations—mean nothing. His nomination is to be salted away and forgotten. This is the Senate which so often

has professed itself to be the friend of the veteran and the friend of civil service.

Another First World War veteran who is at present an acting postmaster and who is also No. 1 on the register is Eaton A. Hartman of Windsor, Pa., in York County. He was a corporal in the Meuse-Argonne offensive in the decisive last months of the First World War. Despite his service, despite his preference, despite his civil-service standing, and despite the Republican Party's solemn platform declaration in 1944 to support, and I quote, "suitable measures to reflect the Nation's gratitude and to discharge its duty toward the veterans of all wars," Mr. Hartman, like Mr. Latshaw, and like all the others I have mentioned whose nominations are frozen in committee, cannot be made postmaster of Windsor, Pa., cannot have the security of permanent status, cannot have the consideration his service and his ability earned for him.

Is this the way the Republican Party carries out its platform pledges, Mr. President? Going through that platform indicates that this is just one of numerous ways in which the Republican Party has demonstrated that its 1944 platform was something to run on, but not to stand on, once elected.

The acting postmaster of Twin Rocks in Cambria County, Pa., is Robert A. Lanzendorfer. He was nominated last January to the permanent position. He was an electronic technician's mate, third class, in the Navy. He spent a year on sea duty in the Pacific. He is an official of his Veterans of Foreign Wars post. He aided in the liberation of the Philippines, but the Republican Party won't let him be a postmaster. He is the only eligible for the job.

Here are some more acting postmasters in Pennsylvania, veterans, men qualified by Civil Service, some top men on their registers, others top among veterans, who can't be postmasters with permanent status at present because the Republican Party won't let them.

There is, for instance, former Master Sgt. William Debreczeni, of Richeyville, in Washington County, Pa., a man who spent 19 months overseas, and was a specialist in air intelligence, helping to chart and analyze enemy activity and enemy strength, and enemy strength and location, and probable intentions, while attached to the Fifteenth Air Force in Italy at the time it was operating in the Balkans and into France and Germany and the Po Valley, a man who once worked in the coal mines. He is the only veteran on his register.

There is Harry T. Richey, acting postmaster of Hyndman, in Bedford County, Pa., No. 1 on his register, a veteran of 4 years in the Navy, of which 2 years 3 months and 2 days were spent overseas; a yeoman, first-class, who was given responsible clerical work, admirably qualifying him for the post-office work he is now doing. His VFW post commander at Hyndman, Charles H. Sides, says that by training and experience, both in civilian and service life, Richey is completely qualified for the job.

There is Thomas J. Zimmerlink, of Allison, in Fayette County, Pa., a radio operator overseas during the war for the Fifty-eighth Army Airways Communication System.

Another one is former First Sgt. Adam C. Dietrich, of East Petersburg, in Lancaster County, Pa., the only veteran on the register, a man with disability preference, a man who served overseas in Oahu and Guam.

These men are not being permitted by the Republican leadership of the United States Senate to take their rightful positions with the security and the prestige of permanent status as postmasters in their home towns. Why, Mr. President? Why? Who has protested their nomination? Who says they aren't fitted? Who says they shouldn't be confirmed?

Douglas McHenry, acting postmaster at Fort Washington, Montgomery County, a veteran of World War I, was first on the register in the civil-service examination for postmaster. He was nominated on July 17, 1947. Again, no action. He was renominated last January. His nomination, like so many others, is being passed over, neglected, ignored.

Let me name a few more veterans who have been pushed around by the Republican Senate personally and individually, for reasons unpublished, unknown, unfathomable:

Joseph Ersagovich, acting postmaster, nominated for postmaster at Crucible in Greene County; Frank W. Thomas, nominated for postmaster at Skytop, in Monroe County; Victor Lescovitz, nominated for postmaster at Midway, in Washington County; Robert N. Eisenhart, nominee for the postmastership at Aspers, Adams County; Michael J. Pagani, acting postmaster and nominee for postmaster at New Galilee, Beaver County; and Malcolm A. Young, Monroeton, Bradford County.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a letter I just received a few days ago from Acting Postmaster John A. Habel, of Garrett, in Somerset County, Pa. Mr. Habel was nominated for postmaster on January 26, 1948, 5 months ago. Here is what he wrote me:

GARRETT, PA., *June 7, 1948.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MYERS: Although I received word several months ago that my name has been sent to the Senate for confirmation as postmaster, I have heard nothing about it since.

Is there any possible chance that my appointment may be confirmed before the adjournment of the present session of Congress? As a veteran with 45 months of service (42 of which were spent overseas), I am most anxious about the security of my position.

Your continued interest and support in my behalf will be greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN A. HABEL,
Acting Postmaster.

Think of it, Mr. President, nearly 4 years in the service; exactly three and a half years spent overseas; shipped overseas only 3 months after he went into the service and left there for 3½ years—and now he cannot be postmaster of Garrett, Pa.

What can I tell Mr. Habel? That the Republican-controlled Senate, in 5 months, has not had time to examine his qualifications? That the Republican-controlled Congress thinks him unfit? That the Republican-controlled Congress is not interested in keeping 1944 Republican platform pledges to the veterans?

Mr. President, it occurs to me that since so many of these nominees are now acting postmasters, that if anything in their backgrounds or their records or their qualifications or their character or their habits or their standing in the community made them unsuitable, unfit or improper to be postmasters, then certainly those who oppose their confirmation, who are holding these nominations in cold storage, in the deep freeze, in the refrigerator of the Senate Post Office Committee, are derelict in their obligations as citizens in not bringing to the attention of the Post Office Department the scandal, if any, in the lives of these men, so that if they are unfit for office, they can be removed for cause from the present responsible positions they now hold.

Contrariwise, if there is nothing damaging in their records either as citizens or as veterans or as acting postmasters—those who now hold such positions—then by all that is right and decent and proper—under the pledges of the Republican Party in 1944 in their platform—these men should be confirmed for the positions to which they have been nominated.

Mr. President, I am amazed, I am disappointed, I am hurt by the arbitrary manner in which this Senate and its Post Office Committee, under the direction of the Republican Party, have allowed only four veterans from Pennsylvania to have their nominations for postmaster confirmed in this entire session of Congress and have arbitrarily ruled out about 30 others, similarly deserving, and have refused to allow their nominations to come to the floor.

What were the standards which were used? What were the criteria? How did the committee decide on the 4 that it approved and on the 30 or so that it refused to approve? If it was on the basis of service records, no standards were followed, because many of these 30 have outstanding service records. It could not have been on the basis of civil service rating. What could it have been?

I invite an answer. But I am afraid there is no Senator, Mr. President, who can, in any conscience, and with any conviction give an answer which will be reasonable or credible. There is only one answer. It is politics at the expense of the veteran.

This is a fine record for the Republican Congress to take to the veterans of America.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three editorials dealing with the housing bill or housing.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

CONGRESS MUST NOT LET THE HOUSING BILL DIE

Omission of any provision for alleviating the housing shortage is by far the worst feature of the whittled-down "must" list of legislation to be passed by Congress before it adjourns.

The Nation's need for housing speaks for itself, through high prices, the virtual disappearance of rental space, doubling up of families, and the existence of trailer camps near many cities. All the arguments and pressures of the real-estate lobby cannot dispel the unpleasant fact that there is a shortage.

Congress had it in its power—and still has—to do something toward solving the problem. More than 6 weeks ago, the Senate passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill, which aimed at spurring the construction of 15,000,000 new housing units over the next 10 years.

That the House had done nothing about the measure since then is a tribute to its stubbornness, but not to its willingness to come to grips with a national need. Because of their opposition to the public-housing feature, a relatively few men have blocked the legislation, even though it contains many necessary inducements for continuing private building.

Attacks on the modest public-housing provision gloss over the fact that present high prices of homes put them out of reach of large numbers of families, including those of veterans. Opponents of any Federal low-cost housing program refuse to acknowledge the effects of the wartime halt in construction on the Nation's housing requirements.

It would take but a few hours of Congress' remaining time to complete action on a housing program. All that is needed is a decision to face the problem. The leaders of Congress should decide without further delay that they, and the Nation, cannot afford to let the housing bill die.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 14, 1948]

PA PITT AND THE T-E-W BILL

The Allegheny Conference on Community Development, in urging passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, rightly sees that measure as essential to Pittsburgh's as well as the Nation's welfare. Certainly private enterprise here and elsewhere has proved itself unable to meet the desperate need for low-cost rental housing—simply because it is just not profitable for builders to put up such units.

The T-E-W bill, which the Senate has already approved, would overcome this condition by making Federal loans and subsidy grants to municipalities in order to finance construction of 500,000 housing units over the next 4 years. This, of course, would greatly benefit Pittsburgh.

Moreover, the T-E-W bill would help the city in another way. One section of the measure permits the Federal Government to "write down" some of the cost of redeveloping local slum areas and other deteriorated districts. With this aid, the conference's executive director, Park H. Martin, notes, "the Pittsburgh Redevelopment Authority would be in a position to make a full-scale attack upon the city's blighted districts."

Actually, unless Federal assistance is forthcoming, there is no real hope of meeting the Nation's housing crisis or of ridding Pittsburgh and other American metropolitan areas of the cancer of slums. The support now given the T-E-W bill by the Allegheny Conference should spur district Congressmen to do all they can to bring the measure, presently bottled up in committee, to an early vote in the House.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 18, 1948]

THE HOUSING FIASCO

The Republican leadership in the House has resorted to unconscionable procedure in denying the American people an adequate long-range housing program.

After a long, bitter struggle, the House Banking Committee last week approved legislation substantially in accord with the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. That measure, already passed twice by the Senate, included provisions for public housing, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment. It was a broad approach to this country's greatest domestic need.

But then the Rules Committee, led by Chairman LEO S. ALLEN, vetoed the Banking Committee's action by voting 6 to 2 to table the legislation. Now Chairman WOLCOTT of the Banking Committee has come forth with another housing bill, an emasculated document eliminating the public-housing features of the T-E-W bill. It is expected to reach the floor under an airtight gag rule. The only hope now for a decent housing bill lies in the meager possibility that eventually the Senate might prevail in a joint conference.

Perhaps the best way to drive home the real nature of the blow the House leadership has dealt ill-housed Americans is to state briefly what it means to the Pittsburgh district.

It means, first, that the Pittsburgh Housing Authority's plans for 7,000 more badly needed low-rent housing units, now on file in Washington, are stymied. The need of 62,000 families in the district's lower rent market, like those of thousands of others over the Nation, have been ignored. The 30,000 families actively applying for low-rent housing here can continue to cool their heels.

The House action means that work of Pittsburgh's new urban redevelopment authority is severely handicapped. The law creating the authority provides quite properly that before a blighted area can be cleared for redevelopment, housing provisions must be made for persons who will be dislocated. Invariably, such areas are tenanted by those in the lower-income brackets, whose housing needs private industry has been unable to meet. The T-E-W bill would make available funds for the redevelopment work.

The T-E-W bill also provided for a subsidy to bridge the gap between the cost of acquiring land for urban redevelopment and the use value of the land after it is cleared. Moreover, it encouraged private housing projects by guaranteeing returns to large-scale investors like insurance companies.

Now these provisions, constituting the real backbone of a housing bill, have been knocked out by the House leadership.

Apparently the reactionary Martin-Halleck-Taber-Allen-Wolcott clique in the House cares not how many campaign obstacles it puts in the way of the man its party will nominate next week in Philadelphia.

RAY FOLEY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press congratulating Mr. Ray Foley.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS, RAY FOLEY

Today's chamber of commerce luncheon honoring Raymond M. Foley is a fitting and well-deserved tribute to a former Pontiac resident.

His unusual ability, unquestioned integrity, and devotion to the tasks at hand have highlighted the Washington career of Federal Housing Administrator Foley. They have enabled him to achieve a success in National Government equaled by few appointive officeholders.

Without resort to the political maneuverings of lesser men, Ray Foley has won a national reputation in an office so politically trying it has broken several predecessors.

Not only has he earned the confidence and respect of his own party, but of Republicans as well. His contribution to good government also has won him the unusual recognition of an honorary degree which was conferred on him Wednesday evening by the University of Detroit.

No one in Pontiac who has known him is surprised by Ray Foley's Washington success.

He would succeed in any chosen field.

He doesn't know how to slight a task.

In the finest and fullest meaning of the words, he is a former home-town resident who has made good in one of the most difficult appointive posts in our National Capital.

We of the Daily Press who worked with him when he was our managing editor are proud to join the congratulations extended to him.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a notice of public hearings which will be held during the adjournment by a special subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The special subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee authorized by Senate Resolution 241 to conduct an inquiry into existing legislation concerning Government policy affecting the activities of the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission and impact of recent Supreme and other court decisions relative to basing-point or freight-equalization system of pricing and its effect upon small and large business and the American consumers and the trend toward economic concentration will hold hearings during the recess of the Congress to receive information and suggestions pertaining to the subject matter of the Senate resolution.

The exact date for the commencement of these hearings cannot now be stated. Further information as to the dates will appear in the public press.

Any person or organization wishing to testify or offer information on this subject matter to the subcommittee may do so by notifying the office of the subcommittee chairman, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, room 140, Senate Office Building. Telephone National 3120, extension 814.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 10, it is proposed to insert a period after the word "States", and to strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$80,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, in line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$80,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10 in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "1952" and insert "1951."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Nevada considered offering an amendment to meet the criticism which was raised by the Senator from Missouri to the committee amendment on pages 9 and 10, so that it would be clear that the $60,000,000 provided shall be a limitation both on the disbursements for exploration and development and on commitments of every kind?

Mr. MALONE. I do not quite understand the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair finds that the Senator from Nevada has sent to the desk three other amendments, which have not yet been stated or considered.

The Chair suggests that the Senator from Wyoming defer his remarks until after the reading of the amendments.

The first amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, in line 7, it is proposed to insert a period in place of the semicolon after the word "tons", and to strike out the remainder of line 7 and lines 8 and 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, in line 10, after the word "metals" it is proposed to insert "that were."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out the comma after the word "act", in line 1, and to insert "and subject to the limitations of section 7 (a) of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, in line 3, after the word "year" and the period, it is proposed to insert a new sentence, reading as follows:

During the fiscal year 1949 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of the Interior not to exceed $350,000 for the administration of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I tried to get the attention of the Chair in regard to the last amendment which was acted upon. I have tried to obtain the attention of the Senator from Nevada and those who have been following this bill.

We wish to meet the criticism made by the Senator from Missouri and also by the Senator from Rhode Island: namely, that there is a double authorization in section 7. The committee amendment which begins in line 22, on page 9, and ends at the end of line 3 on page 10, should be revised to read as follows:

Nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments or payments for administrative expenses as authorized by this act in excess of $60,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year, nor shall any such disbursement be made in excess of such sum.

Such a statement would definitely tie the two together, and would also bring the administrative expense within the $60,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the amendment which the Senator has sent to the desk, the administrative expense would be beyond the $80,000,000; would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I certainly think it would be a good thing to clarify the possibility of a double authorization there, so that there could be no question whether the $60,000,000 is to be subtracted from the $80,000,000, or added to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the fact that the measure has been criticized because of the expenditures involved—although those of us who have supported the bill feel that in view of the great necessity for the building up of stock piles it is justified—I think it would be proper to have all the amounts in one authorization.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator read it again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to read it as a whole, so that the entire committee amendment, as amended, will be understood:

Nor shall any commitment be made by any officer or employee of the United States which obligates the United States Government (including all departments and agencies thereof) to make disbursements for exploration and development and conservation payments or payments for administrative expenses as authorized by this act in excess of $60,000,000 in the aggregate in any one year, nor shall any disbursement be made in excess of such sum.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator be willing to include in that limitation the amounts expended for additional ores, metals, or minerals or the equivalent thereof, under the provisions of subsection (b) on page 8? It is my understanding that it is the contention of the proponents of the bill that the over-all expense to the Government shall not exceed $80,000,000 a year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to offer another amendment which would cover that point.

Mr. MALONE. If I may explain, that is not the entire expense of the Government. It is an expense incurred by the Board under the pending bill. The Stock-Piling Act provides the amount of money to buy the mineral. This is the amount of money the producers get.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. If I might finish my explanation, that is the money provided in the bill for the development payments. It is confined to the $80,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not want to interrupt. There did not seem to be anything going on. I should like to get the floor as soon as I can. I have waited 5 hours now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment which I suggest the Senators from Nevada and Colorado accept.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question arises, in that case, on reconsidering the committee amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. KEM. Is the Senator from Wyoming including in the limitation the amounts paid for the acquisition of title to ores and metals?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator referring to subparagraph (b) on page 8?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not included in this amendment, but I have another amendment that I shall submit with respect to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on reconsidering the committee amendment. Is there objection to the reconsideration thereof? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendment is reconsidered.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Barkley	Holland	Revercomb
Brewster	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Connally	Kilgore	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Donnell	Lucas	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McGrath	Umstead
Feazel	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 8, line 15, after the word "corporation", I move to insert the words "within the limitations of section 7."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open for further amendment.

If there be no further amendments, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Barkley	Holland	Revercomb
Brewster	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Connally	Kilgore	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Stewart
Donnell	Lucas	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McGrath	Umstead
Feazel	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the final passage of Senate bill 2756.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not for a minute pose as an expert in the mining business. I have had, however, an opportunity for observation of that business in connection with the practice of law. In my judgment, there is nothing wrong with the metal market that a higher price will not cure. Most minerals are produced and come into use when the price is raised. If the price is lowered they go into hiding or are not produced. The same applies to the metals with which we are dealing. When the price is increased, production is increased; when the price is reduced, production falls off. There is no problem faced by the small mine today that cannot be cured by high Government metal prices. The proponents of the bill say it is the small mine in which they are particularly interested. What such producers need, in my judgment, and in the judgment of many experienced mining men, is a higher price.

We have never had and never will have, even with subsidies, a sufficiently high price in the United States to justify the operation of every prospect of every kind in the country. That is the dilemma faced by those who currently urge subsidies based upon some such system as proposed in this bill—this price premium plan. They do not know where to draw the line without hurting somebody. If, for example, they believe that a subsidy amounting to 5 cents a pound should be given to eligible lead properties, any mines that could not operate short of the current price of 15 cents plus 5 cents a pound subsidy would feel discriminated against.

I wish to put this question to the Senate, Is it not better for a free market to decide whether a mine shall operate, rather than to have it depend on a Government subsidy? We have had Government subsidies in the past. We had them as recently as last June. We know from recent experience what the subsidy does and what the free market does. I placed in the RECORD a few minutes ago the records of production in different parts of the United States under the free-market plan and under the subsidy plan, and those figures show conclusively that in almost every district the production was larger under the free market than under a fixed regimented subsidy plan.

There is another immediate aspect of subsidies, Mr. President, which I think has been lost sight of, namely, its very impact on the metal market. In times of rising demands for metals and an unsaturated market, the metal produced by virtue of subsidies, if sold on the open market, has a restraining influence as a brake on a higher market. The effect is just the reverse when the market becomes filled and there is oversupply. Then sales of comparatively modest tonnages might even be demoralizing in their influence.

The only experience we have had in this country with subsidies in metal markets, so far as I know, was the recent one during the war that terminated in June 1947. That was a price premium plan not unlike that proposed in the pending bill.

I quoted some time ago the statement of Mr. Andrew Fletcher, the president of the St. Joseph Lead Co., to the effect that there was a marked drop in efficiency in mines operating in the southeast Missouri district during the operation of the plan because inefficiency was paid for by the Government. There is no incentive, there is no impetus, to the private operator to be efficient, insistent on a full day's work for a full day's pay, when the Government is holding an umbrella over the entire operation. I believe, on adequate evidence, that this experience was had by many mines in our State operating under the premium-price plan.

Some advocates of subsidies say what they are interested in is the marginal mine. I assume by "marginal mine" they mean one that never appeared profitable in a free market. The argument is based, I understand, on the fact that increased production is necessary today. The contention is made that this is only procurable from marginal production; that they have to open up these marginal mines in order to supply the demand.

Let us see how that works out. The record does not bear out the contention. Recently the Hero mines indicated in its statistical report that 51 mines had been closed because of the termination of the premium-price plan. These 51 mines, closed for that reason, accounted for only 600 tons of lead a month. Of course, 600 tons a month is a very minor matter in a market which produces and consumes a hundred thousand tons and more a month.

As I have said, strangely enough the termination of the premium-price plan came along in June 1947, and, contrary to the expectations of many who studied the situation, instead of falling off, production increased.

I remember very well when a similar bill was under consideration by the Senate in the closing days of the last session. The feeling on the part of the proponents of the bill was that if the price-premium plan were allowed to expire, the whole metal business would go to pot; that very dire consequences would ensue. Induced by that feeling the Congress passed a bill providing for a price-premium plan. The bill, as I recollect, was vetoed by the President. So there was no price-premium plan, but the dire consequences predicted did not ensue. To the contrary production increased.

This production increased, due partly to the migration of labor from subsidized markets where the output per mine is low, to the larger mines with richer ores where the metal output per day is bound to be higher.

If these gentlemen are really concerned about the actual amount of metal available for military purposes, if they think that the stock piles require increases in size, I think it is clear from the record that the place to secure those increases is not through sending out a lot of people boondoggling and trying to open up some new mines or trying to open some marginal properties, and get them into production again, but to turn to the large, known mineral deposits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri suspend while the Senate may receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2767) to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following

concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

House Concurrent Resolution 218

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Sunday, June 20, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m. on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock m. on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

House Concurrent Resolution 219

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator from Illinois move the adoption of the report on the farm bill so we can get out of here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is just about to recognize the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] if the Senator from Missouri will be so kind as to yield to him.

Mr KEM. I yield without protest.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of the RECORD, p. 9338.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. AIKEN. The conference report, Mr. President, embodies that part of the House bill which provided temporary price supports for the six basic commodities and for milk, hogs, chickens, and eggs, at 90 percent of parity or comparable price for 1 year. At the conclusion of the 1 year titles III and IV of the Senate long-range farm program, which are the price-support part of the farm program, come into effect and continue thereon.

That, in brief, is what the conference bill is.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont what disposition was accorded the so-called tobacco amendment. Is it still in the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendments adopted by the Senate are still in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under this bill the amendment which extended the present situation for 2 years has been modified to extend for 1 year, although the bill adopted by the Senate a few days ago takes on from thereon without any change in the Senate bill as passed.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The higher support levels the House proposed will prevail for 1 year instead of a year and a half. Then the titles III and IV of the Senate bill take effect on January 1, 1950, instead of 1949, the date fixed in the bill as it passed the Senate.

There is one little amendment in the conference report which does fix a base period for Maryland 32 tobacco for the period of 1 year.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is in what would be the House bill?

The AIKEN. That is in what would be the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall say only two or three words. I congratulate the Senator from Vermont for the rugged obstinacy he has shown in securing the enactment of his bill. I am glad that we have 1 year to operate under the present program for I believe present laws are more advantageous to the farmers of the country than the Aiken bill which takes effect in January 1950.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Georgia include, along with the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly would not deny any honors the Senate conferees deserve, and they deserve the very highest accolade for imposing their will on the House. I refer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] who, I believe, were the conferees on the part of the Senate. But the Senator from Vermont, being the author of the bill, I thought was entitled to perhaps a small measure of credit larger than the other conferees.

Mr. President, I hope the committees of the two Houses which have to deal with agricultural matters will carefully study this legislation, because it has come upon us here at the end of a very lengthy session, a tiring session, and that they will examine it in the 1 year interim we have.

I think the general principle embodied in the Aiken bill is excellent for a normal period in this country. I have not yet been able to reconcile it in my mind as desirable under present conditions, in view of the great demands that are being made and that will be made upon American agriculture to increase production, because I do not believe sufficient incentives are provided to maintain the high levels of production in the future to enable us to meet our commitments under the Marshall plan. In any event, I am still opposed to any program to reduce the amount of parity and commodity loans. Farm income is not too high and Aiken bill will reduce it materially. I hope the next Congress will rewrite the Aiken bill before it takes effect and thereby avoid loss to the already underpaid farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RECRUITMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2767) to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment, which were, on page 1, lines 3 and 4, to strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency", and on page 2, line 20, to strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency."

Mr. AIKEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to take up the consideration of the bill (S. 2756) to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals in the interest of national defense and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as I have been saying, there is no reason for speculation as to the effect of the price premium plan on production, because we have the actual figures of last year and of this year showing what the production was under the premium plan and what it has been since. I have put it in the RECORD. It is available there.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KEM. I will yield without prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields without prejudice.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask unanimous consent, and without prejudice at all to the Senator from Missouri, to have the Senate consider two stamp bills. When they were reached on the calendar I objected

to one, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] objected to the other. I do not believe any other Senator objects to the two bills. I want to get them acted upon and off the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to permit the Senator from South Carolina to have action on the bills to which he has referred?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, if it will have no effect on me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assures the Senator from Missouri that he can resume after action has been taken on the two bills in question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have some information. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Senate consider what bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. House Joint Resolution 327, Calendar 1741, and House Joint Resolution 305, Calendar 1753. Both measures provide authorization for issuance of a special series of stamps. When the calendar was called I objected to one measure and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] objected to the other.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I have indicated, I have been waiting very patiently for the bill which was next on the list presented. I do not think it will take a very long time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If there is any opposition——

Mr. BREWSTER. I had understood that we were to terminate the discussion long before now. The bill to which I refer is a bill which very much concerns our national defense, one which the House has passed, and upon which it is awaiting our action. I want to have it considered by this body before we go away, and I must ask that we proceed as promptly as possible to that end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BREWSTER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as I was saying, I have heretofore inserted in the RECORD a monthly tabulation of the mine production by States which shows that lead and zinc production actually increased, with certain minor exceptions, after the premium plan was ended. From expressions on the floor, there seems to be a particular interest in the proposed price premium plan in the Western States.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri please yield to the Senator from Nebraska, without prejudice?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Before we adjourn——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we are not going to adjourn right now. We are going to transact some further business.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I believe it is planned to have an executive session and take up the question of postmasters.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall ask the Senate to be patient while we proceed.

Mr. President, I see no reason for not laying down the concurrent resolution which has come over from the House. I ask it be laid before the Senate at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the concurrent resolution is laid before the Senate, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wished to ask my good friend from Nebraska what time he thought we might adjourn?

Mr. WHERRY. We have some other things to do. We plan to adjourn just as soon as we can.

Mr. MAYBANK. What time would the Senator guess?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot tell the Senator. It will not be long.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator wishes to ask unanimous consent to take up the oleomargarine bill——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the pending bill been abandoned or laid aside?

Mr. WHERRY. No; this is a privileged matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending bill is still the unfinished business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Sunday, June 20, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair points out that the concurrent resolution is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to say a few words.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wish to observe that in my opinion a resolution of this sort is really in violation of the provision of the Constitution with respect to the calling back of Congress by the President of the United States.

When the Democrats were in the majority, the Republicans insisted that a provision of this sort go into the resolution of adjournment; otherwise, they would fight the adjournment. But in the resolution we always gave the minority some voice in determining whether the Congress should be called back, even in an unconstitutional way. I am wondering why it is, in this resolution, that only the majority are to be consulted as to whether Congress shall be called back. Also, why is the adjournment proposed to be taken until the 31st of December, when the new Congress will meet on the third day of January?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is precedent for this resolution. It is almost identical with the one adopted last year.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, but that still does not satisfy my inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. I am giving the Senator one reason. If he will give me sufficient time, I can give him several more reasons. That is the first one.

The second reason is that I am quite satisfied that the minority leader would agree with the proponents of the resolution that the President has a right to bring the Congress back. He happens to be of the same party as the distinguished minority leader. The resolution provides that the opposite party, through their constitutional officers, have the right to summon the Congress back to their duties if it becomes necessary. That is reason No. 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say further that heretofore all such resolutions have been adopted as a matter of expediency. I have never yielded in my opinion that they are not constitutional. We cannot by concurrent resolution modify the Constitution of the United States which provides for an adjournment of Congress, to be called back by the President of the United States under extraordinary circumstances.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a debatable question, and the Senator has a perfect right to his opinion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky sponsored resolutions exactly like this when he was majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. But it was on the demand of the minority, who would have been unwilling to adjourn unless we had done it.

Mr. TAFT. The argument that it is unconstitutional hardly lies in the Senator's mouth. He must at that time have satisfied his doubts as to the constitu-

tionality or I presume he would not have sponsored such a resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I stated that we adopted similar resolutions as a matter of expediency, because the minority even threatened to bring about the failure of an effort to recess or adjourn unless we included them in the power to bring Congress back.

Mr. TAFT. But at the present time the Democratic Party, represented by the President, can bring Congress back at any time. This resolution in no way limits the power of the President to call us back, as he did last year, during the recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator contending that he has more faith in the President of the United States than he has in the officers of the minority?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all; but so far as calling Congress back on its own motion is concerned, the Republican Party had no representation whatever. The only purpose of giving some right to call Congress back was to allow the minority party during the war to have some voice—not a final voice, but some voice. I think it was a final voice. I think the two Republican leaders could have done it, if there had been no other way in which the Republican Party could call Congress back.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wished to call attention to the difference between the resolution now proposed and the kind of resolution we sponsored when we were in the majority in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is the identical wording of the resolution adopted last year, which I think provided equal rights for all those who wanted them. It worked out very satisfactorily.

Mr. BARKLEY. That reminds me—what about the equal-rights amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. That is another measure which we have on the calendar. Would the Senator like to have it taken up at this session?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am merely asking the Senator——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has been after me day after day to adjourn with this type of resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. I know what the Senator has told me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have said that I would cooperate in adjournment, but I never have said——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is one of those who has been complaining about adjournment, but I suppose he has his railroad ticket in his pocket right now.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's supposition is as erroneous in that respect as it is on everything else.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The resolution is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry if a mere inquiry has stirred up so much discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky was proceeding under unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to make only one observation with respect to the statement of the Senator from Nebraska and the statement of the Senator from Ohio. The reason I regard this resolution as being unfair to the minority is based upon the fact that life is uncertain. We all hope and pray that nothing will happen to the present President of the United States. But in the event that providence should intervene to remove him from this scene of action, under the legislation sponsored by the Senator from Nebraska he would be succeeded by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and in that event the minority would be absolutely helpless and would be denied the rights of the minority when the majority was in power.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nebraska a question, by unanimous consent: Why the hiatus between the 31st of December and the 3d of January, when the new Congress assembles?

Mr. WHERRY. New Year's Day falls on Saturday and is a holiday. Tuesday, January 3, is the day when the Congress would ordinarily convene. I think December 31 was selected, so that the Congress could come back without interfering with the meeting of the new Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, the Congress would automatically have to come back.

Mr. WHERRY. At any rate, I gave the reasons; and now that the concurrent resolution has been adopted, I am satisfied that there will be no quarrel about it.

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., OF MAINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to contain my very deep expressions of appreciation to our majority leader, Mr. WALLACE WHITE, for the advice and counsel he has given to me during my term in the Senate. I am wishing for him very many years of happy living, following his retirement from the Senate this year.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 219), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

NORTHWEST FLOOD-RELIEF LEGISLATION—INTERPRETATIONS BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed Senate bill 2877, a bill which seeks to afford some permanent housing relief to the flood victims of the Pacific Northwest.

The bill was so amended in the House of Representatives that it will provide very little relief to the flood victims. Nevertheless, in order that the matter might be clarified, I sent to Mr. Dougherty, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under date of June 13, 1948, a letter concerning certain questions as to interpretations by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of Senate bill 2877. Under date of June 18, 1948, I received a reply to my letter. I ask that the two letters be inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 18, 1948.

Mr. JAMES L. DOUGHERTY,
General Counsel, Reconstruction Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOUGHERTY: In conference yesterday with members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, we worked out a bill to thoroughly adapt the RFC disaster loan operations to the situation resulting from the flood in the Pacific Northwest. In view of the understandings reached and statements made at that time I am anxious to have certain questions answered regarding operations under the bill.

You will recall that the bill which I had introduced clearly recognized and made adequate provisions for a direct and open subsidy operation where necessary to provide housing for families deprived of housing as a result of the Vanport flood disaster and who could not afford to buy or rent existing housing.

You will recall that in the course of discussions with the committee it was clearly pointed out that if the RFC disaster loan operation was to meet this portion of the need, the RFC would be required to take substantial losses on disaster loans made for this purpose. Furthermore, in this connection, in response to my questions you stated that this is clearly contemplated by the RFC. I think it would be desirable if this understanding were confirmed in writing.

I am listing below several statements of your undertakings which I would like to have confirmed. I am sure you agree that this information must be made available to the public officials and the people of the communities in the flood area at once. The RFC bill was substituted for my bill upon the understanding that it would meet fully the objectives which I had in mind, which were contained in my bill and which are obviously necessary to meet the needs of these disaster victims. If the bill is to achieve these objectives, all parties concerned must be fully conversant with the program which you stated the RFC would undertake and carry forward expeditiously under the terms of this bill.

1. The RFC will be able to make loans to former residents of Vanport for both the purchase of existing or new dwellings and the construction of dwellings.

2. The granting of such a loan by the RFC will be based solely on the need of the family for housing and such loans will not be denied

because the income of any family is too low or too uncertain to assure repayment of the RFC loan under normal mortgage loan payment and amortization schedule.

3. The RFC will be able to establish low monthly payments within the means of the former Vanport families, with a balloon payment subject to refinancing at the end of the twenty-fifth year.

4. In the event that the borrower fails to meet monthly payments on the RFC loan, except in the case of a willful failure to meet monthly payments, the RFC will undertake to refinance or otherwise adjust the debt and payments to avoid foreclosure. If foreclosure is thereafter necessary, the RFC will not obtain any deficiency judgment against the borrower as a result of any foreclosure sale, and will not dispossess the borrower, except for waste or other misuse of the property, and will offer the borrower continued occupancy as tenant for at least 5 years on terms reasonably suited to his ability to pay.

5. The RFC is prepared to make a loan or loans to the Portland Housing Authority for the construction and ownership of large-scale rental-housing projects for rental to families formerly residents of Vanport who cannot pay economic rents and thus cannot assure sufficient income to assure repayment of the RFC loan over a 25-year period. The RFC will be able and willing to make such loans in order to meet this need which has resulted from the flood disaster even if the making of such loans involves the possibility or probability of substantial deferments of principal and interest and eventual loss at the end of the mortgage term. The RFC will not find it necessary to pass upon the proposed rent schedules of projects of this type, but will rely upon the physical properties as its security for the ultimate repayment of the loan.

I await your confirmation of these understandings in order that I may apprise local officials of this program at the earliest possible moment.

Yours very truly,

WAYNE MORSE.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1948.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have your letter of June 18, 1948, requesting a written reaction of this Corporation to the series of statements outlined therein with regard to the operations of this Corporation in connection with the disastrous flood situation existing in the Pacific Northwest.

You mention that the bill which you introduced clearly recognized and made adequate provisions for direct and open subsidy operation where necessary to provide housing for needy families, and that in lieu of your bill the modifications proposed to be made in the RFC bill with respect to disaster loan operations would constitute a substitute for the bill which you had introduced and that RFC would be required to take substantial losses on disaster loans made for housing purposes. The amendatory bill which was voted out of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and passed by the Senate on Wednesday, June 16, 1948, had the effect of making two changes in the present RFC bill. The first was to eliminate the maturity limit of 10 years on disaster loans with the understanding that the loan maturity would not exceed 25 years, and secondly, increased the amount that this Corporation may have outstanding at any one time in disaster loans from $25,000,000 to $45,000,000. There was, however, no change made in the basic lending authority of the Corporation for disaster purposes, and we are of the opinion that the present RFC bill, as amended by the Senate, does not permit the making of grants or subsidies to alleviate flood sufferers, but is limited to the extension of loans on a reasonable credit basis with the expectation that such loans shall be repaid.

In the case of disaster loans as distinguished from loans made under other sections of the RFC act, the Corporation does liberalize substantially its collateral requirements. Notwithstanding this liberal approach, however, they are loans and not grants. The Corporation would be outside the scope of its authority under the act and the intent of Congress if, at the time of making a disaster loan, the Corporation anticipated that the loan would not be paid. It is obvious, however, that with the liberal approach to such loans, which we believe to be the intent of Congress, that substantial losses may occur in the aggregate of the loans made. As I stated to the subcommittee yesterday, loans of this character, if they are to serve the purpose intended, must be made even though the security is considered "light."

With respect to the statements set forth in your letter, I shall comment on them in numerical sequence as follows:

1. Those residents of Vanport who have been damaged and have suffered loss by the flood are eligible for loans for the purchase of existing or new dwellings and the construction, repair, rehabilitation of dwellings.

2. The granting of such loan by the RFC will be based on the need of the family for housing and a showing that the applicant has a reasonable possibility of repaying the loan under terms which would be more liberal than the normal mortgage-loan amortization. This does not mean, however, that a family which, by the application of minimum economic standards, is found financially incapable of repaying a loan made on liberal terms, will be granted the money to acquire a new dwelling.

3. The RFC will be able to establish reasonably low monthly payments with a balloon payment at maturity date as may be established by the Congress.

4. In the event the borrower fails to meet monthly payments on the loan, except in the case of willful failure, the RFC will make every effort to work out and adjust the terms and payments in order that foreclosure may be avoided. If, after all efforts have been exhausted, foreclosure becomes necessary, the RFC will be obligated to obtain a deficiency judgment against the borrower if the facts and circumstances in a particular case warrant such action. Dispossession of the borrower after foreclosure will have to be determined when and if such occasion arises, and no assurance can be given that the borrower will not be dispossessed when action to foreclose has been instituted.

5. The RFC is prepared to make a loan or loans to the Portland housing authority for the construction and ownership of large-scale rental housing projects for rental to such families as the Housing Authority may determine, provided that the housing authority is legally authorized to borrow money and makes a proper showing that the housing it will supply is necessary and appropriate to relieve flood sufferers. The RFC, in passing upon a loan to the housing authority, will of necessity look to the housing authority's source of income in order that there may be some assurance that the loan, if made, will ultimately be repaid. In addition thereto, the RFC will rely upon the physical properties as security for the ultimate repayment of the loan.

I agree that it is appropriate that the officials in Oregon be apprised of these understandings.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. DOUGHERTY,
General Counsel.

THE POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain telegrams addressed to me, dealing with various phases of the postal pay bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 17, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Gilbert Goodkind has talked with you concerning discriminatory rider on postal pay bill. I hope you can help kill rider. I recall with pleasure our visit at bookseller's banquet last year.

R. B. CAMPBELL,
President, American Booksellers Association.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *June 16, 1948.*

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Vigorously protest hasty discriminatory action on proposed raise in book postal rate which is part of bill raising postal pay.

OSC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION.

EUGENE, OREG., *June 16, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber:

Proposed increase book postal rate carries dynamite for western book stores. Bill appears hastily drawn and discriminatory. Will greatly appreciate your best effort to prevent its passage. Best regards.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON CO-OP STORE,
MARION M. MCCLAIN.

CITY LIGHT OF CASCADE LOCKS, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement concerning the history and record of the City Light of Cascade Locks, Oreg.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOD RIVER, OREG., *June 11, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
443 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of a story from the Hood River County Sun concerning the history and record of the City Light of Cascade Locks, Oreg. This community was the first customer on the books of the great Bonneville Dam. I thought you might be interested in it.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. TRAVIS.

CITY LIGHT,
Cascade Locks, Oreg., June 10, 1948.

DEAR MR. TRAVIS: This is the data compiled and edited (supposedly) by members of the Bonneville Administration. Anyhow, after a conference on the matter, and with the help of the BPA, this is what was finally completed.

I believe you requested Russel Nichols to have something of this sort done, and this is it.

Sincerely,

CITY LIGHT,
NORMA ANDERSON,
Secretary.

CASCADE LOCKS—BRIGHTEST TOWN BY A "DAMSITE"

In a few days Cascade Locks will observe the ninth anniversary of its municipally owned electric system, and city fathers are congratulating themselves on the record they have made in public distribution of Bonneville power. The success story is indelibly written into the ledgers and records of the city light department, but the men who can see the twinkling lights of the dam they built prefer

to reminisce about shoulder-to-shoulder stand they made nearly a decade ago.

By a vote of better than 10 to 1, the people of Cascade Locks decided to issue bonds to operate their public power system. But the local utility refused to sell its lines to the town. In fact, the company president threatened to procure a court injunction to stop the townspeople from distributing Bonneville power themselves.

The community promptly responded by forming an emergency citizens' committee. Late that Saturday afternoon—and far into the night—they worked up and down the main street of Cascade Locks, setting up poles and insulators, helping the crews string the heavy wire that was to link their homes and shops to the newly built dam. Bonfires dotted the town, and the women kept huge pots of coffee brewing for the menfolk who were determined to build the backbone of their city light system before the courts reopened Monday morning.

Eventually the company relented and the town bought the local power lines with the bonds the people had voted. Seventy-nine thousand dollars worth of revenue bonds were issued—bonds which were to be paid for out of power earnings rather than taxes. Twenty-eight thousand dollars worth of the bonds already have been retired; the people have an equity in their business amounting to $57,000, or better than $100 a customer. The depreciated value of the power properties now exceeds $100,000. The town has improved and extended its lines, bringing electricity to many families who had never been served.

But the real achievement of Cascade Locks power system may be found in the power bill residents proudly pay at the end of each month. For the cost of electricity has dropped from 4.92 cents (per kilowatt-hour) to 1.39 cents—a reduction of 72 percent. Most astounding is the way the demand for electricity has skyrocketed under these low rates. Nine years ago the average home used 53 kilowatt-hours a month; today the figure is 314—nearly six times as much. Forty-two homes are heated entirely by electric heat—and many are planning to follow suit.

Official Federal Power Commission figures reveal that the average patron of Cascade Locks municipal system pays $14 less per year for electricity than the average householder in nearby Hood River Valley. Stores and mills have profited equally from the low price at which Cascade Locks distributes Bonneville power. Commercial rates have dropped nearly 60 percent and use has shot up 378 percent. That is why the lights burn so brightly in the shops that line the highway at Cascade Locks. It explains why Gibbs Restaurant is all electric in every sense of the word.

With industrial power rates cut from 60 to 72 percent over the old charges, Cascade Locks is looking forward to its share of industrial expansion. The Cascade Locks Lumber Co. is completing its all-electric mill—safer and more efficient than the old-style operations with steam or Diesel power.

In 1939 the town's power system had 387 customers; today it has 560. The new line to Bridal Veil has added 75 new customers to the books, and the lumber mill there absorbs 162,000 kilowatt-hours a month.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven revenues of the city light system totaled $38,656. Cost of Bonneville power was $6,980, operating expenses $11,589, depreciation $1,330, taxes $1,330, and interest and bond payments $1,210. Add up these figures and you'll see that Cascade Locks city light department netted $6,217 after paying all expenses. This net of $6,217 represents a return of 10 percent upon the people's investment in the business of $57,000. But they still have their eye on the record of Monmouth's city light department, which just burned the last of its bonds and became another debt-free public power system.

City of Cascade Locks, accomplishments by municipal distribution

REDUCTIONS IN TYPICAL MONTHLY RESIDENTIAL BILLS

	50 kilowatt-hours	85 kilowatt-hours	100 kilowatt-hours	125 kilowatt-hours	200 kilowatt-hours	500 kilowatt-hours
Former residential rates [1]	$3.10	$4.15	$4.60	$5.35	$7.60	[2] $10.60
Present residential rates with Bonneville power [3]	$2.25	$2.95	$3.25	$3.50	$4.25	$6.25
Savings with municipal distribution:						
Monthly	$0.85	$1.20	$1.35	$1.85	$3.35	$4.35
Annually	$10.20	$14.40	$16.20	$22.20	$40.20	$52.20
Percent	27	29	29	35	44	41

[1] Rates of the West Coast Power Co.
[2] Includes 300 kilowatt-hours water heating on separate rate.
[3] In effect since November 1939. Began distributing Bonneville power July 1939.

REDUCTIONS IN TYPICAL MONTHLY COMMERCIAL BILLS

	Commercial lighting			Commercial power			Industrial power service				
							150 kilowatts		500 kilowatts		1,000 kilowatts, 400,000 kilowatt-hours
	3 kilowatts, 375 kilowatt-hours	6 kilowatts, 750 kilowatt-hours	12 kilowatts, 1,500 kilowatt-hours	6 kilowatts, 750 kilowatt-hours	12 kilowatts, 1,500 kilowatt-hours	30 kilowatts, 6,000 kilowatt-hours	30,000 kilowatt-hours	60,000 kilowatt-hours	100,000 kilowatt-hours	200,000 kilowatt-hours	
Former rates [1]	$14.25	$25.50	$41.00	$31.00	$62.00	$180.00	$855	$1,140	$2,851	$3,801	$7,602
Initial rates with Bonneville Power (November 1939)	$13.50	$22.25	$39.15	$22.25	$39.15	$127.25	$403	$540	$1,036	$1,326	$2,391
Present rates [2] by municipal distribution	$11.63	$18.50	$31.65	$18.50	$31.65	$84.75	$328	$457	$910	$1,167	$2,160
Initial savings with Bonneville power:											
Monthly	$0.75	$3.25	$1.65	$8.75	$22.85	$52.75	$452	$600	$1,815	$2,475	$5,211
Annually	$9.00	$39.00	$22.20	$105.00	$274.20	$633.00	$5,424	$7,200	$21,780	$29,700	$62,532
Percent	5	13	4	28	37	29	53	53	64	65	69
Present savings by municipal distribution:											
Monthly	$2.62	$7.00	$9.35	$12.50	$30.35	$95.25	$527	$683	$1,941	$2,634	$5,442
Annually	$31.44	$84.00	$112.20	$150.00	$364.20	$1,143.00	$6,324	$81,960	$23,292	$31,608	$65,304
Percent	18	27	23	40	49	53	62	60	68	69	72

[1] Rates of West Coast Power Co.
[2] Effective July 1942.

City of Cascade Locks, annual revenue reductions by municipal distribution

Service	Reduction of November 1939				Reduction of July 1942			
	Annual revenues		Annual reductions		Annual revenues		Annual reductions	
	Former rates [1]	New rates	Dollars	Percent	Former rates	Estimated present rate	Dollars	Percent
Residential	$12,042	$8,242	$3,800	32	$15,130	$15,130		
Commercial and other	16,727	15,097	1,630	10	16,106	14,419	$1,687	10
Total	28,769	23,339	5,430	19	31,236	29,549	1,687	5

[1] West Coast Power Co.

City of Cascade Locks, accomplishments by municipal distribution, relationship of price and use

	Residential		Commercial	
	Kilowatt-hours per customer	Price per kilowatt-hour	Kilowatt-hours per customer	Price per kilowatt-hour
		Cents		*Cents*
1939 [1]	635	4.92	3,970	3.36
1940	1,079	2.67	5,253	2.88
Use increase, 1939–40, percent	70		32	
Price decrease, 1939–40, percent		46		14
1941	1,483	2.22	5,111	2.91
Use increase, 1940–41, percent	37		−3	
Price decrease, 1940–41, percent		17		−1
1942	1,880	1.97	6,659	2.06
Use increase, 1941–42, percent	27		30	
Price decrease, 1941–42, percent		11		29
1943	2,280	1.77	7,382	1.60
Use increase, 1942–43, percent	21		11	
Price decrease, 1942–43, percent		10		22
1944	2,463	1.68	5,489	2.08
Use increase, 1943–44, percent	8		−26	
Price decrease, 1943–44, percent		5		−30
1945	2,806	1.57	5,892	2.00
Use increase, 1944–45, percent	16		7	
Price decrease, 1944–45, percent		7		1
1946	3,204	1.49	7,293	1.92
Use increase, 1945–46, percent	12		24	
Price decrease, 1945–46, percent		5		7
1947	3,768	1.39	18,970	1.39
Use increase, 1946–47, percent	18		160	
Price decrease, 1946–47, percent		7		28
OVER-ALL DEVELOPMENT, 1939–47				
Use increase, percent	493		378	
Price decrease, percent		72		59

[1] Based on first 9 months at company's rates expanding for a year's operations.

City of Cascade Locks, comparison of principal rate schedules

Former rates (W. C. P. Co.)	Rates effective November 1939	Present rates
Residential:		
40 kwh, at 7¢	50 kwh, at 4½¢	50 kwh, at 4½¢.
260 kwh, at 3¢	50 kwh, at 2¢	50 kwh, at 2¢.
Excess, at 2¢	200 kwh, at 1¢	200 kwh, at 1¢.
	900 kwh, at ½¢	900 kwh, at ½¢.
Minimum, $1.	Excess, at ¾¢	Excess, at ¾¢.
Water heating, 1¢ per kwh.	Minimum, $1	Minimum, $1.
		(*Effective since July 1948*)
Commercial:		
75 kwh, at 7¢	150 kwh, at 4.5¢	150 kwh, at 3¢.
725 kwh, at 3¢	350 kwh, at 3¢	350 kwh, at 2.5¢.
Excess, at 2¢	1,000 kwh, at 2¢	1,000 kwh, at 1.5¢.
	3,500 kwh, at 1.8¢.	13,500 kwh, at 0.8¢.
Minimum, $1.	10,000 kwh, at 0.8¢.	50,000 kwh, at 0.5¢.
	25,000 kwh, at 0.6¢.	Excess kwh, at 0.3¢.
	60,000 kwh, at 0.4¢.	
	Excess kwh, at 0.3¢.	Demand charge, first 10 kw, no charge.
	Demand charge, first 10 kw, no charge. Over 10 kw, 95¢ per kw.	Over 10 kw, 95¢ per kw.

HOUSING FOR VANPORT, OREG., EVACUEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram which I have received relative to housing for the Vanport evacuees.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 15, 1948.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Two provisions are indispensable if private enterprise is to build for Vanport evacuees: (1) easy long-term financing; (2) guaranteed return so builder is assured of income to meet mortgage payments, fixed charges with small return for self in case of rental units. Financing would be easier if term were 32 years 7 months, the same as 608. Telegram mentions no provision in proposed legislation for guaranteed return to builder-owner in case of rental unit. Every unit should be built for either rent or sale without both above provisions. We doubt private enterprise will build many units. Any limitation in cost should apply equally to private and public housing. Until survey of family size is made formula for price limitation is difficult. Would prefer discretion in hands of Administrator. If limit is imposed it should be at least $9,000 to house larger families. Between properties owned and adjacent sites easily acquired builders have estimated 2,000 lots near utilities, many with improvements in construction, can start immediately. Within 5 to 8 months 3,000 to 4,000 units can be built. These scattered sites would not present problems of schools, playgrounds, utilities, and shipping centers. Only private enterprise using lots where improvements are substantially in place can do anything before next winter if flood victims live in emergency housing and trailers over winter. Many serious problems will develop, and the longer they live in this emergency phase the greater will be the expense for the Government. Legislation providing simultaneously for public and private housing should extend equal benefits to both. No public housing project will ever produce home ownership with attending responsibility and good citizenship. Over the long period most single-family units built by private enterprise will be sold. Result would be less cost to Federal Treasury and each such unit will pay its just share of the tax burden.

LOYD F. CARTER,
President, Portland Realty Board.
HERMAN SCHMITT,
President, Portland Builders Association.
EDWIN SANDBERG,
Northwest Regional Vice President, National Association of Home Builders.

FLOOD DAMAGE TO FARMS IN COLUMBIA BASIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement issued by the United States Department of Agriculture relative to flood damage to farms in the Columbia Basin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD DAMAGE TO FARMS IN COLUMBIA BASIN ESTIMATED

Lost farm-production income estimated for this year in the areas of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, devastated by the Columbia River floodwaters, will approximate nearly $10,000,000, according to preliminary advance estimates sent to Secretary Charles F. Brannan, of the United States Department of Agriculture, today by George T. Hudson, special representative of the Secretary, stationed in the Pacific Northwest to coordinate efforts of the Department agencies in behalf of flood sufferers.

In making their estimates, the Department observers in the stricken areas did not include part-time farmers or nonfarm rural residents in the first list of damages. It is also exclusive of flood damage now being surveyed and reported by the Forest Service on upper watersheds. Likewise, possible damage to public roads, bridges, rural electric-power lines, or telephone lines are not included in any survey to date.

To date, the best available flood-damage figures furnished to the Department of Agriculture by State USDA councils and other agency specialists include the following for Washington and Oregon farms, which are sketchy and incomplete pending further surveys:

Washington State: 1,375 farms affected, with rehabilitation costs placed at $1,375,000; acres of farm land inundated, 104,000; cropland or cultivated pasture flooded, 52,135 acres; cost to return cropland to normal cultivation, $781,900; cows evacuated, 11,500 head; hay requirements to next pasture season, 20,000 tons, valued at $700,000; seed requirements, 263,800 pounds, worth $205,000; grain feed requirements, 10,625 tons, worth $1,062,500; fences destroyed, 1,955 miles, to cost $627,000 for replacement; 880 farm buildings damaged or destroyed, at a cost to rehabilitate of $2,279,500; fertilizer needed, 5,000 tons, worth $375,000; farm bridges to rebuild or repair, at cost of $200,000; repair of damaged farm roads, $50,000; loss of home-grown food, estimated at $137,500; and personal-property damages, valued at about $1,330,000. In addition, special needs must be met in Chelan, Douglas, and Pend Oreille Counties, at cost of about $272,000, the estimate concludes.

Oregon estimates: 800 farms affected with rehabilitation costs put at $450,000; acres of farm land inundated, 50,000; cropland or cultivated pasture flooded, 26,000 acres; cost to return cropland to normal cultivation, $390,000; number of cows evacuated, 5,400 head; hay requirements to next pasture season, 12,150 tons, at a value of $425,000; seed requirements, $430,000 for replanting mint and seeding pasture and hay crops; grain feed requirements, 4,050 tons, worth $405,000; fences destroyed, 500 miles, to cost $157,000 for replacement; 450 farm buildings damaged or destroyed, at a rebuilding and repair cost of $1,350,000; fertilizer needed, 1,000 tons, worth $75,000; $50,000 for repair of farm bridges; $20,000 for repair of farm roads; loss of home-grown food, $45,000; and personal-property damages, estimated at $225,000.

Loss of income from crops and livestock, in addition to the current flood-damage rehabilitation costs, is estimated for Washington, Oregon, and Idaho farms at $9,863,000.

ALBERT W. HAWKES, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to my friend, ALBERT W. HAWKES, with whom I have disagreed on some issues, I wish to say, as he retires from the Senate, that my sincere good wishes go with him. Although we have had our differences, I think both Senator HAWKES and I have sought in the sincerity of our convictions to preserve what we call the American system in accordance with the principles and guaranties of the Constitution. I served with Senator HAWKES when both of us were members of the War Labor Board, during the war. My association with him there, as well as here in the Senate, has been a source of inspiration to me.

ARTHUR CAPPER, OF KANSAS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also wish to pay my respects to the grand young man of the Senate, ARTHUR CAPPER. As a boy on a farm in Wisconsin, I first came under the influence of Sen-

ator CAPPER as I read his writings in the Capper Farm Journal. All one needs to say about ARTHUR CAPPER is that he retires from the Senate rich in the love of all of us.

CARL A. HATCH, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show my appreciation of my very good friend, CARL HATCH, for our many pleasant associations in the Senate.

DUPLICATION OF CLEAR CHANNELS AND SUPERPOWER—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE AND THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Federal Communications Commission. As ranking member of the minority side of that committee, I believe that these letters will help clarify the existing situation with respect to the question of duplication of clear channels and superpower, a subject which has had a great deal of committee attention during the present session of Congress.

I believe it will be clear from this exchange of letters and the favorable committee report of the White radio bill (S. 1333), which includes a section—section 6—prohibiting the granting of power in excess of 50 kilowatts for any AM radio broadcast station, that the Federal Communications Commission must maintain its present policy of limiting power to 50 kilowatts. It is important to likewise point out that the language of Senate bill 1333 makes clear that the Commission's present authority to duplicate clear channels wherever and whenever the Commission finds that it is in the public interest to do so is not interfered with in any way and that the Commission retains such authority. I insist that it continue to exercise that authority, but with more vigor, in the public interest.

The letters, which follow, include the letter of February 27 from the committee to Chairman Coy, of the Commission, advising him that the committee has under consideration a bill dealing with the question of superpower, and requesting the Commission to take no administrative action on that question until the committee has held hearings on the legislation; the letter of March 2, 1948, from the committee to Chairman Coy, of the Commission, requesting that the Commission take no action on the question of clear channels and superpower until the committee has taken definite action on the legislation then pending; the letter of April 5, 1948, from Chairman Coy, of the Commission, to the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], advising him that the Commission will take no action on the question of clear channels and superpower under the conditions set forth in the committee's letter of February 27; the letter of June 9, 1948, from the committee to Chairman Coy, of the Commission, advising him that the committee had voted to favorably report Senate bill 1333, and that under the circumstances the letter of February 27 was being withdrawn; and finally the letter of June 15, 1948, from Chairman Coy to the committee acknowledging receipt of the letter of June 9, 1948.

I repeat that in the interests of clarification, I deem it important to point out that the committee has favorably reported legislation which sets a limitation on power and preserves the Commission's authority to duplicate AM radio frequencies. To the extent that the committee's views are important to a quasi-judicial agency which is an arm of Congress, I assume the Commission will take into the fullest consideration these views.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
February 27, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN COY: I understand that your Commission has been giving long and serious consideration to the question of clear channels and superpower; that your public hearings have been completed; and that the Commission will shortly take up the matter for decision. We of the committee, primarily concerned with the peoples' interest, are anxious that no decision be reached in the premises which is contrary to the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

For your information, there has been introduced in the Senate, as of yesterday, S. 2231, introduced by Senator JOHNSON, a bill to limit the power of radio broadcast stations and to provide for the break-down of clear-channel frequencies. A copy of the bill is enclosed herewith. The bill speaks for itself. You will understand it fully upon reading.

Because of the importance of this legislation and of the interest of our committee as expressed in executive session today, I have been instructed by the committee unanimously, by formal vote, to write you, advising you of this legislation and request your Commission to reach no conclusions and take no action in the pending matter of superpower and clear channels until such time as the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has assigned hearings on S. 2231 and have you and other interested parties come before this committee in the premises.

I write this letter upon the instruction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, made in executive session this afternoon. Will you kindly acknowledge receipt of this letter and confirm that your Commission will take no action on the question of superpower and clear channels until the enclosed bill, S. 2231, has been assigned for hearing and testimony is heard from interested and affected parties.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Acting Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
March 2, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter being mailed by the committee this week to all radio stations in the United States. It is being sent you for the information of the Commission.

You will note that it is an announcement that hearings on the Johnson bill, S. 2231, will begin on or about April 5 before the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In my letter of February 27, as acting chairman, I requested that no further action be taken in the so-called clear-channel case until our committee has completed hearings on the pending bill. I will appreciate confirmation from you that the commission will take no action in the matter of clear channels and superpower until such time as the committee has taken definite action for or against the proposed legislation.

Very sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Acting Chairman.

APRIL 5, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have your letter of February 27, 1948, and your note of February 28, 1948. In your letter you refer to the introduction in the Senate of S. 2231 and you state that because of the importance of this legislation and the interest of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as expressed in an executive session that you have been instructed by the committee, by unanimous vote, to write the Commission advising us of this legislation and requesting that the Commission reach no conclusions and take no action on the question involved until testimony is heard by the Senate committee. You request that I confirm that the Commission take no action on the question.

You will recall that in a conference with you shortly after receipt of your letter I explained the situation which the Government of the United States faced with respect to the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement which expires March 28, 1949. I am sure that after our discusison you and I were in agreement that we should persuade the State Department to seek agreement with the other countries involved to a further extension of NARBA. At a later date the Assistant Secretary, Garrison Norton and Mr. Walter Radius of the Telecommunications Division, State Department, accompanied me to a conference with Senator Johnson. The result of that conference was that Senator Johnson, as you had done earlier, expressed his opinion that the State Department should seek an extension of NARBA. The State Department is now proceeding with the negotiations looking toward an extension of NARBA.

In view of the understanding which the State Department now has of your views and Senator JOHNSON's views and in view of the fact that they are proceeding to seek an extension of NARBA, the Federal Communications Commission now confirms the Committee's request that it take no action on the question of superpower and clear channels under the conditions set forth in your letter of February 27.

Sincerely yours,
WAYNE COY,
Chairman.

JUNE 9, 1948.

Hon. WAYNE COY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce today voted to favorably report the bill S. 1333, dealing with various amendments to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, the committee voted to instruct me, as chairman, to advise you that the committee is hereby withdrawing its letter of February 27, 1948, addressed to you as Chairman of the Federal Communications

Commission, in which was discussed the matter of superpower and clear channels.

Very sincerely yours,

WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Chairman.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1498.

Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHITE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 8, 1948, informing me of the action of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in voting to withdraw its letter of February 27, 1948, addressed to me as Chairman of the Commission, concerning the matter of superpower and clear-channel broadcasting. I have informed my fellow Commmissioners of the action of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE COY,
Chairman.

AUTHORITY FOR APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES AND FOR SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AFTER ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President pro tempore be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

Ordered further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the adjournment of the present session.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 19, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of General Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, even in this closing hour of the session, I am very hopeful that we may get to the next bill. If those who are responsible for the pending bill will consider laying it aside at this stage, I shall ask the Senator from Nevada whether he feels it proper to do that, so that we may take up Senate bill 2644, Calendar No. 1507, a defense measure which many of us feel to be of very considerable importance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he will consent to let the Senator from Maine be recognized to request the consideration of a bill?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1507, Senate bill 2644, to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service. I have spent a very interesting 5 hours waiting to be recognized so that I could request consideration of this bill. I shall take only 5 minutes to explain briefly what the bill is, in the hope that it may be considered and passed at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has the bill been passed by the House?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; it has been passed unanimously by the House, and also has been approved by every Government agency concerned with our defense and with the development of civil aviation, and also by every other group that has studied it. The President's Board on Aviation Policy strongly recommended its passage, and the Joint Aviation Board has strongly recommended it.

The bill has been very carefully prepared, and it is considered the only means by which American aviation can continue its progress.

The more recent planes which have been developed have cost around $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 to develop; and the two or three companies that have done that have literally lost their shirts. They have to sell 300 of these planes in order to get their money back. The air lines cannot buy them, so that situation is perfectly hopeless.

The defense aspect of the matter is perfectly apparent. We need thousands of these planes of the most modern and constantly improved types. With the complete stoppage of the development of new types of transport planes, our defense transport will be terribly crippled.

I hold in my hand a list of six jet-propelled planes being developed by England at the present time. That gives us an indication of how seriously England regards this matter. Some of these planes are actually flying. They are 2 years ahead of us in the development of this type of transport plane.

The only way this desirable development can be brought to pass is by having an authorization of this character. It creates within the various defense agencies concerned the Government group which shall determine the different types to be developed.

One small one and one large one are contemplated at the start, with the idea that once the Government develops a prototype, at whatever expense may be involved, private companies will then build the planes, at whatever reasonable profit shall be determined, and with whatever recapture of Government costs may be determined.

In the judgment of those who are concerned with aviation, it is the only way by which this development can possibly be carried on.

I hope very much that the Senate may see fit to pass this measure at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. I object.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then I move that the bill be considered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a motion of that sort, if agreed to, would displace the unfinished business, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. But the Senator from Nevada permitted it to be brought up.

Mr. WHERRY. I simply wish to make plain what the situation is.

Mr. BREWSTER. I now move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 2644.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask now that House bill 6501, which is in exactly the same terms, be substituted for the Senate bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does it require unanimous consent in order to take up consideration of the House bill at this time? Has the House bill been printed, and is it on the calendar?

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall have to object.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then, may we not proceed with the consideration of the Senate bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is perfectly in order.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask that that be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the House bill on the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. PEPPER. Does it require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. PEPPER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate bill is now before the Senate, having been taken up on motion. The Clerk will state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in the interest of national security the Federal Government should promote the employment in air commerce in as large numbers as possible of more efficient transport and cargo aircraft; and, to this end, sponsor the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototype transport and cargo aircraft, intended primarily for commercial use, but adaptable also for auxiliary military service.

SEC. 2. The Civil Transport Aircraft Evaluation and Development Board (referred to hereinafter as "the Board") hereinafter provided for, is authorized and directed—

(a) to survey the national requirements for aircraft types designed primarily for commercial transport and cargo service, but adaptable also as auxiliary military transport for one or more of the departments of the National Military Establishment;

(b) to prepare and recommend, from time to time, the operating and utility characteristics and specifications of such aircraft: *Provided*, That such characteristics and specifications shall be consistent with the requirements of the civil air regulations promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

(c) to advise the Secretary of the Air Force (referred to hereinafter as "the Secretary") of the Board's findings and recommendations under this section, and to recommend the allotment by the Secretary, from funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this

act, of appropriate sums for design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type of aircraft.

SEC. 3. (a) The Board shall be composed of one representative designated by each of the following agencies: The United States Air Force, the United States Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and such other agencies of the Federal Government, concerned with aeronautics, as the Board may, from time to time, determine.

(b) To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, it is authorized to establish an industrial advisory committee composed of not less than six members appointed by the Board with the approval of the Secretary. Each member of such committee shall serve for a term of 2 years, except that (1) the terms of three of the members first taking office after the enactment of this act shall expire at the end of 1 year, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occuring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. No member shall be eligible to serve continuously for more than one term unless in the opinion of the Board his reappointment is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. Members of such committee may be designated without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and shall receive such compensation, not in excess of $50 for each day or part of a day actually devoted to the performance of the duties of such committee, as the Board shall determine. Each member of such committee shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence when engaged in the performance of the duties of such committee at any place other than his permanent residence or place of business. Nothing contained in section 41, 109, 112, or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 93, 198, 202, and 203), section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119), or any other provision of law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply to any such person solely by reason of membership on such committee: *Provided*, That the provisions of the act of July 12, 1870 (R. S. 3679; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 665), as amended, shall not apply to the acceptance of voluntary service by any member of any such committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Board shall be designated by the Secretary from among the members thereof and the Board shall act in accordance with such regulations and rules of procedure as it may, from time to time, prescribe. The Board is authorized and directed to consult with manufacturers of aircraft, and with United States operators of transport aircraft. Members of the Board shall serve as such without additional compensation, but each member of the Board shall be allowed actual necessary transportation expenses and an allowance not to exceed $10 per diem, in lieu of subsistence, when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Board at any place other than his permanent station.

(d) The Board and the Secretary are authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but without regard to any provision of law limiting the number of civilian personnel which may be employed by the Department of the Air Force, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be deemed necessary to assist the Board and the Secretary in carrying out their respective functions under this act: Provided, That to the extent possible, consistent with other duties and assignments, the personnel and facilities of the member agencies of the Board shall be used to carry out the duties of the Board.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board referred to in section 2 of this act, to provide, out of funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, for the design, development, testing, tooling, construction, service testing, and modification of prototypes of each such type of aircraft, by contract or otherwise. Any such contract entered into by the Government shall contain a provision that—

(1) sales of aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be made at a price allowing a reasonable profit, not exceeding such profit as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and

(2) in determining the fair selling price of such aircraft, except to the extent required by the Secretary, there shall not be included in the cost thereof any development, engineering, tooling, or other costs which have been reimbursed to the manufacturer by the Secretary; and

(3) aircraft subsequently manufactured from the design specifications of such prototype or prototypes shall be sold only to purchasers who, by contract with the Secretary, have undertaken (a) unless required by the civil air regulations to make no changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft without first obtaining the approval of the Secretary; and (b) to make, for an agreed sum payable by the Secretary, such changes in the design or standard equipment of such aircraft, not inconsistent with the civil air regulations, as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of this act, may enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, with or without legal consideration, with or without performance or other bonds, and, in carrying out such contracts, arrangements, or modifications thereof, may make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Each contract, arrangement, or modification thereof, executed pursuant to this act, shall contain such provisions, consistent with the laws affecting the issuance or use of patents, governing the disposition and use of inventions made thereunder as are appropriate, in the judgment of the Secretary, to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract, arrangement or modification thereof is executed.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to procure and test prototype aircraft from any manufacturer whose design meets the operating and utility characteristics and specifications recommended by the Board: *Provided*, That, in the event such manufacturer is not in a position to produce promptly the prototype aircraft desired, then the Secretary may procure such prototype aircraft from any other qualified manufacturer.

SEC. 7. Aircraft manufactured from design specifications pursuant to this act shall not be sold directly or by resale to either foreign governments or other foreign users without the approval of the Secretary: *Provided*, That in approving any such sale the Secretary may waive such of the requirements of section 3 hereof as he may deem proper.

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized and directed, if he concurs in the advice and recommendations of the Board with respect thereto, by appropriate contractual conditions, or otherwise, to recover, in whole or in part, as deemed to be practicable and expedient, the costs incurred by the United States pursuant to this act. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress within a period of 1 year following the passage of this act a report setting forth the means and methods which he intends to utilize in effecting such recovery.

SEC. 9. In the event the Board shall recommend the development of a seaplane commercial transport or cargo aircraft and the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force concur, the Secretary of the Navy shall be authorized to perform all of the functions with respect to such aircraft as are vested in the Secretary of the Air Force by this act, and the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy such funds appropriated under this act as may be necessary for the performance of such functions.

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) The term "aircraft" shall include engines, propellers, instruments, accessories, and standard equipment for such aircraft.

(b) The term "standard equipment" means all operational features of such aircraft, including, without limitation, standard cockpit arrangement, communications facilities, and provisions for such items, but excluding commercial equipment.

(c) The term "commercial equipment" means removable furnishings and fittings, not part of the primary structure or the mechanical apparatus of such aircraft, and which is generally installed for the accommodation of passengers, baggage, or cargo.

(d) The term "prototype aircraft" means the initial models of each type, built primarily for static tests, flight performance, and service test.

SEC. 11. The Secretary and the Board shall transmit to the Congress, on the 1st day of January in each year, a report on (1) the progress made in the accomplishment of the purposes of this act and (2) the amounts of the expenditures made or obligated pursuant thereto.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Air Force such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my reason for objecting was that the bill is pretty much in the same class as the one we were discussing in the earlier part of the evening—perhaps I should say morning. I do not understand why bills of such importance should come to us right at the end of the session, and on Sunday morning.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator will recognize that the reason it is so late in being presented is because the Senator from Delaware has been objecting for the last 2 weeks when I was trying to have it considered. That is why it is necessary to call it up now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought it was not the kind of bill to be disposed of on a call of the consent calendar, but the Senator will recall I told him I would not delay consideration of the bill, but would limit my remarks to 10 minutes.

I think the bill has some merit. On the other hand, the bill in my opinion is too uncertain in some respects. Section 12 authorizes funds to be appropriated for the Department of the Air Force in such amount as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the bill, with absolutely no limitation on the amount. As many of the so-called prototype planes may be developed as may be thought advisable.

Section 7 of the bill provides that the airplanes produced may be sold to foreign governments if the Secretary of Defense sees fit. Congress has nothing to say about it.

The best explanation I can make of the bill is to read an analysis of it that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 4, entitled "Airplane Subsidy." The headlines are, "Taxpayers may foot bill for costly design of new commercial craft; Senate bill would lift load from makers, airlines; insure going industry; Air Force would be boss." I am going to read this, because it is the best analysis of the bill I can get.

It says:

The commercial air fleet of the future may be designed with taxpayers' dollars.

Congress is pressing a measure to shift the burden of development costs for new style cargo and passenger planes from aircraft manufacturers and commercial air lines to the Federal budget.

The argument: A modern, healthy commercial air fleet is a necessary defense supplement for the military air force.

Backers of the plan think they have a better than a 50-50 chance of getting it enacted this session. The Senate Commerce Committee approved the bill yesterday and House sanction is expected if the full Senate adopts the plan.

Air-minded Congressmen are pushing this new subsidy for aircraft in the closing minutes of Congress because they think it a needed defense measure. Also, this would put into effect one major recommendation of the Congressional Air Policy Board.

MONEY SAVER FOR AIR LINES

The so-called prototype bill would enable air lines to buy the latest planes for a fraction of the price they now plunk down for new cruisers like the DC–6's and the Constellations.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the remainder of the article, but I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

They'd have to pay only actual production cost of each plane plus a "reasonable profit" for plane makers. Uncle Sam would foot the bill for all the costly research, designing, tooling, building, testing, and refining of the first basic model—the prototype.

But, paying the piper, the Government would also call the tune. There would be Federal control over all the prototypes it finances—right down to the matter of determining what the "reasonable profit" should be for makers of the aircraft.

The goal of the subsidized airplane development program is nearly 1,000 newly developed cargo and passenger planes in the air by 1953. Cost estimates range as high as $1,000,000,000.

Senator BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, sponsor of the Senate measure, hesitates to estimate the total outlay required. He generalizes that it "used to cost" from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 to develop a new style aircraft. There would be at least three prototype planes to start with. More would be promoted as the program gets under way. Aircraft makers estimate only $10,000,000 would be needed to get started on designs for the three planes in the first year.

IN THE PILOT'S SEAT

The United States Air Force would ride in the pilot's seat to guide the spending of "such sums as may be necessary" and to determine final specifications for the plane research.

Arguments flared over who should control this new Federal subsidy program. The Civil Aeronautics Administration, contending the show should be run by civilians, lost out to the Secretary of the Air Force. Senator BREWSTER said Congress would be likely to approve the measure only on grounds of national defense.

Here's how the prototype bill would work:

A Civil Transport Aircraft Evaluation and Development Board, working with a special industry advisory committee, would survey national requirements for new commercial aircraft types. Recommendations would go to the Air Force Secretary.

The Air Force Secretary, if he approved the plans, would authorize funds. The Air Force would contract with an aircraft manufacturer to make a prototype to recommended specifications, with the Government paying for all design and development costs. Once the working model was perfected, manufacturers could fill orders from commercial air lines. But the cost of the individual plane wouldn't have to include the expense of developing the model. Each airplane would be priced to cover only actual cost of production plus a reasonable profit. The Air Force Secretary would decide what a reasonable profit should be.

AIR FORCE CONTROLS DESIGN

Air lines buying planes fashioned on the Government-sponsored prototype would be required to make no changes in the design or standard equipment without special Air Force permission. Also, they would be required to make any changes the Air Force might demand. The aircraft made from the specifications couldn't be sold to foreign governments, directly or through resale, without special Air Force approval.

The Senate bill suggests that the Air Force Secretary should figure out some way to get back part or all of the Government funds put into aircraft development. The legislation is vague on whether this is mandatory or not and merely directs the Air Secretary to report to Congress on how he would go about getting the Government repaid.

Prototype contracts would be let by the Air Force in design competition among the aircraft manufacturers. The plane makers could also submit their ideas for new type planes to the Air Force.

The air lines back the measure because it means more and cheaper cargo and passenger planes for them. Aircraft manufacturers consider such a subsidy necessary if they are to keep up the research and development needed for a modern United State air fleet. The miltary favors the proposal because it will guarantee a going aircraft industry, with designs convertible for military use.

MARKET IS LIMITED

When private plane manufacturers pay the cost of bringing out a new airplane model, they have to pass on the costs to the air lines—the main purchasers. But the market is comparatively limited.

For example, Douglas Aircraft Corp. designed the new DC–6. At the time the corporation put the plane into production it figured it had to sell about 200 planes at nearly $800,000 each to break even on its cost of development. Now, Douglas officials think, the break-even point will come after some 350 DC–6's have been sold and they've boosted the price to $900,000. So far, only 97 DC–6's are in use, and around 50 more are still to be delivered against orders on the books.

Under the prototype plan, the development of this plane might have been paid for by the Air Force. Thus, the company would have passed the break-even point when it sold its first plane at a reasonable profit.

In the first year aircraft officials believe there will be three design competitions—one for a trans-Atlantic passenger-cargo plane, one for a feeder-line plane, and one for a cargo type capable of operating for 5 cents a ton-mile or less.

Speed and economy of operation are the two main features that the development board will look for in paper plans submitted to it.

Here's what the Nation's air-transport systeem needs to get it out of the financial doldrums, according to the industry:

1. High-speed, long-range transports capable of carrying 50 or more passengers on nonstop flights from coast to coast and between continents. Jet-propelled transports promise speeds of 500 miles an hour or more, but there are plenty of bugs to be taken out of existing jet engines before they can be used on scheduled flights. At present, jet propulsion hasn't much range. It burns fuel too quickly to be practical over long distances.

2. A small, compact plane for use on the feeder or regional air lines—the short-route operators which link the trunk-line air systems with outlying towns. What's needed is a safe passenger-cargo plane which can be operated cheaply enough to break even when only half of its seats are taken. At present the feeder air lines are largely operating surplus DC–3's. Empty seats, coupled with rising costs of operation, make them increasingly dependent on Government mail pay.

3. A cargo plane which will cost less than 5 cents a ton-mile to operate. Such a development would have a ready market for several thousand planes, a prototype bill witness told Congress. Present theoretical operating costs range upward from 7.5 cents a ton-mile.

Lawrence B. Richardson, president of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Co., told the congressional committee that commercial cargo operators "cannot make full use of the terrific potential" volume of business until they have this inexpensive type airplane.

What may evolve from the prototype program could be a combination of any of these needs. A basic plane for use on the feeder lines might, for instance, be converted for all-cargo service over short routes. Or a long-range jet-propelled passenger plane prototype could also be used for transcontinental cargo.

The development board could also recommend new seaplanes, if the Secretaries of Navy and Air Force agree. For seaplane development, the Secretary of the Navy would be given the powers vested in the Air Secretary for land aircraft.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not saying the bill does not have some merit, but I think it is much too loosely drawn to be a suitable defense measure.

In section 8 it is provided that the Secretary of Defense shall prepare and transmit to the Congress within a specified time a plan whereby the Government may be able to regain a part of the money which is to be expended.

If a plan to regain some of the money is to be prepared by the Secretary of Defense, I think the plan should have accompanied the bill. The Senator from Maine has pointed out that discussions have been had on the subject of the bill for nearly a year. I think it is time it came to Congress. We should have had a program for that purpose in our minds, indicating how the money is to be regained.

We should also have been advised how much money the program is to cost. The article from which I have read claims the cost might amount to as much as $1,000,000,000 in the next 2 years. I do not agree with that estimate, of course.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Wall Street Journal spoke of the $1,000,000,000 which

was to be paid by private interests who would purchase the planes from aircraft companies. It was not in any sense a suggestion that the cost to the Government might be any such sum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have said I do not agree that the figures are accurate. I think they are overloaded. But I believe the bill could cost the Government a substantial amount of money. As the Senator from Maine well knows, I think, when we first discussed the possibility of an amendment limiting the amount of money to be spent, the suggestion was that the maximum should be $5,000,000. The last suggestion was that it should be——

Mr. BREWSTER. Six million dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Six million dollars for the first year. But the Senator wanted an 8-year limitation. I opposed the bill, until we could determine what the program would cost, and until we might know.

I think if the Government is going to subsidize planes in the interest of military defense, it is inexcusable to include a provision in the bill authorizing the Secretary of Defense, if he sees fit, to sell the planes to a foreign government. Therefore I object to the bill. If the Senate wants to pass it, I shall not block its passage, but I believe it to be an unsound measure.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. So long as the Senator from Delaware does not like this bill, I wonder if he would object if I requested unanimous consent for the Senate to consider a bill to pay a bonus of 30 cents a bushel on wheat and corn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the Senator might put it on this bill as an amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I must object to the bill. If I correctly understand what the Senator from Delaware says, I think he is absolutely correct. The Committee on Armed Services has already held up a bill which was passed by the House, which would authorize the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy to make contracts and then come to the Congress and ask for an appropriation, without any prior knowledge of the authorization on the part of the Congress. At the present time the Navy—and I say this advisedly, because I have studied the subject—has 1,161,000 tons of ship capacity which it can build by getting the consent of the President, and then coming to the Congress and saying, "Here is the bill; now appropriate the money." The House put through a bill to allow the same authority to be extended to the Army and to the Air Force, putting the Air Force on a pound basis for planes, and the Army for tanks and trucks. If the authority is extended, if I understand the last section of this bill along with its other sections, we would completely lose our authority over the building of planes. The Air Secretary could authorize contracts, and then could come to Congress and say, "Appropriate the money to pay for them."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure this bill in no way affects any existing authority of the Secretary for Air. In fact, he is one of the sponsors of this measure and is the one given authority to handle the entire appropriation. He also has other authority which would be in no way mitigated by the passage of this bill. He says that appropriations should be separately allocated. They do not want them merged with other appropriations. That is really the purpose of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Maine confirms my idea. If we pass bills of this character we give the National Defense Establishment complete authority to go ahead on a large scale and then they can come to Congress and say, without any prior authority, "Pay these bills." Of course the Secretary of the Air Force has approved the bill. He approved the other bill that came before the Senate Committee on Armed Services. So did the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy, with some hesitation. I believe we would make progress by proceeding in the other direction and taking away, if necessary, some of the powers we have given the naval authorities, rather than to give them more power.

I hope this bill will not pass without more careful consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. The Chair inadvertently overlooked that fact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have never conceived, and I do not now conceive, that there is any contractual authority whatsoever in this bill for the Secretary for Air or any other Government official, apart from appropriations which will have to be made by the Congress, or the authority for contract issuing by the Congress. We simply say that "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated" to the Department, or to the Air Force, "such sums as may be necessary." Until the appropriation is made, there is not a cent that can be either expended or obligated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Section 5 (a) provides that the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of section 4, "may enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof, with or without legal consideration, with or without performance or other bonds, and, in carrying out such contracts, arrangements, or modifications thereof, may make advance, progress, and other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes."

Section 12 provides:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Air Force such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

In other words, if I read it correctly—I want to be right about it before we attempt to pass it—the Air Force could make contracts and then say, "Pay for them."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART I am a member of the Air Policy Board and am on the committee that sponsored this legislation. Unless I am badly mistaken, and I do not believe I am, the bill permits the Secretary of Air only to engineer and design one airplane, called a prototype. It does not contemplate in any way the construction of airplanes. It is purely to design one prototype, or possibly more than one model.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yielded to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have finished. I think I have said all anyone can say about it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Indiana is correct. The bill authorizes the Government to pay for one initial plane; but I should like also to point out that in some of the recent hearings which were held before our committee, as the Senator from Maine well knows, it was testified that the cost of prototypes would be $12,500,000; that is, for the first plane.

Paragraph (2), page 13 provides that—

> Any contract entered into by the Government shall contain a provision that in determining the fair selling price of such aircraft, except to the extent required by the Secretary, there shall not be included in the cost thereof any development, engineering, tooling, or other costs, which have been reimbursed to the manufacturer by the Secretary.

The tooling costs might make up three-fourths of the cost of the airplane, just as in the case of General Motors when they are designing and building a Chevrolet. The first one costs a great deal more than the second one.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is very evident that there is objection to this bill. I have spoken to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and I do not want to engage in any such strange ventures as we have been embarking upon in the last 3 or 4 hours. So if there is a single objection it will make it impossible for us to act. While the House bill is here and has been approved, since it did not go on the calendar, after 42 hours, technically it would have to go to the calendar and be printed.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM (S. 2318) AND FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION (S. 1322)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that is to come out after the adjournment an analysis of the long-range farm bill and the Commodity Credit Corporation charter bill as they

were reported by the conference committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

JULIETTE LOW COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a short time ago the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] submitted a unanimous-consent request regarding a joint resolution about which he said there was no controversy. I think the Senator objected to the consideration of the joint resolution, and desired to see that it was passed. At that time there was an indication at least that he would have an opportunity to present the joint resolution, and I say now that I shall be glad to yield for that purpose, providing there is no objection to it. If there is objection, I shall ask for the regular order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up Calendar No. 1741, House Joint Resolution 327.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROUGH RIDERS COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is on the calendar another joint resolution similar to the one just passed, which merely authorizes the issuance of a commemorative stamp, and I wish to have it passed also. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1753, House Joint Resolution 305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 305) authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps, commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of Rough Riders of the Spanish-American War, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT BOARD ON DEFENSE, UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar, Order No. 1436, House bill 5708, relating to the exemption of civilian members of the permanent Joint Board on Defense, United States and Canada, from certain statutory restrictions on outside activities, which I think should be passed by the Senate, having already been passed by the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have an objection to the bill, and I am sorry, but it would have to be raised now on a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I should have to object.

ALASKAN RAILROADS AND RECIPROCAL TARIFFS AND IMMIGRATION ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator about to present a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the calendar number of the measure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is Senate Concurrent Resolution 59, requesting the President to commence negotiations with Canada relating to the existing railroad system, and studies relating to tariff and immigration arrangements.

Mr. WHERRY. To what committee was it referred?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is Calendar No. 1830.

Mr. GURNEY. I can acquaint the Senator from Nebraska with the objective of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the concurrent resolution be reported by title.

Mr. WHERRY. If it is not on the calendar I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: I should like to inquire of the Senator from Washington if there are amendments of any importance to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59), which I see is on the latest calendar.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know of any important amendments. The Foreign Relations Committee reported it unanimously.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not object if the Senator from Washington wishes to bring it up now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, on page 2, line 2, after the word "toward", to insert "determining the desirability of"; in line 4, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "and"; in line 5, after the word "specifications", to insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "prepared", to strike out "for the purposes of constructing" and insert "covering the construction of"; in line 10, after the word "including", to strike out "negotiations" and insert "studies"; in line 11, after the word "for", to strike out "the establishment of"; and in line 12, after the word "arrangements", to insert "in connection with this project", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the President is requested to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward determining the desirability of extending the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska, to cause surveys to be made and plans, specifications, and cost estimates, and budget requests to be prepared covering the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, with a railroad system extended from Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska; also including studies with the Canadian Government for reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements, in connection with this project.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the defense of the Territory of Alaska is essential to the national security of the United States; and

Whereas further development of mineral, timber, and other resources of Alaska is necessary to the defense of that Territory and to the welfare and security of the United States; and

Whereas adequate transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are essential to the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska; and

Whereas existing transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are inadequate for the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska: Therefore be it

NOMINATION OF FRIEDA B. HENNOCK TO THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, 2 days ago a nomination on the Executive Calendar came up for consideration, and at that time I said that I felt that the nomination should go over because objection had been made. I understand the objection still exists. I realize the Senate has been continuously in session for 2 days and 2 nights, and Senators are worn out, and certainly this is no time for bringing up something which will provoke argument. But so long as I have been the acting majority leader I have tried to be fair about all the duties surrounding that position, and even though some Members of the Senate on this side are insistent that this nomination not come up, I feel that because of the representations made, and because of the fact that those who are interested feel that they would have a right at least not to be short circuited in regard to the nomination, I now ask, as in executive session, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member

of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I move that the nomination of Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, what kind of procedure is this? We are not in executive session.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked for unanimous consent.

Mr. BALL. I did not hear any motion.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. I asked for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator asked unanimous consent, and unanimous consent was granted.

Mr. BALL. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand that that is what it was for.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is any doubt about it——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Consent was granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. BALL. Are we in executive session, then?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

Mr. WHERRY. We are, for the consideration of the nomination of Miss Frieda B. Hennock.

Mr. BALL. May we proceed in the regular order, then, and have the nomination stated, so that we will know what we are doing? I do not like to have the Senate doing things by unanimous consent. I am not going to hold up the Senate——

Mr. WHERRY. That is the very thing that is done after the Executive Calendar is taken up, and I ask that the nomination be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Nomination passed over. Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I do not intend to make a lengthy speech about this nomination. I am opposed to it, and I want the RECORD to show that. So far as I can discover, the only investigation, the only hearing, regarding this nomination, was a brief executive session of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. For several weeks the reports were that the nomination would never get out of committee. Then all of a sudden it was reported, with, I may say, somewhat suspicious haste. It is for a 7-year term on the Federal Communications Commission. In my opinion that is a tremendously important Commission. I think it is up to the Senate to satisfy itself—and frankly I am not satisfied; I do not know about the wisdom of the nomination one way or the other—that appointments to this Commission will really serve the best interests of the Nation.

I myself have observed some rather disturbing things about the Federal Communications Commission. I have heard more disturbing reports since this nomination was reported. I have heard a report, on what I consider reliable authority—and obviously in the past few days I have not had any opportunity to investigate it, I do not know whether it is true or not—which indicates that certain interests, groups, who are greatly interested in this nomination, have a direct pipe line to the Federal Communications Commission, which we certainly would not want to have occur. What the score is I do not know. So far as I can determine, Miss Hennock is a lawyer from New York, and I might point out that the late President Roosevelt never appointed a member of the Federal Communications Commission from New York City, for the simple reason that New York City is the center of the radio industry, and he wanted to avoid any possibility of the industry itself having too much influence on the Commission. So far as I can discover, she has had no experience in radio matters, and from what I can learn of her background, frankly I do not think she is qualified for the job, and I want to be on record as opposed to her confirmation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota has been very fair in his statement. As chairman of the subcommittee which investigated this nomination for the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which reported it by a vote of 8 to 0, with another member voting "present," I think the Senate should know what we have learned as to the circumstances.

Miss Hennock has been a member of the New York bar for 20 or 25 years. I hesitate to estimate the age of a lady, but I should say she is between 40 and 50 years old, so she is reasonably mature. She has had quite a brilliant record at the bar. She is a member now, which is somewhat unusual for a woman, of the third largest law firm in New York City, one of the most highly respected and distinguished, one composed almost exclusively of Republicans. She has had no experience in radio, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, which, it seemed to many of us, was perhaps most fortunate, because one who had been active in radio work, representing radio clients, would by that very fact come in under somewhat of a cloud. The committee took into consideration her breadth of experience and training and recognized abilities.

I may say that one of her most earnest sponsors was John W. Davis, of New York, who certainly is a leader of the New York bar, and who vouched most earnestly for her capacity and character. And from many other quarters there have come most earnest testimonials as to the character and competency of this woman.

Obviously only the future can tell how well she can fulfill these responsibilities. I can say that we in our committee, share the concern which the Senator from Minnesota has experienced concerning the functioning of the Federal Communications Commission. We think it needs new blood, and it was the consensus of those of us who became familiar with this matter through contact with many who were acquainted with her and through various representations, that she would be well qualified to fit into this position, and we believed her confirmation was warranted and wise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

The nomination of Jack Bostwick to be postmaster at Bastrop, in the State of Louisiana.

On motion by Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the said nomination be considered with those postmasters appearing on today's calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator intend that the nominations of postmasters shall be considered?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be confirmed en bloc.

Without objection the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, are there any measures any Senator desires to bring up at this time, or is there any other matter that is desired to be considered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader whether there is any intention to proceed with Calendar No. 1253, Senate Joint Resolution 76?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the equal-rights amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the Senator who was particularly interested in the legislation stated that it would not be taken up at this time. I would not undertake to take it up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO DECEMBER 31, 1948

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes a. m., Sunday, June 20, 1948) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the provision of House Concurrent Resolution 218, to Friday, December 31, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

TRUCE COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

John J. Macdonald, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations April 23, 1948, vice Thomas C. Wasson, deceased.

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1948

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, established under title I, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948:

James Barron Carey, of the District of Columbia.
George Meany, of New York.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Albert S. Goss, of Washington.
James George Patton, of Colorado.
Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.
Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina.
Robert Henry Hinckley, of Utah.
Sarah Blanding, of New York.
George Houk Mead, of Ohio.
Eric A. Johnston, of the District of Columbia.
Arlon Everett Lyon, of Illinois.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of June 15), 1948:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Frieda B. Hennock to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1948.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Betty M. Means, Boligee.
Arcaster Kimbrell, Fayette.
Lucy Torreano, Marvel.

ARIZONA

Robert S. Collins, Superior.

ARKANSAS

Edbert Jessup, Glenwood.
Rayburn G. Smith, Harrisburg.

CALIFORNIA

John S. Hillery, Cathedral City.
William H. Lambert, Eureka.
Howard T. Mitchell, Kenwood.
John E. McSweeney, Mill Valley.
Boyd Beall, Monterey.
Haskell E. Strawn, Rancho Santa Fe.
Ivor E. Lanigar, Susanville.

COLORADO

Ernest J. Redmon, De Beque.
Philip Madonna, Keenesburg.

FLORIDA

Arrie R. Royal, Brewster.
Mary R. Buzbee, Gibsonton.
Grady A. Warren, Lake City.
Alice S. Given, Windermere.

GEORGIA

Benjamin L. Robertson, Jr., Byron.

LOUISIANA

Jack Bostwick, Bastrop.
Inman J. Vining, Choudrant.
Robert Lee Trahan, Maurice.
Hughes T. Young, Sicily Island.

MAINE

Edwin C. Brown, Yarmouth.

MARYLAND

Charles L. Brockmeyer, Glenarm.
Cora L. Sappington, Keymar.
Edward C. Seipp, Pasadena.
Edward V. Dorsey, Upper Marlboro.

NEW YORK

Naoma Brown, Fair Haven.
Victor A. Willette, Mooers.

NORTH CAROLINA

Simon C. Sitterson, Kinston.

OKLAHOMA

Ethel V. Hamrick, Avant.
Omri B. Autry, Marietta.

OREGON

Robert E. Ballard, McMinnville.
Albert R. McCall, Rainier.

RHODE ISLAND

Edward J. Quinn, Barrington.
Stephen H. Greene, Slatersville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Gerome H. Stafford, Jr., Latta.
Edmund R. Kaminer, Lexington.
George C. Aycock, Pinewood.

TEXAS

Arlie Farrington, Alba.
Wallace L. Rickaway, Blessing.
Robert A. Runyon, Brownsville.
Sims A. Palmer, Colorado City.
Sidney R. Malone, Devine.
Elmer E. Carruth, Elsa.
Timmie A. George, Louise.
Guy Miller Mann, Malone.
Wilson O. Dunn, Mauriceville.
Alfred M. Weir, McAllen.
Jewel M. Latimer, Olmito.
Alvin O. Fields, Ozona.
Earl Bennett Spinks, Raymondville.
Guy B. Karr, Spur.
Cleo M. Hagan, Yoakum.

VIRGINIA

O. Ray Vanlandingham, Avalon.
Abram C. Turner, Jr., Clover.
Edward C. Taylor, Hanover.
Clinton Webb, Jr., Hillsville.
Arlene H. Bane, Vernon Hill.
Robert C. Sanders, Warsaw.

WASHINGTON

Melvin S. Jones, Cheney.
Malcolm P. Hutton, Edwall.
Walter A. Oliver, Hoodsport.
LeRoy P. Jensen, Lopez.
Sherman T. Combs, Packwood.
James C. Banta, Millwood.
Lavon B. Kelly, Zenith.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord God, forever let our prayers go up and Thy blessings of love and mercy come down upon all associated with the Congress. In these final hours, as we make difficult decisions, be Thou with us and guide us, for what we do here is of untold influence upon all our people.

As we separate for a while, O keep us beneath the shadow of a great protection, for we know that naught Thou hast made, above, below, can part us from Thy tender care. Let Thy wonderful love encircle all our homes and bless us with good health and comfort. The Lord bless you and keep you. The Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. The Lord lift the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, June 17 (June 17 and 18), 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948; and

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 411. An act for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old);

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer;

S. 2075. An act for the relief of Wisia Paryzenberg;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic;

S. 2299. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 2339. An act to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein;

S. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States

the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; and

S. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; and

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) entitled "An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two matters.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, two things become most apparent today. One is that the House will not be given a chance to vote on a genuine housing bill that will do something to eliminate the critical housing shortage for veterans in the cities and for veterans on the farms.

It also becomes apparent that the Congress will not adjourn sine die tonight, but will be back here in session. Therefore, I urge you and all Members who want a real housing bill, instead of a phony one, to sign the discharge petition to discharge the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill so that when we come back here after this recess this bill will be up for action and the House will be able to stand up and be counted on how we stand on a genuine and a real housing bill.

CHRONIC SOBBING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to hear the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the great statesman who was awarded $10,000 and the Collier's certificate of merit as an outstanding Member of the Congress, take the floor and cry and sob and complain about the shortcomings of the Republican Congress—and his sob story he will probably leave out of the RECORD.

He has long been a member of the Democratic, or of the New Deal, I know not which, party in the Congress. For 14 years his party was in control of the Congress or, perhaps more accurately, of the executive branch of the Government, which was a Democratic or a New Deal—shall we say—institution or mouthpiece—perhaps the latter is the better term—for as many long-haired, dizzy crackpots as could conveniently find housing in Washington.

For that period, the Democratic Party—and let us get down to facts—was under the domination of the New Dealers. The majority party was so befuddled, confused, and without leadership, so spineless, that it became known the country over as the "yes man" party, the rubber stamp party. The party organization had no mind of its own; consequently, no will of its own. It merely executed orders which came from the executive branch, of which the New Dealers had control.

It might be said, with a degree of truth, that the gentleman's party dictated the policy of the judicial branch of the Government; that we had in that branch of the Government men who, instead of interpreting the laws enacted by the Congress in accordance with judicial precedence and the will of Congress as expressed in the debates, wrote their ideas of what the Congress should do or imposed them upon the enactments of the Congress.

The gentleman's party organization spent and caused to be spent billions upon billions of dollars, some of it needfully, most of it extravagantly, much of it wastefully. According to some of the reports of congressional committees of which the party which was doing the spending had control, some of the money was spent for political purposes.

The gentleman's party caused to be given to foreign governments, much of it to politicians of other nations, since 1940, something like $80,000,000,000. That does not include the cost of the war to which we were surreptitiously committed and in which we were engaged months before the Congress declared war.

During the war and after the war, as well as prior to the war, the gentleman's party caused other billions to be spent upon unsound projects. Lend-lease, UNRRA, the Voice, to mention but three, have been demonstrated to be the sources for corruption and activities which, instead of being good for the country, were bad—absolutely bad.

Billions upon billions of dollars were spent by the gentleman's party, taken from the taxpayers, and wasted upon socialistic plans and schemes. A million or more unnecessary Federal employees were put upon the Federal pay roll. Millions of dollars were spent on public housing, and while a few were provided with homes, the cost was exorbitant, and the number who were disappointed and disillusioned was far greater than the number of those who actually received a benefit.

Oh, the gentleman can criticize the Republican Party for its failure to cure all of the ills inflicted upon the country during the 14 years his party was in control, but the mess they left us it will take years to clean up. The cleaning of the Aegean stables was but child's play compared to the job which the Republicans inherited from the New Dealers.

Our efforts to do a worth-while job have been obstructed, hindered, delayed, and thwarted by the executive branch of the Government. With an Executive whose agencies cover up the stealing of elections, pardon known gangsters, and who himself assails the Congress and attempts to discredit it in the eyes of the people, it is small wonder that we have been able to accomplish anything worth while.

Yet the fact remains that, in spite of the obstacles thrown in its pathway, notwithstanding the efforts of a President who has time and again vetoed legislation and which—may I say to the gentleman—the members of his own organization have been forced to override, this Congress—the Eightieth Congress—has done a worth-while job.

If the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] can find consolation in forgetfulness of the sins of omission and commission of his own party, whose activities seem destined to involve us in a third world war and to make certain our national bankruptcy, by crying and whining about the Republican Party, I shall not sob, but I do not propose to let the gentleman nor his party forget that, in addition to all the financial ills which we have inherited from his party, we have been confronted with a situation where a majority of the Congress seems to feel that it is necessary to draft our young men, to conscript them, to take them from their homes in order that we may meet a situation which, we are told, threatens our national security and which the gentleman's party in the Congress and in the executive departments—particularly in the State Department—lacks the statesmanship to prevent.

Talking about housing, how can the gentleman expect a returned veteran to get building materials when all the time his organization has been insisting that it and other essential items be sent abroad?

I wonder, sometimes, if there will be lumber enough left in this country to make caskets to bring back the ashes and the bones of those who, if we continue our foolishness, vacillation, and

interference in the problems of other nations, will be what is left of the boys we conscript to back up United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not true also they had the so-called Wyatt housing bill and spent billions on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. They had everything. They had the public purse, they had the ability to tax the taxpayers, the citizens of this country. The net results are bankruptcy, hardships for our citizens, higher and ever higher prices, and conscription in peacetime.

The record is so bad, I think the gentleman should hang his head in shame, repent in sackcloth and ashes, and ask the good Lord to forgive his party for the irreparable harm it has done to our citizens, to our Nation.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the gentleman from Oklahoma, absolutely surprised. We had a bill up here yesterday to help the veterans to get more housing, and it will help them, and he voted against that bill. It is a great thing for some of these New Deal Democrat spenders to come in here now at the end of a session and cry "Wolf, wolf, wolf." For 14 years they have had everything their own way, and they did not do what they should have done for some of the people of this country. For 14 long years they have spent money like drunken sailors. They have thrown everything in the category of permanent help to our people to the winds. A lot of people in this country who needed help, they overlooked, yet they go out here now and cry, "Wolf, wolf." There is the gentleman from Texas. He did the same thing; he voted against the housing bill. It is about time that some of these fellows take recognition of what they have done in the past. They cry "Wolf, wolf," and there is no wolf. They try to let veterans know there is no help, it is just the opposite—it gives the greatest help to all veterans. If you will just come to the conclusion that the Republican Party is going to help the people of America instead of selling out to the people in foreign countries, we will do something for our own people.

The housing bill passed yesterday will aid the veterans get more housing than ever before and last year we built the most houses ever built for veterans.

The slum-clearance feature of a bill at this time does not make sense, if they tore down slums now it would increase cost of veterans' houses because it would make materials more scarce and cause the price to be higher. It would work against the veterans.

We can postpone slum clearance for another year because it is sensible to do so and I am for slum clearance and I hope we start here in the District of Columbia, but not this year.

I hope the gentlemen from Oklahoma and Texas stop such criticism as they offer as I think it is anything but just practical or gives the honest situation. Do not try to fool the people any longer. It is not good taste or sound.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 123]

Anderson, Calif.	Gallagher	Meade, Md.
Andresen, August H.	Gamble	Mitchell
	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton
Andrews, N. Y.		O'Konski
Bates, Mass.	Harless, Ariz.	Peden
Beckworth	Hartley	Price, Fla.
Bell	Hébert	Rains
Brown, Ohio	Isacson	Regan
Buffett	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Celler	Jensen	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Russell
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Sasscer
Cox	Kee	Scoblick
Cravens	Kefauver	Simpson, Ill.
Cunningham	King	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Smith, Maine
Domengeaux	Lane	Stigler
Dorn	Ludlow	Stratton
Ellsworth	Macy	Taber
Fellows	Manasco	Thomas, N. J.
Flannagan	Marcantonio	West
Fuller	Meade, Ky.	Wolcott

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WAR CLAIMS BILL OF 1947

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide relief for internees in certain cases, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to say that in my opinion, Congress ought not to adjourn sine die if it means rushing legislation through in this way.

It is doing infinitely more harm than good. If you want to adjourn over for a few days so that you can hold your convention, that is all right; but I do not believe in rushing important legislation through without due consideration.

I am not going to object to sending this bill to conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HINSHAW, O'HARA, HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., CHAPMAN, and BECKWORTH.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5888) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the conference report, including the statement on the part of the manager of the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the report, I might say, is unanimous.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) entitled "An Act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: change the figure "$40,000,000" to read "$450,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 4, of the amendments of the Senate, strike out the words "one fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof the words two fiscal years;

Page 2, line 12, of the amendments of the Senate, after the word "year" insert the following: ", including any funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of subsection (a) under 2 (a) and on page 3, line 8, strike out "(b)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Page 4, line 8, of the amendments of the Senate, change the figure "$20,000,000" to read "$17,500,000";

Page 5, line 19, change the colon to a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph through line 9, on page 6; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
E. G. ROHRBOUGH,
J. GLENN BEALL,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5888) submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 strikes out the unnecessary word "postwar".

Amendment No. 2 fixes the amount authorized to be appropriated at $450,000,000, $50,000,000 less than the House bill, for each fiscal year.

Amendment No. 3 inserts the word "and", an insertion made necessary by elimination of the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

Amendment No. 4 eliminates the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

The Senate conferees, by receding from amendment No. 5, agree to restoration of the House language in lines 11–21, page 2.

Amendment No. 6 advances the latest date on which the apportionment to the States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, must be made to September 1, 1948. Under existing law such apportionment could have been made as late as January 1, 1949.

Amendment No. 7, as agreed to by the conferees, makes the grace period, in which apportionments shall be available for expenditure, 2 years; the House bill provided for 3 years. Also, insertion of the words ", including any funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act," after the word "year", in line 1, page 4, makes more definite the application of the provisions regarding apportionment under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948.

Amendment No. 8, as agreed to by the conferees, strikes out section 2 (a) and thereby eliminates amendment of existing law regarding the Federal share payable on projects on the national system of interstate highways. Subsection (b) becomes section 2.

Amendment No. 9, as agreed to by the conferees, authorizes $20,000,000 for forest highways, as compared to $25,000,000 in the House bill; authorizes $17,500,000 for forest development of roads and trails, as compared to $12,500,000 in the House bill. By changing the colon, after the word "program", in line 17, page 7, and striking out the balance of the language in section 3 (a), the provision is eliminated whereby any State wherein forest highways are located, and where it is not found feasible to expend all of the funds apportioned under section 1 for the purposes for which such funds were so apportioned, the Commissioner of Public Roads in his discretion, and upon application in writing by the State highway department of the State, could agree to pay, from the funds apportioned under section 1 to the State, any or all of the funds which are not covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects, for payment up to the full cost of the construction of forest highways across national-forest lands within the State.

Section 3 (b) of amendment No. 9 cancels the authorization in section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

Section 3 (c) of amendment No. 9 provides that—

Hereafter, construction work on forest-development roads and trails, pursuant to the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, estimated to cost $10,000 or more per mile, exclusive of bridges, shall be advertised and let to contract. If such estimated cost is less than $10,000 per mile, or if, after proper advertising, no acceptable bid is received, or the bids are deemed excessive, the work may be done by the Secretary of Agriculture on his own account.

Amendment No. 10 changes a section designation; amendments Nos. 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 18 are made necessary by elimination of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

Amendment No. 11 increases the amount authorized for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, from $4,250,000 in the House bill to $10,000,000.

Amendment No. 14 was receded to by the Senate conferees, leaving the authorizations for access roads to national parks and Indian reservation roads, but in each instance eliminating the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

Amendment No. 19 merely changes a section designation.

Amendment No. 20 corresponds to H. R. 3759, passed by the House on July 7, 1947, and increased the percent for administrative costs from 2½ percent to 3¾ percent.

Amendment No. 21 merely changes a section designation.

GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
J. GLENN BEALL,
E. G. ROHRBOUGH,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2849) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to say that the Veterans' Committee went into this proposition fully. We think this measure is justified.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to Washington County, Ark., without consideration, the following-described tract of land, which is a part of the lands of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Fayetteville, Washington County, Ark.:

A part of the southeast quarter of northeast quarter of section 9 and a part of the southwest quarter of northwest quarter of section 10, township 16 north, range 30 west, fifth principal meridian, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the southwest corner of southeast quarter of northeast quarter of said section 9, running thence north 200 feet; thence east 530 feet; thence north 50 degrees 18 minutes east 234$^{33}/_{100}$ feet; thence east 744$^{17}/_{100}$ feet to the center of said United States Highway No. 71; thence south 2 degrees 2 minutes west along center of said United States Highway No. 71 350$^{24}/_{100}$ feet; thence west 1,442$^{40}/_{100}$ feet to the place of beginning, containing 9$^{89}/_{100}$ acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, insert after the word "directed" the words "subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, insert: "The deed shall reserve to the United States all interest in and to any oil, mineral, or fissionable material in said land, and shall provide for reversion to the United States if the land ceases to be used for hospital purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SOMERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GORDON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. KECGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and an editorial.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain articles.

Mr. SABATH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two different instances and to include an editorial from the New York Times, and two additional articles.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert various clippings from newspapers.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two different instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include an editorial in each.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts and letters from constituents.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include two newspaper editorials and a magazine column.

Mr. CHAPMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a transcript of a program held in the Press Gallery honoring the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters and information from the Veterans' Administration, and certain newspaper articles.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 122, the housing bill, I am recorded as not voting. I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present I would have voted in favor of that measure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on research in the Quartermaster Corps, notwithstanding the fact that the article may slightly exceed the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Maryland) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an article from the Women's Investors' League.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, one on the late Thomas L. Owen, one on veterans' legislation, and in one to include a telegram on parachutes for airplanes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include quotations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous material. In one I ask unanimous consent to include the Meet the Press program of a recent date. This will probably slightly exceed the limit established by he Joint Committee on Printing. The Government Printing Office has not supplied the figure. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests of the gentleman from Nebraska are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of the Red Lake Indians, and the per capita payment to Indians.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in answer to President Truman and his farm set-up.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

PATMAN WITHDRAWS RESTRAINING AMENDMENT CONCERNING PERU

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today withdrawing my proposed amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act which I introduced a few days ago in the House Banking and Currency Committee. This amendment would have prohibited loans to countries who had failed to live up to their agreements with the United States. This proposal was the result of action on the part of Peru in suspending the operating permit of Braniff International Airways into Lima. The reason for my change of position is that the Government of Peru Thursday lifted the Braniff suspension, and Braniff Airways is now able to inaugurate service into Lima, effective immediately.

UNITED STATES MUCH IN COMMON WITH PERU

I am only too happy to learn of the decision of the Government of Peru to lift the Braniff suspension. Peru has worked side by side with us during the war. They have stood shoulder to shoulder with the United States in many problems before the United Nations. We want to maintain the friendly relations with Peru which have existed these many years.

COLOMBIA, ARGENTINA, AND MEXICO

It is my sincere hope that the Governments of Colombia, Argentina, and Mexico will soon complete the Bilateral Air Transport Agreements with the United States which have been under discussion for many months. Nothing would bring our countries closer together than rapid means of transportation, and nothing would pour dollars into these countries quicker than an air line bringing in tourists and businessmen.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a uniform American pension.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that this Congress has not done more to provide a reasonable and uniform American pension for the aged of this country. I have, from time to time, raised my voice not only in the Third

Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent in Congress, but elsewhere pleading that something really constructive be done about this matter.

When I think of the billions and billions, and then more billions of dollars that have been appropriated by this Congress for so-called foreign aids of all kinds, the major portion of which money can be considered as having been poured down a rat hole, I think the least that we could have done was to have given more consideration to our aged here at home. It is this group of people who, over the past generations, have done their part to bring America forward to the great nation that we are today. They certainly are entitled to and should have received more consideration than has been given them. It is appalling when we consider that all we have done for our aged is approximately raise the figure of assistance of $1 a day to $1.17 a day on an average. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues agree with me that this can only be considered little or nothing in view of the increased cost of living that has taken place in the last few years. It really amounts to nothing more than a moderate-priced dessert for one meal. As my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GERALD LANDIS], has put it, this leaves nothing for breakfast, nothing for dinner, nothing for housing, nothing for medical care, and nothing for the myriads of incidentals so necessary to the security and comfort to which they are entitled in the twilight of life.

Mr. Speaker, we should all stand and bow our heads in shame for what we have failed to do for the honored and respected mothers and fathers of our country to whom we owe so much. For Europe we say, "How much does it take?" Then we appropriate it. Why not say with respect to our elder citizens, "How much do they need?" and then appropriate that? That is, in my opinion, the least we can do with any conscience. Is it so much worse, Mr. Speaker, to be hungry and cold in Europe than it is in America? God forbid. Cold and hunger are no respecters of persons or places.

Do we feel so much more concern for the poor in Europe than we do in America? Whom do we as Representatives in the Congress really represent?

I know not what course other Members of this great legislative body propose to take, but as for myself, I shall continue to raise my voice to the best of my ability and strive to do something for our aged.

When we assumed our most solemn obligation to discharge the duties of our offices as Members of the Congress in support of the Constitution of the United States, we obligated ourselves to "promote the general welfare and make secure the liberties" of the people of this country. That is our first and most solemn duty, Mr. Speaker. I am agreeable to being a good neighbor to other countries, but I also believe that charity begins at home. Our first duty is to the citizens of this country. I cannot, therefore, reconcile myself to the idea of billions for foreign countries and mere "beans" for the fathers and mothers who preserved and made this country a great nation.

I am sincerely convinced that a great many of our bureaus in the executive department of our Government are thoroughly unnecessary and if the proper economy measures were taken in the right places billions of dollars could be stricken from our budget and more than enough money left over after making a substantial payment on our national debt to provide a uniform American pension that would be hailed by people in every walk of life as one of the greatest social advancements of our age. This seems to me not only the American way of doing things but also the Christian thing to do.

The united pension program sponsored by the gentleman from Indiana, Representative LANDIS, is, in my opinion, reasonable and just. It would provide for a uniform payment to the elder citizens of our country and certainly is not out of line when we stop to consider the high cost of living in these reconstruction days. This program is not promoted to glorify any individual or any organization either in Congress or out of Congress, but is a sincere desire on the part of many people to recognize a pressing American problem and to strive to do something about it. This matter, in my opinion, should be given earnest and prayerful consideration and should be enacted into law. Failure of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, to do something about this urgent problem may be responsible for bringing about untold suffering and hardships upon millions of our elder citizens this coming winter. This is one of the emergencies which should have been given proper consideration and legislation passed to correct the deplorable condition. Even at this late hour, it is my hope that this Congress will do something about it before we adjourn and go home. The responsibility is ours and should be acted upon now.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of God and for the sake of the aged of this country let us assume our responsibility and take care of them.

Before taking my seat I cannot help but pay tribute to the many people who have worked so diligently and tirelessly to bring the attention of Congress to this grave problem, and to those Members of Congress who have banded themselves together in this cause. These patriotic men and women who have a great love for our country and a sincere desire to assist in bringing about proper recognition for our elder citizens. God bless them and give them strength to carry on the fight.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech on labor legislation.

COLUMBIA RIVER FLOODS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we in the great Pacific Northwest are thankful that the flood waters are receding, but it will be several weeks before the submerged lands are uncovered and an appraisal and survey can be made of the destruction wrought and the actual property damage as well as the accurate determination of the lives lost. The Department of Agriculture reports that loss in farm crops and production alone in the Washington-Oregon-Idaho areas will approximate nearly $10,000,000. The loss to buildings privately owned, Federal and public structures and facilities cannot be accurately determined at this time.

I include for the information of the House Members the following reports which give such information as is available now:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 16, 1948.

FLOOD DAMAGE TO FARMS IN COLUMBIA BASIN ESTIMATED

Lost farm production income estimated for this year in the areas of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho devastated by the Columbia River flood waters will approximate nearly $10,000,000, according to preliminary advance estimates sent to Secretary Charles F. Brannan, of the United States Department of Agriculture, today by George T. Hudson, special representative of the Secretary stationed in the Pacific Northwest to coordinate efforts of the Department agencies in behalf of flood sufferers.

In making their estimates, the Department observers in the stricken areas did not include part-time farmers or nonfarm rural residents in the first list of damages. It is also exclusive of flood damage now being surveyed and reported by the Forest Service on upper watersheds. Likewise, possible damage to public roads, bridges, rural electric power lines or telephone lines are not included in any survey to date.

To date, the best available flood damage figures furnished to the Department of Agriculture by State USDA councils and other agency specialists include the following for Washington and Oregon farms, which are sketchy and incomplete pending further surveys:

Washington State: One thousand three hundred and seventy-five farms affected, with rehabilitation costs placed at $1,375,000; acres of farm land inundated, 104,000; cropland or cultivated pasture flooded, 52,135 acres; cost to return cropland to normal cultivation, $781,900; cows evacuated, 11,500 head; hay requirements to next pasture season, 20,000 tons valued at $700,000; seed requirements, 263,800 pounds, worth $205,000; grain feed requirements, 10,625 tons worth $1,062,500; fences destroyed, 1,955 miles, to cost $627,000 for replacement; 880 farm buildings damaged or destroyed at a cost to rehabilitate of $2,279,500; fertilizer needed, 5,000 tons worth $375,000; farm bridges to rebuild or repair at cost of $200,000; repair of damaged farm roads, $50,000; loss of home-grown food estimated at $137,500, and personal property damages valued at about $1,230,000. In addition special needs must be met in Chelan, Douglas, and Pend Oreille Counties at cost of about $272,000, the estimate concludes.

Oregon estimates: Eight hundred farms affected with rehabilitation costs put at $450,000; acres of farm land inundated, 50,000; cropland or cultivated pasture flooded, 26,000 acres; cost to return cropland to normal cultivation, $390,000; number of cows

evacuated, 5,400 head; hay requirements to next pasture season, 12,150 tons at a value of $425,000; seed requirements, $430,000 for replanting mint and seeding pasture and hay crops; grain feed requirements, 4,050 tons worth $405,000; fences destroyed, 500 miles, to cost $157,000 for replacement; 450 farm buildings damaged or destroyed at a rebuilding and repair cost of $1,350,000; fertilizer needed, 1,000 tons, worth $75,000; $50,000 for repair of farm bridges; $20,000 for repair of farm roads; loss of home-grown food, $45,000; and personal-property damages estimated at $225,000.

Loss of income from crops and livestock, in addition to the current flood damage rehabilitation costs, is estimated for Washington, Oregon, and Idaho farms at $9,863,000.

DIGEST OF REPORT FROM L. R. DURKEE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY, PORTLAND, JUNE 16, 1948

Columbia and Willamette are dropping faster than estimated with prospects of 2-foot recession by Saturday. Portland level down to 29.35 and Vancouver stage at 29.6 Tuesday noon. River forecaster Elmer Fisher expects river at Portland to be 28.4 Thursday, 27.9 Friday, and 27.5 Saturday.

Down-river dikes, seriously saturated, described as still critical, but no new breaks reported. Levee repairs on upper Puget Island about completed which will permit faster drainage of flooded acreage below, and the Columbia slough, filling the Multnomah drainage district northeast of Portland since Friday morning, has been plugged at both ends. Army engineers expressed hope their battle was nearing an end.

Flood levels started dropping on the upper Columbia 4 days ago and in British Columbia the flood-control commission announced recessions in the Frazer River Valley.

Known dead attributable to the flood placed at 42, missing at 28.

Red Cross case load in Oregon and Washington numbered 8,523 families Tuesday, homeless families 43,440. It is sheltering 8,533 individuals and feeding 19,354. Peak case load registration expected to reach 12,000 families.

Red Cross emergency relief expenditures so far approximately $600,000 for food, clothing, some shelter, and hay for cattle.

Housing: Dr. J. Bion Philipson, representing Foley, arrived Monday, visited Vancouver Tuesday with Epstein and Portland-Vancouver Housing Authority. Floyd S. Ratchford, Vancouver, said 22 apartment wings at Ogden Meadows would be renovated, work starting today and first families moving in July 1. Rearrangement will provide 43 three-room units, 88 two-room, and 12 one-room units. The buildings were up for sale 3 days before the Vanport disaster. Bids were returned and the sale canceled. Cost estimate for work is $400,000 to come out of $10,000,000 flood-relief fund.

Ten buildings being renovated at Vancouver Barracks include four barracks-type buildings to be made into 128 three- and four-bedroom apartments, three apartments to house 26 families and two nurses' homes to be developed into 16 apartments. Believe War Assets would make more buildings available at the deactivated Army post. About 1,300 evacuees already housed at Swan Island.

Unable yet to get working figure on estimated number of housing units needed. Two hundred eighty-three trailers expected by Thursday at Guilds Lake housing site, under FWA assignment. Been coming in since Saturday from Stockton and 100 due Wednesday afternoon on 50 flatcars from San Antonio. A trailer city is growing on the housing site. Water and sewers ready to be hooked up.

Philipson unwilling to guess number of houses needed, everybody else reluctant to hazard opinion at this time, among the Federal men.

FWA: Large amounts of materials, expendable and inexpendable, are converging on Portland by trains, trucks, and vans. Beds, mattresses, and bedding for more than 1,500 families, other furniture, mobile unexpendable equipment out of WAA surplus, are being assigned to various areas of the disaster district. Formal applications for such assistance are being received from towns, counties, and diking districts. The big impact of the movement has not yet arrived, but eight carloads of additional furniture, including 560 beds, mattresses, chests, chairs, and tables would reach the FWA warehouse on Swan Island by tonight. Twenty-five vanloads of furniture and expendable equipment from housing projects and military installations in Texas, Arkansas, New Mexico, and Kansas were expected in Portland by Sunday. An additional 25 vanloads of materials and equipment, including furniture, have been loaded at Willow Run, Mich.; Ottawa, Ill., and Manitowoc, Wis., for shipment here.

Movement of nonexpendable equipment into the flood-disaster areas about Bonners Ferry, Orofino, and St. Maries, Idaho, includes 32 Quonset huts in transit from Cincinnati to replace city and county buildings lost in the flood at Orofino. Equipment also includes dump trucks, drag lines, a bulldozer, and lumber for rebuilding bridges. Materials were moving into the Kootenai River flood areas from the Ogden Army depot and WAA warehouses in Spokane and San Francisco, and included 43,000 feet of cable, power shovels, and trucks, a suction dredge, pile driver, and steam cleaning unit. Also included were DDT spray and portable sprayers. A water-purification system for Bonners Ferry was located at the University of Idaho.

Have assigned a fire pumper truck located by WAA in Portland to the mayor of Clatskanie.

Public health: Dr. H. M. Erickson, Oregon State health director, and Porter Stephens, in charge of the Portland-Vancouver area for the State sanitary service, report excellent cooperation with USPHS, Department of the Interior, FWA, and other Federal agencies. The present need is for prompt immunization and typhoid vaccine has been received in sufficient quantities. Sanitary engineers have been sent to the flood area from Atlanta, New Orleans, and San Francisco, with Federal entomologists. The environmental sanitation problem will grow as the water recedes, the work of mosquito and fly eradication is already proceeding. In the Oregon-Washington area 10,000 pounds of 40-percent DDT, 400 pounds of 100-percent DDT, and 3,000 gallons of oil are now available.

Interior expects more funds by July 1 for its work on rat control. Col. Roy Bessey, executive director for the Pacific Northwest region, says that mobile and electrical equipment and transportation services have been supplied to flooded areas.

Public roads, FWA: The Union Avenue cut-off is now serving for emergency travel, busses, milk, vegetables, and other perishables. Public Roads Administration engineers in Washington, Montana, and Idaho are reporting on the condition of roads, and the State highway departments in Washington and Oregon are taking care of emergency traffic with detours and temporary work, such as sandbagging between Portland and Longview, Wash.

Department of Agriculture: Reports engineering assistance and the assignment of equipment, bulldozers, drag lines, etc., in rehabilitation of irrigation work in Okanogan County, and the Methow and Kittitas Valleys, in Washington, and in northern Idaho. (Don't know about the reported $1,400,000 residue from 1942 act.)

Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Receiving some applications for loans for repair or rebuilding of barns and other farm buildings, William Kennedy, Portland manager, said. Reconstruction Finance Corporation has opened offices in Woodland, Rainier, and Vancouver. To examiners from Cleveland and two from San Francisco, experienced in disaster work, have been assigned to Portland. An anticipated situation of considerable gravity is expected as the flood waters recede.

Pacific Northwest floods

(Compiled from latest reports and issued by Disaster Relief Service, American Red Cross, June 15, 1948)

	Number of families affected	Number needing Red Cross aid	Number of families registered	Number of homes destroyed	Number of homes damaged	Number of persons made homeless	Number of persons in Red Cross shelters	Number of persons fed by Red Cross
Montana:								
Flathead County	55	39	8		35			
Lincoln County	50	20			50			
Sanders County	15	6			15			
Lake County	15	4			10			
Missoula and Mineral Counties	15	5			15			
Ravalli County	5	4			5			
Cascade County	65	15			40			
Total	220	93	8	0	170	0	0	0
Idaho:								
Benewah County	60	40	22	1	60	100		
Bonner County	50	10			40	30		
Boundary County	550	380	100	35	300	1,400		
Clearwater County	150	100	50		50			
Idaho County	195	135	180	25	60	60		
Nez Perce County	25	2	6		1			
Shoshone County	19	7	5	1	10	55		
Total	1,349	674	363	62	521	1,645	0	0

Pacific Northwest floods—Continued

(Compiled from latest reports and issued by Disaster Relief Service, American Red Cross, June 15, 1948)

	Number of families affected	Number needing Red Cross aid	Number of families registered	Number of homes destroyed	Number of homes damaged	Number of persons made homeless	Number of persons in Red Cross shelters	Number of persons fed by Red Cross
Washington:								
Spokane County	15							20
Benton County	1,349	175	377	1	437	5,400	113	149
Franklin County	300	100	140	2	148	900	30	70
Okanogan County	500	200	56	55	370	244		
Chelan County	95	40	12		60	200		
Kittitas County	103	24	5		60	60		
Walla Walla County	30	4	5		4	22		
Yakima County	600	150	352	25	246	700		555
Clark County	3,850	795	859		524	2,200	85	1,600
Cowlitz County	1,600	344	314	10	365	7,400	275	1,230
Wahkiakum County	275	200	225		140	1,050	30	250
Whitman County	16	8	8		3	1		
Skamania County	3	1	1		1			
Grant County	25	8	3		23	6		
Pend Oreille County	300	150	95	1	184	600		
Douglas County	60	20	5		35	120		
Klickitat County	3				3			
Total	9,124	2,219	2,457	93	2,703	18,903	533	3,874
Oregon:								
Clatsop County	40	3	9					
Umatilla County	18	18			18			
Wasco County	24	17	17	2	6	8		
Multnomah County (Portland)	7,800	6,380	6,152	[1] 5,042	16	24,900	3,000	15,000
Columbia County	395	295	67	15	142	860		500
Sherman County	15							
Union County	1							
Clackamas County	1	1	1		1			
Total	8,294	6,714	6,246	5,059	183	25,768	3,000	15,500
Grand total	18,987	9,700	9,074	5,214	3,577	46,316	3,563	19,374

[1] On the last report a footnote indicated "Represents 4,000 living units in Government housing project buildings."

Distribution: President O'Connor; United States Senators and Representatives from Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon; headquarters management; area managers. Copies also sent to: General Fleming, Federal Works; Mr. Eagan, Public Housing; Mr. Foley, Housing and Home Finance; Colonel Morrell, FWA.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

JUNE 17, 1948.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE MEMBERS THEREOF:

This is to notify you that I have resigned as a Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Indiana, effective at the close of the day, July 1, 1948, and have transmitted my resignation to the Governor of the State of Indiana, a copy of such resignation so transmitted is hereto attached.

NOBLE JOHNSON.

To the GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF INDIANA:

This is to notify you that the undersigned, a Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Indiana, hereby and by this instrument resigns as such Representative in Congress, said resignation to take effect on the 1st day of July 1948.

Dated this 17th day of June 1948.

NOBLE JOHNSON.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

JUNE 19, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on appropriations.

Respectfully yours,

NOBLE JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON THE COURTS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK WITH RESPECT TO OFFENSES COMMITTED ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1683) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of New York shall have jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations within the State of New York to the same extent as the courts of the State have jurisdiction over offenses committed elsewhere within the State as defined by the laws of the State.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any Indian tribe, band, or community, or members thereof, hunting and fishing rights as guaranteed them by agreement, treaty, or custom, nor require them to obtain State fish and game licenses for the exercise of such rights."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON THE STATE OF IOWA OVER OFFENSES COMMITTED BY OR AGAINST INDIANS ON THE SAC AND FOX INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1820) to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa for offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation in that State to the same extent as its courts have jurisdiction generally over offenses committed within said State outside of any Indian reservation: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall deprive the courts of the United States of jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE WARM SPRINGS RESERVATION OF OREGON

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1243) to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm

Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what this bill is all about?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, this has to do with certain lands adjoining a national forest in Oregon, formerly held by the Indians in that area. It is proposed in this bill to give the revenues from this national forest to the Indians, but the land is to be administered by the National Forest Administration.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, is this S. 580?

Mr. D'EWART. It is S. 1243.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what happened to the provision with respect to attorney's fees?

Mr. D'EWART. Section 3 is stricken from the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) all money received by or on account of the Forest Service or other agency of the United States after the dismissal of the proceeding in the Court of Claims entitled "The Warm Springs Tribe of Indians of Oregon versus the United States," numbered M-112, for timber (on a stumpage basis) grown on, the lease or rental of, or other rights in, the lands described in subsection (b) of this section shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, pursuant to the provisions of the Act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560). The funds so deposited together with any other funds credited to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Spring Reservation of Oregon under said act shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of said Confederated Tribes and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The sixth paragraph under the heading "Forest Service" of the act of May 23, 1908, and section 13 of the act of March 1, 1911, both as amended (16 U. S. C., sec. 500), and the fourteenth paragraph under the heading "Forest Service" of the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C., sec. 501), shall not be applicable to the money so received.

(b) The lands referred to in subsection (a) of this section are described as follows:

All lands of the United States included within the Mount Hood National Forest in the State of Oregon and lying and being within an area bounded by a line beginning at a point in the middle of the channel of the Deschutes River, established as the initial point of the Handley survey of 1871; thence in a direct line northwestwardly to the seven-and-one-half-mile post of the McQuinn survey of 1887; thence continuing northwestwardly along the line of the McQuinn survey to the 30-mile post thereof at Little Dark Butte in the Cascade Mountains; thence following the McQuinn survey southwestwardly in a direct line to the summit of Mount Jefferson; thence northeastwardly in a direct line to the western terminus of the northern boundary of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation as established by the act of June 6, 1894 (28 Stat. 86); thence along said northern boundary to the place of beginning.

(c) The lands described in subsection (b) of this section shall continue to be administered by the departments and agencies now administering them.

SEC. 2. The benefits herein granted to the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such Indians asserted in the above-mentioned proceeding in the Court of Claims. Any remaining jurisdiction of the Court of Claims with respect to such proceeding is hereby withdrawn, and no court or commission shall have jurisdiction over the subject matter of such proceeding.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall determine the proper fees to be paid to the attorneys of said Confederated Tribes as full compensation for services rendered and amounts necessarily expended by them in representing the tribes in the above-mentioned proceeding. Such fees shall be paid out of the tribal funds of said Confederated Tribes: *Provided*, That no payment on account of said fees in any year shall exceed 50 percent of the sums received by said Confederated Tribes in said year under the terms of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall not become effective unless the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon accept its provisions, in such manner as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, within 1 year after the approval hereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 20, strike out all of section 3.

Page 4, line 5, strike out "4" and insert "3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALIDATING CONVEYANCES OF THE OREGON SHORT LINE RAILROAD CO. AND THE UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2371) validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain this bill?

Mr. D'EWART. This bill clears the title to a fraction of an acre of land along the rights-of-way of these railroads on which an elevator and a mill has been built. It was formerly owned by the Indians, and a flaw has developed in the title. This simply clears the title of this fraction of an acre of ground.

Mr. RICH. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that certain conveyance made by Oregon Short Line Railroad Co., a corporation of Utah, to the Colorado Milling & Elevator Co., a corporation of Colorado, dated September 30, 1927, and recorded April 25, 1932, at 9:02 a. m. in book 68 of deeds at page 42, records of Bannock County, Idaho, and covering the following-described land located in Bannock County, Idaho, to wit: A tract of land one hundred feet wide and one hundred and forty feet long in northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 26, township 6, south, range 34 east, of Boise meridian, and more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the present northeasterly corner of right-of-way of Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. opposite and west of block 329 of townsite of Pocatello, said corner bearing south thirty-three degrees forty-two minutes twenty seconds east three thousand four hundred and sixty-one and three-tenths feet from northwest corner of said section 26; thence south eight degrees forty-one minutes east along present easterly right-of-way boundary of said railroad company, one hundred and forty feet; thence south eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes west one hundred feet; thence north eight degrees forty-one minutes west one hundred and forty feet to point in the present northerly right-of-way boundary of said railroad company; thence north eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes east along said northerly right-of-way boundary one hundred feet to point of beginning, and containing in all thirty-two one-hundredths of an acre, more or less; and that certain conveyance made by the Union Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation of Utah, to the Colorado Milling & Elevator Co., a corporation of Colorado, dated April 28, 1941, and recorded May 29, 1941, at 2:14 p. m. in book 84 of deeds at page 183, records of Bannock County, Idaho, and covering the following-described land located in Bannock County, Idaho, to wit: A tract of land one hundred feet wide and one hundred and forty feet long in northeast quarter of southwest quarter of section 26, township 6 south, range 34 east, of Boise meridian and more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the present northeasterly corner of right-of-way of Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. opposite and west of block 329 of townsite of Pocatello, said corner being southeasterly corner of that certain tract of land conveyed by Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. to the Colorado Milling & Elevator Co. by quit claim deed dated September 30, 1927, and recorded April 25, 1932, in book 68 at page 42 of deeds, records of Bannock County; thence south eight degrees forty-one minutes east along said right-of-way boundary one hundred and forty feet; thence south eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes west one hundred feet; thence north eight degrees forty-one minutes west one hundred and forty feet; thence north eighty-one degrees nineteen minutes east one hundred feet to point of beginning, and containing thirty-two one-hundredths of an acre, more or less; which said lands heretofore formed part of the right-of-way, station grounds, and yards of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. granted by the United States of America to the Utah & Northern Railway Co., predecessor of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co., by act of Congress dated September 1, 1888, or by any other act of Congress, are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed and all title and all rights of reverter or forfeiture of the United States of America in or to the lands described in said conveyances, as provided in the act of September 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 452), or otherwise, is hereby waived, relinquished, and disclaimed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO THE ARMING OF AMERICAN VESSELS

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1107) relating to the arming of American vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during time of war or national emergency the President is authorized, through such agency or agencies of the National Military Establishment as he may designate, to arm, or to permit or cause to be armed, any American vessel as defined in the Neutrality Act of 1939. For the purposes of this act, the term "national emergency" means any time at which the President determines that the security of the United States is threatened through the application, or imminent danger of the application, of physical force by any foreign government or agency against the United States, its citizens, their property, or commercial interests. The provisions of section 16 of the Criminal Code (relating to bonds from armed vessels on clearing) shall not apply to any such vessel.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall become effective on July 1, 1948.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CANAL ZONE CODE

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2747) to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is the policy of this act, incorporating the Panama Railroad Company pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, approved December 6, 1945, for the purpose of conducting business activities incident to the care, maintenance, sanitation, operation, improvement, government, and protection of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone; to preserve the authority vested in the President by the Panama Canal Act of August 24, 1912; to govern and operate the Panama Canal and govern the Canal Zone, or cause them to be governed and operated, through a Governor of the Panama Canal and such other persons as he may deem competent to discharge the various duties connected with the care, maintenance, sanitation, operation, government, and protection of the Canal and Canal Zone. Also it is the policy of this act that the operations in the Canal Zone shall continue to be coordinated, through the President, in order that the responsibility for and authority over this important utility shall not be divided.

REINCORPORATION OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

SEC. 2. Chapter 12 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended by adding at the end of said chapter a new article numbered 8, embracing new sections 245 to 256 of said title 2, and reading as follows:

"ARTICLE 3—PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY ACT

"245. Creation, purpose, offices, and residence of Panama Railroad Company: For the purpose of conducting business operations incident to the care, maintenance, sanitation, operation, improvement, government, and protection of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone, there is hereby created, as an agency and instrumentality of the United States, and as an adjunct of the Panama Canal, a body corporate to be known as the Panama Railroad Company, hereinafter referred to as the 'corporation'. The principal offices of the corporation shall be in the city of New York, N. Y., and in the Canal Zone, but the corporation may establish agencies or branch offices in such other place or places as it may deem necessary or appropriate in the conduct of its business. Within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to venue in civil actions, the corporation shall be deemed to be an inhabitant and resident both of the southern judicial district of New York and of the Canal Zone.

"246. Investment of the United States: (a) As of the beginning of business July 1, 1948, the corporaton shall issue to the United States, and deliver to the Secretary of the Treasury, a receipt for $1 acknowledging the transfer to the corporation, under the provisions of section 251 of this title, of the net assets of the Panama Railroad Company, hereinafter referred to as the 'New York company', a corporation created by an act of the Legislature of the State of New York passed on April 7, 1849, as amended by an act of that legislature passed on April 12, 1855, and which is wholly owned by the United States, and such receipt shall be evidence of the ownership of the corporation by the United States of America. In its capacity as owner of the corporation, the United States shall be represented by the President of the United States or such officer of the United States as may be designated by him, hereinafter referred to as the 'stockholders'.

"(b) The amount of the receipt (referred to in paragraph (a) above) shall be increased by subsequent additional direct investments of the United States, in excess of repayments to the Treasury and extraordinary expenditures and losses applicable as offsets to such investments under the provisions of paragraph (d) of this section, due to (1) funds advanced to the corporation from the Treasury within such appropriations by the Congress as may from time to time be made to meet increased capital needs, and (2) transfers to the corporation from other Government agencies (or, conversely, decreased by transfers from the corporation to other Government agencies), pursuant to applicable provisions of law, of business enterprises, facilities, appurtenances, and other assets, less liabilites assumed in connection with such transfers. Transfers of properties and other assets from or to other Government agencies under clause (2) above shall be at such appropriate amount or amounts as shall be agreed upon between the corporation and the agencies concerned and approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and in the determination thereof due consideration shall be given to the cost and probable earning power of the transferred assets, or usable value to the transferee if clearly less than cost, and adequate provisions made for depreciation of properties and equipment, obsolete or otherwise unusable inventories, and other reasonably determinable shrinkages in values, and, insofar as practicable, there shall be excluded from such amount any portion of the value of the transferred property which is properly allocable to national defense. The board of directors shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of each such transfer, the amount of any accumulated repayments to the Treasury or extraordinary expenditures or losses applicable as offsets to the amount of such transfer under the provisions of paragraph (d) of this section, and the effective date of the transfer.

"(c) In order to reimburse the Treasury, as nearly as possible, for the interest cost of the funds or other assets directly invested in the corporation, the corporation shall pay interest to the Treasury, at least annually, on the net direct investment of the Government in the corporation, as defined in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, and shown by the receipt described therein, at a rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as required to reimburse the Treasury for its cost.

"(d) The corporation shall account for its surplus as follows: (1) The total net income from operations from and after 1904 (when the Government acquired control of the New York company), plus the undistributed net income prior to 1904, less (2) payments to the Treasury as dividends from and after 1904, not applied as offsets to direct capital contributions as described below, and less (3) extraordinary expenditures or losses incurred through directives based on national policy and not related to the operations of the corporation, not reimbursed through specific appropriations by the Congress, and not applied as offsets to direct capital contributions as described below. The corporation shall not be required to pay interest to the Treasury on any part of its surplus, as above defined. Repayments to the Treasury as dividends shall be applicable as offsets against directly contributed capital, past or future, in determining the base for the interest payments required under paragraph (c) of this section. Extraordinary expenditures and losses (as defined in clause 3 above), to the extent not reimbursed through specific appropriations, shall be considered as repayments to the Treasury analogous to dividends and similarly applicable as offsets against directly contributed capital.

"247. Board of Directors: The management of the corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of not less than 9 nor more than 13 persons who shall be appointed by and hold office at the pleasure of the stockholder, or if he so elects, consisting of the stockholder and 8 to 12 other persons: *Provided*, That the Governor of the Panama Canal shall be a director and president of the corporation. Before entering upon his duties, each of the directors so appointed shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. The directors shall receive no salary for their services on the board, but under regulations and in amounts prescribed by the board of directors, with the approval of the stockholder, may be paid by the corporation a reasonable per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence expenses in connection with attendance at meetings of the board or in connection with the time spent on special service of the corporation, and their traveling expenses to and from meetings or when upon such special service, without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, or the Standardized Government Travel Regulations. Nothing contained in this article or in any other act shall be construed to prevent the appointment and service, as a director, officer, or employe of the corporation, of any officer or employee of the United States. The directors, of whom a majority shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, shall meet for organization purposes

when and where called by the stockholder, and for subsequent meetings as provided by the bylaws.

"248. General powers of corporation: The corporation shall have and may exercise the following general powers, in addition to those elsewhere conferred in this article:

"(a) Shall have perpetual succession in its corporate name, unless dissolved by act of Congress.

"(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) May adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its general business, and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law.

"(d) May sue and be sued in its corporate name.

"(e) May appoint such officers, agents, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the corporation, define their authority and duties, fix their compensation, delegate to them such of the powers of the corporation as may be necessary, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums of such bonds. Persons employed by the corporation whose compensation is paid on any basis other than a per annum basis shall not be included in making computations pursuant to the provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945.

"(f) May enter into contracts, leases, agreements, or other transactions.

"(g) Shall have, in the payment of debts out of bankrupt estates, the priority of the United States.

"(h) May determine the character of and necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, and may incur, allow, and pay the same, subject to pertinent provisions of law generally applicable to Government corporations.

"(i) May purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, and hold, own, maintain, work, develop, sell, lease, exchange, convey, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of, and deal in, lands, leaseholds, and any interest, estate, or rights in real property, and any personal or mixed property, and any franchises, concessions, rights, licenses, or privileges necessary or appropriate for any of the purposes expressed in this article.

"249. Specific powers of corporation: Subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, the corporation shall have and may exercise the following specific powers, in addition to those elsewhere conferred in this article:

"(a) May construct, maintain, and operate a railroad across the Isthmus of Panama.

"(b) May construct or acquire vessels, and operate the same for transportation of passengers or freight and for other purposes.

"(c) May construct or acquire, establish, maintain, and operate docks, wharves, piers, harbor terminal facilities, shops, yards, marine railways, salvage and towing facilities, fuel-handling facilities, motor-transportation facilities, power systems, water systems, a telephone system, construction facilities, living quarters and other buildings, warehouses, storehouses, hotels, a printing plant, commissaries and manufacturing, processing or service facilities in connection therewith, laundries, dairy facilities, restaurants, amusement and recreational facilities, and other business enterprises, facilities, and appurtenances necessary or appropriate for the accomplishment of the purposes of this article.

"(d) May make or furnish sales, services, equipment, supplies, and materials, as contemplated by this article, to vessels, to agencies of the Government of the United States, to employees of the Government of the United States, and to any other governments, agencies, persons, corporations, or associations eligible to make or receive such purchases, services, supplies, or materials under the laws prevailing at the time and the policies heretofore or hereafter adopted consistently with such laws.

"(e) May use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

"(f) May take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers in this article or hereafter specifically conferred upon it: *Provided*, That the corporation shall undertake no new types of activities not included in the annual budget program prescribed by section 102 of the Government Corporation Control Act (except those which may be transferred to it under the provisions of section 246 (b) of this title): *And provided further*, That in the event an emergency is declared to exist by the board of directors during a period when the Congress is not in session (or by the Governor of the Panama Canal, acting in his capacity as president of the corporation, with the concurrence of as many of the directors as may be consulted without loss of time unreasonable in the circumstances), recommended appropriate action within the scope of this article may be undertaken. A report on such emergency activity shall be presented promptly to the Congress, when it reconvenes, for its approval and such action as it may deem necessary or desirable with respect to reimbursement through supplemental appropriation of funds to cover costs or losses arising from such emergency.

"250. Subjection of corporation to laws applicable to New York company: The corporation shall, so far as consistent with the terms of this article, be deemed subject to all provisions in treaties and in acts of the Congress of the United States, now in force, which relate or apply to the New York company; and shall have all the rights, privileges, and exemptions, and be subject to all the obligations, liabilities, and responsibilities applicable to the New York company under or by virtue of such provisions.

"251. Taking over of assets and liabilities of, and dissolution of, New York company; release of United States treaty rights in assets: The corporation is authorized and directed to take over the assets and assume the liabilities of the New York company as of July 1, 1948. To accomplish the transfer of such assets to, and the assumption of such liabilities by, the corporation, and to accomplish the dissolution of the New York company, the two corporations are authorized and directed to take, under the supervision of the stockholders, whatever action shall be determined to be appropriate and necessary, whether by agreement, transfer, merger, consolidation, dissolution, or otherwise. Effective upon the transfer of such assets and the assumption of such liabilities, there are hereby released and transferred to the corporation all the right, title, and interest, in and to such assets, which the United States now has or may hereafter acquire by virtue of the convention of November 18, 1903, between the United States and the Republic of Panama; and, specifically, there are hereby released to the corporation any and all reversionary rights of the United States in the lands of the corporation located in the cities of Panama and Colon, Republic of Panama.

"252. Reimbursement of other agencies: The corporation shall reimburse the Civil Service and Canal Zone Retirement and Disability Funds for Government contributions to the retirement fund applicable to the corporation's employees, and the Employees' Compensation Fund, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, for the benefit payments made to the corporation's employees, and shall also reimburse other Government agencies for any payments of a similar nature made on its behalf.

"253. Payment of excess funds into the Treasury: The board of directors shall have the power and duty to appraise, at least annually, its necessary working capital requirements, together with reasonable foreseeable requirements for authorized plant replacement and expansion, and to pay into the Treasury as dividends the amount of funds in excess thereof. Such dividends shall be treated by the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, but shall be treated on the books of the corporation as applicable to reduction of past or future direct Government capital contributions (as provided in section 246 (d) of this title) in determining the base for interest payments required under section 246 (c).

"254. Emergency fund: The corporation may borrow from a fund to be established and maintained in the Treasury, for any authorized purposes of the corporation, but for limted periods only, sums of money not to exceed a total of $10,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The fund shall be established by the deposit by the New York company with the Treasury on or before June 30, 1948, of the sum of $10,000,000 from the invested depreciation reserve funds presently maintained by the New York company, which amount, less any amounts borrowed therefrom by the corporation from time to time, shall be maintained by the Treasury as a separate fund. Amounts borrowed from said fund shall be paid over to the corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, and repayments thereof shall be redeposited in said fund and will be available for subsequent loans. Loans to the corporation from this fund shall not bear interest.

"255. Amendment or repeal: The right to alter, amend, or repeal this article is expressly reserved.

"256. Separability clause: If any provision of this article, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this article and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASSMAN CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JENNINGS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of Massman Construction Co., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of Massman Construction Co., submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of $88,000 to Massman Construction Co. for the use and rental of equipment under a contract, which sum was inadvertently and mistakenly omitted by said company from its

bid for the work done under contract No. W-1096-eng-7350.

The Senate reduced the amount to $28,623.12; and at the conference, the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
ALBERT L. REEVES, Jr.,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUTHER BROS. CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6428) to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by Luther Bros. Construction Co. of Fort Worth, Tex., under Reclamation Bureau contract No. 12r-15757 arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials as provided for in said contracts.

"SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the Luther Bros. Construction Co."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN AMERICAN RAILWAY CONGRESS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States in, and to appoint the United States delegates and their alternates to, the Pan American Railway Congress, the constitution and bylaws of which were approved in Montevideo, Uruguay, April 1946, and deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union in Washington.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

(a) Not more than $5,000 annually for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Pan American Railway Congress and its permanent Commission; and

(b) Such additional sums as may be needed for the payment of all necessary expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities thereof, including expenses of the United States delegates, their alternates, and appropriate staff, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and such other expenses as the Secretary of State finds necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, 79th Cong.), and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b).

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1639) authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of aiding and assisting the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico to protect its diversion dam and the existing works of said irrigation district from flood damage, in the event the Secretary of the Interior determines that flood damage is or appears to be imminent, he, the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby authorized to cooperate with such district and to perform such flood preventive work, repair and rehabilitation upon the diversion dam and the irrigation works of said irrigation district as may be necessary or proper: *Provided*, That, prior to the initiation of such work under this authorization, a repayment contract in pursuance of the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws has been executed with said district.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be expended not to exceed $60,000 from any funds previously appropriated for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation for use in said prevention work, the rehabilitation, reconstruction, and repair of the existing works of such irrigation district, in accordance with the relief program hereinbefore authorized.

SEC. 3. Nothing hereinbefore contained shall be construed as a determination of or in any way to prejudice any rights involving the use of the waters of the Pecos River, or any part thereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2676) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the Regents of the University of Minnesota, a body corporate, organized and existing by virtue of the constitution and laws of the State of Minnesota, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those parcels of real property located in the county of St. Louis, Minn., which were formerly operated as a Federal fish-cultural station, and more particularly described as follows:

All that part of sections 5 and 8 in township 50 north, range 13 west, fourth principal meridian, which is bounded as follows: Beginning at a point in the westerly shore of Lester River, three hundred feet southeasterly from the center line of the Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railway track measured on a line at right angles to the line of said railroad track, thence southwesterly parallel with said railroad track six hundred and fifty-six feet, thence southeasterly at right angles with the line of said railroad track to the shore of Lake Superior, thence northeasterly along the shore line of Lake Superior to the mouth of the Lester River, thence along the westerly shore of Lester River to the place of beginning, containing 6 acres of land, more or less, together therewith all of lots 9 and 10 in block 7 in Lester Park first subdivision, according to the recorded plat thereof, but subject to the right-of-way for highway purposes as conveyed by deed dated February 7, 1945, recorded on March 13, 1945, at 3:30 p. m., in book 765, page 47, in the offices of the register of deeds in and for St. Louis County, Minn.: *Provided*, That the State of Minnesota shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2096) to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317) relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the

State of Kentucky, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after "receipts" insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this authorization shall be used for road development or construction until after all the lands within the maximum boundaries, as authorized by the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635), have been acquired by purchase, condemnation or otherwise."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, the total cost of the Mammoth Cave area was $2,600,000, which was raised through the medium of State and Federal funds, which included $800,000 contributed from a voluntary Mammoth Cave National Park Association with a membership of some 17,000 loyal Kentuckians.

In order to acquire the present acreage of some 50,000, it was necessary to buy out and to move over 600 families. Mammoth Cave was known for its scenic beauty and had attracted thousands of tourists for more than 50 years before the State of Wyoming came forth with the report of its now famous Yellowstone National Park.

I believe that the late Irvin S. Cobb has described this magnificent natural beauty far better than anyone when he stated that the cave was "an open mouth to proclaim the glories of Kentucky and an open door to her hospitality." It was said at the dedication ceremony at which the State transferred the park to the Federal Government:

Kentucky does not part with Mammoth Cave; it merely transfers to the custody of the Nation a great national asset for the perpetual use of a great and generous people.

In the acquisition and purchase of this vast acreage of surface land, the additional rights to the cave's and cavern's minerals, gas, oil, timber, and limestone were also acquired. In the acceptance speech at the dedication on September 17, 1946, Secretary of the Interior Krug said:

Public interest has always, and naturally, been focused on the underground here. Yet this park has those things above ground which contribute much to the enjoyment of visitors. So far as I know, no other park can boast of two navigable rivers—

The Green and Nolin—

and these are rivers of loveliness and charm. I hope to see developed here better means by which the traveler may become acquainted with what they have to offer.

H. R. 2096 provides for the authorization of an appropriation not to exceed $350,000 to acquire additional adjoining lands and interest in adjoining lands which are so vitally necessary for the full and complete development of the Mammoth Cave National Park. At the present time, there are several caves individually owned which are not only contiguous to the boundary of Mammoth Cave National Park, but in some instances, are completely bounded by the present park area. For instance, there is one cave known as the Great Onyx Cave located under a tract of land which is entirely surrounded by the Mammoth Cave Park and, at the present time, the owners of this and other privately owned caves are placed in the unfortunate and unhappy position, as taxpayers, of competing against the United States Government which pays no taxes.

The purchase of these additional caves which are contiguous to the Mammoth Cave Park itself would most certainly enhance the value, prestige, and scenic beauty of the Mammoth Cave National Park. The additional revenues from these caves would add considerably to the revenue now derived by the Mammoth Cave Park from the tourist trade. It is estimated that the total receipts from these privately owned caves, within less than a period of 10 years, will be more than enough to repay to the Federal Treasury the sum authorized in this appropriation.

As my good friend and former colleague from the Second District of Kentucky, the Honorable Earle C. Clements, who is now the Governor of Kentucky, has said:

The entrance is in FRANK'S district—but I have the cave over in the Second District.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the proper development and expansion of Mammoth Cave National Park simply because the entrance lies within the boundary of the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, but I am interested in its growth and development because it will mean so much to all native Kentuckians and citizens throughout the Nation and the world.

For these reasons I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2096, as amended and passed by the Senate, revises this bill and brings it into line with the original form in which it was introduced by my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Earle C. Clements, presently Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; this bill is now in the form that it should be and the Senate amendment thereto has my hearty endorsement and approval.

The purpose of this legislation is to enable the National Park Service to acquire additional cave lands in the present area of the Mammoth Cave National Park, which will not only add to the value and increase the revenues of this national park but contribute to the more orderly, efficient, and harmonious operation of this entire cave area. As the House report on H. R. 2096 explains, under existing conditions an unsatisfactory situation exists, in that the Mammoth Cave National Park is contiguous to and in some instances completely surrounds privately owned caves. Out of this situation has developed confusion and even a competitive spirit which, obviously, is not in the interests of the public or the National Park Service. The enactment of H. R. 2096 will correct this situation.

Mammoth Cave was discovered in 1799—hundreds of thousands of people have visited this marvel of nature's work and countless thousands of people will continue to visit it; while some of you may not as yet have afforded yourselves the opportunity and pleasure of seeing it, all of us are familiar with it—in fact, long before the discovery and development of many of our other great national parks and playgrounds, Mammoth Cave was listed among the "Seven Wonders of the World." Because it is one of America's great natural marvels—one of our national treasures—we all share in it and all of us are interested in its development, progress and welfare.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH PICKERING WINN

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 83) authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, Elizabeth Pickering Winn may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States by taking the naturalization oath of allegiance before any court having jurisdiction of the naturalization of aliens, or by taking such oath before any diplomatic or consular office of the United States abroad.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNA V. REYER ET AL.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1730) for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, who was admitted into the United States on a visitor's visa, and her two sons, Alexander A. Reyer and Vitaly A. Reyer, who were admitted into the United States on student visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entries.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota

for nationals of the Soviet Union and two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of China.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6039) to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after "1946", insert "The President is further authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint in the Regular Navy one officer in the permanent grade of admiral from among any officers on the active list of the Regular Navy who served in the temporary grade of admiral from February 4, 1944, to the present date, and commanded a major combatant unit of the United States Fleet in the Pacific Theater of Operations during all or any part of the Second World War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know the purpose of making these appointments.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill as passed by the House provides for the appointment in the Army of one general of permanent rank and in the Air Force of a general of permanent rank. It was amended in the Senate to provide for the promotion of one admiral to permanent rank. My request is to concur in the Senate amendment, so that the bill when passed will authorize the appointment of one permanent general in the Army, one permanent general in the Air Force, and one permanent admiral of the Navy. The individuals affected by the bill are General Spaatz, General Bradley, and Admiral Spruance.

Mr. RICH. Is this going to add to the high-ranking officials of our Government additional officers?

Mr. COLE of New York. All of these men within a few days will be in retirement. As a matter of fact, one of them already is in retirement.

Mr. RICH. As I understand it, in the last 3 or 4 years, you have been increasing the rank of so many people in the Army and the Navy that it has become quite a burden on the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. COLE of New York. On the contrary, I can assure the gentleman that it has been the determined effort of the Committee on Armed Services to hold down the advancement of and appointment of top-ranking generals. In fact, we wrote a provision of limitation in the promotion bill adopted by the Congress last year designed to effect that very objective.

Mr. RICH. I understand that if the bill which was before the House yesterday on conscription is not passed, that a great many generals and admirals who are now in the Navy will have to be demoted because they do not have a sufficient number of men to keep these ranks. Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. COLE of New York. I cannot advise the gentleman of the effect of the selective-service bill upon the retention or promotion of individuals to the rank of general. However, I can assure the gentleman that the promotion or retention of individuals to the rank of general and admiral was not considered as one of the purposes of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. RICH. Is there such a motive behind the high-ranking officials of the Army and Navy that if they do not keep a great large Army they will not be permitted to keep their rank?

Mr. COLE of New York. All I can say in reply to the gentleman is that so far as I have observed, I have seen no indication of that as being their motive.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to compliment the committee highly upon their fairness in dealing with this bill. Does this extend the same privilege to Admiral Spruance as to the generals involved?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 543. An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Richard T. Charett;

S. 1301. An act for the relief of Alfonso Felici;

S. 1872. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;

S. 1973. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 1982. An act for the relief of Herman A. Bennink;

S. 1995. An act for the relief of George Bailey;

S. 2049. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.;

S. 2050. An act for the relief of Gracy Mariluch;

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. 2504. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 2524. An act for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty;

S. 2551. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes;

S. 2605. An act for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland;

S. 2662. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach;

S. 2667. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

S. 2686. An act to establish the Navajo-Hopi Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other purposes;

S. 2691. An act authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2726. An act for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson;

S. 2764. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2810. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired members of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 2831. An act to authorize the coordination of emergency and relief activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, and for other purposes; and

S. 2850. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Cabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 2729. For the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; and

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5904. An act to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. HATCH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4044) entitled "An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MAGNUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) entitled "An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the said bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2830) entitled "An act to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) entitled "An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6705) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 126, 189, 211, 212, and 214 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 418) entitled "An act to provide for water pollution control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2524. An act for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; and

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to print as a document a manuscript entitled "Toward Peace," relating to American international relations.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) entitled "An act to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6641) entitled "An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Any such annuitant who died during the period beginning on February 29, 1948, and ending on April 30, 1948, leaving a surviving wife or husband, shall be deemed to have made the election authorized in the foregoing proviso and to have named such wife or husband to receive an annuity as provided in such proviso, but no such annuity shall become due or payable to such wife or husband prior to April 1, 1948.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTESTED ELECTION—WILSON AGAINST GRANGER

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House Resolution 692 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of David J. Wilson, contestant, against Walter K. Granger, contestee, First Congressional District of Utah, be dismissed, and that the said WALTER K. GRANGER is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said district and State.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the committee has reached a conclusion on a very difficult contest; and in behalf of the committee I want to say that every member of the committee approached this contest in a judicial frame of mind, and throughout the hearing of evidence, arguments, and deliberations that attitude and frame of mind was maintained.

The conclusion represented by this resolution is an honest, sincere, and, I think, judicial decision of this difficult matter. All angles and all phases and incidents were considered. It is true this is not a unanimous conclusion, but it is a carefully considered decision, and the members of the committee did what seemed to be right and correct in the premises. There were irregularities in connection with the election beyond doubt, and those were weighed. The majority believes that this resolution represents the correct conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, no one has asked to be heard, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4856) entitled "An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "law.", insert "Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to supersede or modify in any way the provisions of section 9 of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESCINDING CITATION FOR CONTEMPT AGAINST JOSEPH P. KAMP

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 495) to rescind the citation for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the citation heretofore voted by the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1944, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, for contempt against Joseph P. Kamp, vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., be, and the same hereby is, rescinded for the following reasons:

1. Said citation was not the legal act of the said committee for the reason that information necessary to said committee and to each member thereof for their consideration was withheld from them.

Certain of said withheld and necessary information was improperly deleted from the official printed record of the hearings without the knowledge of any member of said committee and, therefore, was not available to the members of the said committee at the time they considered the matter and took action resulting in voting a citation for contempt.

Certain of other withheld and necessary information was denied to some members of said committee who were refused answers to specific questions about information available to other members of the committee. Some of this same withheld and necessary information was deliberately kept from the knowledge and consideration of a majority of the members of the said committee.

2. Said citation was not the legal act of the said committee for the reason that exhibits in evidence before the committee and necessary to said committee and to each member thereof for their consideration was withheld from them.

The said withheld necessary exhibits were illegally removed from the committee's files prior to the consideration of the matter by the committee and were not available to the members of the committee at the time they took final action resulting in voting a citation for contempt.

3. The said citation resulted in the indictment of the said Joseph P. Kamp, who was tried for criminal contempt of the Congress in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in December 1946.

On behalf of the defense, the court issued a subpena for one of the said withheld exhibits. Because the said withheld exhibit was not available in the files of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, where it legally belonged, having been removed without the knowledge of the committee or by the authority of the House, the defendant, the said Joseph P. Kamp, was prevented from presenting a full defense and therefore was denied a fair trial.

4. The said Joseph P. Kamp is again to be tried under the said indictment which resulted from the said illegal act of the said committee. The said withheld exhibit, together with the other committee exhibits, were delivered to a representative of the American branch of an international propaganda movement, and the former chairman of the said committee has unsuccessfully attempted to have the said withheld exhibits returned to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and has written to the said Joseph P. Kamp, * * * "We have made another effort to secure the memorandum you desire. We have not been able to get it." Therefore, the said withheld exhibit will again be unavailable and the said Joseph P. Kamp will again be unable to subpena this evidence in his behalf and will therefore again be denied his constitutional right to a fair trial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. EBERHARTER and Mr. KLEIN objected.

REVENUE REVISION ACT OF 1948

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6712) to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequalities, and for other purposes, with committee amendments.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice the motion stated "permission to offer amendments." Am I correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman misheard the request. The request was to suspend the rules and pass the bill with committee amendments.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does that allow those who oppose the amendments 5 minutes on each amendment?

The SPEAKER. The rule provides for 20 minutes on each side. That is, the Republican side will have 20 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who will demand a second, will have 20 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the only amendments that may be considered then are those that the committee acted upon?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Short Title: This act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Revenue Revision Act of 1948":

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—INCOME TAXES

Sec. 101. Taxable years to which amendments applicable.
Sec. 102. Definition of corporation surtax net income.
Sec. 103. Dividends on preferred stock of public utilities.
Sec. 104. Life insurance, annuities, etc.
Sec. 105. Certain employees annuities.
Sec. 106. Restriction on exclusion of certain compensation for disability.
Sec. 107. Allowance for military and naval personnel.
Sec. 108. Last-in first-out inventory.
Sec. 109. Tax treatment upon death of partner.
Sec. 110. Expenses incurred by farmers for soil and water conservation.
Sec. 111. Deduction on account of worthless stock or securities in affiliated corporations.
Sec. 112. Bad debts.
Sec. 113. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.
Sec. 114. Contributions to employee retirement plans.
Sec. 115. Charitable contributions by corporations.
Sec. 116. Change of election with respect to standard deduction.
Sec. 117. Disallowance of deduction for wearing apparel.
Sec. 118. Wages paid to dependents.
Sec. 119. Items not deductible in the case of related taxpayers.
Sec. 120. Dividends received credit.
Sec. 121. Installment basis.
Sec. 122. Taxable years of approximately 12 months.
Sec. 123. Returns by certain tax-exempt organizations.
Sec. 124. Farmers' returns as declarations of estimated tax.
Sec. 125. Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus.
Sec. 126. Service rendered for a period of 36 months or more.
Sec. 127. Election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations.
Sec. 128. Distribution of stock on reorganization.
Sec. 129. Gain or loss in connection with certain corporate liquidations.
Sec. 130. Gain resulting from involuntary conversions.
Sec. 131. Percentage depletion.
Sec. 132. Retirement of bonds.
Sec. 133. Holding period of capital assets.
Sec. 134. Sales of livestock.
Sec. 135. Unlimited deduction for charitable contributions.
Sec. 136. Net operating loss deduction.
Sec. 137. Stock options.
Sec. 138. Foreign tax credit.
Sec. 139. Withholding of tax at source.
Sec. 140. Taxation of the income of estates and trusts.
Sec. 141. Life insurance trusts.
Sec. 142. Family partnerships.
Sec. 143. Capital gains of nonresident alien individuals.
Sec. 144. Treaty obligations.
Sec. 145. Income from sources within possessions of the United States.
Sec. 146. Period of limitations on claims against transferees.
Sec. 147. Date of payment of taxes withheld.
Sec. 148. Extension of period for refund in case of waiver by transferee.
Sec. 149. Tax on regulated investment companies.
Sec. 150. Commuting expenses of disabled individuals.
Sec. 151. Short sales of capital assets.

TITLE II—ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Part I—Estate tax

Sec. 201. Estates to which amendments applicable.
Sec. 202. Transfers taking effect at death.
Sec. 203. Proceeds of life insurance.
Sec. 204. Transfers in contemplation of death.
Sec. 205. Exclusion of amounts payable under certain employee retirement plans.
Sec. 206. Repeal of deduction for support of dependents.
Sec. 207. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.
Sec. 208. Marital deduction in case of life-insurance or annuity payments.
Sec. 209. Technical amendments.
Sec. 210. Credit for taxes of foreign countries and of Puerto Rico.
Sec. 211. Requirement of transfer certificates.
Sec. 212. Period of limitation upon assessment and collection.
Sec. 213. Exemption from the additional estate tax for members of armed forces.

Part II—Gift tax

Sec. 251. Reciprocal trusts.
Sec. 252. Certain employee-retirement plans.
Sec. 253. Gift tax exclusion for future interests.
Sec. 254. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.
Sec. 255. Valuation of gifts.
Sec. 256. Period of limitation upon assessment and collection in cases of omitted gifts.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS AND PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Review of Tax Court decisions.
Sec. 302. Penalty for failure to pay withholding tax.
Sec. 303. Verification of returns.
Sec. 304. Reports to Congress of refunds.
Sec. 305. Reports of compensation of officers and employees.
Sec. 306. Collection of delinquent taxes of Federal employees.
Sec. 307. Distraint on salaries, wages, and compensation.
Sec. 308. Loans of bonds.
Sec. 309. Compromises.
Sec. 310. Reports of refunds to the joint committee.
Sec. 311. Relief in case of certain recapitalizations.
Sec. 312. Travel of field employees.

(b) Act amendatory of Internal Revenue Code: Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a chapter, subchapter, title, supplement, section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, subparagraph, or clause, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Internal Revenue Code.

(c) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

TITLE I—INCOME TAXES

SEC. 101. Taxable years to which amendments applicable.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, the amendments made by this title shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 102. Definition of corporation surtax net income.

(a) The first sentence of section 15 (a) (relating to corporation surtax net income) is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'corporation surtax net income' means the net income minus the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b) (computed by limiting such credit to 85 percent of the net income in lieu of 85 percent of the adjusted net income) and minus, in the case of a public utility, the credit for dividends paid on its preferred stock provided in section 26 (h)."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be effective as if it were made by section 122 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1945.

SEC. 103. Dividends on preferred stock of public utilities.

(a) Surtax on corporations: The second sentence of section 15 (a) (relating to corporation surtax net income) is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this subsection dividends received on the preferred stock of a public utility with respect to which the credit provided in section 26 (h) is allowed shall be disregarded in computing the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b)."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be effective as if it were made by section 116 of the Revenue Act of 1943.

SEC. 104. Life insurance, annuities, etc.

(a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 22 (b) (relating to exclusions from gross income) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Proceeds of life insurance:

"(A) Amounts received under a life insurance contract paid by reason of the death of the insured, whether in a single sum or otherwise (but if such amounts are held by the insurer under an agreement to pay interest thereon, the interest payments shall be included in gross income);

"(B) Transfers: In the case of a transfer for a valuable consideration, by assignment or otherwise, of a life insurance contract, or any interest therein, only the portion of the amounts received thereunder equal to the aggregate of the value of such consideration and the amount of the premiums and other sums subsequently paid by the transferee shall be exempt from taxation under this paragraph. This subparagraph shall not apply in the case of such a transfer if such contract or interest therein has a basis for determining gain or loss in the hands of a transferee determined in whole or in part by reference to such basis of such contract or interest therein in the hands of the transferor.

"(C) Life insurance in discharge of alimony: This paragraph shall not apply with respect to so much of a payment under a life insurance contract, or any interest therein, as, under section 22 (k), is includible in gross income.

"(2) Annuities, etc.:

"(A) Amounts other than annuity payments: Amounts received (other than amounts excludible from gross income under paragraph (1) (A) of this subsection and other than amounts includible in gross income under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of this paragraph) under an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract, but if such amounts (when added to amounts received before the taxable year under such contract and excluded from gross income) exceed the aggregate premiums or consideration paid for such contract (whether or not paid during the taxable year) then the excess shall be included in gross income.

"(B) Amounts received as an annuity: There shall be included in gross income all amounts received as an annuity, whether for a period certain or during one or more lives, under an annuity contract or under an endowment or life insurance contract payable other than by reason of death, and all additional amounts received under such a contract on or after the date on which the first annuity payment is received; except that there shall be excluded from gross income an amount equal to the same proportion of the amounts received as an annuity during the taxable year under such contract which the total consideration paid for such contract bears to the aggregate of the amounts receivable as an annuity under such contract.

"(C) Employees' annuities:

"(i) If any annuity contract is purchased by an employer for an employee under a plan with respect to which the employer's contribution is deductible under section 23 (p) (1) (B), or if an annuity contract is purchased for an employee by an employer exempt under section 101 (6), or if an employer enters into an employee retirement benefit contract with an employee, the employee shall include in his income the amounts received under such contract for the year received; except that if the employee paid any of the consideration for such contract, amounts received as an annuity under such contract shall be included in his income as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph; and except that in the case of amounts received under a contract with respect to which the employer's contribution is deductible under section 23 (p) (1) (B), if the total distributions payable with respect to the employee are paid to the distributee within one taxable year of the distributee on account of the employee's separation from the service, the amount of such distribution to the extent exceeding the consideration paid by the employee, shall be considered a gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months.

"(ii) If an annuity contract (other than a contract described in clause (i) of this subparagraph) is purchased by an employer for an employee and if the employee's rights under the contract are nonforfeitable except for failure to pay future premiums, the amount contributed by the employer for such annuity contract on or after such rights become nonforfeitable shall be included in the income of the employee in the year in which the amount is contributed, and amounts received as an annuity under such contract shall be included in the income of such employee as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph: *Provided, however,* That amounts contributed by an employer to a trust (other than a trust, which on May 25, 1948, met the requirements of section 165 (a)) to be applied by the trustee for the purchase of annuity contracts for the benefit of an employee of said employer shall not be included in the income of the employee in the year in which the amount is contributed if the amount is contributed to the trustee pursuant to a written agreement entered into prior to October 21, 1942, between the employer and the trustee, or between the employer and the employee, and if under the terms of the trust agreement the employee is not entitled, except with the consent of the trustee, during his lifetime to any payments under annuity contracts purchased by the trustee other than annuity payments.

"(D) Annuities in discharge of alimony: Subparagraph (B) shall not apply with respect to so much of a payment under a life insurance, endowment, or annuity contract, or any interest therein, as, under section 22 (k), is includible in gross income.

"(E) Annuities having a refund feature: Where an annuity contract contains a provision giving the estate or beneficiary of a deceased annuitant the right to a refund in respect of the consideration paid, the following special rules shall apply:

"(i) the refund received by the estate or beneficiary of the annuitant shall be included in gross income only to the extent that it, plus any amounts received by the annuitant prior to his death, exceeds the total consideration paid;

"(ii) where the entire consideration for an annuity contract is paid by the annuitant or annuitants, the amount of the 'total consideration paid for such contract', as defined in subparagraph (F) (i), shall be further reduced by the value of any payments to be made to a beneficiary or the estate of an annuitant upon or after the death of the

annuitant or annuitants which are in the nature of a return of the consideration;

"(iii) for the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'refund in respect of the consideration paid' shall include amounts paid after the death of an annuitant by reason of a provision in the contract for an annuity certain.

"(F) Definitions: For the purposes of this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'total consideration paid for such contract' means the aggregate consideration paid reduced by any amounts received prior to January 1, 1948, under such contract or prior to the date on which the first annuity payment under such contract is receivable, whichever is later, and excluded from gross income; and, in the case of an annuity contract referred to in subparagraph (C) (i) or in the proviso in subparagraph (C) (ii), the portion of the consideration contributed by the employee reduced by any amounts received prior to January 1, 1948, under such contract and excluded from gross income; and, in the case of an annuity contract referred to in subparagraph (C) (ii) (but not in the proviso thereof), the aggregate of the portion of the consideration contributed by the employer on or after the employee's rights under such contract become nonforfeitable except for failure to pay premiums and the portion thereof contributed by the employee, reduced by any amounts received prior to January 1, 1948, under such contract and excluded from gross income; and, in the case of a transfer for a valuable consideration, by assignment or otherwise, of a life insurance, endowment, or annuity contract, or any interest therein, if such contract or interest does not have a basis for determining gain or loss in the hands of a transferee determined in whole or in part by reference to such basis of such contract or interest in the hands of the transferor, the aggregate of the value of the consideration paid for such contract and the amount of the premiums and other sums subsequently paid by the transferee, reduced by any amounts received prior to January 1, 1948, under such contract and excluded from gross income:

"(ii) the term 'aggregate of the amounts receivable as an annuity under such contract' includes, in the case of a contract providing for annuity payments during one or more lives, the sum of the amounts receivable as an annuity under an annuity, endowment or life-insurance contract during the period of normal expectation of life of the person or persons whose life or lives were involved in determining the cost of such contract, computed as of the date on which the first annuity payment under such contract was receivable or January 1, 1948, whichever is later, in accordance with mortality tables under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, except that if such contract was transferred but does not have a basis as provided in clause (i), such period of normal expectation of life shall be computed as of the date on which the first annuity payment after the transfer was receivable by the transferee.

"(G) Definition of employee retirement benefit contract: For the purposes of subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, the term 'employee retirement benefit contract' means a bona fide contract between an employer and his employee under which the employer agrees to pay to the employee a specified amount, annually or at more frequent intervals, for the period beginning with the date of retirement of such employee from the service of such employer and ending with the date of death of such employee, if—

"(i) the rights of the employee to receive payments under such contract are to be forfeited in the event of his separation from such service prior to such date of retirement,

"(ii) no life insurance, endowment or annuity contract is at any time purchased or acquired by such employer for the purpose of providing, directly or indirectly, for the payments to be made under such contract,

"(iii) such employee does not, at any time during such employment, own stock possessing more than 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of the employer corporation or of a parent corporation. For the purposes of this clause such individual shall be considered as owning the stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for his brothers and sisters (whether by the whole or half blood), spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendants; and stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for a corporation, partnership, estate, or trust, shall be considered as being owned proportionately by or for its shareholders, partners, or beneficiaries,

"(iv) the date of retirement under such contract will in no event occur before such employee attains the age of 65, except in the case of his total and permanent disability, and

"(v) in any case where such employee is an officer, director, or highly compensated employee of a corporation, the contract has been approved or ratified at a duly constituted meeting of the stockholders of the employer corporation after reasonable notice to such stockholders of the proposed contract; except that such term shall not include any such contract which has as a principal purpose the prevention of the imposition of the surtax on such employee during any part of the period of such employment."

(b) Section 23 (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(bb) Employee retirement benefit contract: If amounts are paid by an employer to an employee under an employee retirement benefit contract as defined in section 22 (b) (2) (G), such payments shall be deductible only in the taxable year when paid by the employer without regard to the method of accounting used by the taxpayer."

SEC. 105. Certain employees' annuities.

(a) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938, and prior to January 1, 1948, amounts contributed by an employer to a trust to be applied by the trustee for the purchase of an annuity contract described in the second sentence of section 22 (b) (2) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code (prior to its amendment by this Act) for the benefit of an employee of such employer shall not be included, notwithstanding any provision of the Internal Revenue Code, in the income of the employee in the year in which the amount is contributed if—

(1) the amount is contributed to the trustee pursuant to a written agreement entered into prior to October 21, 1942, between the employer and the trustee, or between the employer and the employee; and

(2) under the terms of the trust agreement the employee is not entitled, except with the consent of the trustee, during his lifetime to any payments under annuity contracts purchased by the trustee other than annuity payments.

Such amounts contributed by the employer shall not constitute consideration paid by the employee for such annuity contract in determining the amount of annuity payments required to be included in his gross income under section 22 (b) (2) of such code, unless the tax under chapter 1 of such code has been paid by the employee with respect to such amounts and not credited or refunded.

(b) No interest shall be allowed or paid on any overpayment, or assessed on any deficiency, resulting from the application of this section.

SEC. 106. Restriction on exclusion of certain compensation for disability.

Section 22 (b) (5) (relating to compensation for injuries or sickness) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(5) Compensation for injuries or sickness:

"(A) Except in the case of amounts attributable to (and not in excess of) deductions allowed under section 23 (x) in any prior taxable year, amounts received, through accident or health insurance or under workmen's compensation acts, as compensation for personal injuries or sickness, plus the amount of any damages received whether by suit or agreement on account of such injuries or sickness; and

"(B) Amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country, except that if such amounts exceed $2,400 during the taxable year, and the taxpayer also receives during the same taxable year earned income, as defined in section 116 (a) (3), the exclusion under this subparagraph shall be reduced by the amount of such earned income, but not to an amount less than $2,400. The provisions of this subparagraph shall not affect amounts exempt from taxation under the act of August 12, 1935, entitled 'An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pension, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay and insurance, and for other purposes' (49 Stat. 609; 38 U. S. C. 454a).

SEC. 107. Allowance for military and naval personnel.

(a) Section 22 (b) (13) (relating to exclusions from gross income) is hereby amended by striking out "January 1, 1949" wherever occurring therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1950."

(b) Section 10 (b) of the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 384, 80th Cong.), entitled "An act to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II" is hereby amended by striking out "January 1, 1949" and inserting in lieu there of "January 1, 1950."

SEC. 108. Last-in first-out inventory.

(a) Section 22 (d) (6) (A) (relating to the involuntary liquidation and replacement of elective inventories) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By amending that portion thereof preceding clause (i) to read as follows:

"(A) Adjustment of net income and resulting tax: If, for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, and prior to January 1, 1948, the closing inventory of a taxpayer inventorying goods under the method provided in this subsection reflects a decrease from the opening inventory of such goods for such year, and if the taxpayer elects, at such time and in such manner and subject to such regulations as the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary may prescribe, to have the provisions of this paragraph apply, and if it is established to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, in accordance with such regulations, that such decrease is attributable to the involuntary liquidation of such inventory as defined in subparagraph (B), and if the closing inventory of a subsequent taxable year, ending prior to January 1, 1951, reflects a replacement, in whole or in part, of the goods so previously liquidated, the next income of the taxpayer otherwise determined for the year of such involuntary liquidation shall be adjusted as follows:".

(2) By amending the last sentence thereof to read as follows: "Any increase in such taxes resulting from such adjustments shall be assessed and collected as a deficiency with interest computed from January 1, 1948, or from the date prescribed by law for the payment of the tax for the year of replacement, whichever date is the later, and any overpayment so resulting shall be credited or refunded to the taxpayer with interest computed from January 1, 1948, or from the date of expiration of one year after the filing of

a claim for credit or refund of such overpayment, whichever date is the later."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

SEC. 109. Tax treatment upon death of partner.

(a) Income tax treatment of surviving partners: Section 22 (b) (relating to exclusions from gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(15) Exclusion of income after death of partner:

"(A) If, in accordance with an agreement between individuals carrying on business in partnership, a share of the net income from the business is paid, subsequent to the death of a partner, to the estate of the decedent or to any person who acquired from, or by reason of the death of, such decedent the right to receive such share, the amount so paid, except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, shall not be included in the gross income of a surviving partner or in computing the distributive shares of surviving or successor partners under section 182 (c).

"(B) The provisions of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall not apply to any portion, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, of the amount paid in accordance with such an agreement which is paid on account of such decedent's interest in partnership property having a basis (unadjusted) for determining gain or loss on sale or exchange in the hands of the partnership prior to such death in excess of zero."

(b) Income-tax treatment of decedent's estate, etc: So much of section 126 (a) (1) (relating to income in respect of decedents) as precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) General rule: The amount of all items of gross income in respect of a decedent which are not properly includible in respect of the taxable period in which falls the date of his death or a prior period, and all amounts paid in respect of a deceased partner to which section 22 (b) (15) (A) applies, shall be included in the gross income, for the taxable year when received, of:".

(c) Basis: Section 113 (a) (13) (relating to the basis of partnership property) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(13) Partnerships:

"(A) If the property was acquired, after February 28, 1913, by a partnership and the basis is not otherwise determined under any other provision of this subsection, then the basis shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the transferor, increased in the amount of gain or decreased in the amount of loss recognized to the transferor upon such transfer under the law applicable to the year in which the transfer was made. If the property was distributed in kind by a partnership to any partner, the basis of such property in the hands of the partner shall be such part of the basis in his hands of his partnership interest as is properly allocable to such property.

"(B) If any interest in partnership property with a basis (unadjusted) for determining gain or loss on sale or exchange of zero in the hands of the partnership prior to the death of a partner is acquired by a surviving partner or partnership making a payment under an agreement described in section 22 (b) (15) (A), and if any amount paid under such agreement on account of such interest is not includible under such section in the gross income of a surviving partner or in computing the distributive shares of surviving or successor partners under section 182 (c), the basis of such interest shall be zero."

SEC. 110. Expenses incurred by farmers for soil and water conservation.

(a) Section 23 (a) (1) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(D) In the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming, expenditures made for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion of land used in farming shall be allowed as deductions under subparagraph (A). For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'expenditures made for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion' means expenditures for the treatment, moving, or cultivation of earth, including (but not limited to) leveling, grading, and terracing, contour furrowing, the construction of diversion channels and drainage ditches, the control and protection of watercourses, outlets, and ponds, the planting and cultivation of cover and protective crops or windbreaks, the control of weeds and brush and other special or emergency cultivation and tillage; but such term does not include the purchase, construction, installation, or improvement of structures, appliances, and facilities made of masonry, concrete, tile, metal, or wood, such as tanks, reservoirs, pipes, conduits, canals, dams, wells, and pumps, which are subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 23 (l). For the purpose of this subparagraph, the term 'land used in farming' means land used (prior to the expenditure for conservation made by the taxpayer) by the taxpayer or his tenant or the predecessor owner or his tenant for the production of crops, fruits, and similar agricultural products or for the sustenance of livestock."

(b) Section 24 (a) (2) is hereby amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except, in the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming, expenditures incurred for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion within the meaning of section 23 (a) (1) (D)".

(c) Section 113 (b) (1) (A) is hereby amended by inserting after "other carrying charges" the following: ", or for expenditures described in section 23 (a) (1) (D),".

SEC. 111. Reduction on account of worthless stock or securities in affiliated corporations.

Section 23 (g) (4) (B) (relating to worthless stock in affiliated corporations) and section 23 (k) (5) (B) (relating to worthless securities in affiliated corporations) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(B) either—

"(i) more than 90 percent of the aggregate of its gross incomes for all taxable years has been from sources other than royalties, rents (except rents derived from rental of properties to employees of the company in the ordinary course of its operating business and except rents constituting 50 percent or more of the gross income for all taxable years), dividends, interest (except interest received on deferred purchase price of operating assets sold), annuities, or gains from sales or exchanges of stocks and securities; or

"(ii) it is a corporation excluded from the definition of personal holding company under section 501 (b); and".

SEC. 112. Bad debts.

The last sentence of section 23 (k) (4) (relating to nonbusiness debts) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term 'nonbusiness debt' means a debt other than (A) a debt evidenced by a security as defined in paragraph (3), (B) a debt arising in the course of the taxpayer's trade or business, and (C) a debt the loss from the worthlessness of which is incurred in such trade or business."

SEC. 113. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.

(a) Section 23 (o) (relating to charitable and other contributions by individuals) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by inserting in paragraph (2) thereof after "or of any State or Territory" the following: ", or of the District of Columbia,"; by inserting in such paragraph after "religious, charitable, scientific," the following: "veteran rehabilitation service,"; and by striking out of such paragraph after "or educational purposes," the words "or for" and inserting in lieu thereof "including the encouragement of art, and"; and

(2) by striking out paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of, or trusts or foundations for, any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, societies, trusts, or foundations are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(4) a domestic fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation, but only if such contributions or gifts are to be used exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals";

(b) Section 23 (q) (relating to charitable and other contributions by corporations) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by striking out of paragraph (2) thereof after "or educational purposes" the words "or for" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", including the encouragement of art and"; by inserting in such paragraph after "prevention of cruelty to children" the words "or animals"; and by striking out of such paragraph the parenthetical expression appearing therein; and

(2) by amending paragraphs (3) and (4) thereof to read as follows:

"(3) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of, or trusts or foundations for, any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, societies, trusts, or foundations are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(4) a domestic fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, but only if such contributions or gifts are to be used exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals;".

(c) Section 213 (c) (relating to charitable, etc., contributions by nonresident aliens) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Charitable, etc., contributions: The so-called 'charitable contribution' deduction allowed by section 23 (o) shall be allowed whether or not connected with income from sources within the United States, but only as to contributions or gifts made to—

"(1) domestic corporations, or

"(2) trusts, community, chests, funds, or foundations, created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, and if such contributions or gifts are

to be used within the United States or any of its possessions."

(d) Section 232 (b) (relating to charitable, etc., contributions by foreign corporations) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "(but in the case of contributions or gifts to a trust, chest, fund, or foundation, only if such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions)."

SEC. 114. Contributions to employee retirement plans.

Section 23 (p) (1) (E) (relating to contributions of an employer to an employees' trust or annuity plan) is hereby amended by striking out "within 60 days after" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following".

SEC. 115. Charitable contributions by corporations.

(a) Section 23 (q) (relating to charitable and other contributions) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"In the case of a corporation whose net income is reported on the accrual basis, contributions or gifts payment of which is made on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of a taxable year shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be considered as paid during such taxable year and not during the succeeding taxable year. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as is provided under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942. If the taxpayer elects the benefits of the amendment made by this section for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1948, such election shall not be allowed unless the taxpayer, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, consents in writing to the assessment (within such period as may be agreed upon) of any deficiency, to the extent resulting from such election, for any other taxable year of the taxpayer, even though on the date of the filing of such consent such assessment is otherwise prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law.

SEC. 116. Change of election with respect to standard deduction.

(a) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 23 (aa) (3) (relating to optional standard deduction for individuals) are hereby amended by striking out the word "only"; and subparagraph (C) of section 23 (aa) (3) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) If the taxpayer upon making his return fails to signify, in the manner provided by subparagraph (A) or (B), his election to take the standard deduction, such failure shall be considered his election not to take the standard deduction."

(b) Section 23 (aa) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) Change of election: Under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, a change of election with respect to the standard deduction for any taxable year may be made after the filing of the return for such year. If the spouse of the taxpayer filed a separate return for any taxable year corresponding, for the purposes of paragraph (4), to the taxable year of the taxpayer, the change shall not be allowed unless, in accordance with such regulations—

"(A) the spouse makes a change of election with respect to the standard deduction for the taxable year covered in such separate return, consistent with the change of election sought by the taxpayer, and

"(B) the taxpayer and his spouse consent in writing to the assessment, within such period as may be agreed upon with the Commission, of any deficiency, attributable to such change of election, even though at the time of the filing of such consent the assessment of such deficiency would otherwise be prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law."

SEC. 117. Disallowance of deduction for wearing apparel.

Section 24 (a) (relating to items not deductible) is hereby amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (6) thereof, by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding after paragraph (7) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(8) Any amount otherwise allowable as a deduction under section 23 (a) or (l) with respect to wearing apparel (including uniforms and work clothes), but this paragraph shall not prevent the allowance of a deduction to an employer with respect to such apparel furnished to an employee; or."

SEC. 118. Wages paid to dependents.

(a) Section 24 (a) (relating to items not deductible) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) Any amount paid or accrued as salary or other compensation for personal services rendered by any individual with respect to whom a credit is allowed to the taxpayer by section 25 (b) (1) (D) for the taxable year in which such amount is paid or accrued."

(b) Section 25 (b) (1) (D) (relating to credits for dependents) is hereby amended by striking out "$500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$600."

SEC. 119. Items not deductible in the case of related taxpayers.

Section 24 (c) (relating to unpaid expenses and interest) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Unpaid expenses and interest: In computing net income no deduction shall be allowed under section 23 (a), relating to expenses incurred, or under section 23 (b), relating to interest accrued—

"(1) if, at the close of the taxable year of the taxpayer or at any time on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year, both the taxpayer and the person to whom the payment is to be made are persons between whom losses would be disallowed under section 24 (b); and

"(2) if, by reason of the method of accounting of the person to whom the payment is to be made, the amount thereof does not become includible in the gross income of such person during the period ending on or before the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of the taxable year of the taxpayer."

SEC. 120. Dividends received credit.

Section 26 (b) (relating to dividends received credits of corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Dividends received: 85 percent of the amount received as dividends—

"(1) from a domestic corporation which is subject to taxation under this chapter, and

"(2) from a foreign corporation which is subject to taxation under this chapter and is engaged in trade or business within the United States if more than 50 percent of the gross income of such foreign corporation for the 3-year period ending with the close of its taxable year preceding the declaration of such dividends (or for such part of such period as the corporation has been in existence) was derived from sources within the United States as determined under the provision of section 119, but only in an amount which bear the same ratio to 85 percent of such dividends as the gross income of the corporation for such period from sources within the United States bears to its gross income from all sources.

For the purpose of the preceding sentence, if the whole or any part of a dividend is received in property other than money, and if no gain or loss is recognized to the distributing corporation by reason of the distribution, then, with respect to such property, the shareholder shall be considered to have received as a dividend an amount not in excess of the adjusted basis of such property in the hands of the distributing corporation at the time of distribution. In no event shall the credit allowed by this subsection exceed 85 percent of the adjusted net income. The credit allowed by this subsection shall not be allowed in respect of dividends received from a corporation organized under the China Trade Act, 1922, 42 Stat. 849 (U. S. C., title 15, ch. 4), or from a corporation which under section 251 is taxable only on its gross income from sources within the United States by reason of its receiving a large percentage of its gross income from sources within a possession of the United States."

SEC. 121. Installment basis.

Section 44 (d) (relating to gain or loss upon disposition of installment obligations) is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the fourth sentence thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of section 23 (w) (2) and section 126 (c) (relating to deduction for estate tax), all amounts of income for which bonds are filed as provided in the preceding sentence shall be considered income in respect of a decedent described in section 126 (a) (1), and the recipient shall be considered a person who includes such amount in income under section 126 (a) (1)."

SEC. 122. Taxable years of approximately 12 months.

Section 48 (b) (defining fiscal year) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Fiscal year: 'Fiscal year' means—

"(1) an accounting period of 12 months ending on the last day of any month other than December, or

"(2) under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, an accounting period regularly adopted and used by the taxpayer varying from 52 weeks to 53 weeks and ending within 7 days of the last day of any month. The last day of such month shall be deemed the close of the fiscal year for the purpose of determining the time for filing the return and the time for payment of the tax."

SEC. 123. Returns by certain tax-exempt organizations

Section 54 (f) (relating to returns by certain tax-exempt organizations) is hereby amended by striking out paragraphs (2) to (6), inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) which is an organization exempt under section 101 (15), if such organization is a corporation wholly owned by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or a wholly owned subsidiary of such a corporation; or

"(3) which is an organization exempt under section 101 (3) or (6) and has gross receipts of less than $25,000 (exclusive of gifts or contributions, dues or assessments other than service charges, and payments made by or on behalf of students, patients or inmates) and, in the case of an organization exempt under section 101 (6), is—

"(A) an educational organization which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on; or

"(B) a charitable organization, or an organization for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, which is supported, in whole or in part, by funds contributed by the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof, or is primarily supported by contributions of the general public; or

"(C) an organization operated, supervised, or controlled by or in connection with a religious organization exempt under section 101 (6).

If, under the provisions of paragraph (3), an organization would not be required to file a return but for the fact that its gross receipts are $25,000 or more, such organization will not be required to itemize its gross receipts from gifts or contributions, dues or assessments other than service charges, and payments made by or on behalf of students, patients or inmates, but the aggregate of each class of such receipts shall be shown on the return."

SEC. 124. Farmers' returns as declaration of estimated tax.

Section 60 (a) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and if such an individual files a return on or before January 31 of the succeeding taxable year, and pays in full the amount computed on the return as payable, such return shall have the same effect as that prescribed in section 58 (d) (3) in the case of a return filed on or before January 15."

SEC. 125. Surtax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus.

(a) Reasonable needs of the business: Section 102 (c) (relating to evidence determinative of purpose) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Accumulation of surplus:

"(1) Evidence determinative of purpose: The fact that the earnings or profits of a corporation are permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business shall be determinative of the purpose to avoid surtax upon shareholders unless the corporation by the clear preponderance of the evidence shall prove to the contrary.

"(2) Reasonable needs of the business: In any case in which the Commissioner proposes to determine a deficiency with respect to the tax imposed by subsection (a) he may, prior to the mailing of a notice of deficiency as provided in section 272 (a), give the taxpayer notice, by registered mail, of an opportunity to file with the Commissioner a statement of the grounds (together with facts sufficient to apprise the Commissioner of the basis thereof) on which the taxpayer relies as establishing that the earnings or profits of the corporation have not been accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business. If a statement of such grounds, with such supporting facts, is filed with the Commissioner within such time (not less than 30 days after such notice is mailed) as the Commissioner may prescribe, the burden of proof with respect to the issue as to whether earnings or profits have been permitted to be accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the taxpayer's business shall be upon the Commissioner if the taxpayer (after the mailing of a notice of deficiency as provided in section 272 (a)) files a petition with the Tax Court of the United States, and if the taxpayer in the proceedings before such court does not rely upon any grounds with respect to such issue other than those presented to the Commissioner in such statement. If the Commissioner mails such notice of deficiency for any taxable year without giving the taxpayer an opportunity to file such a statement, the Commissioner shall have the burden of proof in any proceeding before the Tax Court of the United States with respect to such issue for such year."

(b) Long-term capital gains: Section 102 (d) (1) (relating to definition of section 102 net income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) Long-term capital gains: The excess of the net long-term capital gain for the taxable year over the net short-term capital loss for such year, minus the taxes imposed by this chapter attributable to such excess. The taxes attributable to such excess shall be an amount equal to the difference between (i) the taxes imposed by this chapter (except the tax imposed by this section) for such year and (ii) such taxes computed for such year without including such excess in net income."

(c) Dividends paid after close of year: Section 102 (d) (2) (relating to definition of undistribution section 102 net income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "At the election of the taxpayer, the computation of such credit under section 27 (b) for any taxable year shall be made by considering the dividends paid within 75 days after the close of such taxable year, to the extent such dividends exceed the dividends paid within the first 75 days of such year, as paid within such taxable year; but if such election is made for the taxable year, then such dividends to the extent of such excess shall not, for the purposes of computing the tax imposed by this section for the succeeding taxable year, be considered as paid during such succeeding taxable year. Such election shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, but may not be made at any time after the filing of any claim for refund, or after the date of the filing of a petition with the Tax Court of the United States, with respect to the tax imposed by this section."

SEC. 126. Service rendered for a period of 36 months or more.

(a) Section 107 is hereby amended by inserting before the closing parenthesis in subsection (a) a comma and the words "or, in the case of uncompleted services, to the close of the taxable year."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947, and at the election of the taxpayer, made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

SEC. 127. Election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations.

(a) Section 112 (b) (7) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(7) Election as to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations:

"(A) General rule: In the case of property distributed in complete liquidation of a domestic corporation, if—

"(i) the liquidation is made in pursuance of a plan of liquidation adopted after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Revision Act of 1948; and

"(ii) the distribution is in complete cancellation or redemption of all the stock, and the transfer of all the property under the liquidation occurs within some one calendar month in 1949—

then in the case of each qualified electing shareholder (as defined in subparagraph (C)) gain upon the shares owned by him at the time of the adoption of the plan of liquidation shall be recognized only to the extent provided in subparagraphs (E) and (F).

"(B) Excluded corporation: The term 'excluded corporation' means a corporation which at any time between May 1, 1948, and the date of the adoption of the plan of liquidation, both dates inclusive, was the owner of stock possessing 50 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote on the adoption of such plan.

"(C) Qualified electing shareholders: The term 'qualified electing shareholder' means a shareholder (other than an excluded corporation) of any class of stock (whether or not entitled to vote on the adoption of the plan of liquidation) who is a shareholder at the time of the adoption of such plan, and whose written election to have the benefits of subparagraph (A) has been made and filed in accordance with subparagraph (D), but—

"(i) in the case of a shareholder other than a corporation, only if written elections have been so filed by shareholders (other than corporations) who at the time of the adoption of the plan of liquidation are owners of stock possessing at least 80 per centum of the total combined voting power (exclusive of voting power possessed by stock owned by corporations) of all classes of stock entitled to vote on the adoption of such plan of liquidation; or

"(ii) in the case of a shareholder which is a corporation, only if written elections have been so filed by corporate shareholders (other than an excluded corporation) which at the time of the adoption of such plan of liquidation are owners of stock possessing at least 80 per centum of the total combined voting power (exclusive of voting power possessed by stock owned by an excluded corporation and by shareholders who are not corporations) of all classes of stock entitled to vote on the adoption of such plan of liquidation.

"(D) Making and filing of elections: The written elections referred to in subparagraph (C) must be made and filed in such manner as to be not in contravention of regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. The filing must be within 30 days after the adoption of the plan of liquidation, and may be by the liquidating corporation or by the shareholder.

"(E) Noncorporate shareholders: In the case of a qualified electing shareholder other than a corporation—

"(i) There shall be recognized, and taxed as a dividend, so much of the gain as is not in excess of his ratable share of the earnings and profits of the corporation accumulated after February 28, 1913, such earnings and profits to be determined as of the close of the month in which the transfer in liquidation occurred under subparagraph (A) (ii), but without diminution by reason of distributions made during such month; but by including in the computation thereof all amounts accrued up to the date on which the transfer of all the property under the liquidation is completed; and

"(ii) There shall be recognized, and taxed as short-term or long-term capital gain, as the case may be, so much of the remainder of the gain as is not in excess of the amount by which the value of that portion of the assets received by him which consists of money, or of stock or securities acquired by the corporation after May 1, 1948, exceeds his ratable share of such earnings and profits.

"(F) Corporate shareholders: In the case of a qualified electing shareholder which is a corporation the gain shall be recognized only to the extent of the greater of the two following—

"(i) The portion of the assets received by it which consists of money, or of stock or securities acquired by the liquidating corporation after May 1, 1948; or

"(ii) Its ratable share of the earnings and profits of the liquidating corporation accumulated after February 28, 1913, such earnings and profits to be determined as of the close of the month in which the transfer in liquidation occurred under subparagraph (A) (ii), but without diminution by reason of distributions made during such month; but by including in the computation thereof all amounts accrued up to the date on which the transfer of all the property under the liquidation is completed."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only to taxable years ending after December 31, 1948.

SEC. 128. Distribution of stock on reorganization.

(a) Section 112 (b) is hereby amended by adding after paragraph (10) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) Distribution of stock on reorganization:

"(A) In liquidation: If there is distributed (whether in one distribution or a series of distributions), in pursuance of a plan of reorganization, to a shareholder of a corporation which is a party to the reorganization, in complete cancellation or redemption of all of its stock, solely stock in two or more corporations, each of which is a party to the reorganization in pursuance of which its stock is distributed, no gain or loss to the distributee from the receipt of such stock shall be recognized, unless it appears that any corporation whose stock is so distributed pursuant to such reorganization (i) was not intended to carry on business or (ii) was principally a device for the distribution of earnings or profits to the shareholders of the corporation whose stock was canceled or redeemed.

"(B) Not in liquidation: If there is distributed, in pursuance of a plan of reorganization, to a shareholder of a corporation which is a party to the reorganization, stock (other than preferred stock) in such corporation or in another corporation which is a party to the reorganization, without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such a corporation, no gain or loss to the distributee from the receipt of such stock shall be recognized, unless it appears that (i) any corporation which is a party to such reorganization was not intended to carry on business after such reorganization, or (ii) the corporation whose stock is distributed was principally a device for the distribution of earnings and profits to the shareholders of any corporation a party to the reorganization.

"(C) Any provision of this section, other than this paragraph and so much of subsection (c) or (e) as refers to this paragraph (except as otherwise provided in section 371 (g)) shall not apply in respect of any property distributed, in respect of which the provisions of this paragraph or so much of the provisions of subsection (c) or (e) as refers to this paragraph are applicable."

(b) Technical amendments:

(1) Section 112 (c) is hereby amended by striking out "or (5)," and inserting in lieu thereof "(5), or (11) (A)."

(2) Section 112 (e) is hereby amended by striking out "or (10)," and inserting in lieu thereof "(10), or (11) (A)."

(c) Section 113 (a) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(23) Tax-free distributions: If the property consists of stock distributed after August 1, 1948, to a taxpayer in connection with a transaction described in section 112 (b) (11) (B), the basis in the case of the stock in respect of which the distribution was made shall be apportioned, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, between such stock and the stock so distributed."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to distributions of stock made after August 1, 1948, but only if, in the case of a series of distributions in complete cancellation or redemption of all of the stock, the first distribution in such series is made after such date.

SEC. 129. Gain or loss in connection with certain corporate liquidations.

(a) Gain or loss on sales or exchanges in connection with certain corporate liquidations: Section 112 (b) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(12) Gain or loss on sales or exchanges in connection with certain corporate liquidations:

"(A) In general: No gain or loss from the sale or exchange by a corporation of property shall be recognized to such corporation if—

"(i) prior to such sale or exchange a written plan of complete liquidation is formally adopted and, within 30 days after the date of adoption of such plan, the Commissioner is notified thereof in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary; and

"(ii) within 12 months after the date of adoption of such plan of liquidation, all the assets of the corporation are distributed in complete liquidation, other than such assets in reasonable amounts as are set aside for the purpose of meeting unascertained or contingent liabilities and expenses.

"(B) Definitions: As used in subparagraph (A)—

"(i) the term 'property' includes (1) stock in trade of the taxpayer or other property of a kind which would properly be included in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year, and property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business, if, in accordance with this paragraph, substantially all of the assets (including such stock in trade and other property) of the corporation are sold or exchanged to one person, and (2) installment obligations acquired in respect of such sale or exchange;

"(ii) except as provided in clause (i), the term 'property' does not include (1) stock in trade of the taxpayer or other property of a kind which would properly be included in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year, (2) property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of its trade or business, (3) installment obligations acquired in respect of property sold or exchanged prior to the date of adoption of the plan of liquidation referred to in subparagraph (A), or (4) installment obligations acquired in respect of the sale or exchange (without regard to whether such sale or exchange occurred prior to, on, or after such date) of stock in trade or other property referred to in (1) and (2) of this clause;

"(iii) the term 'sale or exchange' does not include a sale or exchange in respect of which gain or loss in whole or in part is not recognized under any provision of this section (other than this paragraph); and

"(iv) the term 'liquidation' does not include a liquidation which is a liquidation within the provisions of subsection (b) (6) or as to which an election under subsection (b) (7) is made."

(b) Gain or loss on the distribution in liquidation of certain installment obligations: Section 44 (d) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If an installment obligation is distributed by a corporation in liquidation and if no gain or loss would have been recognized to the corporation under the provisions of section 112 (b) (12) if the corporation had sold or exchanged such installment obligation on the day of such distribution, then no gain or loss shall be recognized to such corporation by reason of such distribution."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to plans of liquidation adopted after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 130. Gain resulting from involuntary conversions

(a) Section 112 (f) (relating to recognition of gain or loss resulting from involuntary conversions) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "(f) Involuntary conversions.—" and inserting in lieu thereof

"(f) Involuntary conversions:

"(1) In general.—."

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Anticipatory replacement: If a conversion described in paragraph (1) is into money, and the taxpayer before the receipt of such money, for the purpose of replacing the property so converted, makes expenditures or incurs indebtedness in the acquisition of other property similar or related in service or use to the property so converted, or in the acquisition of control of a corporation owning such other property, at the election of the taxpayer such money so received shall be considered, for the purposes of paragraph (1), as having been expended in the acquisition of such other property or control of such corporation to the extent that such money is forthwith used by the taxpayer in replacement of the amounts so expended or in liquidation of such indebtedness. Such election shall be made at such time and in accordance with such regulations as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe. If such other property or control of such corporation was acquired prior to the taxable year in which any part of the money was received, such election may be made only if the taxpayer, in accordance with such regulations, consents in writing to the assessment (within such period as may be agreed upon) of any deficiency, to the extent resulting from such election, for any taxable year ending before the date of the filing of such consent, even though on such date such assessment is otherwise prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to money received after December 31, 1947, except that the amendments shall not be applicable to the extent that such money is used in replacement of amounts expended, and in liquidation of indebtedness incurred, on or before such date.

SEC. 131. Percentage depletion.

Paragraphs (2) and (4) (A) of section 114 (b) are hereby amended by inserting after "bentonite," the following: "marble, granite, tripoli,".

SEC. 132. Retirement of bonds.

Section 117 (f) (relating to retirement of bonds) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Retirement of bonds, etc.: For the purposes of this chapter, amounts received by the holder upon retirement of bonds, debentures, notes, or certificates or other evidences of indebtedness originally issued with interest coupons or in registered form by any corporation (including those issued by a Government or political subdivision thereof) shall be considered as amounts received in exchange therefor."

SEC. 133. Holding period of capital assets.

The first sentence of section 117 (a) (1) (relating to hold period) is hereby amended to read as follows: "In determining the period for which the taxpayer has held property received on an exchange there shall be included the period for which he held the property exchanged, if the property exchanged, at the time of such exchange, was a capital asset as defined in section 117 (a) (1), and if under the provisions of section 113, the property received has, for the purpose of determining gain or loss from a sale or exchange, the same basis in whole or in part in his hands as the property exchanged."

SEC. 134. Sales of livestock.

Section 117 (j) (1) (relating to definition of property used in trade or business) is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Such term includes animals used in the trade or business of the taxpayer except those animals which customarily would be selected during the taxable year for sale or exchange in the ordinary course of his business."

SEC. 135. Unlimited deduction for charitable contributions.

(a) Section 120 is hereby amended by striking out "in respect of preceding taxable years" and inserting in lieu thereof "in respect of such year or preceding taxable years".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 136. Net operating loss deduction.

(a) Amendment of section 122 (a): Section 122 (a) (relating to definition of net operating loss) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Definition of net operating loss: As used in this section, the term 'net operating loss' means the excess of the deductions allowed by this chapter over the gross income. Such excess shall be computed, in the case of a net operating loss for a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d), or in the case of a net operating loss for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, with the exceptions and limitations provided in subsection (d) (3) and (5)."

(b) Amendment of section 122 (b): Section 122 (b) (relating to amount of carry-back and carry-over) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Amount of carry-back and carry-over:

"(1) Net operating loss carry-back:

"(A) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1949: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, and before January 1, 1949, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-back for each of the two preceding taxable years, except that the carry-back in the case of the first preceding taxable year shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the net income for the second preceding taxable year computed—

"(i) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6); and

"(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such second preceding taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

"(B) Loss for taxable year beginning after 1948: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-back for the preceding taxable year.

"(2) Net operating loss carry-over:

"(A) Loss for taxable year beginning before 1949: If for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the two succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of the second succeeding taxable year shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the net income for the intervening taxable year computed—

"(i) if such intervening taxable year began before January 1, 1949, with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6), or if such intervening taxable year began in 1949, with the limitation provided in subsection (d) (4) (B); and

"(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss, to any net operating loss carry-back, or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

For the purposes of the preceding sentence the net operating loss for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, shall be reduced by the sum of the net income for each of the two preceding taxable years computed for each such preceding taxable year—

"(iii) with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6); and

"(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction without regard to such net operating loss, to any net operating loss for the succeeding taxable year, or to any reduction specified in subsection (c).

"(B) Loss for taxable year beginning after 1948: If for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, the taxpayer has a net operating loss, such net operating loss shall be a net operating loss carry-over for each of the five succeeding taxable years, except that the carry-over in the case of each of such succeeding taxable years (other than the first succeeding taxable year) shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such net operating loss over the sum of the net income for each of the intervening taxable years computed—

"(i) with the limitation provided in subsection (d) (4) (B); and

"(ii) by determining the net operating loss deduction for each intervening taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to the net operating loss for any succeeding taxable year.

For the purposes of the preceding sentence the net operating loss for any taxable year shall be reduced by the amount, if any, of the net income for the preceding taxable year computed—

"(iii) if such preceding taxable year began after December 31, 1948, with the limitation provided in subsection (d) (4) (B), or if such preceding taxable year began in 1948, with the exceptions, additions, and limitations provided in subsection (d) (1), (2), (4), and (6); and

"(iv) by determining the net operating loss deduction for such preceding taxable year without regard to such net operating loss or to any reduction specified in subsection (c)."

(c) Amendment of section 122 (c): Section 122 (c) (relating to amount of net operating loss deduction) is hereby amended by striking out "taxable year reduced" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "taxable year, except that in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, such aggregate shall be reduced."

(d) Amendment of section 122 (d):

(1) Section 122 (d) (4) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(4) (A) Gains and losses for any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949, from sales or exchanges of capital assets shall be taken into account without regard to the provisions of section 117 (b). As so computed the amount deductible on account of such losses shall not exceed the amount includible on account of such gains.

"(B) In the case of gains and losses for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1948, from sales or exchanges of capital assets, the amount deductible on account of such losses shall not exceed the amount includible on account of such gains."

(2) The last sentence of section 122 (d) (5) is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this paragraph deductions and gross income for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1949, shall be computed with the exceptions and limitations specified in paragraphs (1) to (4), both inclusive, of this subsection.".

(e) Rule for application of section 122: Section 122 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Law applicable in computing gross income, etc.: In computing the net operating loss deduction for any taxable year, the gross income and deductions for any other taxable year involved in such computation, and the exceptions, additions, and limitations (provided in subsection (d) in effect for such other taxable year) with respect to such gross income and deductions, shall be determined under the law applicable to such other year."

(f) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941, and the amendment made by subsection (e) of this section shall be applicable in computing the net operating loss deduction for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940.

(g) Carry-overs in the case of certain reorganized railroads: Subsection (c) of the first section of the act of July 15, 1947 (Public Law 189, 80th Cong.), entitled "An act to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code" is hereby amended by striking out "three instead of two" and inserting in lieu thereof "one more than that prescribed in the Internal Revenue Code."

SEC. 137. Stock options.

(a) Supplement B of chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 130A. Employee Stock Options.

"(a) General rule: In the case of an option granted by an employer (or any other person) to an individual, for any reason connected with the employment of such individual, to purchase stock of a corporation, no income shall result upon the granting of such option; but if stock is transferred to such individual upon his exercise of such option for an amount less than its fair market value, the difference between the amount paid for such stock and the fair market value of the stock at the time of the transfer shall be included as compensation in the gross income of such individual for the taxable year in which falls the date of such transfer.

"(b) Restricted stock options: In the case of a restricted stock option (as defined in subsection (c))—

"(1) Option price not less than 90 percent of value of stock: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), if, at the time such option is granted, the option price is at least 90 percent of the fair market value at such time of the stock subject to the option—

"(A) No income shall result at the time of the transfer of such stock to the employee upon his exercise of the option; no deduction under section 23 (a) shall be allowable at any time to the employer corporation with respect to the stock so transferred; and no amount other than the option price shall be considered as received by the employer corporation for the stock so transferred;

"(B) If the employee, within 3 years after the transfer to him of such stock, makes a disposition (as defined in subsection (c)) of the stock, there shall be included as compensation (and not as gain upon the sale or exchange of a capital asset) in his gross income, for the taxable year in which falls the date of such disposition, an amount equal to the lesser of—

"(i) the amount of the excess of the fair market value of the stock at the time of its transfer to the employee over the option price; or

"(ii) the amount of the excess of the fair market value of the stock at the time of such disposition over its adjusted basis determined without regard to the following sentence.

The basis of such stock in the hands of such employee shall be increased by an amount equal to the amount so includible in his gross income.

"(2) Option price less than 90 percent of value of stock: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), if, at the time such option is granted, the option price is less than 90 percent of the fair market value at

such time of the stock subject to the option—

"(A) For the taxable year in which falls the date of the transfer of such stock to the employee upon his exercise of the option, there shall be included in his gross income as compensation an amount equal to the amount by which the option price is exceeded by the lesser of—

"(i) the fair market value of the stock at the time the option is granted, or

"(ii) the fair market value of the stock at the time of the transfer of the stock to the employee.

No deduction under section 23 (a) shall be allowable at any time to the employer corporation, with respect to the stock so transferred, in any amount in excess of the amount so includible as compensation, and no amount other than the option price plus the amount of such compensation shall be considered as received by the employer corporation for the stock so transferred. If, upon the application of this subparagraph (without regard to this sentence) for any taxable year of the employee, not more than $200 is includible in his gross income by reason of all such transfers of stock of any one corporation, the provisions of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), and not the provisions of this subparagraph, shall be applicable for such year with respect to the transfers of such stock.

"(B) If the employee, within 3 years after the transfer to him of such stock, makes a disposition (as defined in subsection (c)) of the stock there shall be included as compensation (and not as gain upon the sale or exchange of a capital asset) in his gross income, for the taxable year in which falls the date of such disposition, an amount equal to the lesser of—

"(i) the amount of the excess of the fair market value of such stock at the time of its transfer to the employee over the option price plus the amount includible in gross income under the provisions of subparagraph (A); or

"(ii) the amount of the excess of the fair market value of the stock at the time of such disposition over its adjusted basis determined without regard to the following sentence.

The basis of such stock in the hands of such employee shall be increased by an amount equal to the amount so includible in his gross income.

"(3) Acquisition of new stock: If the stock transferred by the employer corporation to the employee upon his exercise of the option is exchanged by him for stock or securities in an exchange within the provisions of section 112 (b) (2) or (3), or if new stock, as described in section 113 (a) (19), is acquired upon a distribution with respect to such stock, the stock or securities acquired in such exchange and such new stock shall be considered as having been transferred to the employee upon his exercise of such option. A similar rule shall be applied in the case of a series of such exchanges or acquisitions.

"(4) Death of employee: If such option is exercised after the death of such employee by his executor or any other person, the provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable with respect to such exercise or any subsequent disposition of the stock acquired upon such exercise. (For provisions relating to such exercise by an executor, etc., see section 126.) If stock received by an employee during his lifetime upon his exercise of such option is disposed of after his death by his executor or any other person, the provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable with respect to such disposition.

"(c) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) Restricted stock option: The term 'restricted stock option' means an option granted by a corporation to an individual, for any reason connected with its employment of such individual, to purchase stock of the employer corporation or stock of a parent corporation, but only if—

"(A) Such option by its terms is not exercisable after the expiration of 10 years from the date such option is granted;

"(B) Such option by its terms is not transferable by such individual otherwise than by will or under the laws of descent and distribution, and, during his lifetime, is exercisable only by him and only if he is an employee of the employer corporation at the time of exercise;

"(C) Such option, prior to any exercise thereof, is approved or ratified at a duly constituted meeting of the stockholders of the employer corporation, after reasonable notice to such stockholders of the proposed option; and

"(D) Such individual, at the time the option is granted, does not own stock possessing more than 10 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock of the employer corporation or of a parent corporation. For the purposes of this subparagraph—

"(i) such individual shall be considered as owning the stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for his brothers and sisters (whether by the whole or half blood), spouse, ancestors, and lineal descendant; and

"(ii) stock owned, directly or indirectly, by or for a corporation, partnership, estate, or trust, shall be considered as being owned proportionately by or for its shareholders, partners, or beneficiaries.

"(2) Parent corporation: The term 'parent corporation' means any corporation in an unbroken chain of corporations ending with the employer corporation if, at the time of granting of the option, each of the corporations other than the employer corporation owns stock possessing more than 50 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock in one of the other corporations in such chain.

"(3) Disposition: The term 'disposition' includes a sale, exchange, gift, or any transfer of legal title, but does not include—

"(A) a transfer from a decedent to his estate or a transfer by bequest or inheritance;

"(B) an exchange which is within the provisions of section 112 (b) (2) or (3); or

"(C) a mere pledge or hypothecation."

"(d) Modification, extension, or renewal of option: If the terms of any option to purchase stock are modified, extended, or renewed, the following rules shall be applied with respect to transfers of stock made upon an exercise of the option after the making of such modification, extension, or renewal:

"(1) For the purposes of subsection (c), such modification, extension, or renewal shall be considered as the granting of a new option;

"(2) For the purposes of subsection (b), the fair market value of such stock at the time of the granting of such option shall be considered as (A) the fair market value of such stock on the date of the original granting of the option, (B) the fair market value of such stock on the date of the making of such modification, extension, or renewal, or (C) the fair market value of such stock at the time of the making of any intervening modification, extension, or renewal, whichever is the highest."

(b) Amendment of section 126: Section 126 (a) (relating to income in respect of decedents) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Employee stock option: If an option to purchase stock granted by an employer (or any other person) to a decedent, for any reason connected with the employment of such decedent, is acquired by the estate of the decedent from the decedent or by a person who acquires such option by reason of the death of the decedent or by bequest, devise, or inheritance from the decedent—

"(A) upon transfer of the stock subject to the option to such estate or such person, the excess of the fair market value of such stock at the time of transfer over the option price shall be considered as an item of gross income in respect of the decedent; and

"(B) such option shall, for the purposes of paragraph (2), be considered as a right to receive an item of gross income in respect of the decedent."

(c) Amendment of section 22: Section 22 (relating to gross income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(o) Employee stock options: For provisions relating to amounts includible in gross income upon the transfer of stock to an employee upon his exercise of a stock option, see section 130A."

(d) Amendment of section 24: Section 24 (relating to items not deductible) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Certain stock options granted to employees: For disallowance of deductions in the case of certain stock options granted by employers to employees, see section 130A (b)."

(e) Amendment of section 113 (b) (1): Section 113 (b) (1) (relating to adjustment of basis of property) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(I) to the extent provided in subparagraph (B) of section 130A (b) (1) or (2) in the case of certain dispositions of stock acquired upon the exercise of a restricted stock option."

(f) Effective date:

(1) General rule: Except as hereinafter provided, the amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to options granted on or after the date of the enactment of this act. If the terms of an option granted before such date are modified, extended, or renewed on or after such date, the amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to such option after the making of such modification, extensions, or renewal. If an option granted before such date is a restricted stock option on the date of such enactment, the amendments shall be applicable with respect to any exercise, by the employee receiving such option, made on or after such date, even though the terms of such option have not been modified, extended, or renewed on or after such date.

(2) Restricted stock options: In the case of any transfer of stock made before the date of the enactment of this act upon the exercise of a restricted stock option granted after February 26, 1945, at the election of the employee receiving such stock the amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to such a transfer, but only if there are filed with the Commissioner before July 1, 1949 (in accordance with regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary), by such persons as may be prescribed under such regulations, signed consents—

(A) that the basis of such stock received by the employee shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of such amendments; and

(B) that there shall be paid, at such time as the Commissioner may prescribe, all of the taxes under chapter 1 or chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code which would have been imposed for all taxable years concerned if such amendments had been applicable with respect to such option.

(3) Deficiencies and overpayments: The period of limitations provided in sections 275 and 276 of the Internal Revenue Code on making of assessments and the beginning of distraint or proceeding in court for collection shall with respect to any deficiency resulting

from any such consents include 1 year immediately after the date such consents were filed, and such assessment and collection may be made notwithstanding any provision of law or any rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment or collection. No interest shall be allowed or paid on any overpayment, or assessed on any deficiency, resulting from the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

SEC. 138. Foreign tax credit.

(a) Refund of foreign taxes: Section 131 (c) (relating to adjustments on payment of accrued taxes) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "In such redetermination by the Commissioner of the amount of tax due by the taxpayer for the year or years affected by a refund, the amount of the taxes refunded for which credit has been allowed under this section shall be reduced by the amount of any tax described in subsection (a) imposed by the foreign country or possession of the United States with respect to such refund; but no credit under this section shall be allowed for any taxable year with respect to such tax imposed on the refund. No interest shall be assessed or collected on any amount of tax due upon any redetermination by the Commissioner, resulting from a refund to the taxpayer, for any period prior to the receipt of such refund, except to the extent interest was paid by the foreign country or possession of the United States on such refund for such period."

(b) Effective date of subsection (a): The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938. If the allowance of a credit or refund of any overpayment of tax resulting from the application of the amendment made by subsection (a) is prevented on the date of the enactment of this act, or within 1 year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to compromises), credit or refund of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be allowed or made if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act.

(c) Taxes of foreign corporations: Section 131 (f) (relating to credit for taxes of foreign corporations) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by striking out—

"(f) Taxes of foreign subsidiary—

"(1) Foreign subsidiary of domestic corporation.—"

and inserting in lieu thereof—

"(f) Taxes or foreign corporations:

"(1) Stock of foreign corporation owned by domestic corporation.—"

(2) by amending the first sentence of paragraph (1) thereof to read as follows: "For the purposes of this section, a domestic corporation which owns stock of a foreign corporation from which it receives dividends in any taxable year shall be deemed to have paid the same proportion of any income, war-profits, or excess-profits taxes paid or deemed to be paid by such foreign corporation to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States, upon or with respect to the accumulated profits of such foreign corporation from which such dividends were paid, which the amount of such dividends bears to the amount of such accumulated profits."

(d) Limitation on claims for refund:

(1) Section 322 (b) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) Special period of limitation with respect to foreign taxes paid or accrued: If the claim for credit or refund relates to an overpayment attributable to any income, war profits, and excess-profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States for which credit is allowed against the tax imposed by this chapter in accordance with the provisions of section 131 or the provisions of any treaty to which the United States is a party, in lieu of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in paragraph (1), the period shall be 7 years from the date prescribed by law for filing the return for the year with respect to which the claim is made. In the case of such a claim, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in paragraph (2) or paragraph (3), whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the allowance of a credit for the taxes described in this paragraph."

(2) Section 322 (d) is hereby amended by inserting in lieu of the period at the end thereof a semicolon and by adding the following thereafter: "or (4) if such portion was not paid within the period described in clause (1), but the notice of deficiency was mailed within 7 years from the time prescribed for the filing of the return, or a claim described in subsection (b) (7) was filed, that such portion does not exceed the amount of the overpayment attributable to the allowance of a credit for taxes described in subsection (b) (7)."

(e) Effective date of subsection (d): The amendments made by subsection (d) shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1945.

SEC. 139. Withholding of tax at source.

(a) The first sentence of section 143 (c) (relating to return and payment of certain taxes withheld at source) is hereby amended to read as follows: "Every person required to deduct and withhold any tax under this section shall, on or before June 15 of the following year, make return thereof and pay the tax to the collector designated in section 53 (b)."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxes required to be deducted and withheld after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 140. Taxation of the income of estates and trusts.

(a) Income of estates and trusts: Section 162 (b), (c), and (d) (relating to the computation of the net income of estates and trusts) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Income required to be distributed currently: There shall be allowed as an additional deduction in computing the net income of the estate or trust the amount of the income of the estate or trust for its taxable year which is to be distributed currently as income by the fiduciary to the beneficiaries, but the amount so allowed as a deduction shall be included in computing the net income of the beneficiaries whether distributed to them or not. No deduction shall be allowed under this subsection with respect to any amount of the income of the estate or trust which does not constitute gross income of the estate or trust under this chapter; and no such amount shall be included in computing the net income of the beneficiaries.

"(c) Income not required to be distributed currently: There shall be allowed as an additional deduction in computing the net income of the estate or trust the amount of the income (other than an amount deductible under subsection (b)) of the estate or trust for any period which is distributed as income by the fiduciary to the beneficiaries during the taxable year of the estate or trust, but not in excess of the distributable income. If the aggregate of such distributions during the taxable year exceeds the distributable income, the amount of the deduction allowed with respect to the distribution to any one beneficiary shall be that proportion of the distributable income which the amount so distributed bears to the aggregate of such distributions. The amount allowed as a deduction under this subsection shall be included in computing the net income of the beneficiaries. For the purposes of this subsection, 'distributable income' means the income of the estate or trust for the taxable year less amounts allowed as deductions under subsections (a) and (b) and excluding amounts which do not constitute gross income of the estate or trust under this chapter.

"(d) Other distributions: There shall be allowed as an additional deduction in computing the net income of the estate or trust amounts (other than an amount deductible under subsection (b) or (c)) distributed by the fiduciary to the beneficiaries during the taxable year of the estate or trust, but not in excess of the statutory income. If the aggregate of such distributions during the taxable year exceeds the statutory income, the amount of the deduction allowed with respect to the distribution to any one beneficiary shall be that proportion of the statutory income which the amount so distributed bears to the aggregate of such distributions. The amount allowed as a deduction under this subsection shall be included in computing the net income of the beneficiaries. Amounts allowed as deductions under this subsection shall not include any amount distributed under the terms of the will or trust instrument as a gift of a specific sum of money (not to be made at intervals) or as a gift of specific property. For the purposes of this subsection, 'statutory income' means the net income of the estate or trust for the taxable year computed under this chapter without the deductions allowed under this subsection.

(b) Distributions by estates and trusts: Section 162 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) Rules for the application of subsections (b), (c), and (d):

"(1) No deduction shall be allowed to the estate or trust under subsection (b), (c), or (d) with respect to any amount which is not includible in computing the net income of the beneficiaries.

"(2) If the gross income of the estate or trust for the taxable year includes gains from the sale or exchange of capital assets, that portion of the amounts to be included under subsection (b), (c), or (d) in computing the net income of the beneficiaries which is attributable to such capital gains shall, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, be treated as long-term capital gains or short-term capital gains in the hands of such beneficiaries depending upon the period during which such capital assets were held by the estate or trust, but the provisions of section 117 (b) shall not be applicable with respect to such portions in computing their net capital gain, net capital loss, and net income.

"(h) Definition of beneficiary: For the purposes of this section, the term 'beneficiary' includes heir, legatee, and devisee."

(c) Credits of beneficiary: Section 163 (b) (relating to credits of beneficiary) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Credits of beneficiary: If the income of the estate or trust for the taxable year includes interest specified in section 25 (a), each beneficiary, required to include amounts under this supplement in computing his net income, shall, for purposes of the normal tax, be allowed as a credit against net income, in addition to the credits allowed to him under section 25 an amount equal to that portion of the amount so included by such beneficiary which is attributable to such interest. Any portion of such interest with respect to which credits are not allowed to the beneficiaries shall, for the purpose of the normal tax, be allowed as a credit to the estate or trust."

(d) Bond premium deduction: Section 163 (c) (2) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the purposes of subsection (b) the portion of the amount included by the

beneficiary which is attributable to such interest shall be such portion (determined without regard to this paragraph) reduced by so much of the deduction under section 23 (v) attributable to such portion. The remainder of such deduction, for the purposes of the last sentence of subsection (b), shall be applied in reduction of such credits of the estate or trust."

(e) Gifts of income: The last sentence of section 22 (b) (3) (relating to exclusion of gifts, etc., from gross income) is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this paragraph, a gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance shall be considered a gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance of income from property to the extent that it is paid out of income from property, if under the terms of the gift, bequest, devise, or inheritance the distribution thereof is to be made at intervals, or to the extent that the distribution thereof constitutes a deduction to the estate or trust under section 162."

(f) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948, except that, in the case of amounts distributed or to be distributed by an estate or trust, the amendments made by this section shall not be applicable with respect to such amounts distributed or to be distributed in any taxable year of the estate or trust beginning prior to January 1, 1949.

SEC. 141. Life insurance trusts.

(a) Section 167 (a) (3) is hereby amended by striking out "or of any person not having a substantial adverse interest in the disposition of such part of the income" and inserting in lieu thereof: "not acting as trustee or cotrustee."

(b) Section 167 (a) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In cases where premiums upon policies of such insurance are paid out of corpus or out of other than income for the taxable year, such premiums shall be considered paid out of income to the extent of the income of the trust for such taxable year which is not paid, credited, or to be distributed under section 162 and which is not otherwise taxable to the grantor."

SEC. 142. Family partnerships.

(a) In general: Supplement F of Chapter 1 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 191. Family Partnerships.

"(a) Partnership status: An individual who is carrying on business in partnership and who is a relative of another member of such partnership shall be deemed to be a partner for the purpose of the tax imposed by this chapter if—

"(1) he was 21 years of age or over at the beginning of the taxable year of the partnership or at the date the partnership agreement was entered into, whichever is later;

"(2) he contributes either capital or substantial personal services to the partnership;

"(3) the partnership agreement is in writing; partnership books are kept showing the contribution, if any, of such individual to the capital of the partnership and his interest in the partnership income; and no misrepresentation has been made by any partner with respect to such contribution or interest;

"(4) his distributive share in any partnership income is determined on the basis of a reasonable allocation of the income of the business as between income attributable to personal services and income attributable to capital, with the amount of income attributable to such services apportioned between him and the other members of the partnership who are his relatives on the basis of the fair value of the services rendered by each, and with the amount of income attributable to capital contributed by him and such relatives apportioned between him and such relatives on the basis of the capital contributed by each;

"(5) he has an equal right with other members of such partnership who are his relatives to determine whether or not partnership income is to be distributed; and

"(6) his distributed share of the partnership income is not subject to any control by another member of the partnership.

"(b) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'capital' includes money or other property (including good will and an interest in an existing business) acquired by an individual at any time by purchase, bequest, device, inheritance, or bona fide gift from any person even though such person is his partner and relative. A gift is a bona fide gift if the donee has absolute control over the money or property acquired.

"(2) The term 'relative' means an individual who bears any of the following relationships either to the partner or his spouse: (A) spouse, (B) son or daughter, or a descendant of either, (C) brother or sister, (D) father or mother, or an ancestor of either, (E) stepfather or stepmother, (F) son or daughter of a brother or sister, (G) brother or sister of the father or mother, (H) son-in-law, daughter-in-law, father-in-law, mother-in-law, brother-in-law, or sister-in-law. As used in this paragraph the terms 'brother' and 'sister' include a brother or sister by the half-blood. For the purpose of determining whether any of the foregoing relationships exist, a legally adopted child of a person shall be considered a child of such person by blood and a trust or an estate shall be deemed to be a relative of another partner if a beneficiary thereof is a relative of such other partner.

"(3) The term 'individual' includes a trust created by the will of a deceased partner, a trust where neither the grantor nor any trustee is a partner or the spouse of a partner, and the estate of a partner who is deceased or who is incompetent (other than by reason of minority). Such term also includes a guardian of a minor if such guardian is not a relative of such minor, and if no capital contributed to the partnership by such guardian on behalf of such minor originated with any partner."

(b) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to partnership taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

(c) Treatment of family partnerships for taxable years 1941–47:

(1) Partnership status: An individual who was carrying on business in partnership during any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, and before January 1, 1948, and who was a relative of an individual who was a member of such partnership during any such taxable year shall be deemed to be a partner for such taxable year for the purpose of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code if—

(A) with respect to any such taxable year, he was 21 years of age or over at the beginning of the taxable year of the partnership or at the date the partnership agreement was entered into, whichever is later;

(B) he contributed either capital or substantial personal services to the partnership;

(C) in cases where formal books of account were kept by the partnership, such books of account show the contribution, if any, of the taxpayer to the capital of the partnership and his interest in the partnership income;

(D) his distributed share of the partnership income was not subject to absolute control by another member of the partnership; and

(E) he had an equal right with other members of such partnership who are his relatives to determine whether or not partnership income was to be distributed.

(2) Computation of distributive share: For the purposes of section 182 of the Internal Revenue Code, the distributive share of an individual, with respect to whom the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection have been complied with, in any partnership income shall be an amount which is determined on the basis of a reasonable allocation of the income of the partnership as between income attributable to personal services and income attributable to capital, with the amount of income attributable to such services apportioned between him and the other members of the partnership who are his relatives on the basis of the fair value of the services rendered by each, and with the amount of income attributable to capital contributed by him and such relatives apportioned between him and such relatives on the basis of the capital contributed by each.

(3) Definitions: As used in this subsection the terms "capital," "relative," and "individual" shall have the meaning assigned to them in section 191 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The provisions of subsection (c) shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940, and prior to January 1, 1948, at the election of the taxpayer, made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Such election shall not be allowed unless in accordance with such regulations, the taxpayer and his partners who are his relatives consent in writing to the assessment, within such period as may be agreed upon with the Commissioner, of any deficiency attributable to such election, even though at the time of the filing of such consent the assessment of such deficiency would otherwise be prevented by the operation of any law or rule of law; and such assessment and collection may be made notwithstanding any provision of the internal revenue laws or any rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment and collection.

SEC. 143. Capital gains of nonresident alien individuals.

(a) Section 211 (a) (1) (B) (relating to tax on nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(B) Capital gains of aliens temporarily present: In the case of a nonresident alien individual not engaged in trade or business in the United States, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year, in addition to the tax imposed by subparagraph (A)—

"(i) if he is present in the United States for a period or periods aggregating less than 90 days during such taxable year—a tax of 30 percent of the amount by which his gains, derived from sources within the United States, from sales or exchanges of capital assets effected during his presence in the United States exceed his losses allocable to sources within the United States, from such sales or exchanges effected during such presence; or

"(ii) if he is present within the United States for a period or periods aggregating 90 days or more during such taxable year—a tax of 30 percent of the amount by which his gains, derived from sources within the United States, from sales or exchanges of capital assets effected during such year exceed his losses, allocable to sources within the United States, from such sales or exchanges effected during such year.

For the purposes of this subparagraph, gains and losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets shall be computed without regard to the provisions of section 117 (b), and such losses shall be determined without the benefit of the capital loss carry-over provided in section 117 (e).

"(C) Cross reference: For inclusion in computation of tax of amount specified in shareholder's consent, see section 28."

(b) Section 211 (a) (2) (relating to tax on nonresident alien individuals with income of more than $15,400) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Aggregate more than $15,400: The tax imposed by paragraph (1) shall not apply to any individual if during the taxable year the aggregate amount received from sources specified in paragraph (1) (A) plus the amount by which the gains exceed the losses determined under paragraph (1) (B) is more than $15,400."

(c) So much of section 211 (c) (relating to tax on nonresident alien individuals with income of more than $15,400) as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) No United States trade or business and income of more than $15,400: A nonresident alien individual not engaged in trade or business within the United States who has received for any taxable year an aggregate amount from sources specified in subsection (a) (1) (A) plus the amount by which the gains exceed the losses determined under subsection (a) (1) (B) of more than $15,400 shall be taxable without regard to subsection (a) (1), except that—."

(d) Section 211 (c) (3) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) The tax under this subsection shall, in no case, be less than 30 percent of the aggregate amount received from sources specified in subsection (a) (1) (A) plus the amount by which the gains exceed the losses determined under subsection (a) (1) (B); and".

SEC. 144. Treaty obligations.

No amendment made by this act shall apply in any case where its application would be contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

SEC. 145. Income from sources within possessions of the United States.

(a) Section 251 (relating to income from sources within possessions of United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Employees of United States: For the purposes of this section, amounts paid after December 31, 1947, for services performed by a citizen of the United States as an employee of the United States or any agency thereof shall be deemed to be derived from sources within the United States."

(b) Section 1621 (a) (8) (B) (relating to definition of wages) is hereby amended by inserting after "for an employer" the following: "(other than the United States or any agency thereof)".

(c) The amendment made by subsection (b) shall be applicable with respect to wages paid on or after January 1, 1949.

SEC. 146. Period of limitations on claims against transferees.

(a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 311 (b) (relating to period of limitation for assessment of transferee liability) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) In the case of the liability of an initial transferee of the property of the taxpayer, within 1 year after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the taxpayer (except that where such transferee becomes a transferee after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the taxpayer and no assessment against the taxpayer has been made, no assessment of the liability of such transferee shall be made);

"(2) In the case of the liability of a transferee of a transferee of the property of the taxpayer, within 1 year after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the preceding transferee, but only if within 3 years after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the taxpayer (except that where the transferee of a transferee becomes such a transferee after the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment against the preceding transferee and no assessment against the preceding transferee has been made, no assessment of the liability of such transferee shall be made);".

(b) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to transferees whose liability arises after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 147. Date of payment of taxes withheld.

(a) Section 322 (e) (relating to presumption as to date of payment of taxes) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Presumption as to date of payment: For the purposes of this section—

"(1) any tax actually deducted and withheld at the source during any calendar year under subchapter D of chapter 9 shall, in respect of the recipient of the income, be deemed to have been paid by him not earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of his taxable year with respect to which such tax is allowable as a credit under section 35;

"(2) any amount paid as estimated tax for any taxable year shall be deemed to have been paid not earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year; and

"(3) any tax actually deducted and withheld at the source during any calendar year under section 143 or section 144 shall, in respect of the recipient of the income, be deemed to have been paid by him not earlier than the fifteenth day of June following the calendar year during which such tax was withheld."

(b) Section 3771 (f) (relating to estimated tax and tax withheld at source) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Estimated tax and tax withheld at source: For date of payment in respect of estimated tax, tax withheld at source on wages, and tax withheld under section 143 or 144, see section 322 (e)."

(c) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxes deducted and withheld after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 148. Extension of period for refund in case of waiver by transferee.

(a) Section 322 (relating to the period of limitation for refunds and credits) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Exception in the case of waivers by transferees or fiduciaries: If both the Commissioner and a transferee or fiduciary have agreed in writing under the provisions of section 311 (b) (4) to extend the time within which the Commissioner may make an assessment—

"(1) the provisions of this section applicable in case an agreement is executed under section 276 (b) shall be applicable with respect to such transferee or fiduciary as if such provisions referred to agreements executed under section 311 (b) (4) within the period prescribed in section 311 (b) (4) for making such waiver, and without regard to section 275; and

"(2) in applying the limitations on the amount of the credit or refund, the period prior to the execution of the agreement within which a portion of the tax is paid and the period from the time of filing the return within which the agreement was executed shall be increased by so much of the applicable period of limitation for assessment against the transferee or fiduciary provided in section 311 (b) (1), (2), or (3) elapsed prior to the execution of the agreement, as exceeds the period of limitation for assessment against the taxpayer with reference to whom the liability of such transferee or fiduciary arises."

(b) Effective date: A provision having the effect of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to be included in the revenue laws respectively applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1937, but such amendments shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1948, only if on or at some time after the date of the enactment of this act the Commissioner may assess the tax for such taxable year solely by reason of having made (either before, on, or after the date of such enactment) an agreement with the taxpayer pursuant to section 311 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code or the corresponding provision of the applicable prior revenue law to extend beyond the time prescribed in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 311 (b) or the corresponding provision of such prior revenue law the date within which the Commissioner may assess the tax.

SEC. 149. Tax on regulated investment companies.

Section 362 (b) (relating to tax on regulated investment companies) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) For the purposes of this subsection, a distribution of a taxable dividend other than a capital gain dividend made during the first 75 days of any taxable year may at the election of the taxpayer, to the extent that such distribution exceeds any such distribution made within the first 75 days of the preceding taxable year, be treated as having been made during such preceding taxable year; but if such election is made as to any taxable year, an amount equal to the excess so computed shall be excluded in determining the amount of such distribution in the year in which it was actually made. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as is provided under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary."

SEC. 150. Commuting expenses of disabled individuals.

Section 23 (relating to deductions from gross income) is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (x) thereof the following new subsection:

"(y) Transportation of disabled individuals to and from work: In the case of a disabled individual, expenses paid during the taxable year for transportation to and from work to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $600. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'disabled individual' means an individual who has lost the use of a leg, of both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train, or similar form of public transportation, as a means of traveling to and from work."

SEC. 151. Short sales of capital assets.

(a) Section 117 (relating to capital gains and losses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(l) Short sales, etc.: In the case of a short sale of property made by the taxpayer after May 31, 1948:

"(1) Short-term gains and holding periods: If substantially identical property has been held by the taxpayer on the date of such short sale for not more than 6 months (determined without regard to the effect, under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, of such short sale on the holding period), or if substantially identical property is acquired after such short sale and on or before the date of the closing thereof—

"(A) any gain upon the closing of such short sale shall be considered as a gain upon the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for not more than 6 months (notwithstanding the period of time any property used by the taxpayer to close such short sale has been held); and

"(B) the holding period of such substantially identical property shall be considered to begin (notwithstanding the provisions of

subsection (h)) on the date of the closing of the short sale, or on the date of a sale, gift, or other disposition of such property, whichever date occurs first. This subparagraph shall apply to such substantially identical property in the order of the dates of the acquisition of such property, but only to so much of such property as does not exceed the quantity sold short.

"(2) Long-term losses: If substantially identical property has been held by the taxpayer on the date of such short sale for more than 6 months, any loss upon the closing of such short sale shall be considered as a loss upon the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months (notwithstanding the period of time any property used by the taxpayer to close such short sale has been held, and notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (g) (2)).

"(3) Rules for application of subsection:

"(A) The provisions of paragraph (1) (A) or (2) shall not apply to the gain or loss, respectively, on any quantity of property used to close such short sale which is in excess of the quantity of the substantially identical property referred to in the applicable paragraph.

"(B) For the purposes of this subsection—

"(i) the term 'property' includes only stock, securities, or commodity futures which are capital assets in the hands of the taxpayer; and

"(ii) an option to sell such property at a fixed price shall be considered as a short sale, and the exercise or failure to exercise such option shall be considered as a closing of such short sale."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after May 31, 1948.

TITLE II—ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

PART I—ESTATE TAX

SEC. 201. Estates to which amendments applicable.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, the amendments made by this part shall be applicable only with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 202. Transfers taking effect at death.

So much of section 811 (c) (relating to certain transfers of a decedent) as precedes the last sentence thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Transfers in contemplation of, or taking effect at death: To the extent of any interest therein of which the decedent has at any time made a transfer (except in case of a bona fide sale for an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth), by trust or otherwise—

"(1) in contemplation of his death; or

"(2) under which he has retained for his life or for any period not ascertainable without reference to his death or for any period which does not in fact end before his death (A) the possession or enjoyment of, or the right to the income from, the property, or (B) the right, either alone or in conjunction with any person, to designate the persons who shall possess or enjoy the property or the income therefrom; or

"(3) intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after his death. In no case shall the amount includible in determining the value of the gross estate under the provisions of this paragraph exceed the value of any reversionary interest of the decedent immediately before his death with respect to the interest so transferred. Such value immediately before his death shall be determined in accordance with tables of experience or probability or other accepted methods of actuarial valuation under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. For the purposes of this paragraph, (A) a reversionary interest includes a possibility that an interest so transferred or a portion thereof may return to the decedent or his estate, and (B) a possibility that an interest so transferred or a portion thereof may be disposed of through the exercise of a power by the decedent shall be considered as a possibility that the interest subject to such power may so return."

SEC. 203. Proceeds of life insurance.

Section 811 (g) is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (3) thereof, and section 811 (g) (2) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Receivable by other beneficiaries: To the extent of the amount receivable by all other beneficiaries as insurance under policies upon the life of the decedent with respect to which the decedent possessed at his death any of the incidents of ownership, exercisable either alone or in conjunction with any other person."

SEC. 204. Transfers in contemplation of death.

(a) Transfers, etc., in contemplation of death: Section 811 (relating to gross estate) is hereby amended by striking out "(l)" at the beginning of subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "(n)," and by inserting after subsection (k) the following new subsection:

"(l) Contemplation of death: If the decedent within a period of three years ending with the date of his death (except in case of a bona fide sale for an adequate and full consideration in money's worth) transferred an interest in property, relinquished a power, or exercised or released a power of appointment, such transfer, relinquishment, exercise or release shall, unless shown to the contrary, be deemed to have been made in contemplation of death within the meaning of subsections (c), (d), and (f); but no such transfer, relinquishment, exercise, or release made prior to such 3-year period shall be deemed or held to have been made in contemplation of death."

(b) Amendments of section 811 (c) and (d):

(1) Section 811 (c) (relating to transfers in contemplation of death) is hereby amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(2) Section 811 (d) (relating to revocable transfers) is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (4) thereof.

SEC. 205. Exclusion of amounts payable under certain employee retirement plans.

Section 811 (relating to gross estate of the decedent) is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (l) thereof (added by section 204 of this act) the following new subsection:

"(m) Exclusion of certain employee benefits: In determining the value of the gross estate of a decedent there shall not be included in the gross estate the value of amounts receivable by any person (other than the executor) under—

"(1) a pension, annuity, or retirement plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

"(2) an employees' trust forming part of a pension, stock bonus, or profit-sharing plan which, at the time of the decedent's separation from employment, met the requirements of section 165 (a);

"(3) a retirement annuity contract purchased by an employer (and not by an employees' trust) pursuant to a plan which, at the time of the decedent's separation from employment, met the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6).

If such amounts payable after the death of the decedent under a plan described in paragraph (2) or (3) are attributable to any extent to payments or contributions made by the decedent after his separation from the employment covered by such plan, no exclusion shall be allowed for any part of the value of such amounts."

SEC. 206. Repeal of deduction for support of dependents.

Section 812 (b) (relating to deductions for expenses etc.) is hereby amended—

(a) by inserting the word "and" at the end of paragraph (3) thereof;

(b) by striking out of paragraph (4) thereof the following: "and ;

(c) by striking out paragraph (5) thereof; and

(d) by striking out "(3), (4), and (5) exceed" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3), and (4) exceed".

SEC. 207. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.

(a) Section 812 (d) (relating to transfers for public, etc., uses) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses: The amount of all bequests, legacies, devises, or transfers (including the interest which falls into any such bequest, legacy, devise, or transfer as a result of an irrevocable disclaimer of a bequest, legacy, devise, transfer, or power, if the disclaimer is made prior to the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return) to or for the use of:

"(1) the United States, any State, Territory or any political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States, for exclusively public purposes; or

"(2) a corporation, trust, or community chest, fund or foundation, created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, veteran rehabilitation service, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation; or

"(3) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of, or trusts or foundations for, any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, societies, trusts, or foundations are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(4) a domestic fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation, but only if such contributions or gifts are to be used exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals. Property includible in the decedent's gross estate under section 811 (f) received by a donee described in this subsection shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be considered a bequest of such decedent. If the tax imposed by section 810, or any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance taxes, are, either by the terms of the will, by the law of the jurisdiction under which the estate is administered, or by the law of the jurisdiction imposing the particular tax, payable in whole or in part out of the bequests, legacies, or devises otherwise deductible under this paragraph, then the amount deductible under this paragraph shall be the amount of such bequests, legacies, or devises reduced by the amount of such taxes. The amount of the deduction under this subsection for any transfer shall not exceed the value of the transferred property required to be included in the gross estate."

(b) Section 861 (a) (3) (relating to transfers for public, etc., uses) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses: The amount of all bequests,

legacies, devises, or transfers (including the interest which falls into any such bequest, legacy, devise, or transfer as a result of an irrevocable disclaimer of a bequest, legacy, devise, transfer, or power, if the disclaimer is made prior to the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return) to or for the use of:

"(A) the United States, any State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof or the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States, for exclusively public purposes; or

"(B) a corporation, trust, or community chest, fund or foundation, created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, veteran rehabilitation service, literary or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals (but in the case of contributions or gifts to a trust, chest, fund, or foundation, only if such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions exclusively for such purposes), no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation; or

"(C) posts or organizations of war veterans, or auxiliary units or societies of, or trusts or foundations for, any such posts or organizations, if such posts, organizations, units, societies, trusts, or foundations are organized in the United States or any of its possessions, and if no part of their net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; or

"(D) a domestic fraternal society, order, or association, operating under the lodge system, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, but only if such contributions or gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals.

Property includible in the decedent's gross estate under section 811 (f) received by a donee described in this paragraph shall, for the purposes of this paragraph, be considered a bequest of such decedent. If the tax imposed by section 860, or any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance taxes, are, either by the terms of the will, by the law of the jurisdiction under which the estate is administered, or by the law of the jurisdiction imposing the particular tax, payable in whole or in part out of the bequests, legacies, or devises otherwise deductible under this paragraph, then the amount deductible under this paragraph shall be the amount of such bequests, legacies, or devises reduced by the amount of such taxes. The amount of the deduction under this paragraph for any transfer shall not exceed the value of the transferred property required to be included in the gross estate."

SEC. 208. Marital deduction in case of life insurance or annuity payments.

(a) Section 812 (e) (1) (G) (relating to life insurance with power of appointment in surviving spouse) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(G) Life insurance or annuity payments with power of appointment in surviving spouse: Where proceeds receivable under an insurance contract on the life of the decedent, or under an endowment or annuity contract, are payable in annual or more frequent installments commencing not later than 13 months after the decedent's death, or where proceeds of an insurance or endowment contract are held by the insurer under an agreement to pay interest thereon annually or at more frequent intervals, if, under the terms of the contract, all amounts payable during the life of the surviving spouse are payable only to such spouse, and such spouse has the power to appoint all amounts payable under such contract (exercisable in favor of such surviving spouse, or of the estate of such surviving spouse, or in favor of either, whether or not in each case the power is exercisable in favor of others), with no power in any other person to appoint to any person other than the surviving spouse any part of the amounts payable under such contract—

"(i) such proceeds shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), be considered as passing to the surviving spouse, and

"(ii) no part of such proceeds shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (i), be considered as passing to any person other than the surviving spouse.

This subparagraph shall be applicable only if, under the terms of the contract, such power in the surviving spouse to appoint, whether exercisable by will or during life, is exercisable by such spouse alone and in all events."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1947.

SEC. 209. Technical amendments.

(a) Section 821 (a) (3) (relating to requirement of estate-tax return) is hereby amended by striking out "$40,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$60,000."

(b) Section 851 and Supplement E of chapter 3 (relating to estates in China) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 210. Credit for taxes of foreign countries and of Puerto Rico.

(a) Credit against basic estate tax: Section 813 (relating to credits against tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof two new subsections to read as follows:

"(c) Same—Paid to foreign countries:

"(1) The tax imposed by section 810 (after deducting from such tax the credits provided by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be credited with the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any foreign country in respect of any property situated within such foreign country and included in the gross estate (not including any such taxes paid with respect to the estate of a person other than the decedent). The determination of the country within which property is situated shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, in accordance with principles not inconsistent with the provisions of section 862. If the decedent was not a citizen of the United States, credit shall not be allowed under this subsection unless the country of which such decedent was a national, in imposing such taxes, allows a similar credit in the case of a citizen of the United States resident in such country.

"(2) The credit provided in this subsection—

"(A) shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax actually paid to such foreign country as the value of property which is—

"(i) situated within such foreign country,

"(ii) subjected to the tax of such foreign country, and

"(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of all property subjected to the tax of such foreign country; and

"(B) shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax imposed by section 810 as the value of property which is—

"(i) situated within such foreign country,

"(ii) subjected to the tax of such foreign country, and

"(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of the entire gross estate reduced by the aggregate amount of the deductions allowed under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 812.

"(3) (A) The values referred to in the ratio stated in paragraph (2) (A) are the values determined for the purposes of the tax imposed by such foreign country.

"(B) The values referred to in the ratio stated in paragraph (2) (B) are the values determined under this chapter; but, in applying such ratio, the value of any property described in clauses (i) (ii), and (iii) of such ratio shall be reduced by such amount as will properly reflect, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the deductions allowed in respect thereof under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 812.

"(4) The credit provided in this subsection shall be allowed only if the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Commissioner (A) the amount of tax actually paid to the foreign country, (B) the amount and date of each payment of such tax, (C) the description and value of the property in respect of which such tax is imposed, and (D) all other information necessary for the verification and computation of the credit.

"(5) The credit provided in this subsection shall be allowed only for such taxes as were actually paid and credit therefor claimed within 4 years after the filing of the return required by section 821, except that—

"(A) If a petition for redetermination of a deficiency has been filed with the Tax Court of the United States within the time prescribed in section 871, then within such 4-year period or before the expiration of 60 days after the decision of the Tax Court becomes final.

"(B) If, under section 822 (a) (2) or section 871 (h), an extension of time has been granted for payment of the tax shown on the return, or of a deficiency, then within such 4-year period or before the date of the expiration of the period of the extension.

Refund based on the credit may (despite the provisions of sections 910 to 912, inclusive) be made if claim therefor is filed within the period above provided. Any such refund shall be made without interest.

"(d) Same—Paid to Puerto Rico: If the decedent died on or after March 22, 1946, the tax imposed by section 810 (after deducting from such tax the credits provided by sec. 813 (a) and (b) shall be credited with the amount of any inheritance taxes actually paid to Puerto Rico in respect of any property situated within Puerto Rico and included in the gross estate. Such credit shall be computed, allowed, and refund based thereon made, as provided in section 813 (c)."

(b) Technical amendment: Effective with respect to estates of decedents dying on or after March 22, 1946, section 813 (b) is hereby amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "(except Puerto Rico)."

(c) Credit against additional estate tax: Section 936 (relating to credits against tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) The tax imposed by section 935 (after deducting from such tax credit provided by subsec. (b) of this section) shall be credited with the amount of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes actually paid to any foreign country in respect of any property situated within such foreign country and included in the gross estate (not including any such taxes paid with respect to the estate of a nonresident not a citizen of the United States or a person other than the decedent). The determination of the country within which property is situated shall be made in ac-

cordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, in accordance with principles not inconsistent with the provisions of section 862. If the decedent was a resident but not a citizen of the United States, credit shall not be allowed under this subsection unless the country of which such decedent was a national, in imposing such taxes, allows a similar credit in the case of a citizen of the United States resident in such country.

"(2) The credit provided in this subsection—

"(A) shall not exceed the amount by which such tax paid to such foreign country exceeds the amount of the credit allowed for such tax under section 813 (c); and

"(B) shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax imposed by section 935 as the value of property which is—

"(i) situated within such foreign country,

"(ii) subject to the tax of such foreign country, and

"(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of the entire gross estate reduced by the aggregate amount of the deductions allowed under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 812.

"(3) (A) For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A) 'such tax paid to such foreign country' shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the tax actually paid to such foreign country as the value of property which is—

"(i) situated within such foreign country,

"(ii) subjected to the tax of such foreign country, and

"(iii) included in the gross estate

bears to the value of all property subjected to the tax of such foreign country. The values referred to in this ratio are the values determined for the purposes of the tax imposed by such foreign country.

"(B) The values referred to in the ratio stated in paragraph (2) (B) are the values determined under this chapter; but, in applying such ratio, the value of any property described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of such ratio shall be reduced by such amount as will properly reflect, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the deductions allowed in respect thereof under subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 812.

"(4) The credit provided in this subsection shall be allowed only if the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Commissioner (A) the amount of tax actually paid to the foreign country, (B) the amount and date of each payment of such tax, (C) the description and value of the property in respect of which such tax is imposed, and (D) all other information necessary for the verification and computation of the credit.

"(5) The credit provided in this subsection shall be allowed only for such taxes as were actually paid and credit therefor claimed within 4 years after the filing of the return required by section 821, except that—

"(A) If a petition for redetermination of a deficiency has been filed with the Tax Court of the United States within the time prescribed in section 871, then within such 4-year period or before the expiration of 60 days after the decision of the Tax Court becomes final.

"(B) If, under section 822 (a) (2) or section 871 (h), an extension of time has been granted for payment of the tax shown on the return, or of a deficiency, then within such 4-year period or before the date of the expiration of the period of the extension.

Refund based on the credit may (despite the provisions of sections 910 to 912, inclusive), be made if claim therefor is filed within the period above provided. Any such refund shall be made without interest.

"(d) If the decedent died on or after March 22, 1946, the tax imposed by section 935 (after deducting from such tax the credit provided by section 936 (b)) shall be credited with the amount of any inheritance taxes actually paid to Puerto Rico in respect of any property situated within Puerto Rico and included in the gross estate. Such credit shall be computed, allowed, and refund based thereon made, as provided in section 936 (c)."

(d) Technical amendment: Section 927 (relating to credit for State death taxes) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 927. Credit for death taxes.

"Such part of any estate, inheritance, legacy, or succession taxes allowable as a credit under section 813 (b), (c), or (d) against the tax imposed by this subchapter, or under section 936 (c) or (d) against the tax imposed by subchapter B, as is attributable to such reversionary or remainder interest may be allowed as a credit against the tax attributable to such interest, subject to the limitations on the amount of credit contained in such sections, if such part is paid, and credit therefor claimed, at any time prior to the expiration of 60 days after the termination of the precedent interest or interests in the property."

(e) Estates or residents of Puerto Rico:

(1) The heading to subpart IV of part II of subchapter A of chapter 3 reading "Subpart IV—Special classes of residents" is hereby amended to read as follows: "Subpart IV—Special classes of decedents."

(2) Such subpart IV is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 852. Residents of Puerto Rico.

"In the case of the estate of a resident of Puerto Rico (other than such a resident who was at the time of his death a citizen of the United States and who was not, at the time he became such a citizen, a resident of Puerto Rico) the tax under this subchapter shall be imposed in the same manner as in the case of the estate of a nonresident not a citizen of the United States."

(f) Extension of period of limitations, etc., in case of recovery of taxes claimed as credit: Section 874 (b) (relating to exceptions to general rule as to period of limitation upon assessment and collection) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Recovery of taxes claimed as credit: If any tax claimed as a credit under section 813 (b), (c), or (d) or section 936 (c) or (d) is recovered from any foreign country, State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States, the executor, or any other person or persons recovering such amount, shall give notice of such recovery to the Commissioner at such time and in such manner as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, and the Commissioner shall redetermine the amount of the tax under this chapter and the amount, if any, of the tax due upon such redetermination, shall be paid by the executor or such person or persons, as the case may be, upon notice and demand by the collector."

SEC. 211. Requirement of transfer certificates.

Section 828 (relating to certain cross-references) is hereby renumbered section 829, and there is inserted immediately following section 827 the following new section:

"SEC. 828. Transfer Certificates.

"If any corporation or its transfer agent or registrar transfers certificates of its stock or bonds situated in the United States and standing in the name of or known by such corporation or its agent to belong to a nonresident decedent, or if any corporation or person transfers, removes, or extinguishes a property right situated in the United States of the estate of a nonresident decedent (such as a debt, stock, bond, or note) issuing from or enforcible against corporation or person, or if any bank, trust company, or custodian in possession of property situated in the United States of the estate of a nonresident decedent transfers or removes such property (whether or not such stock, bond, property right, or property was jointly held with one or more other persons), before the tax, interest, and penalties, if any, imposed by this chapter with respect to the estate of such nonresident decedent is fully paid or provided for to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, such corporation, agent, registrar, person, bank, trust company, or custodian shall be personally liable for such tax, interest, and penalties, to the extent of the value at the time of the decedent's death of such stock, bonds, property right, or property, unless prior to such transfer, removal, or extinguishment, the Commissioner issues his certificate permitting the transfer, removal, or extinguishment of such stock, bonds, property, or property rights without personal liability or unless under regulations, prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, such transfer, removal, or extinguishment may be made without such certificate."

SEC. 212. Period of limitation upon assessment and collection.

(a) Section 874 (b) (relating to exceptions to period of limitation upon assessment and collection) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Omission from gross estate: If the executor fails to make disclosure in or with the return of property the value of which is properly includible in the gross estate and such value exceeds 25 percent of the value of the gross estate stated in the return, the tax may be assessed or a proceeding in court for the collection of such tax may be begun without assessment at any time within 5 years after the return was filed."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to returns filed after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 213. Exemption from the additional estate tax for members of armed forces.

(a) Subchapter B of chapter 3 (relating to additional estate tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 939. Members of the Armed Forces.

"The tax imposed by section 935 shall not apply to the transfer of the net estate of a citizen or resident of the United States dying on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1947, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations if such decedent—

"(1) was killed in action; or

"(2) died as a result of wounds or other injuries, or of disease, suffered while in line of duty by reason of a hazard to which he was subjected as an incident of military or naval service."

(b) If the refund of any overpayment resulting from the application of this section is prevented on the date of the enactment of this act, or within 1 year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to compromises), refund of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act. No interest shall be paid on any overpayment resulting from the application of this section.

PART II.—GIFT TAX

SEC. 251. Reciprocal trusts.

Section 1000 (relating to imposition of gift tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Certain reciprocal trusts: In the case of property in a trust created prior to January 1, 1940, if and to the extent that such property may be deemed to have been transferred to such trust by a person other than

the nominal grantor of such property (by reason of the fact that such person has made a reciprocal transfer of property in trust), then a relinquishment by such person on or before December 31, 1948, of any power over such property or the income therefrom shall not be deemed a transfer of property for the purposes of this chapter. If such property was transferred in trust while a law was in effect imposing a tax upon the transfer of property by gift, this subsection shall apply only if (1) a gift tax was paid with respect to the aforesaid reciprocal transfer of property, and not credited or refunded, by the person relinquishing such power, or (2) a gift tax return was made by such person on account of such reciprocal transfer within the time prescribed but no gift tax was paid with respect to such reciprocal transfer because of the deductions and exclusions claimed on such return. If a relinquishment is executed under this subsection, then such reciprocal transfer made by the person relinquishing such power shall for all purposes be deemed to have been a completed gift at the time when such reciprocal transfer was made."

SEC. 252. Certain employee retirement plans.

Section 1000 (relating to imposition of gift tax) is hereby amended by adding after subsection (g) thereof (added by section 251 of this act) the following new subsection:

"(h) Certain employee retirement plans: In the case of a gift made to any person after December 31, 1947, of amounts payable after the donor's death under—

"(1) a pension, annuity, or retirement plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

"(2) an employee's trust forming part of a pension, stock bonus, or profit-sharing plan which, at the time of such gift, meets the requirements of section 165 (a);

"(3) a retirement annuity contract purchased by an employer (and not by an employees' trust) pursuant to a plan which, at the time of such gift, meets the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6);

such gift shall not be considered a transfer of property for the purposes of this chapter. The preceding sentence shall not be applicable with respect to payments or contributions to or under a plan described in paragraph (2) or (3) if such payments or contributions are made after the donor's separation from the employment covered by such plan."

SEC. 253. Gift tax exclusion for future interests.

Section 1003 (b) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Gifts of future interests: In the case of gifts of future interests made by the donor during the calendar year 1948 and subsequent calendar years, an aggregate of $3,000, for all such gifts, shall not, for the purposes of subsection (a), be included in the total amount of gifts made during such year."

SEC. 254. Transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses.

(a) Section 1004 (a) (2) relating to charitable, etc., gifts) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by inserting in subparagraph (A) thereof after "or the District of Columbia," the following: "or any possession of the United States,";

(2) by inserting in subparagraph (B) thereof after "foundation," the following: "created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States,"; and by inserting in such subparagraph after "charitable, scientific," the following: "veteran rehabilitation service,";

(3) by striking out of subparagraph (C) thereof "a fraternal society" and inserting in lieu thereof "a domestic fraternal society"; and by inserting after "under the lodge system," the following: "no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation,";

(4) by inserting in subparagraph (D) thereof after "units or societies of" the following: ", or trusts, or foundations for,"; and by striking out of such subparagraph "or societies are organized" and inserting in lieu thereof "societies, trusts, or foundations are organized"; and by striking out the semicolon at the end of such subparagraph and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(5) by striking out subparagraphs (E) and (F) thereof.

(b) Section 1004 (b) (relating to charitable, etc., gifts by nonresidents) is hereby amended as follows:

(1) by inserting in paragraph (1) thereof after "or the District of Columbia," the following: "or any possession of the United States,";

(2) by striking out paragraphs (2) and (3) thereof and by adding after paragraph (1) a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) a corporation, trust, or community chest, fund or foundation, created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or of the District of Columbia, or of any possession of the United States, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, veteran rehabilitation service, literary, or educational purposes, including the encouragement of art and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals (but in the case of gifts to a trust, chest, fund, or foundation, only if such gifts are to be used within the United States or any of its possessions exclusively for such purposes), no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation;";

(3) by striking out of paragraph (4) thereof "a fraternal society" and inserting in lieu thereof "a domestic fraternal society"; by inserting after "under the lodge system," the following: "no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation,"; and by inserting in such paragraph after "within the United States" the following: "or any of its possessions"; and by renumbering such paragraph as pragraph (3);

(4) by inserting in paragraph (5) thereof after "units or societies of" the following: ", or trusts, or foundations for,"; by striking out from such paragraph "or societies are organized" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "societies, trusts, or foundations are organized"; by striking out the semicolon at the end of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and by renumbering such paragraph as paragraphs (4); and

(5) by striking out paragraphs (6) and (7) thereof.

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to gifts made in the calendar year 1949 and succeeding calendar years.

SEC. 255. Valuation of gifts.

Section 1005 (relating to gifts made in property) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1005. Valuation of Gifts.

"(a) Gifts made in property: If the gift is made in property, the value thereof at the date of the gift shall be considered the amount of the gift.

"(b) Valuation of gifts for preceding calendar years: If the time has expired within which a tax may be assessed under this chapter or under title III of the Revenue Act of 1932, 47 Stat. 245, upon the transfer of property by gift made during any of the preceding calendar years, as defined in section 1001 (b), and if a tax under this chapter or such title III has been assessed or paid for such preceding calendar year, the value of such gift made in such preceding calendar year shall, for purposes of computing the tax under this chapter for the calendar year 1948 and subsequent calendar years, be the value of such gift which was used in computing the tax for the last preceding calendar year, for which a tax under this chapter of such title III was assessed or paid."

SEC. 256. Period of limitation upon assessment and collection in cases of omitted gifts.

(a) Section 1016 (b) (relating to exceptions to period of limitation upon assessment and collection) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Omission from total gifts: If the donor fails to make disclosure in or with the return of property transferred by gift during the calendar year and the total amount of the gifts of such property exceeds 25 percent of the total amount of gifts made during the calendar year stated in the return, the tax may be assessed or a proceeding in court for the collection of such tax may be begun without assessment at any time within 5 years after the return was filed."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to returns for the calendar year 1948, and succeeding calendar years.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS AND PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Review of Tax Court decisions.

(a) Section 1141 (c) (1) (relating to the review of Tax Court decisions) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) To affirm, modify, or reverse: Upon such review, the scope of review by such courts and the power of such courts to affirm, modify, or reverse the decision of the Board, with or without remanding the case for a rehearing, shall be the same as upon review of a decision of a United States district court in a suit for recovery of an internal revenue tax tried without a jury."

(b) The first sentence of section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act is hereby amended by inserting after "the courts," the following: "The Tax Court of the United States",

(c) Effective dates: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable with respect to decisions rendered by the Tax Court of the United States after the date of the enactment of this act; and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall be effective as of the date of the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act.

SEC. 302. Penalty for failure to pay withholding tax.

(a) In general: Section 1626 (c) (relating to penalties) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Failure of employer to file return or pay tax:

"(1) In case of any failure to pay the tax required by this subchapter, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, there shall be added to the tax: 5 percent if the failure is for not more than 30 days with an additional 5 percent for each additional 30 days or fraction thereof during which such failure continues, not to exceed 25 percent in the aggregate. The amount added to the tax by this subsection shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner and as a part of the tax unless the tax has been paid before the discovery of the neglect, in which case the amount so added shall be collected in the same manner as the tax.

"(2) In case of any failure to make and file return or pay the tax required by this subchapter, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the addition to the tax shall not be less than $10."

(b) Waiver of interest: Section 1420 (b) (relating to additions to tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If the date prescribed for payment of the tax is a date prior to the date prescribed for filing of the return in respect of such tax, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may waive such interest for the period beginning on the date prescribed for such payment and ending on the date prescribed for filing such return."

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to wages paid on or after July 1, 1948.

SEC. 303. Verification of returns.

(a) The second sentence of section 52 (a) (relating to corporation returns) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The return shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, signed by the president, vice president, or other principal officer and by the treasurer, assistant treasurer, or chief accounting officer."

(b) Section 142 (a) (relating to fiduciary returns) is hereby amended by striking out the words "make under oath a return," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "make a return, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury,".

(c) The second sentence of section 187 (relating to partnership returns) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The return shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, signed by any one of the partners."

(d) Section 821 (a) (1) and section 864 (a) (1) (relating to estate tax returns) are hereby amended by striking out the words "make a return under oath in duplicate", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "make a return in duplicate, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury."

(e) Section 1006 (a) (relating to gift tax returns) is hereby amended by striking out the words "make a return under oath in duplicate", and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "make a return in duplicate, which shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury."

(f) Chapter 38 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3809. Verification of returns, etc.

"(a) Penalties: Any person who willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury in section 125 of the Criminal Code.

"(b) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a return, statement, or other document filed shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the return, statement, or other document was actually signed by him.

"(c) Power of Commissioner to require: The Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may require that any return, statement, or other document required to be filed under any provision of the internal revenue laws shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and such declaration shall be in lieu of any oath otherwise required."

(g) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 3*, 1947. The amendments made by subsection (d) shall be effective with respect to returns filed after December 31, 1948, and the amendment made by subsection (e) shall be effctive with respect to returns for the calendar year 1948 and succeeding calendar years. The amendment made by subsection (f) shall be applicable with respect to any return, statement, or document filed after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 304. Reports to Congress of refunds.

Section 3776 (relating to reports to Congress of refunds) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 305. Reports of compensation of officers and employees.

Section 148 (f) (relating to reports of compensation of corporate officers and employees exceeding $75,000) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 306. Collection of delinquent taxes of Federal employees.

Subchapter A of chapter 36 is hereby amended by renumbering sections 3662 and 3663 as sections 3663 and 3664, respectively, and by adding after section 3661 a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 3662. Collection of Delinquent Taxes of Federal Employees.

"(a) In general: If any employee (as defined in section 1621 (c)) of the United States, of the District of Columbia, or of any agency or instrumentality thereof, liable to pay any Federal tax (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts), fails to pay the same within 10 days after notice and demand, the collector may send to the agency, in which such employee is employed, a notice setting forth the name of the employee and the amount of unpaid tax. Upon receipt of the notice, such agency shall deduct and pay over to the collector from each payment of compensation thereafter payable to such employee, until the amount specified in such notice is fully paid, 10 percent of the compensation represented by each such payment up to a rate of $10,000 per annum, and 25 percent of the portion of such compensation as exceeds such rate, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary.

"(b) Government agency: As used in this section, the term 'agency' shall include the Office of the President, the Congress, the courts of the United States, all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the United States Government, and all agencies and instrumentalities of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

"(c) Regulations: The Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary shall prescribe the regulations for carrying out the provisions of this section."

SEC. 307. Distraint on salaries, wages, and compensation

(a) Continuing levy: Section 3692 (relating to levy) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "A levy with respect to salary, wages, and compensation for personal services shall be a continuing levy remaining in effect until the liability in respect of which the levy is made is satisfied or becomes legally unenforceable, but shall attach to such salary, wages, or compensation accruing or becoming payable after the date on which such levy is made only to the extent of 10 percent of any such salary, wages, or compensation up to a rate of $10,000 per annum, and 25 percent of the portion of such salary, wages, or compensation as exceeds such rate."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the day following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 308. Loans and bonds.

(a) Section 3481 (a) (relating to stamp tax on transfers of bonds) is hereby amended by inserting after the word "deposited" in the second proviso thereof a comma and the following: "nor upon mere loans of instruments nor upon the return of instruments loaned."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect as of the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 309. Compromises.

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 3761 (relating to compromises) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Authorization: The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, or of the Under Secretary of the Treasury, or of an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, may compromise any civil or criminal case arising under the internal revenue laws prior to reference to the Department of Justice for prosecution or defense. Any case in which the amount of tax liability (including any interest, penalty, additional amount, or addition to such tax) is less than $500, may be compromised prior to reference to the Department of Justice for prosecution or defense by any officer or agent of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, including the field service, who is authorized in writing by the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary. The Attorney General may compromise any civil or criminal case arising under the internal revenue laws after reference to the Department of Justice for prosecution or defense.

"(b) Record: Whenever a compromise is made by the Commissioner in any case in which the amount of tax liability (including any interest, penalty, additional amount or addition to such tax) is $500 or more, there shall be placed on file in the Office of the Commissioner the opinion of the General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, or of the officer acting as such, with his reasons therefor, with a statement of—

"(1) the amount of tax assessed,

"(2) the amount of additional tax or penalty imposed by law in consequence of the neglect or delinquency of the person against whom the tax is assessed, and

"(3) the amount actually paid in accordance with the terms of the compromise."

SEC. 310. Reports of refunds to the joint committee.

(a) Section 3777 (relating to review of refunds and credits by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation) is amended by striking out "$75,000" wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the day following the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 311. Relief in cases of certain recapitalizations.

(a) For the purposes of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, if after March 11, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1945, stock in a corporation held by a testamentary trust was exchanged by such trust solely for other stock and securities in such corporation, in pursuance of a recapitalization of the corporation under the applicable State law, and if the stock and securities so received by such trust are surrendered prior to January 1, 1949, to the corporation solely in exchange for stock identical in character and amount with that held by the trust prior to the original exchange, no gain, profit, income, loss, or deduction (from such exchange or reexchange) shall be recognized to the corporation or to the trust.

(b) In the case of stock acquired by the trust in a reexchange described in subsection (a), the basis for determining gain or loss in the hands of the trust, or any person in whose hands the basis is determined by reference to the basis in the hands of

the trust, shall be the same as the basis of the stock originally exchanged by the trust in connection with such recapitalization.

SEC. 312. Travel of field employees.

Section 4040 (relating to posts of duty of employees in field service or traveling) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Authorization of employees of the internal revenue service to travel on official business may be provided by any officer or employee of the internal revenue service designated by the Commissioner.".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is not one who is opposed to the bill entitled to recognition to demand a second?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. Is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] opposed to the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify to demand a second. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] opposed to the bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 6712 which we have before us today is a revenue revision measure and, in my opinion, the bill represents a new and progressive era in revenue revision. It is not designed to raise revenue or to reduce taxes, nor does this measure contain any excise tax provisions. Rather it is a bill to alleviate hardships, remove inequities, and simplify the administration of our tax laws.

May I say that the committee has worked for over 13 months on this measure. We began hearings on the 9th day of May 1947, and we have worked practically continuously ever since.

I shall not take much time on the bill, because it is highly technical, as every member of the committee will agree, but I do wish to say that this legislation is something that the country needs very much. I doubt if there are any who have had experience with the administration of the Internal Revenue Code who are not in favor of Congress ironing out the wrinkles and removing the inequities therein.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who now says he is against the bill, which, of course, is nothing out of the ordinary or unusual, did not vote against reporting the measure out. The bill H. R. 6712 was voted out of the committee without a dissenting vote. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was there at the time. I realize, even though we were to bring in and propose to enact into legislation the Ten Commandments, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would find something highly objectionable in what was proposed to be done, and if he does not believe in the Bible, it is because he did not write it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I notice the absence of any minority report or any minority views or anything in opposition to the bill. Usually minority views, at least, are filed.

Mr. KNUTSON. It comes with a complete surprise to me that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is opposed to the bill, but in light of his past performances, I should not be surprised.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman well knows that several Members reserved the right to oppose the bill on the floor of the House. I think the House should know that. The gentleman from Minnesota also knows full well that on Friday, June 11, I spoke on the bill and I inserted in the RECORD a complete analysis of what my objections were, and I have repeated those objections at all times that I was opposed to the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. The analyses that the gentleman inserted in the RECORD are suspected of having been made by the Treasury Department.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the gentleman admits that the Treasury is opposed to the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, the Treasury Department blows hot and cold. They did when the gentleman's side was in control; in fact, on several occasions it was necessary for the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], while chairman—and I want to say he was one of the greatest chairmen that the committee has had in my time—to intimate to the Secretary of the Treasury that certain of his aides were persona non grata so far as the Committee on Ways and Means was concerned.

I might say, further, that we have worked in the closest collaboration with the Treasury Department, and when I talked to Mr. Wiggins, Under Secretary of the Treasury, over the telephone, he informed me that there were only three major items in disagreement. You can imagine my surprise when I received a letter from the Treasury saying that there were 12 matters to which they took exception, and a lot of minor ones. Well, I say, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] said upon that occasion after the letter had been read, that it would be passing strange if there would not be something in here that would be objectionable to the Treasury Department, and I consider it a great accomplishment that we have been able to report out a bill to which the Treasury could only find 10 percent objection. I hope I have not misquoted the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. The committee adopted many of the suggestions and recommendations of the Treasury, did it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. We met them more than halfway, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Gladly.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is one provision that many Members are interested in in relation to the exemption of veterans. I think the chairman ought to explain that to the Members of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I said before, this bill is very technical.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a provision in there in relation to the GI's relating to the exemption of those getting disability payments, officers and men, subject to the income tax. I think it is $1,200. My understanding is that the amendment is being offered to that.

Mr. KNUTSON. We exempt all payments under the veterans' law, so that is taken care of.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think my friend from Massachusetts has reference to paragraph 13, extension of additional allowances for military and naval personnel.

Mr. KNUTSON. The amendment was prepared and offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and I yield to him at this point to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. With regard to section 106, which has for its purpose the removal of a part of the exemption provided in the present law for ex-servicemen because of physical disability, the committee since this bill was drawn has proposed and adopted committee amendments which lift the exemption to $2,400 of retired pay and which also eliminate the application of this restriction, so that it now does not apply to enlisted men at all and does not apply to any veteran who draws his pay through the Veterans' Administration. Under the pay charts, which I have here but which are too bulky to review, you can say roughly that any veteran of the rank of captain or less who has less than 12 years' service has complete exemption of his retired pay under the bill as amended, any warrant officer with less than 30 years' service has complete exemption, and any chief warrant officer with less than 12 years' service has complete exemption. All officers and warrant officers retired for physical disability carry a $2,400 exemption of their retired pay from income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in order to give a full dis-

cussion of section 106 of the bill H. R. 6712.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, section 22 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, chapter I, defines gross income. Section 22 (b) sets out the various exclusions from gross income and among the items not to be included in gross income and that are granted exemptions from taxation under chapter I is listed section 22 (b) (5) entitled "Compensation for Injuries or Sickness." Section 22 (b) (5) in the present law reads as follows:

Except in the case of amounts attributable to (and not in excess of) deductions allowed under section 23 (x) in any prior taxable year, amounts received, through accident or health insurance or under workmen's compensation acts, as compensation for personal injuries or sickness, plus the amount of any damages received whether by suit or agreement on account of such injuries or sickness (and amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country).

You will note by comparing section 106 (A) of the bill, H. R. 6712, and the committee amendment offered to that section by the Committee on Ways and Means the only change proposed by section 106 has reference to that part enclosed in parentheses in the foregoing quotation of the law. The portion of the above-quoted law that I have enclosed in parentheses will be changed by section 106 as amended to read as follows:

Except that if such amounts exceed $2,400 during the taxable year, and the taxpayer also receives during the same taxable year earned income, as defined in section 116 (a) (3), the exclusion under this subparagraph shall be reduced by the amount of such earned income, but not to an amount less than $2,400. The provisions of this subparagraph shall not affect amounts exempt from taxation under the act of August 12, 1935, entitled "An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pension, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay and insurance, and for other purposes" (49 Stat. 609; 38 U. S. C. 454a).

Payment of benefits for disability incurred in line of duty in the armed services fall into two general classes. In the case of officers the amount of compensation is governed by the rank held by the officer and by his length of service and no additional payments are made to a retired officer because of the seriousness of his disability. An officer is retired whenever he is found disabled for general military duty and the amount of his retired pay is not dependent upon the extent of his disability beyond that point. On the other hand, veterans' disability compensation is based upon the extent of the veterans' disability for civilian employment. Therefore, the assumption that the recipient is handicapped in competing in civilian employment is far more valid in the case of veterans' pensions than is the case with retired officers. This entire matter came to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means because of the number of officers retired for physical disability who are earning large incomes in private industry while benefiting from the full exclusion of their retired pay under the present law. The maximum compensation that a disabled ex-enlisted man can draw is $360 a month but the higher compensation rates are paid only in cases of extreme disability and necessary care. I should add also that at the time of retirement proceedings an officer who is seriously disabled may elect to forfeit his status as a retired officer and qualify for disability compensation if such compensation exceeds his pay on the retired list. Because the retired pay of officers has generally exceeded the maximum allowances at which they may be entitled under veterans' laws granting disability compensation, I understand very few officers have availed themselves of that election.

Exemption from taxes of retired pay based upon disability came into the law in the 1942 Revenue Act and with the greatly increased rank of officers because of the wartime expansion of the armed forces the tax exemption granted by the 1942 Revenue Act brought about a great increase of retirements based upon physical disability. The legal subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services has just completed a very good survey and study of this matter and I refer you to their recent report to the Committee on Armed Services rather than take the time here to set out the very interesting and informative data and analysis contained in that report. I will confine my remarks here entirely to the matter of tax liability. I do not believe many Members of Congress would oppose exemption from income tax any compensation based upon the extent of the disability incurred in line of duty in the armed forces. On the other hand, high retired pay based upon the rank of the officer retired should not be granted complete exemption from income tax, especially in those cases where the disability that is great enough to disqualify the officer for general military service is not a disability to him in a great many civilian occupations. Section 106 of the bill, H. R. 6712, approaches this problem by continuing the tax exemption of all veterans disability compensation. Section 106 as amended also continues the exemption of retired pay based upon physical disability for those officers who have no other earned income. This action is based logically upon the assumption that the total absence of earned income is due generally to the seriousness of the disability of such retired officer. Section 106 as amended will reduce the tax exemption of officers retired for physical disability by the amount of their earned income but in no case will the exemption of retired pay be reduced below $2,400. This is a fair limitation.

I should add by way of explanation that when section 106 was first drafted it did apply to both retired officers and disabled veterans drawing veterans' disability compensation and when the situation was more fully analyzed by the Committee on Ways and Means the committee quickly approved the proposed committee amendment to produce the effect I have described above.

DISCUSSION OF SECTION 107 OF THE BILL H. R. 6712

Section 22 (b) 13 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 10 (B) of the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 384, 80th Cong.) exclude from gross income $1,500 active-duty pay of commissioned officers and commissioned warrant officers of the military or naval forces and they exclude also the full compensation of men below those ranks. These exclusions in present law terminate with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948 and section 107 of the bill, H. R. 6712, changes the termination date from January 1, 1949, to January 1, 1950. The extension of these laws for 1 year was approved by the Committe on Ways and Means and is recommended for enactment by Congress in order to give the armed services additional time to complete their study relating to pay scale of the armed services.

The studies of the pay structure are now under way and have been conducted at the direction of the Secretary of Defense. An advisory commission to study service pay was appointed and this commission has held numerous meetings, instituted exhaustive collection of data, and has held hearings on the subject. The commission recently advised the Secretary of Defense that their studies could not be completed in time to permit a recommendation being submitted to the Eightieth Congress and the commission recommended the extension of the exemption through the calendar year of 1949, since the discontinuance of the exemption would be in effect an actual reduction in pay starting January 1949. The Committe on Ways and Means desires to cooperate with the Secretary of Defense in this matter in the hope that the extension of the period of exemption will be beneficial in maintaining the personnel strength of the armed services until the Eighty-first Congress has an opportunity to consider the pay matter.

I quote herewith a news item from page 10 of the Army and Navy Register of June 12, 1948:

The Service Pay Commission, which is making a comprehensive analysis of the pay structure of the armed services, met in Washington on May 17, and will meet here again on June 15. Since its appointment, last December, the Commission, of which Mr. Charles R. Hook, formerly president of the American Rolling Mills Co., is chairman, has been meeting at least once a month to receive and review reports from subcommittees and a corps of consultants. Special studies are being conducted in four fields:

1. Industrial wage comparisons.
2. Retirement and allied benefits.
3. Special pay and allowances.
4. Historical analysis.

It is expected that the Commission will report its findings to Secretary of Defense James Forrestal about September 1. It will make recommendations for pay scales in all branches of the armed services, including uniformed personnel in the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the United States Public Health Service.

In addition to Chairman Hook, members of the Commission include the Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, president, Notre Dame University; Mr. Keith S. McHugh, vice president,

American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; and Mr. Lawrence H. Whiting, president of Whiting & Co. and of the American Furniture Mart Building Co. The executive secretary is Mr. John L. Hoen.

DISCUSSION OF SEC. 213 OF THE BILL H. R. 6712

Section 213 of the bill adds a new section, subchapter B of chapter III—relating to additional estate tax. The new section will be section 939 and will provide that the tax imposed by section 935 shall not apply to the transfer of the net estate of a citizen or resident of the United States dying on or after December 7, 1941, and before January 1, 1947, while in active service if the decedent was killed in action or died as a result of wounds, injuries, or disease suffered while in line of duty and because of a hazard incident to the service. Provision is made for refund without interest of overpayment of any taxes already made and 1 year from date of enactment is provided for making application for refund.

The Committee on Ways and Means does not believe that the estate of a member of the armed services meeting the above qualifications should be subjected to the additional burden of an estate tax. A similar exemption was made during World War I.

The exemption provided in section 213 of this bill is restricted to the additional estate tax and does not apply to the basic estate tax. This provision is made in order to avoid interference with the inheritance- and estate-tax laws of the individual States.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that one of the amendments I have sent to the desk by direction of the committee allows a special deduction for expenses incurred by disabled persons traveling to and from work where the use of public transportation results in undue hardship or danger.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that very much. I called that to the attention of the chairman and he cooperated very effectively.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman always has helpful suggestions to make and we always listen to him. He was for years a valued member of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, only in a very few instances do any of the provisions of this bill entail any consequential loss and the effect on the budget is relatively negligible. The loss to the budget for the fiscal year 1949, for example, will be approximately one hundred and fifty million, most of which comes from the provision in the bill continuing for another year the exemption from the income tax of the pay of military personnel. The 1950 fiscal year budget will suffer by about three hundred million, approximately one-half of which is again the result of this same provision.

The task before us is long overdue. Not since 1927 has Congress made any thorough study of the Internal Revenue Code in order to keep its provisions in line with our constantly shifting economic forces, and to make it more workable and fair to all our taxpayers. As you well know, our present tax system was adopted in the midst of great financial stress. Like "Topsy" it has been permitted to grow with too little regard for its effect and operation. Fully recognizing the need for general revision of the tax laws, and in conformity with the recommendation of Secretary Snyder, our committee started hearings on general tax revisions early in May of 1947. These hearings were continued through the winter of 1947–48 and embrace over 3,000 pages of printed testimony. More than 100 witnesses from every part of the country appeared and outlined to us particular recommendations for improving and streamlining the effective operation of our tax laws. In addition, the committee appointed a special tax study group of which the Honorable Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, was the chairman. This committee made a report containing a great many useful suggestions for simplifying and improving our tax laws. We have had, moreover, the benefit of suggestions from the Treasury Department and, as a matter of fact, almost half of the provisions of this bill are based directly on recommendations made to us by the Treasury Department. Furthermore, we have had the constant service of our own staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, as well as suggestions from the American Bar Association and many State bar associations. You will fully appreciate, therefore, that this measure is the result of long, careful, and detailed planning; that each provision has been studied and analyzed with the utmost attention, and that there exists today a real need for the remedial provisions in this administrative revenue revision bill.

The bill before us contains some eighty-odd changes in the Internal Revenue Code, and there are provisions which specifically benefit every type of taxpayer. For example, members of the armed forces have received attention under section 107 of the bill, which provides for the continuance for another year of the existing law which specifically excludes the first $1,500 of compensation for officers, and all the compensation of enlisted men, from the income tax. These exclusions would otherwise expire January 1, 1949, and the armed forces have particularly requested us to make this extension effective in order to assist them in attracting high-caliber personnel. This provision will, as I have stated, result in the largest single revenue loss, estimated at $145,000,000 for the calendar year 1949. Moreover, the bill provides that a person who gave his or her life while serving in the armed forces during World War II should not be made to bear the additional penalty of an estate tax. This is similar to the relief Congress granted to persons killed in action during World War I.

The bill contains several provisions specifically benefiting our farmers. The bill provides, for example, for the deductibility as an expense of amounts spent on soil and water conservation, yet at the same time we have been careful to provide that improvements which involve the construction or purchase of assets subject to depreciation must continue to be treated as capital outlays. The bill, moreover, rectifies a congested situation by giving a farmer the option to file his final return on January 31 following the close of his taxable year in lieu of making a declaration of estimated tax. Under present law a farmer in order to avoid making an estimate is required to file his final return on or before January 15.

As in the case of military personnel and farmers, the bill contains several specific provisions which will benefit employees of all businesses throughout our country. Section 137 of the bill deals, for example, with the over-all problem of employee stock options. The underlying purpose of the provision in this bill is to encourage and increase incentive in employees by giving them a stake in the business, and to eliminate the present uncertainty existing as the result of current Bureau regulations. Under the present law the general rule is that an employee exercising an option to purchase stock from his employer corporation receives taxable income at the time of the exercise of the option to the extent of the difference between the market value of the stock at the time of the exercise and the option price. Actually, you see, at this time the employee has received nothing but stock, and yet he must, under existing law, pay an income tax on what is at most a paper profit. In order to pay this tax, however, the employee must in many cases sell the very stock given him under an option as an incentive for him to remain with the company. Under the provisions of our bill, however, the imposition of a tax at the time the option is exercised is delayed, and in the ordinary case where the option price is approximately equal to the fair market value of the stock at the time the option is granted, no tax is levied against the employee until the employee subsequently sells his stock which he purchased under the option from his company. We have provided special rules to govern cases where the option price differs materially from the fair market value, and we have limited this favorable treatment only if the option in question conforms to certain rules intended to distinguish options which have the characteristics of true incentive devices.

In this bill we have added a new section to the code dealing with family partnerships in order to clarify the existing law in this field, which extends to small businesses in all parts of our country, and in order to remedy an inequitable situation resulting from two recent Supreme Court cases.

This new section provides in general that related members of a partnership shall be partners for purposes of Federal income tax if they meet the tests which are set forth in the section. Family partnerships qualifying under section 191 will determine their distributive share in the manner provided in the bill, and members of the family will not be denied partnership status because the capital they contributed to the partnership originated with some other member of the family if the provisions of this section are complied with. Partners

who do not meet the test set forth in the new section 191 are now, however, denied status as partners but they are restricted to the present law and decisions in determining whether or not they are partners and to what extent they are recognized as partners for income-tax purposes.

We have provided new and simpler laws in regard to the taxation of estates and trusts and their beneficiaries. Section 140 of the bill provides that a beneficiary is taxable only on the part of the income as defined in the terms of the trust instrument (or local applicable law), which is also included in the gross income of the trust for tax purposes. Under present law distributions are in some cases taxable to the beneficiary even where the amounts involved do not represent taxable income to the estate or trusts. The distributions out of past accumulations are deductible by the trust and included as income to the beneficiaries to the extent of the current income of the trust. The bill also provides that income received by the beneficiary will be taxable to him in the same way as if he had received it directly, rather than through the estate or trust. As a result of this rule a long-term capital gain received by the trust or estate and distributed, will also be considered for tax purposes, as a long-term capital gain in hands of the beneficiary.

The bill also contains provisions relating to a pension and profit-sharing plan and we have revised the present formula applied to annuities under the individual income tax by eliminating the so-called 3-percent rule which excludes from taxable income the portions of the annual receipt in excess of 3 percent of the price the annuitant paid for the annuity. Our bill substitutes a new plan for the 3-percent rule. In the simple case the amount of the annuity payment to be excluded from the taxpayer's annual income is calculated by applying to the annuity payment a percentage obtained by dividing the annuitant's aggregate consideration by the total sum receivable under the annuity contract during the period of the annuitant's life expectancy at the time the annuity period begins.

In the field of corporate taxes we have amended the net operating loss carryover by substituting a 5-year carry-forward and a 1-year carry-back for the 2-year carry-forward and 2-year carry-back allowed under the existing law. The bill moreover, redefines the content of the net operating loss in order to eliminate the current discrimination against those businesses with fluctuating incomes.

Section 125 of the bill contains three amendments to section 102 of the code which provides for the surtax on corporate earnings improperly accumulated. Our amendments have been made necessary in order to permit corporations to retain in their businesses their reasonable needs in order that they may have a cushion for the less prosperous times which will some day come. Also in the field of corporations the bill contains a clarification of the existing law in connection with certain corporate liquidations. This provision is made necessary by the Court Holding Company case.

Just as we have provided for the relief of hardship cases and inequities, so have we endeavored to plug existing loopholes in our tax structures. The bill, for example, contains a provision relating to the capital gains on nonresident aliens. This is section 143 of the bill which provides that nonresident aliens who have been within this country for less than 90 days during a taxable year are taxed on such capital gains as were realized in the United States during their presence in this country. If the nonresident alien is present 90 days or more then the tax applies to all such capital gains during the entire taxable year, whether or not the nonresident alien is present in the United States at the time the sales took place. The 30-percent tax on net capital gains provided in this bill applies only to those nonresident aliens not engaged in trade or business in the United States. Nonresident aliens who have a place of business in the United States are already taxed on capital gains.

These are a few of the major provisions which this revenue-revision bill contains. Many important and urgent revisions could not be made at this time because of the revenue loss which they would entail. Among these are the double taxation of dividends, earned income, the additional penalty on consolidated returns, relief from unincorporated business, accelerated depreciation, and the elimination of the "notch" provision in the corporation tax on small business.

This bill, however, represents the first step in our tax-revision program. We hope to and we plan to continue our studies on tax revision so that we may place the Internal Revenue Code on a sound, practicable, and workable basis.

Section 106 of your committee's bill limits the exclusion from the income tax in the case of pensions, annuities, and similar allowances for disability resulting from active service in the armed forces. Under the bill where the taxpayer also receives earned income, the exclusion is reduced by the amount of the earned income, but never below $1,200 a year. In the bill as reported by your committee this restriction applies to veterans' pensions, as well as officers' disability pay. An amendment is now being offered which will make section 106 apply only to officers retired by reason of physical disability and raises the limit to $2,400 below which the exclusion is never reduced.

As the committee report indicates, section 106 was intended to correct a situation in which retired officers earning large incomes in private industry are also benefiting from the full exclusion of their retirement pay. This is possible because the test used to determine disability in these cases is the officer's fitness for military service rather than civilian employment. Moreover, the amount of the retirement pay depends not on the extent of the officer's disability, but upon his rank at the time of retirement and his length of service.

The assumption that the recipient is handicapped in competing in civilian employment is far more valid in the case of veterans' pensions. These are based squarely upon disability for civilian rather than military activities, and the size of the payment depends on the degree of disability rather than rank or length of service. When recipients of veterans' pensions obtain earned incomes, they usually do so in the face of very real handicaps. Therefore, your committee recommends that in the case of veterans' pensions the full exclusion allowed under existing law continue in effect and that the $1,200 limit be raised to $2,400.

The proposed amendment to section 106 is drafted so as to restrict the application of the section to cases where the exclusion depends entirely upon the existence of section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code. Payments received under the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 609; 38 U. S. C. 454a) and any other similar veterans' legislation are not subject to the restriction imposed by section 106 of this bill.

RETURNS OF CERTAIN TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

Most types of tax-exempt organizations are now required to file an informational return, although they pay no income taxes. Section 123 of your committee's bill extends this filing requirement to certain fraternal beneficiary societies and educational and charitable organizations. However, these organizations are required to file the return only if they have gross receipts of $25,000 from sources other than dues or assessments, tuition, and gifts or contributions. The primary purpose of this extension of the filing requirement is to give the Government some indication of the extent of the business and investment income of these organizations. It does not in any way change their tax-exempt status.

Tuition was excluded in determining whether or not one of these exempt organizations must file a return, so that educational organizations with only a small amount of income from investments or business enterprise would not be required to file. However, the attention of your committee has been called to the fact that schools frequently receive fees and service charges from students in addition to tuition. These fees and charges, like tuition, are essential in carrying on educational activities and do not represent a type of receipt on which more information is needed. For this reason your committee is offering an amendment to liberalize the filing requirement by substituting the phrase "payments made by or on behalf of students" for the word "tuition."

The amendment offered by your committee also adds to the list of receipts, which will not be taken into consideration in determining whether one of these organizations must file a return, payment by or on behalf of "patients or inmates." Thus tax-exempt hospitals, homes for the aged, orphanages and various similar types of charitable institutions will not be required to file the informational return because of receipts of these types.

Even where a return is required from a tax-exempt organization by reason of section 123 of the bill, your committee believes that there is no need to make them itemize the receipts from gifts or contributions, dues or assessments, and payments made by or on behalf of students, patients, or inmates. Therefore,

this amendment requires that only the aggregates of each class of such receipts need to be shown on the return.

COMMUTING EXPENSES OF DISABLED INDIVIDUALS

Your commitee is offering an amendment to H. R. 6712 to provide for the deduction by disabled persons of commuting expenses up to a limit of $600 a year.

It is believed that disabled persons, who despite their handicap are supporting themselves, should be encouraged to continue working. However, present tax laws place disabled persons, who are forced to take taxis or private cars, at a disadvantage because they must pay a tax on the portion of their income devoted to this extraordinary commuting expenses—an expense not required in the case of the average person.

To correct this inequity your committee is offering an amendment to permit special deductions in these cases. A deduction of up to $600 is allowed a disabled individual for expenses paid during a taxable year for transportation to and from work. A disabled individual is defined for the purpose of this new subsection as an individual who has lost the use of a leg, of both legs, or of both arms to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train or similar form of public transportation in traveling to and from work. The words "similar form of public transportation" as used here do not include taxicabs.

TAX AVOIDANCE THROUGH SHORT SALES

Under existing law, as it has been since the passage of the Revenue Act of 1942, the tax on a net long-term capital gain is not more than, and may be less than one-half the tax on a net short-term capital gain. Under section 117 (b), for an individual, only 50 percent of the gain or loss resulting from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held more than 6 months is taken into account in computing net income—whereas 100 percent of such gain or loss is taken into account if the capital asset has been held not more than 6 months—and under section 117 (c) (2) the maximum rate of tax on this 50 percent of the gain is 50 percent. It is thus not surprising that various devices have been used to give what is in effect a short-term gain the appearance of being a long-term gain.

A device which has been widely used and extensively publicized is the use of a short sale within the 6 months' period instead of an actual sale, to convert a short-term gain into a long-term gain, and, if circumstances are favorable, to reduce the amount of the gain which is to be taxed. A short sale of stock is effected by selling borrowed stock. At a later time stock either previously owned or bought for that purpose, is delivered to the lender to close the short sale.

As applied to stock and securities, transactions and devices commonly used may be illustrated as follows:

A. January 1 buys 100 shares of stock at $10 per share for a total of $1,000. June 1, sells short 100 shares at $16 per share for a total of $1,600.

July 2, he delivers the 100 shares he bought January 1 to the lender of the stock used to effect the short sale.

Actually, the taxpayer has a short-term gain of $600, but by deferring delivery of his long stock this is converted into a long-term gain, so that $300 instead of $600 is included in taxable income.

B. January 1, buys 100 shares of stock at $10 per share for a total of $1,000. On June 1, he sells short 100 shares at $16 per share for a total of $1,600.

July 2, he sells 100 shares of stock at $18 per share for a total of $1,800. He buys 100 to cover at $18 for a total of $1,800.

Here also, the true result is a short-term gain of $600. But, under existing law, the four transactions are viewed as: First, the purchase of 100 shares in January and their sale in July with a long-term gain of $800; and, second, a short sale in June, closed by purchase and delivery in July, with a short-term loss of $200. This results in a tax of $200 instead of a tax on $600.

It should be noted that when a taxpayer having a long position in securities sells short an equal number of shares, bonds, and so forth, nothing that happens thereafter can affect his actual gain. If the market goes down after the short sale is effected, this decline does not affect the taxpayer, since he has sold at the higher price and can deliver the stock which he holds long at any time to close the short sale. On the other hand, if the market goes up, he is similarly unaffected, since any loss resulting therefrom in his short position is exactly offset by a gain in his long position. Although his actual gain is thus unaffected, the tax saving resulting from the use of a short sale may be substantial.

The device of a short sale can be used whenever, within a period of not more than 6 months, the taxpayer is willing to take any gain he may then have, being so uncertain about the future trend of the market as not to risk the chance of the price of his security going down thereafter, or being uncertain whether any additional gain would be greater than probable tax savings.

Having made his short sale, the taxpayer will then use device A above if, after 6 months from his original purchase, the price has dropped below the price at which he made the short sale. If, for example, the price on July 2 is 14, if he used device B he would have a long-term gain of $400 and a short-term gain of $200, with $400, instead of $300, as his taxable income. He will use device B if the price, after 6 months from the original purchase, is higher than at the time of the short sale. The greater such an increase, the less the tax. If, for example, the price on July 2, or any time after July 1, were 24 instead of 18, there would be, for tax purposes, a long-term gain of $1,400 and a short-term loss of $800, with a deductible loss of $100 instead of taxable income of $600.

Taxation should be based upon realities—upon gains or losses as they actually are—not as they may appear to be. For that reason it is proposed that the Internal Revenue Code be amended by adding new provisions, subsection (l), to section 117, which will give rules intended to eliminate the tax advantages resulting from short sales made at a time when the taxpayer has equivalent property. The provisions of the new subsection will apply in the case of short sales made after May 31, 1948.

The new provisions deal with the first situation described above—where the taxpayer sells short within the 6 months' period and delivers his long stock to cover the short sale after he has held it 6 months—by providing that where a short sale is made at a time when the taxpayer has substantially identical property, held not more than 6 months, any gain on the closing of such short sale shall be considered as a short-term gain. Thus, if these provisions were applied to the situation described in A above, the taxpayer, instead of having a long-term gain of $600 as under existing law, would have a short-term gain of $600.

The situation described in the second example—where the taxpayer buys stock to cover his short sale, and sells his long stock independently when it has been held more than 6 months—is dealt with by a provision which treats the holding period of the long stock as beginning on the date the short sale is closed—unless it is disposed of previous to that date, in which case, the date of such disposition starts the building period. If this provision were applied to the illustration given in B above, the $800 gain on the sale of the long stock would become a short-term gain, since the holding period would be 1 day—beginning on July 2 when the short sale was closed—instead of 6 months and 1 day. The loss on the closing of the short position would still be a short-term loss of $200, but such a loss offsetting a short-term gain of $800 leaves, as the amount to be included in taxable income, the actual net gain of $600.

These two provisions apply only to the extent that, at the time of the short sale, the taxpayer has substantially identical property which he has held not more than 6 months at that time. Thus, these provisions do not apply to a normal short sale effected at a time when the taxpayer does not own substantially identical property. Neither do they apply if the substantially identical property has been held by the taxpayer for more than 6 months at the time the short sale is made, since in that case a long-term gain would result whether the taxpayer sold his long stock outright or indirectly by means of a short sale.

Another provision deals with a loss arising from the closing of a short sale, where the taxpayer has substantially identical property which he has held for more than 6 months at the time of the short sale. Here there is no question of converting a short-term gain into a long-term gain, but by making a short sale instead of selling his stock directly, the taxpayer can offset any loss that may arise from buying stock in the open market to close his short position against double the amount of long term gain. For example, if stock which was acquired at 10 and has been held more than 6 months is selling at 16, the taxpayer may

make a short sale at that time. If subsequently the market goes up to 20, there is a loss of 4 points on his short position offset by a gain of 4 points in his long position. Under existing law, if the taxpayer then buys to close his short sale and sells his long stock, he will have a long-term gain of $1,000, of which $500 is taken into account, offset by a short-term loss of $400, leaving $100 net to be included in taxable income, whereas the actual gain was $600. To eliminate this device, the amendment provides that in such cases the loss on closing the short sale shall be deemed to be a long-term loss rather than a short-term loss, so that the net long-term gain is $600, with the correct $300, instead of $100, taken into account.

Instead of using an actual short sale, as in the illustrations previously given, the taxpayer may buy a "put," which is an option to sell stock of securities at a fixed price during a given period of time, even though the market may go lower than the price indicated. If the market does in fact go lower, the taxpayer holding such a "put" will exercise the "put" and sell his long stock at the price stipulated, when he has held it more than 6 months. If the market goes up he will not exercise his "put" and will thus lose the amount which he paid for the option. Since the use of such a "put" can have tax consequences similar to the use of a short sale, it is provided that, for the purposes of the new subsection, such a "put" shall be deemed to be a short sale, and failure to exercise such a "put" shall be considered as a closing of such short sale.

Similar tax avoidance practices are, of course, possible if the taxpayer starts his operations with a short sale instead of with a purchase. If, for example, the taxpayer makes a short sale in January and buys an equivalent amount of identical property in March at a lower price, he may convert the short-term gain into a long-term gain by holding the property thus acquired for 6 months before delivering it to close the short sale, or he may similarly reduce his taxes by matching purchase and sale transactions at that time. To meet such situations, the provisions of the proposed amendment apply not only where substantially identical property is held at the time of the short sale, but where substantially identical property is acquired after a short sale, and on or before the date of the closing of the short sale.

Substantially similar tax avoidance schemes have been, until recently, practiced on a considerable scale with respect to transactions in commodities for future delivery, and to a limited extent are still possible. If, for example, a taxpayer in January buys, through a member of the Chicago Board of Trade, 10,000 bushels of wheat for delivery in September, he may in March sell 10,000 bushels for delivery in September. Ordinarily the sale in March would be deemed the sale of the wheat bought in January, and a short-term capital gain or loss would result. However, many taxpayers have directed their brokers to keep both transactions open. By then ordering the two transactions to be offset against each other at a date more than 6 months after the date of original purchase, or by arranging matching additional purchase and sale transactions, tax results similar to those described above were possible. Alternatively, the purchase of a commodity for future delivery may be made through one broker and the offsetting sale be made through another broker.

In a ruling issued on March 8, 1948, Mimeograph 6243, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has held that such simultaneous long and short transactions in the same commodity, for delivery in the same future period, and on the same market, are shams, and that the gain or loss is realized at the time the offsetting purchase or sale is made. Moreover, the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department of Agriculture has recently amended its regulations under the Commodity Exchange Act by adding a new section, section 1.46, chapter 1 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations. This new section of the regulations provides that when any broker makes a sale for any customer when he is at that time long, of the same commodity, in the same future, on the same market, or vice versa, such purchase or sale must be immediately applied against the previously held long or short position. This regulation was issued on May 3, 1948, to be effective June 8, 1948.

Whether or not these recent rulings may be effectively questioned, or their effect avoided by devices which do not come specifically within their terms, the proposed amendment would have the effect of eliminating the tax avoidance features of such devices as may be applied in that field.

To avoid interference with bona fide hedging operations by operators of grain elevators, millers, producers of cloth, and so forth, the proposed amendment will apply only to purchases and sales of capital assets as defined in section 117 (a).

The new provisions will apply only when substantially identical property is owned by the taxpayer. No definition of substantially identical is given, since it is believed that the term must be applied in accordance with the actual circumstances of each transaction. As applied to securities, this term has for many years been in section 118 of the code, and various rulings and decisions have been made which will, in general, be equally applicable to the provisions of this proposed amendment. It is not believed that the term substantially identical should be applied to securities of different corporations, nor, in general, to preferred stock or bonds as compared with common stocks. However, in special situations where preferred stocks or bonds are convertible in common stocks of the same corporation, it may be that the relative values and price changes during the period in question may be so similar as to make them substantially identical. It is not believed that different commodities, such as corn and wheat, would ever be substantially identical; and, in general, it appears probable that different futures—for example, May wheat and July wheat—and contracts in different markets—for example, Minneapolis and Kansas City—may be so different as to make transactions in different futures, or in different markets, not substantially identical. In special circumstances, however, contracts on different markets, or with respect to different delivery periods, may be in fact so similar as to be substantially identical.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just a little while ago the Speaker said that this is very important legislation. He said it affects every person in the United States, and with that I agree. Mr. Speaker, is it not a sham and a shame to bring a measure up that affects the pocketbooks of every person in the United States, and to be allowed only 40 minutes' consideration of it? The chairman of the committee stands up and cannot even explain the provisions of the bill. He cannot even tell what one of the important provisions of the bill would do. The committee report does not even contain the usual detailed explanations of the technical sections. Here you are asked to vote for this measure on the last day of the session when any child knows that it is not going to be acted upon finally by the present Congress. So this is all just a question of taking up time uselessly, or passing this in order to promise to the people of great wealth and great means what they may expect in the future from a Republican Congress. There is scarcely a provision here that will affect persons making less than $5,000 a year. The report itself says that it may reduce the revenue by $400,000,000. Where does that benefit go under this bill? That benefit goes only to those of great accumulated wealth. Yes, the bill does a couple of things affecting the workingman. The workingman who has to buy uniforms or special equipment on account of his work is allowed under existing law to charge that as an expense. But in this measure, they take that little bit of crumb away from the man who goes out and works in hazardous employment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield, gladly.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman's statement is not accurate, and he knows it. One hundred and forty-five million dollars is chargeable to our continuing the law which gives $1,500 exemption to those in the military service, and it was placed in the law at the request of John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy. Why does not the gentleman give the facts?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I tried to introduce an amendment the other day to take care of that very situation, and the gentleman from Minnesota raised a point of order because he knew that the House would vote overwhelmingly for it. He knows I am for that provision which continues the same exemption they had since 1943.

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So you are not giving them anything extra.

Mr. KNUTSON. Exactly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And the exemption continues under the present law until the end of the year. So you are not doing a thing extra for them.

Mr. KNUTSON. And it is costing us in revenue $145,000,000. Will the gentleman deny that?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am not denying that that is a good provision.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why does not the gentleman stick to the facts?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman himself objected to the consideration of an identical provision the other day. The benefits will not be shut off under the present law until January 1, 1949.

Of course, the committee knew that it made some errors in passing out this bill so rapidly. Now they have come along with a lot of amendments, committee amendments. Yet they want to consider the measure in 40 minutes. Here is where the number of loopholes is increased and the loopholes made larger.

First, you know that during the war, partnerships increased fourfold. The Treasury started to investigate that matter. They found that men who were in the high-income surtax brackets would form a partnership taking in as partners with them their wife or cousin or a couple of sons, thereby reducing the bracket in which they had to pay tax, and thus saving to themselves and their families thousands upon thousands of dollars.

The Treasury Department caught up with those tax dodgers. Yet here in this bill is a retroactive feature, back to 1940, which legalizes all this tax dodging that occurred during the war.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I cannot yield. My time is limited.

This bill legalizes that tax-dodging practice back to 1940.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I decline to yield. I do not have the time.

Second. Another thing this bill does, and an example is in the RECORD. I put it in the RECORD on Friday, June 11. Under certain provisions of this bill, with relation to estate taxes on insurance proceeds, a man can get an insurance policy for his wife and three children, for instance. He dies, and he pays no estate tax, even though the value of his estate in insurance may exceed a million dollars. He can distribute a million dollars by using the technical definitions and other provisions of this bill. So we are taking care of the wealthy again. It is not without reason that there have been advertisements in the newspapers by tax experts, by banks and trust companies, reviewing the last tax bill, saying: "Bring your will in. We want to reexamine it in view of the provisions contained in the Revenue Act of 1948."

Now, if the provisions of this bill become law, every tax accountant in the country, every tax lawyer will have still more business from the wealthy people. They would all distribute their estates differently. They would all form family partnerships, or they would all find ways in which to dodge taxes.

Mr. Speaker, where would these taxes come from? The $400,000,000 that they even admit in their own report would be lost by this bill? Who is going to pay those taxes? I will tell you who will pay those taxes. The workingman; the man in the bracket up to five, six, seven, and eight thousand dollars.

Another nice thing they did in this bill: For years and years executives of large corporations have been trying to get Congress to legalize what is known as the stock-option plan. By that, corporations give their high-salaried executives, in lieu of salary, an option on their stock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield myself two additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Congress never saw fit to do that, because they knew these corporations could give a stock option to an executive, and then, after a few years, he would sell that stock and would only have to pay the capital-gains tax of 25 percent; whereas, if he received the salary as cash compensation, he would have to pay a higher tax rate, perhaps 50 or 60 or 70 percent. So, finally, on the last day of the session, they slip this bill in with 40 minutes' debate, 20 minutes for the opposition.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. This is a bill to relieve those rich people of their income taxes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct. There is another nice thing. They exempt from the estate tax the value of the interest of these big corporation executives in a pension plan. In other words, in lieu of giving him all of his salary on which he pays a higher income tax rate, they say, "We will give you a pension. After you quit work you will be getting practically the same salary you are getting now." The interest of a surviving widow or other dependent in such a pension or annuity would be excluded from the gross estate of the exemptive. Of course, everybody is exempt from estate tax up to the extent of $60,000. So this provision is just to lower the tax rate on anybody leaving an estate of more than $60,000.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a great day. I am going to ask for the reading of the bill. I am going to ask for the reading of every word in the bill, and then, perhaps, some of the Members will realize what is being done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to go a little more fully into section 106 which has to do with the tax which will be applied to military personnel. The committee has agreed to raise the exemption to $2,400 rather than leave it at $1,200. As I understand it what this means is that a man in the services who lost both arms or both legs and receives a pension which might go up as high as $2,400 a year it will be exempt from taxation. But anything he may earn by reason of his own labor over and above his $2,400 pension is taxable and in some cases his tax exemption on his pension will be reduced.

Now, when these boys came out of the service the Government spent a great deal of money training them to become useful citizens and again take their place in society. We have trained these men to earn a portion of their living. Now we turn around and penalize them by taxing them on the money they derive from their own efforts. It seems to be a very unwise, inconsistent policy and constitutes a waste of the taxpayers' money. I do not think it ought to be done.

The report on this bill indicates a saving will be effectuated to some corporations of $71,000,000—which may be justified but not when the loss in revenue is to be made up by taxing the pensions of paraplegics, amputees, and combat injured veterans.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would not such a policy lead to idleness on the part of the veterans?

Mr. SMATHERS. Absolutely.

Mr. CURTIS. But it does not do what the gentleman says it does.

Mr. SMATHERS. This legislation instead of being an incentive to work penalizes them for working.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. But the gentleman will find out that this does not apply to any sums veterans might receive from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is entirely true; but there are a lot of Regular officers who receive their money direct from the Army.

Mr. CURTIS. They can receive it from the Veterans' Administration if they want to.

Mr. SMATHERS. If they do, they get less; and it is my understanding that some Regular officers have to receive their retirement pay from the Army.

I recognize, of course, the purpose that is sought to be accomplished with this legislation. You are trying to work out a situation in this bill where the big generals and admirals who get large retirement pay will not be able to go out and make a lot of money in high-priced jobs while they are still drawing large pensions. Certainly, I sympathize with the purpose; but the result of this legislation in its present form will be to penalize the little fellow—the enlisted men, the lieutenants, and the captains, and the majors, in which ranks were suffered the greatest casualties. In the Marine Corps the highest rate of attrition was in the grades of lieutenants and captains. Certainly, these restrictions on earnings and the tax penalties should not apply to anyone of the rank of major and below.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. I believe the gentleman misunderstands the purpose of the section. As I understand, it does not take anything away from the retired personnel but merely provides that he shall be taxed on a certain part of his income.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me read the section. It reads:

Except that if such amounts exceed $1,200 during the taxable year, and the taxpayer

also receives during the same taxable year earned income, as defined in section 116 (a) (3), the exclusion under this subparagraph shall be reduced by the amount of such earned income, but not to an amount less than $1,200.

It does not take anything away from retired personnel; it just puts an unjustified tax on his pension and what he may earn.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to call the attention of the membership to the Appendix of the RECORD, at page A3892, which answers in great detail the points raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] in his extension of remarks of last week.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. I presume the minority members of the committee, feeling that in the interest of the country the House will adjourn shortly, have not raised a great deal of opposition to this bill. I further feel that the other body will not have the temerity to pass such an untenable and outrageous piece of legislation.

Nevertheless, I feel that the House should know what the Under Secretary of the Treasury has to say regarding these measures. I quote from his statement, as follows:

> Representing the Treasury, I opposed these measures in hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, but they were nevertheless adopted by the committee. If the objectionable features are removed by the House or the Senate we feel you will have to some extent an acceptable bill.

But none of these objectionable features the Under Secretary of the Treasury has called attention to have been removed. In fact, other objectionable features have been added, and this bill is simply another privileged-class bill, catering and exempting certain special interests from taxation—a practice that the Ways and Means Committee has been guilty of during this Congress. That is, reducing the taxes of those who can best afford to pay and unloading that burden onto the shoulders of those least able to pay.

I feel that this bill will never pass; however, the country ought to know to what extent you are going in trying to aid those you rely on for large contributions which you will need in the forthcoming campaign.

Never before throughout all the years have I witnessed such a procedure as is contemplated in passing H. R. 6712. This bill, containing 145 pages, is being brought up under suspension of the rule and only a very few members of the Ways and Means Committee are familiar with its provisions, to say nothing of the membership of the House.

Not only is this bill being considered under suspension, which will permit only 20 minutes for each side to speak, but a request that it be read has been denied by the action of the Speaker.

I fully apppreciate that the Speaker is trying to expedite the business before the House before adjournment this evening, but this does not justify his preventing the bill from at least being read for those Members who would like to know its provisions.

It has been stated that of the 82 provisions, 68 have had the approval of the Treasury Department, but, unfortunately, the 14 remaining provisions that have not been approved by the Treasury Department are the loopholes that will work in the interest of those with large incomes who will be benefited again to the amount of about $400,000,000.

Because I am confident that the other body will not dare to match the shameful action of the House, I shall not say any more about it. Since I made my statement the bill was declared passed by the Speaker denying the request that it should be read without really submitting it to a vote.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, at long last we have before us a bill to revise the internal-revenue code. Not since 1927 has the Congress made a detailed study of our Federal tax laws and acted on legislation to correct the inequities, simplify the tax system, and generally improve our tax structure. The bill before us is long overdue.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who just addressed you called this measure an outrageous piece of legislation and expressed the opinion that this bill would never pass. While there is some doubt that there is sufficient time, in view of the present adjournment plans, for the Senate to act on the bill, nonetheless the passage of the bill by the House will itself be a forward step. When the new Congress assembles in January we will be in a position to take prompt action for immediate enactment of the bill.

I have no doubt that if those who have the same philosophy as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] were to control the Congress a bill of this character, however meritorious, would never pass. But there has been a great awakening in the United States, and I venture the prediction that it will be many many years—if ever—before the American people allow their Government to come under the control of those who would use the Federal taxing power to socialize our economy.

My colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has called this a privileged-class bill. He would have us continue the injustices and the inequities of existing law, because those injustices and inequities operate against those who have been successful. Mr. Speaker, when the day comes that it is a crime to be successful, that thrift, hard work, and self-sacrifice are to be penalized, there will be an end of national progress.

I believe in the principle that taxes should be paid upon a basis of ability to pay. That is a sound principle. In general those with the largest property holdings and those with the larger incomes receive and have received greater benefits from the Government than those with no property holdings and little income. No one objects to a graduated income-tax scale.

The principle of ability to pay is not in issue here. The bill before us makes no income-tax reductions. It is simply designed to improve our existing tax structure. It is simply designed to correct certain more or less obvious injustices in the operation of our Federal tax laws and, at the same time, provide increased incentives to management and venture capital.

The bill contains 80 sections dealing with income, estate, and gift taxes, as well as with certain administrative provisions. Only a few of the provisions would entail any material revenue loss. It has been estimated that the total revenue loss by virtue of this bill would amount to around $400,000,000, and this total loss will not be effective for a couple of years. Indeed, of this total estimated revenue loss, about $145,000,000 arises from the provision in the bill continuing the $1,500 exemption from individual income tax of the pay of military personnel.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is not an outrageous piece of legislation. It is outrageous to think that it has taken so long for Congress to act on this type of legislation. A general tax revision of this character is long overdue.

The point was also made by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], in their opposition to this measure that the House does not have sufficient knowledge of what is in the bill. The fact is, however, that this measure is the product of many weeks of hearings and exhaustive study by the Treasury Department itself, by the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means and by the committee members, as well as by individual Members of Congress.

The hearings on the subject of improving and streamlining our tax laws began in May of 1947. Over 100 witnesses appeared before the committee, and the testimony embraces over 3,000 printed pages. The bill before us embodies the suggestions of many experts. To assist the committee in this technical job, a special tax study group under the chairmanship of a former Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Roswell Magill, was set up and made its report. And it is my understanding that about half of the provisions of the bill are the recommendations of the Treasury Department.

To be sure, this is a very technical measure. A bill of this nature could never be written on the floor of the House. A single reading of it would not enable one to understand all its contents. The bill is the product of many minds and many weeks of exhaustive study. To try to leave the impression with the country that the measure is being rushed through, without adequate consideration, is pure nonsense.

If this proposed revision of the internal revenue code, as embodied in the pending bill, is so outrageous, why is it that the minority did not file a report? Why is it that the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. DOUGHTON, for whom everyone of us on both sides of the aisle has great respect, has spoken in favor of the bill? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the only people who oppose this

bill are that small group who would socialize our whole economy. They believe that the way to help the poor is to destroy the rich.

I hold no brief for the wealthy and the rich. But, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has made this country great is the fact that each and everyone of us has the opportunity to be wealthy and rich. As each of us strives to improve ourselves we inevitably serve to improve our community and Nation. Those who have the ability and the capacity to create and to produce are entitled to their reward. That is what opportunity means, and this is the land of opportunity. That is why the United States of America is the strongest and the greatest in the world. That is why hundreds of thousands seek to come here.

I did not intend to enter into a discussion of the philosophy of government. I felt constrained to do so, because I become very much annoyed with those who try to make it appear that it is a crime to be successful. I become very much annoyed with those who try to make it appear that every rich man is a criminal and should be punished. Our job is to encourage, not discourage, self-advancement.

It is impossible to discuss all the features of the pending bill in the time allotted me. There is one feature of the bill, however, that I believe should receive special mention. I refer to the attempt to furnish incentives to management and venture capital.

On previous occasions I have pointed out that in order for the country to meet the increasing demands there must be not only sustained production but there must be an expanding production. There must be an expansion of existing facilities. Existing facilities and equipment must be replaced and improved.

In his message to Congress on the state of the Union, President Truman stated that in the next few years industry must invest $50,000,000,000 in new facilities and equipment. I believe his figure was conservative, particularly considering the plant replacement costs at present inflated prices. At any rate, it is perfectly clear that many billions of dollars are needed by industry to improve, replace, and enlarge existing productive facilities.

But where is this money to come from? There is a very grave shortage of venture capital in the United States today. One of our problems is to encourage the flow of venture capital into private enterprise.

This bill assists in that regard by the amendment to the net operating loss carry-over provision of existing law. Under existing law a 2-year carry-back and a 2-year carry-forward is allowed. The bill before us provides for a 1-year carry-back and a 5-year carry-forward.

Thus, under the proposed change more emphasis is placed on the loss carry-forward than on the carry-back. By this provision both management and investors are given greater incentive, and it brings an advantage to the new businesses which cannot benefit in any way by the carry-back. Likewise, established businesses undergoing a material expansion are favored by the change.

Another provision of the bill which is worthy of mention in this regard is that relating to the improper accumulation of surplus under section 102 of the code. This section provides for the imposition of a surtax on corporate earnings accumulated to prevent the imposition of the surtax on individual stockholders.

In order to reduce the pressure on taxpayers to distribute earnings needed for real business purposes, the bill amends this particular section. In the first place, it places on the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the burden of proving that the accumulation of earnings and profits is beyond the reasonable needs of the business. In the second place, the existing law is amended to provide that the excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital losses of any corporation shall not be included in the tax base on which the penalty tax under section 102 is imposed. And, in the third place, the bill would allow a corporation 75 days after the close of its taxable year to make a distribution of dividends and have this distribution deducted in computing the corporation's income for the purposes of the section.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, without entering into all the technical phases of the bill, it is designed not only to correct certain injustices and inequities that have developed in our Federal tax law, but it is also designed to furnish greater incentives to management and to venture capital so that our national economy may continue to move forward. If this were the sole purpose of the bill, that in itself would be sufficient reason for our passing it. Surely we recognize that the key to the problems confronting us, both nationally and internationally, is to find ways and means to stimulate more and more production.

Over the last several years we have allowed our Federal tax laws to become a patchquilt affair. We have even allowed our tax laws to be used for social purposes rather than simply to raise revenue. This bill is a corrective step. I intend to vote for it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is in keeping with the legislative record of the Eightieth Congress. This Congress has not concerned itself with the general welfare of the people. It has legislated to the benefit of those in the high-income groups.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the last hours of the session. We have failed to pass a bill to control prices. And yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], backed by the Republican leadership, succeeded in killing the long-range housing program—a program sponsored by both major parties. A battle was waged between the real estate lobby and the American people. The real estate lobby won at the expense of family life in America.

Yesterday this House voted to subsidize the continuance of slums—breeders of delinquency, disease, crime, and despair. When I say subsidize, I mean subsidize, Mr. Speaker. Do we not pay for crime? Do we not pay for disease? Do we not pay for juvenile delinquency with hard, cold cash?

What is this nonsense that is talked when Congress seeks to help the great mass of American people? Why is any form of social legislation always referred to as socialism?

If subsidy is socialistic, then this Congress voted for socialism yesterday when it voted to subsidize those who will build penthouses for the rich. When Congress seeks to help those in the high-income brackets, some call that free enterprise.

But if we seek to clean out the slums that rot our American democracy at the grass roots, those same people call that socialism.

In the last hours of Congress, what do we do? Take time out to consider this unjust, unfair, loophole-creating, tax-rebating bill when time is so precious.

Here we have a small picture of what we have been doing all year long. We have had time for tax cuts, time to take the railroads out from under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the antitrust laws, time to pass the tidelands bill—time to further impair the Labor Department, time to strike a blow at social security while vowing to believe in it wholeheartedly—time, in fact, for everything but the legislation that is needed to strengthen the Nation and to give hope and security to the American people and leadership to the world.

By the way, where is the Federal aid to education bill? Where is the health insurance bill so desperately needed? Where is minimum wage legislation? I can tell you—in the deep freeze.

By the way, where is the building fund for the United Nations? There is no time, I suppose, to bring that out on the floor. Does the Republican leadership have the effrontery, in the face of its refusal to bring this bill out, to go on protesting its faith in the United Nations?

But, to get back to the tax bill before us, I would like to point out that the bad features do not total more than 10 or 15 new loopholes in a bill of eighty-odd sections. But that argument is like trying to average horses and rabbits.

We are now being asked to vote for this bill because there has been so much work put into it and because it embodies sound revision of the tax structure. Yes, that is right, but it has some jokers in it, too—and I, for one, will not buy jokers.

Why has this bill been brought to the floor, anyway? The President will not sign it. The Under Secretary of the Treasury, in his letter appearing in the RECORD of June 11, has given us advance notice—in my opinion—that he will recommend a veto.

Why then are we considering it? The communication sent by the Republicans after the last tax bill to their contributors via the Republican News, a publication sponsored by the Republican National Committee, throws some light on the subject. Under the title—and I quote—"Do Not Throw Peanuts to the Elephant," we find this language:

Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of

their tax savings for this year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible.

Then they have the gall to print the savings of families under the new plan. I read it:

Savings of family of 4 under new tax plan

Net income	Present tax	New tax	Savings
$2,500	$95.00	$16.60	$78.40
$5,000	589.00	431.60	157.40
$10,000	1,862.00	1,360.96	501.04
$15,000	3,658.50	2,512.00	1,126.50
$25,000	8,521.50	5,475.84	3,045.66
$50,000	24,111.00	16,577.92	7,533.08

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are asking for a kick-back on the first tax bill that was passed by this Congress. The Republican News, in the same June 1948 issue, does not stop there. It goes on to say brazenly:

Don't delay, contribute today.

Don't throw peanuts to the elephant.

Don't count on winning by throwing peanuts to the elephant. The Republican Congress did more than provide a few peanuts for the harassed taxpayer.

We are not going to win this election by sitting around denouncing Democrats or Henry Wallace. We are going to win only by hard work and by liberal contributions. The stakes are too high to take any chance on not winning. If we do not win this year, we may not have another chance.

Mark those words, Mr. Speaker—"the stakes are too high to take any chance on not winning." What are the stakes? Is the bill before us one of them? It won't become law under a Democratic President, but it can be held up as another of the exhibits of what may become law if we have a Republican President and a Republican Congress.

To illustrate just how bad this bill is, let me mention just two provisions which alone should be enough to kill it:

Let me read from the memorandum inserted in the RECORD on June 11, 1948, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], a couple of examples to show the tax avoidance possibilities under the bill. One relates to salaries of corporate executives paid to them in the form of options to buy stock at less than market prices. For example, consider an executive with a net salary (before exemptions) of $50,000. Prior to this year he would have paid a tax of $38,500 on an additional income of $50,000, realized on the exercise of an option to purchase stock in the corporation. The tax has already been reduced to $29,200, or 24 percent, by the Revenue Act of 1948. That, Mr. Speaker, is the tax bill we just got through passing. Remember? This provision in the bill before us would reduce the tax by another 43 percent, to $12,500, for a total 67 percent reduction this year. How's that, Mr. Speaker? I agree with the Republican newspaper that this isn't peanuts.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of carefully selective tax reduction is reckless in its disregard of elementary fairness to taxpayers who continue to be burdened with most of the heavy war-imposed taxes.

The second outrageous provision in this bill is a return to the family partnership device which was such a useful surtax evasion during the war. What does a family partnership enable a taxpayer to do? Consider this example:

Prior to this year a married businessman with two children and an income of $100,000 paid $62,300 in taxes. The Revenue Act of 1948 has already reduced this tax to $45,600 or by 27 percent. If the taxpayer divided the profits in four equal parts between himself, his wife, and two children, the tax would be reduced by this provision by another 18 percent to $34,400, or a total reduction this year of 45 percent. Such possibilities for tax avoidance would weaken, and might eventually discredit, the income-tax system as the fairest method of producing large amounts of revenue.

So, what we have here is another refund of taxes at the top level of the income brackets and this time we do not even sugarcoat the cut in taxes with any pretense of doing anything for the low income groups which are literally abandoned by the premature adjournment of Congress. The Eightieth Congress has done nothing at all for the old people—the mothers and fathers of America—some of whom barely exist on pensions, and nothing at all for the bulk of the wage earners of the country who are in desperate straits. In fact, there is hardly one of the 80 sections of the bill that has general application to the 48,000,000 taxpayers below $5,000.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, those who introduce this bill still have the effrontery to talk about communism. They are not really interested in whether or not communism develops in this country. They are interested in one thing: Winning the next election at any cost.

Mr. Speaker, this bill goes to the heart of the whole peace program and right to the heart of the problem that confronts us here at home.

We still owe a tremendous war debt. Who is going to pay off that war debt? Who is going to pay for the last war while we continue to talk about the next? Are we going to remove from the shoulders of the high income brackets—those who have enjoyed the highest profits in history—the responsibility for paying the war debt and place it on the backs of those in the middle- and low-income brackets? That is what this bill proposes to do. The House should reject it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. * * *.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentleman from Minnesota be taken down.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will withdraw the words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not asked unanimous consent to withdraw them. He just said, "I will withdraw the words." Let us have a little regularity here.

Mr. KNUTSON. I make the point of order that the objection comes too late, because I had recognized the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request at this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. He did not make any request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CHURCH. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request at this time. Is there objection to the request that the words be withdrawn?

Mr. BLOOM. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KNUTSON. The request that the words be taken down comes too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to withdraw his words, and the Chair puts the question to the House.

Mr. BLOOM. I object.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Members on this side of the aisle did not hear the gentleman say that he asked unanimous consent to withdraw the words; he just said, "I will withdraw the words." I reserve the right to object. I want it clearly understood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Minnesota did not make any unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request to the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair. I ask that the words be taken down.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] be permitted to proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the request to the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, there was an objection. I objected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] objected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the benefit of the Members of the House, may I inquire of the Speaker what the present status is?

The SPEAKER. The words will be reported to the House as taken down unless they are withdrawn, which the Chair thinks would be a happy solution of the whole situation.

Mr. KNUTSON. I should like to make a brief statement, Mr. Speaker. I had no reference to the gentlewoman from California. I was referring to the applause up in the gallery.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Minnesota has asked unanimous consent that he withdraw his words?

Mr. BLOOM. That is what I objected to. He did not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that he did not ask unanimous consent, but the previous occupant of the chair put it as a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the unanimous-consent request that he withdraw his words been granted?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in a little doubt about that. The previous occupant of the chair thought the request had been granted.

Mr. McCORMACK. When a gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw his words, that is an admission that he has perhaps unconsciously said something he should not have said, and I hope the request will be granted.

Mr. BLOOM. He has not asked for it. That is the idea.

Mr. McCORMACK. Ask again.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order, that the words taken down be reported.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the wise counsel of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw my remarks, all of them.

Mr. SABATH. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the previous discussion was not taken out of my time. I hope, now that we are back to business, we can look at this without any feeling one way or the other. I am afraid that perhaps a little feeling has been aroused against this bill by this occurrence, but we want to be practical about the matter.

This is a bill that has some 80 amendments to the Internal Revenue Code. These amendments are absolutely necessary. Many of them were recommended by the Treasury. To the 80 amendments something like 13 objections were made by the Treasury, and only 3 are of any great importance. These matters were given careful consideration by the committee.

It has been said here, and truly so, that no great benefit comes to the people in the low brackets with respect to this bill, but I must call your attention to the fact that it is not a tax bill as such; it is a revision bill that was brought in for the purpose of ironing out inequities that developed. The Treasury Department itself did not, nor did anyone on our side, recommend any cut in taxes whatsoever. We understood that it was going to be a revision bill without a reduction in tax rates. We understood that no excise taxes would be taken up. We understood that the purpose of the bill was to try to cut away the underbrush that has developed in connection with the interpretation of the Internal Revenue Code over the past years.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. Is it not true, however, that even a revision, when applied to a tax matter, may have the effect of reducing the amount of taxes that may be paid?

Mr. LYNCH. There is no question about the fact that the gentleman has made a correct statement. There was bound to be some loss of revenue because of the inequities that developed, and it was decided that in view of these inequities, even though it should cost the Government a certain amount of money, and the amount of money is small as we look upon it in these days, a revision of the Internal Revenue Code should be made to do away with these inequities. The very fact that the Treasury recognized these inequities should be sufficient to convince you that a revision was necessary. It takes a long time for the Treasury to recognize an inequity, and a far longer time to recommend that the injustice be corrected.

Every recommendation of the Treasury was carefully considered and a large majority of them adopted. We did not adopt all of the Treasury recommendations, nor did we adopt all the recommendations of the joint staff.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6712, as its name implies, is a bill designed to revise the tax structure, not to reduce taxes. The bill is concerned with the income, estate, and gift taxes, and also with certain administrative features of the tax law.

The introduction in the report on H. R. 6712 points out that the bill will remove inequities, eliminate uncertainties for both taxpayers and tax administrators, prevent tax avoidance, simplify the tax system, moderate certain harsh provisions, and provide increased incentives to management and venture capital. This is a large order, but I can assure you that the sentence I quoted is not an empty phrase. I shall use the time at my disposal to point out to you specific provisions in the bill designed to accomplish each of these goals.

REMOVAL OF INEQUITIES

The first aim of the bill is to remove inequities. This objective is evident in the provisions dealing with the content of the net operating loss carry-over, reverters under the estate tax, the tax treatment of annuities, lump-sum distributions under qualified pension plans, life insurance under the estate tax, corporate liquidations, and the averaging provision for earned income contained in section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code.

At the present time the net operating loss used in the carry-over to off-set income of prior or succeeding years is defined in such a way that this loss is reduced by the amount of tax-exempt interest, the excess of percentage depletion over cost depletion, and the 50 percent of long-term capital gains not taken into account in computing net income.

Your committee believes that it is not equitable to deny these deductions and exclusions to businesses with losses while they are being allowed to businesses which have net incomes. Therefore, your committee's bill removes the present major limitations now being applied in the calculation of the net operating loss.

Another inequality is corrected in the case of reverters under the estate tax. To illustrate how this works at present assume, for example, that a taxpayer has made a gift of property to a friend to take effect at or after the taxpayer's death. Also assume that the property will revert to the taxpayer in case the friend dies before the taxpayer. In this case the taxpayer would pay a gift tax at the time the gift was made. Moreover, at the time of his death the full value of the property, less a credit for the gift tax, is included in his estate. This is true even though the possibility of his outliving his friend on an actuarial basis may be infinitesimally small. Your committee's bill corrects this inequity by including in the taxpayer's gross estate only the actuarial value of the decedent's interest in such property just prior to his death.

Your committee's bill also removes inequities in the tax treatment of annuities. At present annuities are taxed under the so-called 3-percent rule, the vagaries and inequities of which are now well known. In some cases the annuitants can expect to recapture under this rule the amount they paid for the annuity on a tax-free basis only if they live many years beyond their normal life expectancy. In other cases the exclusions during the first years of the annuity period are so large that they exceed the personal exemption and thus are wasted. Your committee's bill replaces the 3-percent rule with a more equitable formula which spreads the amount returned on a tax-free basis over the normal life expectancy of the individual in question. Thus, in the average case there will be neither a wastage of exemption on the one hand, nor a failure to recapture tax-free, before death, the amount paid for the annuity.

Inequity is also removed in the case of lump-sum distributions under qualified pension plans. Existing law treats such distributions as long-term capital gains only if they happen to be paid under trusteed plans. Your committee believes that the treatment of qualified plans should be the same irrespective of whether a trust is employed in financing the plan. Therefore, long-term capital gains treatment is also provided for qualified plans financed without the use of a trust.

The present treatment of life insurance under the estate tax represents still another important example of inequitable tax treatment. At the present time if a husband takes out insurance on his own life and makes his wife the beneficiary, the payments received from the life insurance are includible in the husband's gross estate upon his death. This would not be the case if the situation involved any other type of property. Therefore, the so-called premium payment, which provides for such inclusions in the gross estate under present law, is removed in order to place life insurance on a comparable and equitable basis in this respect with other forms of property.

Certain aspects of the present laws and regulations governing corporate liquidations also are inequitable. At present if a corporation is liquidated by distributing its assets to its stockholders, no tax is imposed on the corporation on any appreciation in the value of the as-

sets while in the hands of the corporation. On the other hand, if the corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, a tax is imposed on the corporation. The two methods of liquidation are essentially the same, and your committee believes that there is no justification for subjecting the second method to discriminatory tax treatment. Therefore, your committee's bill provides that if a corporation sells its assets just prior to liquidation, no gain or loss shall be recognized to the corporation if certain specified rules are followed.

The last example which I shall mention of inequality corrected by the bill concerns the averaging provision relating to personal services covering a period of 3 years or more, where 80 percent of the compensation is received in a single year. Present law limits relief under this averaging device in cases where the work is completed. Relief is denied in situations where an individual is employed continually for long periods but receives portions of his compensation for the work in lump sums at infrequent intervals. Your committee believes that it is only equitable to provide relief in these cases, as well as those where the work is completed.

ELIMINATION OF UNCERTAINTY FOR TAXPAYERS AND TAX ADMINISTRATORS

A very large number of provisions in your committee's bill are designed partially, at least, to eliminate uncertainties for both the taxpayers and the tax administrators. Of the many examples available I shall discuss only the contemplation of death provision under the estate tax, the tax treatment of family partnerships, stock options, the use of 52- or 53-week periods for reporting income taxes, and the tax treatment given to deceased partners where the surviving partners make payments to his estate.

Existing law includes all transfers made within 2 years prior to death within the gross estate of the taxpayer, unless the estate can prove that these transfers were not made in contemplation of death. Transfers made more than 2 years prior to death are not includible in the gross estate unless the Government can prove that they were made in contemplation of death. While the taxation of such transfers has long been recognized as necessary in order to prevent tax avoidance, this feature of the law has resulted in a great deal of uncertainty for both taxpayers and the Government. The result has been much needless litigation. Principally this is due to the fact that contemplation of death deals with intent, and intent is difficult for either the estate or the Government to establish. To eliminate this uncertainty, your committee's bill makes the contemplation of death clause inapplicable to transfers made more than 3 years prior to death, and extends from 2 to 3 years the presumption that transfers were made in contemplation of death. This will give much greater certainty for everyone involved and will probably result in some increase in revenue.

The tax treatment of family partnerships represents another area in which your committee provides more certain tax treatment. At the present time, largely as the result of the Tower and Lusthaus cases, members of a family who are also partners in a business cannot be sure of how the earnings from the partnership will be treated for tax purposes. This is an especially perplexing problem where the capital of one partner arose from a gift made to him by another related partner. Your committee's bill provides that where family partners can meet certain tests laid down in the bill, no question may be raised as to the validity of the partnership even though the capital of one partner was originally given to him by another related partner. It is important to emphasize, however, that this provision of your committee's bill will not in any way deny partnership treatment for tax purposes to any partners who can now qualify under present law irrespective of whether or not they can meet the tests set out in the new section. It simply provides certainty for family partnerships meeting these tests.

Certainty of tax treatment is also provided under your committee's bill for employee stock option plans meeting certain specified tests. This, however, I shall discuss more fully at a later point.

At the present time the Internal Revenue Code requires taxpayers to report their income on the 12-month basis, yet for business reasons many taxpayers have been keeping their records on a 52- or 53-week basis as a matter of business convenience. Although not specifically provided for by present law, the Bureau of Internal Revenue accepts reporting on this basis for purposes of the income tax. Your committee's bill removes the uncertainty faced by taxpayers keeping their records in this manner by giving specific legal sanction to this practice.

The tax law is also made more specific in its application to the tax treatment of payments made to a partner after his death. This provision is concerned with personal service partnerships, such as law partnerships. These partnership agreements often provide for the payment of a specified portion of future partnership income for a limited period to the estate of a deceased partner, as a rough equivalent of the decedent partner's share of the partnership assets at the time of his death. The tax status of such payments is uncertain under existing law. Your committee's bill specifically excludes amounts so distributed from the distributive share of the surviving partners and includes them in the income of the estate of the deceased partner in the year received.

PREVENTION OF TAX AVOIDANCE

Many of the provisions of H. R. 6712 are designed to prevent tax avoidance. For example, your committee's bill plugs loopholes in the case of intercorporate distributions in kind, capital gains of nonresident aliens, and exclusion of military retirement pay. Your committee is also offering an amendment to the bill to plug a loophole in the case of short sales of stock or commodities.

A practice has been developing in recent years which leads to an undesirable type of tax avoidance through the distribution of dividends by one corporation to another in the form of stock in trade rather than money. As a result the distributing corporation realizes no income and pays no tax. Because of the intercorporate dividend credit the corporation to whom the property is distributed pays a tax on only 15 percent of the value added by the first corporation. Thus, through this type of an arrangement it is possible almost entirely to escape the corporate income tax. To plug this loophole your committee's bill restricts the allowance of the dividends received credit to the value of the stock in trade in the hands of the distributing corporation. Thus, when the second corporation sells the stock in trade, income is realized and taxable to it even if the stock in trade has not appreciated in value since it was received by the second corporation.

I am sure that most of you are well acquainted with the fact that under existing law capital gains of nonresident aliens are exempted from the income tax. A number of cases have been brought to the attention of your committee where these nonresident aliens are escaping the capital gains tax, although in fact they are in this country for considerable periods of time and are carrying out transactions on American exchanges. Your committee's bill plugs this loophole by subjecting capital gains derived from sources within the United States by nonresident aliens to a 30-percent tax. If the nonresident alien is present less than 90 days during the year, he is taxed only on such capital gains realized while he was present in the United States. If he is present 90 days or more, the tax applies to all such capital gains during the entire year whether or not he was present in the United States at the time of the sale.

The Armed Forces Committee and the Secretary of Defense have already called attention to the fact that military retirement pay is excluded from the income tax even though the recipient of such a pension or annuity may be receiving a large salary from private industry. Your committee's bill plugs this loophole by restricting this exclusion from the income tax to cases of real need. This is done by reducing the exclusion by the amount of any earned income received, although in no case is the exclusion allowed reduced by the bill below $1,200. An amendment which will be offered by your committee, however, will limit this in such a way that it will not apply to veterans receiving disability pensions and to raise this $1,200 limit to $2,400.

Your committee also intends to offer an amendment to plug a loophole now existing in the case of short sales of stock or commodities. At the present time it is possible to manipulate short sales in such a way that gains on risks entered into on the stock or commodity markets for periods of 6 months or less can technically be made to qualify as long-term capital gains. As a result only half of the gain is now taken into consideration in computing taxable income, while short-term capital gains, which would realistically characterize these transactions, are fully taxable. The amendment to be offered by your committee recognizes reality in these transactions, and treats gains on risks taken for periods of 6 months or less as short-term capital gains irrespective of the form in which they may be carried out.

TAX SIMPLIFICATION

A very large proportion of your committee's amendments have simplification as one of their aims. Outstanding examples of this are the provisions relating to estates and trusts, contemplation of death, and deductions for charitable and other similar contributions.

The present provisions relating to the tax treatment of estates and trusts and their beneficiaries are extremely complex, especially those dealing with taxes imposed on beneficiaries when the prior year's earnings are distributed. The complexity is so great that even lawyers specializing in the field of estates and trusts have complained vociferously. Much of the difficulty has centered around the so-called 65-day and 12-month rules for the taxation of the prior year's earnings distributed in the current year. Your committee's bill eliminates these rules entirely. It substitutes in their place a rule which, in effect, would treat distributions by estates or trusts as if they were made out of any current earnings of the estates or trusts not actually distributed currently. Other changes in your committee's bill improve the equity of the tax treatment of trusts and estates, and it is hoped that it will be possible in the future to do still more along this line.

I have already outlined to you the changes which your committee's bill will make in the estate tax with respect to the contemplation of death provisions. From the standpoint of simplification, this feature of your bill will be especially beneficial.

Your committee's bill makes a series of amendments to the Internal Revenue Code relating to income-, estate-, and gift-tax deductions for contributions to charitable and similar organizations. These amendments are intended to simplify the tax laws by placing the deductions allowed for charitable and related contributions on a comparable basis under all three of these taxes. At the present time one type of contribution may be deductible under the estate tax and not deductible under the income or gift taxes, or vice versa. Your committee's amendment correlates these deductions so that generally any charitable or similar deduction allowed, or limitation imposed, with respect to one of these taxes is also allowed or imposed with respect to the other two.

MODERATION OF HARSH PROVISIONS

The moderation of harsh tax provisions is another aim of your committee's bill. I have already explained to you how harsh and inequitable features of the taxation of annuities, and the taxation of family partnerships are remedied in the bill. Other particularly harsh features of the tax law which also are moderated by your committee's bill include the provision dealing with the improper accumulation of surplus under section 102, the extension of the military exclusions and deductions for another year, the revision of the tax treatment of corporate reorganizations, the leeway granted in the case of deductions for charitable contributions by corporations and the last-in, first-out inventory adjustments.

Your committee has received many taxpayers' complaints that administrative officials are too harsh in their interpretation of what constitutes improperly accumulated surpluses. Reports have been received that the fear of subjecting earnings to the penalty tax imposed on improper accumulated earnings has in many cases resulted in distributions of funds needed by the corporation for valid business purposes. Your committee's bill contains three amendments designed to reduce the pressure on taxpayers to distribute earnings needed for real business purposes and to remove some of the harsher aspects of this penalty tax.

First, the burden of providing that an accumulation of earnings and profits in certain cases is beyond the reasonable needs of a business is shifted from the taxpayer to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This was done to assure the taxpayer that the penalty will be imposed only where there is proof of an improper accumulation.

Second, your committee's bill removes the penalty tax from any excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital gains. Your committee believed that the application of penalty tax in this case is unduly harsh. When such income is realized by a corporation, it is taxed at 25 percent. This represents the maximum rate at which it would be taxed if realized directly by an individual. Thus the accumulation of capital gains by a corporation does not in reality represent a means of avoiding the regular graduated individual income tax, and your committee did not believe that a penalty tax should be applied in this situation.

Third, your committee's bill provides that dividends paid within 75 days after the close of the corporation's taxable year may be deducted in computing the income of the corporation subject to the penalty tax. Many businesses customarily distribute dividends after the end of the year and it is recognized as a legitimate business practice. To ignore this practice and subject these earnings to a penalty tax in the opinion of your committee is unduly harsh.

Your committee believes that it would also represent a real hardship to members of the armed forces if the present exclusions from tax are not continued, in view of the fact that their pay has not been revised upward for some time. As a result your committee's bill extends for another year the full exclusion now available to enlisted personnel and the $1,500 exclusion now granted commissioned officers. Without this extension these exclusions would lapse after December 31 of this year. Your committee is providing this extension at the specific request of the Secretary of the Navy, who has indicated that a study is being made of the pay scales of the armed forces.

Your committee believes that there are many areas of hardship in the present tax treatment of corporate reorganizations, and intends to give this problem further study. However, one feature of the reorganization provisions appeared so harsh as to deserve immediate attention. At the present time where two new corporations are formed by the liquidation of an old corporation, no tax is customarily imposed as a result of such a reorganization. However, if it is desired to retain the old corporate charter and form only one new corporation, the reorganization would be a taxable one. It appeared to your committee that it was undesirable to compel corporations to follow the first rather than the second type of reorganization where there were valid business reasons for using the latter. As a result your committee's bill provides for tax-free organizations in the latter, as well as the former case. However, certain limitations are imposed to assure the Government that this form of reorganization will not be used as a tax avoidance scheme.

Your committee believes that the present tax treatment of charitable contributions by corporations is unduly strict. Many corporations desiring to make the maximum charitable contributions allowable as tax deductions are unable to determine what constitutes 5 percent of their adjusted gross income before closing their books at the end of their taxable year. Yet present law requires them to make these contributions before the end of the taxable year if they are to be taken as deductions for that year. H. R. 6712 permits corporations to treat contributions made in the first 2½ months of the succeeding year as charitable deductions in the current year if they so desire.

There are also certain harsh aspects in the tax law applying to last-in first-out inventory adjustments. One provision under this feature of the law provides for the payment of refunds to taxpayers because of the liquidation of inventories during the war which could not be replaced until the cost of the replacements had risen substantially. However, in many cases these refunds have not yet been paid, and in some cases it appears likely that it will be necessary to wait several more years for these payments. This delay is due in large part to the fact that the corporations involved are also faced with complex excess profits tax problems which must be settled before the refunds may be paid. These refunds do not, however, bear interest, and as a result taxpayers are being denied the use of their money, while at the same time receiving no interest for its use by the Government. For this reason your committee's bill provides that refunds of this type shall bear interest beginning January 1, 1948, or the date for the payment of the tax for the year of replacement, whichever is later.

Other harsh aspects of the tax treatment of last-in first-out inventory adjustments arise from the fact that it has not always been possible for taxpayers to know that they would benefit under this provision. For that reason your committee's bill gives the Commissioner of Internal Revenue discretion in determining when the taxpayer must exercise the election under the last-in first-out adjustment for the involuntary liquida-

tion and replacement of inventories. Thus, it will be possible for him to provide relief in hardship cases.

INCREASED INCENTIVES TO MANAGEMENT AND CAPITAL

The fifth and last aim of your committee's bill outlined in the general statement of the report is to provide increased incentives to management and venture capital. I shall attempt to give you only the two most outstanding examples of provisions in your committee's bill providing such incentives. They are the net operating loss carry-over and stock-option provisions.

At the present time it is possible for either incorporated or unincorporated business to carry a net operating loss first back to the income of the two prior years, and then forward to the two succeeding years. Thus, present law provides a 5-year averaging period for such losses. Your committee's bill extends this averaging period to 7 years. Moreover, a 5-year carry-forward and a 1-year carry-back are substituted for the present 2-year carry-back and 2-year carry-forward. The longer averaging period provided by your comittee's bill will decrease business risks and, therefore, increase the willingness of investors to buy new stock or bond issues. The increased reliance placed on the carry-forward and the decreased emphasis on the carry-back should also be advantageous from an incentive standpoint, since to gain relief under the carry-forward a business must be brought back to a profitable basis, while a carry-back automatically provides relief to business with profitable years in the past.

The stock-option provisions in your committee's bill are also of prime importance from an incentive standpoint. They represent devices which can be used to attract new and better management. They may also be used to increase the interest of employees in the business by giving them a stake in the business. The present method of taxing these options is so severe that they cannot be used extensively for either of these purposes. Moreover, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is attempting to extend the application of court decisions in this area to cases which your committee feels confident that the Congress did not intend them to apply. As a result, businesses frequently are afraid to use stock options because they cannot be certain how either the employer or employee will be taxed.

To remove this difficulty, your committee's bill establishes what are called restricted stop options. For these options where there is only a relatively small leeway between the price at which the employee has the option to buy stock and the fair market value of the stock at the time the options are granted, any difference between the option price and the price at the time the option is exercised under your committee's bill is taxed to the employee at the time the stock is purchased. As a result, under present law, the employee frequently finds that he must sell part of this stock in order to pay the tax due. Your committee's bill removes this deterrent to the use of stock options.

In addition to postponing the date when the tax must be paid, your committee's bill also provides that the gain representing the difference between the option price and the market price of the stock at the time the option is exercised will be treated as a capital gain rather than as ordinary income in certain cases. This special treatment is provided to encourage the holding of stock by the employee and is available to him if he holds the stock purchased under an option for 3 years or more.

The favorable type of tax treatment afforded restricted stock options is limited to stock-option plans which meet certain tests specified in the bill. This was necessary to assure the Government that stock-option plans would be used only as incentive devices or means of increasing employee interest in the business.

SUMMARY

In showing you how H. R. 6712 removes inequities, eliminates uncertainties for taxpayers and tax administrators, prevents tax avoidance, simplifies the tax system, moderates certain harsh provisions and provides incentives to management and capital, I have drawn upon only about a third of the sections in the bill—25 out of a total of 80 sections. Yet despite the size of this bill it represents only a modest beginning on a program of correcting the flaws and incongruities in our tax system.

It is modest in that it loses only about $150,000,000 of revenue in 1949. It is also modest in that many more changes, some much more far-reaching than the provisions in this bill, must be undertaken before we shall have a satisfactory tax structure. However, I believe it is important that we, here and now, take the first step in overhauling the hybrid tax system that has grown up in the last few years. Everyone has recognized the importance of the job to be done, and the passage of this bill represents the best way we can show the country that we are starting on this journey.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill includes a committee amendment in which I am greatly interested.

It is aimed at closing a loophole which has been discovered in the capital-gains provision of the law.

Speculators on the stock and grain exchanges have managed to change what are really short-term profits into long-term profits and thus have avoided a large part of their taxes. I cannot blame anyone for taking advantage of quirks in the law to reduce his taxes. But it is our duty here to watch the workings of the law and plug up loopholes as we find them.

What they have been doing is briefly as follows:

If a man bought shares of a certain stock or so many bushels of a commodity and within the 6 months' period had a profit thereon, instead of selling the item when he felt it the time to do so market-wise, thus subjecting himself to the full income tax on short-term capital gains, he would sell the same number of shares of stock or the same amount of a commodity short keeping both transactions open until the 6 months' holding period had expired and thus pay only a 25 percent tax on the profit as a long-term capital gain, where if he had closed out the transaction technically when he actually did so and ceased to have any risk marketwise, he would have paid a full tax on the entire profit as a short-term capital gain.

There are many ramifications in this method of tax avoidance. There is, of course, the reverse of what I have described—where the short sale is made first, covered by a purchase later.

There is what is called short selling against "box" where securities are already held.

There is the use of "puts" which are an option to sell stock at a fixed price during a given time.

We have attempted in this amendment to close up all the loopholes along this line which we could find. Drafting has been extremely difficult and it is possible that we have not covered everything. However, if other loopholes develop we can correct them at a later date.

Though tax avoidance is legal, those who avoid taxes make necessary higher taxes for others who cannot avoid their own taxes. Therefore, it is the duty of our committee to do everything we can to make everyone pay his fair share. By this amendment we hope to help accomplish this purpose.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the main objection—if it may be called an objection—to this measure is simply that it does not go far enough. There are many other instances, in my opinion, where the Internal Revenue Code should be revised to correct tax inequities and to clarify some of the interpretations of the internal-revenue laws as made by the Internal Revenue Bureau.

I have in mind one instance in particular which I would like to point out at this time. Section 3649 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that the tax imposed on the transportation of persons is interpreted to include transportation on fishing party boats. I had introduced a bill, known as H. R. 5537, to amend the above-mentioned provision of the Internal Revenue Code so that this tax would not apply to persons merely on a fishing party from shore to short distances to fishing grounds and return. This part of the Internal Revenue Code was never intended to apply for fishing party purposes. I have searched through the legislative history of this section. Nowhere in the record can I find any intention, even by inference, that this tax should apply for fishing party purposes. I had hoped that this bill before us now would include a provision to correct this situation. It was my hope that the provisions of the bill which I introduced would have been made a part of the bill before us. I have been working during this Congress to get this matter corrected, and I have found very sympathetic support; and while the

members of the committee were very sympathetic, yet, unfortunately, this bill does not go far enough to correct the provision which I have pointed out.

I would like to make it clear that I intend to continue my fight against the application of this transportation tax to fishing parties.

For the information of all Members of Congress, I would like to insert right here a copy of H. R. 5537:

H. R. 5537

A bill to amend section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax imposed on the transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the exemption of certain trips from the tax on the transportation of persons) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Exemption of certain trips: The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts paid for transportation which do not exceed 35 cents, to amounts paid for commutation or season tickets for single trips of less than 30 miles, to amounts paid for commutation tickets for 1 month or less, or to amounts paid for transportation in a boat where the transportation takes place for the sole purpose of fishing from the boat in which such transportation is furnished."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act for transportation on or after such first day.

WORTH-WHILE TAX REVISION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for many years we have just added and added to our tax structure and the time is overdue when we should have a major revision of our tax program. This tax-revision bill is the first step in the right direction.

There are certain features of it that may have to have a second look when they reach the Senate. I refer particularly to the section on family partnerships. It will, however, be a big improvement over the present situation. Our report calls attention to the fact that in our attempt to clarify the situation in regard to family partnerships, we do not want anyone to lose any of his present rights with respect to rulings and holdings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

There are two important matters in this bill dealing with agriculture. It was my privilege to sponsor these measures, but I am grateful to many others who have helped me in advancing them.

In the first place, we extend the time in which a farmer must file his tax returns. At the present time a farmer's estimated return must be filed by January 15. A high percentage of the farmers like to have this estimated tax be their final tax return. This bill provides that if it is their final return they may have until January 31, instead of the 15th, to make this return. This will be very helpful.

The other provision that I would mention relates to soil conservation. It mean in substance that the farmer who spends his money to improve the soil not only for himself, but for his country and for the benefit of his neighbors shall pay less taxes than if he were a soil robber. Sound soil-conservation practices are a business expense for the farmer. This provision says that they shall be so regarded for the purposes of income tax. This section provides that—

Expenditures made for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion of land used in farming shall be allowed as business deductions. * * * The term "expenditures made for the purpose of soil and water conservation and the prevention of erosion" means expenditures for the treatment, moving, or cultivation of earth including (but not limited to) leveling, grading and terracing, contour furrowing, the construction of diversion channels and drainage ditches, the control and protection of watercourses, outlets, and ponds, the planting and cultivation of cover and protective crops, or windbreaks, and other special or emergency cultivation and tillage; but such term does not include the purchase, construction, installation, or improvement of structures, appliances, and facilities made of masonry, concrete, tile, metal, or wood, such as tanks, reservoirs, pipes, conduits, canals, dams, wells, and pumps, which are subject to the allowance for depreciation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that this proposal will be a great boost to conservation in America.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this tax revision bill is a very important piece of legislation. It represents the work of the members of the Ways and Means Committee for several months and also the work of the Treasury force and the force of the Joint Committee on Taxation, all of whom are tax experts.

For a number of years there has developed a larger number of inequities by reason of overlapping tax laws and regulations. There has been much confusion and much litigation by reason of unfair and unjust regulations and interpretations of any laws controlling the levying and collection of taxes.

The Ways and Means Committee decided to revise the general tax laws and the bill that we are considering today is the result of that decision.

Nobody could give a complete and thorough analysis of this bill in less than an hour. I shall not attempt it here today. I worked on this bill many hours. I listened to the testimony of many witnesses with reference to its provisions. I have no hesitancy in recommending the passage of this legislation. It is not claimed that this bill is a complete revision in all respects. There are many other changes that could yet be made before all the tax legislation is free from any inconsistencies or inequities.

This bill should be passed.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that I am speaking the sentiments of every Member of this House when I say that we have no intention of legislating in such a manner as to work a hardship upon the men who became disabled in the service of our country. I am sincerely interested in the welfare of those men who have served their Nation, whose service has been honorable and because of such service they have become disabled and are receiving compensation for their disabilities from our Government. I believe a great many of our disabled veterans were under the impression that section 106 of this bill would make it necessary for them to pay taxes on their small compensation or pension. I am glad that the intent of the committee to set substantial maximum earnings which retired officers may receive before exemption of their retirement is affected is clarified with this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the best legislation gets the least attention at the time it is passed. There is a section of this bill (H. R. 6712) which may get far less attention than it deserves.

Its long-range benefits, however, warrant special mention. I refer to section 110, which establishes expenditures for soil and water conservation as deductible business expenses in farming operations.

That it is in the national interest, no one can deny. We often appropriate money directly for soil and water conservation. This section says that if a farmer uses his own money for that purpose he may enter it as a business-operating expense in making out his return for income-tax purposes.

The idea is one which I have discussed many times with my good friend and neighbor the gentleman from Nebraska, the Honorable CARL T. CURTIS, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He introduced a bill to accomplish it and I am glad to see it now incorporated in this bill as section 110.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the House will understand my attitude in this matter when I say I favored reporting the bill in order that the House may have the opportunity to vote upon the provisions of the bill, but I made it definite and clear at the time that I had some fundamental objections to the bill and that I reserved the right to oppose the measure. I admit there is much good in the bill. There were many things that should have been corrected over the years. The committee tries to correct these. The administrative difficulties develop with time. They develop with succeeding changes in our tax structure. No one is particularly to blame for these occurrences which manifest themselves in due time. The revisions in the pending bill make many minor administrative corrections, but also and more important several changes are made which constitute a material reduction in taxes. I believe the resulting loss of revenue, approximating about $400,000,000, for the large part that amount of tax cut goes to the benefit of the people with incomes above $5,000—I think that is correct—although people with incomes under that amount do get some concessions for uniforms and certain clothing and other things that they use, perhaps in their business or trade.

I call your attention to the fact that section 102 is being destroyed by changes. I am not a lawyer, so I will not discuss it from a technical standpoint, but the lawyers knew when these changes were proposed that it was intended to weaken that section and give the benefits of the change to a certain class of taxpayers. I favor strengthening rather than weakening section 102 even while making administrative changes.

The Secretary of the Treasury says in his letter of objections that "the present protective tax to prevent corporations from being used as a depository for avoidance of surtaxes by their stockholders would be weakened by increasing the burden of the Government in proving its case."

Instead of weakening section 102, I have always contended that it should have been strengthened. That could be done with justice and fairness, both to the taxpayers and the Treasury. Section 203 also is found to be costly insofar as the Treasury is concerned, and the Treasury strenuously objected to this provision. The Secretary says:

I quote:

SECTION 203. PROCEEDS OF LIFE INSURANCE

Under existing law insurance purchased by the insured on his own life is included in his taxable estate. The basic purpose of this provision is, of course, very clear. Life insurance is inherently testamentary and, like any testamentary arrangement, is intended to benefit the insured's family after his death. In the absence of the present law, wealthy individuals might—as they once did—pass on large portions of their wealth through the form of life insurance without paying an estate tax. The proposed amendment would permit precisely this result. In fact, this amendment, when coupled with the large gift-tax exemptions and exclusions already provided by the Revenue Act of 1948 would permit taxpayers to leave very large estates without paying either an estate tax or a gift tax.

For example, a 40-year-old married man with three children could make annual tax-free gifts of $6,000, each to his wife and children for the payment of life-insurance premiums. These premiums would provide $900,000 worth of life insurance. If at death he left a net estate of $700,000 to his wife, in addition to his insurance estate of $900,000, the estate tax would be $73,300, or 65 percent less than the $206,900 tax due on the $1,600,000 net estate under existing law.

Moreover, if the insured's estate, over and above his life insurance, were $120,000, one-half of which was left to his wife, there would be no tax at all. Thus an estate of over $1,000,000 would pass entirely free of all estate and gift taxes.

These changes constitute at one and the same time, revision and even more reduction in taxes for the favored few.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the pending tax revision bill, which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. Although time did not permit a complete revision of the Internal Revenue Code, it has been possible to correct a number of errors and inequities in the present law.

After hearings lasting many weeks to obtain the views of the Treasury Department, practicing tax attorneys and accountants, and spokesmen for agriculture, industry, and labor, the committee went into executive session to write this bill.

The unanimous vote of the committee to report favorably H. R. 6712, without even a supplementary minority report, is, in my opinion, an achievement and a well-deserved tribute to the leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota. I know by experience the heavy responsibilities that fall upon the committee chairman in the preparation of a technical tax revision bill. And I take the opportunity here to acknowledge for myself, and I feel sure the other minority members of the committee as well, the fair, courteous, friendly, nonpartisan consideration extended to all the members in our deliberations on this measure.

The bill contains more than 30 technical changes recommended by the Treasury Department. Other amendments originated with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, or with members of the committee. The more than 80 amendments of the Federal tax structure were agreed to only after discussion with the Under Secretary of the Treasury and his technical staff. At all times the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation gave us the benefit of his able and experienced judgment. But in the final analysis, this is a committee bill for which joint responsibility has been assumed by the entire membership of the Committee on Ways and Means. In a few instances the committee declined to follow the recommendations of the Treasury, but never was this decision a partisan issue.

It has been my experience that it is impossible to write a technical tax bill that does not contain at least a few provisions which each Member would alter in some respect if he were writing the bill alone. It is my sincere belief and conviction, however, that passage of H. R. 6712 will be a contribution toward a sounder and more equitable Federal tax system.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I believe you stated this bill was considered on a nonpartison basis.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It was.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not correct that 68 of the 82 amendments that are submitted have been approved as being just and fair by the Treasury Department?

Mr. DOUGHTON. There were about 30 technical amendments contained in the bill that were recommended and insisted upon by the Treasury Department. I think the bill contains about 80 changes in the code, and 30 of those were recommended by the Treasury. There were only a few provisions in this bill that were opposed by the Treasury.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true that your committee brought this bill out unanimously? It was by unanimous vote of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, was it not?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, I thought so at the time, but the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who is opposed to it, and whose ability and sincerity nobody questions, said that in voting to report the bill he reserved the right to oppose the bill on the floor. But I heard so little opposition to the bill when it was originally reported that it seems extremely strange that someone did not have enough interest to write a minority report to be included with the majority views, so that we would have known if there were so many objections. There has certainly been ample time to get out a minority report. I think there is much more good in this bill than there is bad.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not also true that not one single provision was ever put into this bill with any idea of saving taxes for anybody?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It seems that you cannot bring out any tax bill but that somebody raises the issue of trying to do something for the rich. I have no brief for the wealthy and the rich. I have helped write a great many tax bills, but where would the Treasury be if somebody did not have some wealth and pay some taxes? Yet every time a bill comes in that issue is raised.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Are we not entitled to a reading of the bill?

The SPEAKER. That time has passed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No one asked unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Nobody demanded the reading of the bill at the right time. If the gentleman wanted the bill read, he should have done that before a second was ordered.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In order to give the Members an opportunity to know what is in this bill, and study it before a vote is taken, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. There can be no demand for reading of the engrossed copy under suspension of the rules.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 656, making in order consideration of the tax-revision bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

MILITARY FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) "making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 6, 8, 16, 41 and 55.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 7, 9, 12, 24, 33, 39, 40, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57 and 58; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$889,486,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$305,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,314,342,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,493,642,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$210,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$113,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$931,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$412,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$153,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$166,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$263,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$429,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$610,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "the purchase (not to exceed one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$290,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"No appropriation in this Act shall be available for the pay, allowances or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the National Guard for periods of active duty, training, drills, instruction or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the Act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress), who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer or enlisted man of the National Guard who may waive or relinquish said pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation where such disability is of such degree as not to prevent acceptance for active federal duty for the periods of active duty, field training, instruction or other duty, except drill, for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the Act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress): *Provided further*, That adjutants general who may be drawing such emoluments may be continued in a federally recognized status without pay under this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "$125,000,000: *Provided*, That $25,000,000 of this appropriation is made contingent upon the enactment into law by the Eightieth Congress of S. 2655 or similar authorization for the voluntary enlistment of persons between the ages of eighteen and nineteen years"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"No appropriation in this Act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Organized Reserves for periods of active duty, drills, training, instruction, or other duty for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the Act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress), who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be so construed as to prevent the application of funds herein contained to the pay, allowances, or traveling expenses of any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Organized Reserves who may waive or relinquish said pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation where such disability is of such degree as not to prevent acceptance for active federal duty for the periods of active duty, field training, instruction, or other duty, except drill, for which he may be entitled to receive compensation pursuant to the provisions of the Act approved March 25, 1948 (Public Law 460, Eightieth Congress)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$39,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$628,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$674,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "or to the use of funds for (a) water transportation of personnel and supplies, or (b) laundry services; and (7) in connection with construction activities"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 19, 28, and 30.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
HOMER FERGUSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommend in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 relates to the purchase of an automobile for the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 relates to a health service program as authorized by law, for the National Security Resources Board, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 relates to funds carried in the bill for the National Security Resources Board, and appropriates $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $3,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4 relates to funds for general expenses, United States Air Force, and appropriates $889,486,000, in lieu of $884,486,000, as proposed by the House, and $896,986,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 relates to funds covering civilian personnel of the Air Force, and establishes a ceiling of $305,000,000, in lieu of $300,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $312,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 relates to the so-called Byrd law, which places a ceiling on the number of civilian employees, and strikes out an amendment proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 relates to departmental salaries of the Air Force and appropriates $825,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $750,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8 relates to the expenses for the Chief of Staff, Air Force, and appropriates $6,500,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $7,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 relates to contingencies of the Army, and appropriates $32,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $30,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10 relates to expenses for the Inter-American Relations, Department of the Army, and appropriates $750,000, in lieu of $650,000, as proposed by the House, and $850,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 relates to pay of the Army, and appropriates $2,314,342,000, in lieu of $2,300,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,320,942,000, as proposed by the Senate; $342,000 of the amount appropriated is to cover flying pay for flight surgeons.

Amendment No. 12 relates to flying pay for flight surgeons, and strikes out the word "not", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13 relates to compensation for employees of the Finance Department and appropriates $28,500,0000, in lieu of $28,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $29,868,630, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14 adjusts the total for the Finance Service, Army, at $2,493,642,000, instead of $2,478,800,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,501,610,630, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 relates to welfare of enlisted men and appropriates $8,250,000 in lieu of $8,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $8,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 relates to the purchase of butter and restores the language as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17 relates to regular supplies of the Army and appropriates $100,000,000, in lieu of $95,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $105,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 relates to clothing and equipage and appropriates $210,000,000, in lieu of $200,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $235,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 relates to contract authorization of $25,000,000 for clothing and equipage and is reported in disagreement. A motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be offered.

Amendment No. 20 relates to incidental expenses of the Army and appropriates $113,000,000, in lieu of $110,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $118,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House figure does not increase the allowance for special service schools.

Amendment No. 21 adjusts the total for Quartermaster Service, Army, at $931,250,000, in lieu of $913,000,000, as carried in the House bill, and $966,500,000, as carried in the Senate bill.

Amendment No. 22 relates to expenses for Transportation Service, Army, and appropriates $412,000,000, in lieu of $400,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $420,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 relates to the Signal Service of the Army and appropriates $153,000,000, in lieu of $150,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $155,787,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24 relates to the Medical Department and appropriates $75,126,163, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $75,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25 relates to Engineer Service, Army, and appropriates $166,000,000, in lieu of $160,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $170,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26 relates to Barracks and Quarters, Army, and appropriates $263,000,000, in lieu of $250,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $280,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 adjusts the total for Engineer Service, Army, at $429,000,000, in lieu of $410,000,000, as carried in the House bill, and $450,000,000, as carried in the Senate bill.

Amendment No. 28 relates to military construction, Army, and is reported in disagreement. A motion to recede and concur with an amendment will be offered.

Amendment No. 29 relates to Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army, and appropriates $610,000,000, in lieu of $580,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $665,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30 relates to contract authorization in connection with Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army, and is reported in disagreement. An amendment to recede and concur with an amendment will be offered.

Amendment No. 31 relates to Chemical Service, Army, and appropriates $26,000,000, in lieu of $25,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $27,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32 relates to maintenance and operation, United States Military Academy, and appropriates $5,440,000, in lieu of $5,279,000, as proposed by the House, and $5,600,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33 relates to the liquidation of indebtedness of cadets at the United States Military Academy and accepts clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34 relates to language and the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles for the National Guard as follows: "The purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only".

Amendment No. 35 relates to expenses for the National Guard and appropriates $290,000,000, in lieu of $240,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $298,113,759, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36 relates to services in the National Guard of partially disabled persons for services in the National Guard if they waive or relinquish any pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation they would otherwise receive from the Federal Government.

Amendment No. 37 relates to the Organized Reserves and appropriates $125,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $100,000,000, as proposed by the House, provided the use of $25,000,000 of the amount appropriated is contingent upon the enactment into law by the present Congress of S. 2655 or similar authorization for the voluntary enlistment of persons between the ages of 18 and 19 years.

Amendment No. 38 relates to services in the Organized Reserves of partially disabled persons and permits the payment to said persons for services in the Organized Reserves if they waive or relinquish any pension, disability allowance, or disability compensation they would otherwise receive from the Federal Government.

Amendment No. 39 relates to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and appropriates $21,175,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $21,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40 relates to the promotion of rifle practice and adopts language proposed by the Senate to permit rifle and pistol teams to compete in the Olympic games during the calendar year 1948.

Amendment No. 41 relates to the promotion of rifle practice and appropriates $175,000, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $303,500, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42 relates to a ceiling on departmental employees and authorizes $39,000,000, in lieu of $37,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $39,172,326, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43 relates to a dollar ceiling placed on civilian personnel (O–1 classification) and adjusts the figure at $628,500,000, in lieu of $600,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $691,700,000, as proposed by the Senate. It is the understanding of the conferees that the personnel table appearing on pages 12 and 13 of the House committee report on H. R. 6771 is advisory in character and not to be considered as a definite limitation on personnel in any instance.

Amendment No. 44 adjusts the dollar ceiling on civilian personnel (departmental and

O-1 classified employees) at $674,525,000, in lieu of $644,525,000, as proposed by the House, and $737,897,326, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45 contains clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46 retains language proposed by the House and includes language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47 relates to contingent expenses, Department of the Army, and appropriates $2,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $2,200,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48 contains language relating to printing and binding, communications, and other services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49 corrects a typographical error.

Amendment Nos. 50 and 51 eliminates language as proposed by the Senate to make the general provisions of this bill conform with other previously passed appropriation bills.

Amendment No. 52 corrects language.

Amendment No. 53 adopts language proposed by the Senate similar to language previously carried in this bill.

Amendment Nos. 54, 56, and 58 correct section numbers.

Amendment No. 55 strikes out language proposed by the Senate which would partially eliminate the so-called Byrd law ceiling.

Amendment No. 57 adopts language as proposed by the Senate to make available funds in this bill contingent upon the enactment, by the present Congress, of S. 2655 or similar authorization is contained for the voluntary enlistment of persons between the ages of 18 and 19 years.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 19, providing a contract authorization of $25,000,000 for clothing and equipage, Quartermaster Corps, Army: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 28, providing an appropriation of $76,000,000 and a contract authorization of $75,000,000 for military construction for the Army: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 30, providing a contract authorization of $70,000,000 for ordnance service and supplies, Army: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
HARVE TIBBOTT,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
Members on the Part of the House.

RECESSES MADE IN ORDER TODAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the balance of the day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MILITARY FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 24, line 18, insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, prior to July 1, 1949, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $25,000,000."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 34, after line 15, insert the following:

"Military construction, Army: For construction, installations, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $76,000,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used for the construction of family quarters for personnel of the Army at a cost per family unit in excess of $14,040, except that when such units are constructed outside the continental United States the average cost per unit of all such units constructed shall not exceed $20,800."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 28: Mr. ENGEL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Military construction, Army: For construction, installations, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities, as authorized by the act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims under the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (28 U. S. C. 921); $76,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, including not to exceed $205,000 for the purchase, development, or construction in connection with land adjacent to the Percy Jones Hospital, Michigan; and, in addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided*, That the funds made available in this paragraph by appropriation and contract authorization shall not be subject to section 10 of this act."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to call the attention of the membership to the fact that this military construction program started by the Senate amendment is under the authorization of the recently passed Bates bill. Members of the House will recall the debate which I precipitated on the floor in reference to the limitation on the size of quarters which might be built. This appropriation bill as passed by the House, in section 10, carried language which has been carried in appropriation bills for a number of years providing a dollar limitation on the size of quarters. In order that the action we are here taking will be consistent with the construction authorization, we carry a proviso in this paragraph in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan that the funds made available in this paragraph by appropriation and construction authorization shall not be subject to section 10 of this act. This leaves housing construction in this paragraph subject to the space limitation that no quarters shall be built with a space in excess of 1,080 feet but exempts it from section 10 of this bill. That was the only way we could bring the bill in harmony with the action that was worked out by the House when we had the construction authorization bill before us.

With permission of the House, I will insert at this point the construction program with priorities as indicated by the armed services and a summary of the estimates and appropriations picture in this bill.

Summary of the bill

Regular and supplemental budget estimates for 1949	$7,278,842,000
House bill	6,509,939,000
Senate bill	6,915,676,052
Conference bill	6,767,663,163
Conference bill under budget	573,423,837
Conference bill over House bill	257,729,163
Conference bill under Senate bill	148,007,889

NOTE.—Totals include $62,250,000 special accounts.

Contract authorizations carried in the bill:	
Clothing and equipage	$25,000,000
Signal Corps	50,000,000
Military construction, Army	75,000,000
Ordnance service	70,000,000
Total	220,000,000

GROUP I.—CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

1. Emergency projects overseas	$18,317,912
2. Emergency projects 21	4,200,000
3. Land for	1,042,200
4. Classified installations, Alaska	5,000,000
5. Alamagordo, N. Mex., rocket-firing facilities and quarters	1,419,570
6. Camp Hood, family quarters	3,699,000
7. Muroc rocket test facilities	2,646,500
8. California Institute of Technology, completion of supersonic wind tunnel	410,700
9. White Sands Proving Grounds, 11 separate projects	3,525,100
10. Carswell Air Force base (Fort Worth), quarters, storage, and training facilities	1,635,170
11. Whittier Port Development (9 projects)	5,332,277
12. Mile 26, barracks and utilities	1,966,238
13. Ladd Field, 12 items, barracks and operating facilities	11,499,650
14. Camp Lee, quarters and barracks	2,871,220
15. Fort Knox, quarters and utilities	2,383,170
16. Mountain Home, quarters	739,830
Total, group I	66,688,537

GROUP II.—CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

17. MacDill Field, control tower and quarters	$829,330
18. West Point, quarters and plans	2,763,590
19. Rapid City Airfield, facilities	5,000,000
20. Air Force bases, Marianas	5,376,708
21. Lowry Field, Colo., quarters	1,035,700
22. Yuma, quarters and other buildings	389,620
23. Camp Detrick, testing buildings and quarters	700,950
24. Vint Hills farm stations, quarters	666,550
25. Oakland Army base, quarters and barracks	850,610
26. Army-Navy medical procurement office, New York	390,000
27. Alaska communication system (16 stations)	2,159,548
28. Sacramento Signal Depot, dust control	47,970
29. Lexington Signal Depot, equipment headquarters	25,000
30. Fort Bragg, N. C., quarters	1,479,000
31. Wright Field, rotary wing test and armament laboratory	1,887,000
32. Kelly Field, 2 helicopter test cells	152,000
33. Oklahoma City, 4 jet-engine test cells	362,000
34. Fort Sheridan, Ill., family quarters	296,000
35. Fort Lewis, Wash., family quarters	2,220,500
36. Selfridge Field, quarters	652,740
37. Tripler General Hospital, bachelor officers and family quarters	2,914,735
38. Bergstrom Field, quarters	1,183,670
39. Air-safety program and fire program	4,573,500
40. Picatinny Arsenal, 6 test buildings	1,228,800
41. Edgewood Arsenal, laboratory and quarters	728,920
42. Army Ground Forces bases, Marianas, barracks	3,668,644
43. Fort Hamilton, N. Y., quarters	474,560
44. Two Rock ranch, Calif., water lines and quarters	139,250
45. Adak (Alaska) Airfield, quarters and utilities	4,181,400
46. Malta test station, New York, hydraulic laboratory	205,000
47. Fort Leavenworth, feeder station and buildings	1,161,500
48. Fort Brook, P. R., water storage and quarters	283,354
49. Fort Buchanan, P. R., water storage and quarters	466,500
50. Marietta Army Airfield, Ga., control tower	54,500
51. Williams Field, Ariz., gunnery range	51,500
52. Craig Field, Ariz., crash station	26,370
53. Wingate Ordnance Depot, additional well	20,000
54. Anniston Ordnance Depot, industrial waste disposal	60,000
55. Kearney Air Force Field, Nebr., family quarters	1,183,790
56. Fort Bliss, quarters	1,007,500
57. Fort Belvoir, Va., quarters	650,920
58. Army-Navy General Hospital, Arkansas, barracks and quarters	750,100
59. Fitzsimons General Hospital, quarters and utilities	$324,760
60. Keflavik Airfield, improvements	10,352,100
Total, group II	62,976,789

GROUP III.—CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

61. Fort Richardson, 8 items of development	$10,190,375
62. Fort Yukon, 14 items of development	4,160,950
63. Randolph Field, control and housing	1,190,200
64. Fort Sill, quarters	443,900
65. Fort Jay, quarters	296,100
66. Fort Sam Houston, quarters	592,200
67. Kindley Field, Bermuda, water and quarters	2,272,429
68. Henry Barracks, P. R., barracks	561,200
69. Watertown Arsenal, shop	87,000
70. Fort McPherson, quarters	296,600
71. Fort Meade, Md., quarters	710,440
72. San Antonio induction center	1,035,700
73. Keesler Field	1,035,700
74. Fort Riley, Kans., quarters	592,000
75. Presidio of San Francisco, quarters	296,600
76. Fort Benning, quarters	1,253,550
77. Hickam Field, barracks and quarters	2,242,200
78. Valley Forge, quarters	231,000
79. Stoneman, quarters	711,640
80. Frobisher Bay, quarters and utilities	396,905
81. Roswell Army Airfield, training facilities	95,790
82. Fort Chimo, Canada, quarters and utilities	214,570
83. Borinquen, P. R., water system	165,000
84. Albrook Field, sewer cover	276,000
85. Percy Jones Hospital and quarters	231,000
86. Army Airfield, Nenana, Alaska, barracks and quarters	505,000
87. Brook Army Medical Center, quarters	474,060
88. Oliver General Hospital, quarters	231,000
89. Madigan General Hospital, quarters	281,670
90. Fort Myers, Va., refrigeration	108,000
91. Clark Stotsenberg, barracks	669,300
92. Chanute Field, quarters	1,035,700
93. Fort Armstrong, Hawaii, telephone exchange	55,000
94. Helemano, Hawaii, quarters	423,535
95. Waipio, Hawaii, quarters	191,410
96. Fort De Russey, Hawaii, quarters	477,400
97. Scott Field, Ill., quarters	1,035,700
98. Andrews Field, quarters	2,384,410
99. Hamilton Field, quarters	44,940
100. Harmon Field, Newfoundland, additional construction	13,812,700
101. Huntsville Arsenal, Ala., fence	20,600
Total, Group III	51,334,674

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement showing the various funds covered by this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Regular and supplemental budget estimates for 1949	$7,278,842,000
House bill	6,509,939,000
Senate bill	6,915,676,052
Conference bill	6,767,668,163
Conference bill under budget	573,423,837
Conference bill over House bill	257,729,163
Conference bill under Senate bill	148,007,889

NOTE.—Totals include $62,250,000 special accounts.

Contract authorizations carried in the bill:

Clothing and equipage	$25,000,000
Signal Corps	50,000,000
Military construction, Army	75,000,000
Ordnance Service	70,000,000
Total	220,000,000

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 36, line 16, after "1948", insert the following: ", and in addition to this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, prior to July 1, 1949, enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $75,000,000: *Provided*."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: Mr. ENGEL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$70,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 1:15 p. m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 1:15 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PHILBIN, and Mr. WOODRUFF asked and were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent now, with the Congress set to adjourn this week, that no Federal-aid-to-education bill will pass the Congress at this session. This is a deep disappointment, not only to the teachers and trustees of our public-school system in the United States, and others interested, but it is also disappointing to many of us here who would like to see an appropriate law enacted providing for Federal aid to our public schools.

As one who taught in the public schools of my native State of Mississippi, and who realizes the necessity for such legislation, I became interested in this subject shortly after I came to Congress. In fact, the late and lamented Senator Pat Harrison from my State, and I, several years ago, cosponsored a bill for this purpose. Unfortunately our efforts at that time were of no avail. Since that time others have sponsored similar legislation. This year it appeared that we were within sight of the goal when a leading Republican, Senator TAFT, of Ohio, introduced and succeeded in passing Senate 472 in the other body, which, of course, like this one, is dominated by the Republican Party.

However, for some unknown reason, the Republican leadership in this body has seen fit to shelve this legislation, notwithstanding the fact that extensive hearings were conducted in the House Labor and Education Committee, and notwithstanding the further fact that I am informed that a majority of the members of that House committee were favorable to such legislation.

I have not only been in close touch and have worked with the representatives of the cause of education in my own State, but have also been in contact with and have cooperated with the officers of the National Education Association of the United States, who have sponsored this worth-while legislation. When it became evident that the majority leadership was stymieing the legislation in committee I was among the first to sign the petition on the Clerk's desk to discharge that committee from further consideration of the bill and to automatically bring it to the floor for a vote, but again the House leadership was successful in preventing the required number of signatures of the Members to get the bill to the floor for a vote.

In this connection, I am appreciative of the following communications from those with whom I have labored in this cause:

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1948.

Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLMER: A large share of the credit should be yours for the progress that has been made toward the enactment of Federal aid to education.

We wish to take this opportunity to express appreciation for your support of this legislation not only in the Eightieth Congress but over a number of preceding years.

Your counsel and assistance will be anticipated and valued as further steps are made in behalf of the Federal-aid program as a means of equalizing basic educational opportunity without impairing State control of educational policy.

Sincerely yours,
R. B. MARSTON,
Director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division.

MERIDIAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
Meridian, Miss., June 15, 1948.

Congressman WILLIAM M. COLMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLMER: Now may I take occasion to express personal appreciation on the part of myself and all teachers, school officials, and patrons who are interested in the proper development of public education facilities in our State and Nation for the help you have been and will continue to be in securing the passage of this legislation and securing it without Federal control. You and I join our fellow Mississippians in opposing Federal dictatorship as to how we shall operate our public schools, but we recognize that our economic status requires that we have national assistance in solving our elementary and secondary school problems, more particularly, in view of the fact that we send so many of our white and Negro youths annually to live in other States in which they become either assets or liabilities.

Looking forward to seeing you some time soon and with kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very truly,
H. M. IVY, *Superintendent.*

It seems strange, indeed, that the Federal Government can and does grant Federal aid to the farms, to roads, to hospitals, and many other activities in the interest of and for the welfare of the people of the several States of the Union, but cannot and does not grant Federal aid to one of the most important activities aimed at the common good of the country, the education of our children.

I realize that there are those from my own section who oppose Federal aid to education for one reason or another. One of the arguments made is that it would eventually mean the break-down of the segregation customs in our public schools of the South.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this Congress or in the South, for that matter, who has been more active against the efforts of the politicians, the northern "do-gooders," and the President to enact the so-called civil-rights program into law, and generally break down our southern traditions with reference to segregation, and so forth, than have I. My selection as chairman of the group of 78 southern Members of Congress organized to fight this program is evidence of this.

But there is nothing in this proposed legislation that would tend to do that. On the contrary, the bill which passed the Senate and which was tentatively approved by the House committee specifically provides that the Federal Government shall have no control whatever over the administration of our public schools; that the administration and control, on the contrary, shall be left entirely within the State and its institutions. Of course, I would not support any legislation which either authorized or appropriated Federal funds in aid to our public school system that carried with it any Federal control whatsoever.

On the other hand, due to the fact that the Southern States are not as wealthy as States in other sections of our common country, they are forced to tax their people on a higher ratio for educational purposes than their more wealthy sister States. And even with this, they are unable to raise anything like a comparative per capita revenue for the education of their children. For instance, up until this year my State of Mississippi taxed its people for this purpose at a higher rate than any other State in the Union, and yet it was at the bottom of the list of States in the amount of revenue expended per child. Therefore, it is obvious that the Southern States, and particularly Mississippi, have more to gain from this legislation than the States in other sections.

The bill, if authorized into law, providing as it does three hundred million dollars a year for this purpose, would not only bring up the standard of opportunities for Mississippi children, and enable our school authorities to pay better salaries to our teachers and those who transport our children to and from school, but would also lighten the burden of taxation on our overburdened taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much in hopes that when this Congress reconvenes, either after the November elections or at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress in January, that this most desirable and necessary legislation will be enacted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and received permission to insert in the RECORD a speech by Maj. W. Calvin Wells, before the Mississippi State Bar Association, at the University of Mississippi. This speech, as I stated yesterday, exceeds the amount allowed under the rule and will require 4½ pages and cost $301.75.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert the speech in the Appendix, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Florida, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. ARNOLD asked and were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts, letters, and documents.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess for 20 minutes.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN IMPORTED ARTICLES

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House Joint Resolution 433, permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That any articles, including approximately 48 railroad cars and incidental equipment, certified by the Secretary of State as being donated in promotion of international good will by the people or Government of the Republic of France for sale for charitable purposes in the United States or for presentation, in the case of the railroad equipment, to noncommercial organizations in the United States may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption free of customs duties, fees, or charges, internal-revenue taxes, and marking or other import requirements or restrictions.

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of its enactment and prior to the close of December 31, 1948.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Joint Resolution 433, was introduced for the purpose of permitting the free entry of certain articles imported into the United States from foreign countries in the promotion of international good will.

The people of France now are planning to send, next October, a train of 48 freight cars (40 hommes—8 chevaux) to the 48 States of the United States, as a gesture of gratitude for the American Freedom Train.

These 48 cars will be filled with French merchandise, such as handbags, women's wear, hats, furniture, perfume, and other typical French productions. The plan is to deliver one car to the capital of each of the 48 States, and let local State committees auction off the merchandise, the money to be used for the benefit of a charity in that State. The freight cars will remain in the United States as a token gift to the American Legion or Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Existing law requires the payment of duty on goods under these circumstances, and for that reason I believe that this legislation should pass so as to encourage this gesture of international good will.

REFUND OF TAXES PAID ON BEER LOST THROUGH BOTTLING OPERATIONS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6808) to permit refund of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 5. That section 3404 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to manufacturers' excise taxes on musical instruments) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Musical instruments, but the tax imposed by this section shall not apply to musical instruments sold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes. The right to exemption under this subsection shall be evidenced in such manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may prescribe by regulations.'

"SEC. 6. Section 3443 (a) (3) (A) (i) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits and refunds) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(i) resold for the exclusive use of any State, Territory of the United States, or any political subdivision of the foregoing, or of the District of Columbia, or in the case of musical instruments embraced in section 3404 (d), resold for the use of any religious or nonprofit educational institution for exclusively religious or educational purposes;'.

"SEC. 7. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be applicable with respect to sales made after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemar from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6116) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "July 31" and insert "April 30."

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "August 9, 1948" and insert "April 30, 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEARNS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 6712, the tax bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the tax bill.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, insist upon the amendments of the House, agree to the conference asked by the Senate and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, SMITH of Ohio, KUNKEL, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. REES submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "$12,000"; and the House agree to the same.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM LANGER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill amends the provisions of law relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the Borough of Brooklyn, so as to

provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.969 miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile nor be less than $10,500 per mile.

The amendment of the House provided that the maximum rate should not exceed $11,000 per mile, and eliminated the minimum payment figure contained in the Senate bill.

The conference agreement restores the $12,000 per mile maximum rate as provided by the Senate bill, and eliminates the $10,500 per mile minimum in accordance with the House amendment.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES & PHELPS CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2705) to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the James & Phelps Construction Co., of Oklahoma City, Okla., in full settlement of all claims under contracts numbered 12r 15920 and 12r 15994, providing for the construction of earthworks and structures, laterals and Altus City pipe line, city laterals and sublaterals, on the W. C. Austin project of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in Oklahoma, such sum, not in excess of $193,617.58, as the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative may find is required to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co. for losses, exclusive of profit, incurred by the company as a result of the failure of the United States to furnish steel reinforcement bars as required under specifications numbered 1180 and 1182: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $25,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABEL CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1734) for the relief of Gabel Construction Co., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss and damages, if any, sustained by Louis E. Gabel, an individual, trading as Gabel Construction Co., of Orlando, Fla., under contract No. NOY-9336 of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Department of the Navy arising out of or attributable to the alleged delay in supplying materials as provided for in said contracts: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction conferred by this section shall be confined to questions of fact.

"SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to Louis E. Gabel, trading as Gabel Construction Co."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DORIS E. SNYDER

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Doris E. Snyder.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doris E. Snyder, of Dayton, Ohio, the sum of $4,737. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Doris E. Snyder against the United States for compensation for the loss of personal property owned by her which was destroyed and lost in the burning and sinking of the Argentine ship, steamship *Rio de la Plata*, on August 17, 1944, aboard which she was accompanying her husband, Capt. Wesley E. Snyder, under War Department orders: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCHIE HAMILTON AND DELBERT HAMILTON

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1715) for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,672 to Archie Hamilton and the sum of $1,696.35 to Delbert Hamilton, of Owensboro, Ky., in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle near Owensboro, Ky., on November 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM R. STIGALL, DECEASED

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1717) for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the death of said William R. Stigall (Army serial number 15041820), sustained on September 5, 1941, between Little Rock and Benton, Ark., as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES DUNCAN MONTIETH

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2440) for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness of Charles Duncan Montieth, of McLean, Va., in the amount of $165.14, arising out of the transportation of his household effects from McLean, Va., to Chicago, Ill., upon transfer of his official station, while employed by the Department of the Interior, extension of authorization for such transportation not having been approved within the 6-month period prescribed by regulations of the President of the United States issued under authority of the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105). The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Charles Duncan Montieth, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amount heretofore credited to such indebtedness or refunded or paid to the United States on account of such indebtedness. In the audit and settlement of the account of any accountable officer of the United States, the payment of the amount for such transportation expenses shall be considered to have been duly and timely authorized.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSE MARY AMMIRATO

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6707) to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the laws requiring retirement of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers because of age shall not apply to officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59). The President, may, in his discretion, upon the request of the officer concerned, restore to the active list of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force any officer of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force on the retired list who was appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59).

"Officers appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), shall not be counted within the limited number of officers authorized to be serving on active duty in grades above lieutenant general as provided in section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) unless they be serving as Chief of Staff or in command of any territorial or tactical subdivision of the Army or the Air Force.

"SEC. 2. In addition to the number of officers authorized to serve after July 1, 1948, on the active list in the grade of General in the Army and Admiral in the Navy pursuant to sections 504 and 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, officers now on the active list of the Army in the grade of general whose dates of rank in such grade are between March 8, 1945, and April 15, 1945, inclusive, and of the Navy in the grade of admiral whose dates of rank in such grade are prior to April 4, 1945, may, at the discretion of the President, be continued in such grades until July 1, 1950, unless sooner retired and the total number of officers authorized by these sections to have the grade, rank, title, pay, and allowances of vice admiral or admiral and lieutenant general or general, is temporarily increased accordingly: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section in no way affect the status of the officer who may be serving as Chief of Staff in the Army on the effective date of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE B. SOTO

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 350.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of the action of the Department of State with respect to the claim of George B. Soto, a native-born American citizen, against the Government of Guatemala, amounting to approximately $3,000,000, which has been pending in the Department of State since 1939; to ascertain why the agreement made by Guatemala with the Department of State to arbitrate this claim in 1932 was not carried out by the Department of State; to ascertain why, when the claim was approved as valid and meritorious by the Legal Department and the Counselor of the Department of State in 1938 and 1940, and dispatches sent to Guatemala demanding settlement of the claim in June 1941, such claim should by October 1941 become not valid and not meritorious and be dropped by the Department of State after Guatemala had made two offers of cash payments of the claim, thereby admitting liability under the claim; to ascertain whether or not the dropping of the Soto claim by the Department of State was the quid pro quo for securing the cooperation of Guatemala in the freezing order issued by the late President Roosevelt in July 1941, and before Guatemala was at war with Germany and Japan; to ascertain the liability of the United States Government for the payment of this claim when the claim has been used by the Government for its own purposes and, if so, to provide for payment of the claim out of Department of State appropriations, if, by the failure of the Department of State to act, the liability has been fixed by the Department of State on the United States Government; to ascertain and determine whether the legal rights of an American citizen under the Pecuniary Claims Convention of Buenos Aires of 1910 to arbitration of the claim can be denied by the Department of State under color of a bureaucratic practice and procedure established by the Department of State for which there is no statutory authority.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) within 120 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, dispatches, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for your action a resolution introduced by me on July 25, 1947, calling for an investigation of the handling of a claim of a native-born American citizen against the Government of Guatemala, which has been in the hands of the State Department for 19 years without conclusive action.

Our Nation has a treaty with the Government of Guatemala which is known as the Convention of 1910 for the Arbitration of Pecuniary Claims, the first article of which treaty provides as follows:

The high contracting parties agreed to submit to arbitration all claims for pecuniary loss or damage which may be presented by their respective citizens and which cannot be amicably adjusted through diplomatic channels, when said claims are of sufficient importance to warrant the expense of arbitration.

The claim of Mr. Soto for loss, damage, and interest is approximately $3,000,000 and is, therefore, such a claim as would be considered of sufficient importance to warrant the expense of arbitration. I wish you also to note that the provisions of the article read and of the remaining articles of the treaty do not provide for any action on the part of the State Department except that of arranging for the arbitration of claims. As you know, the claims of American citizens against foreign governments must be made through the intermediary of the State

Department. The provisions of the article cited do not require or suggest that the intermediary, the State Department, has any other function than that of demanding arbitration for the American claimant. The treaty does not provide, nor is there any law which authorizes the Department of State to prejudge, the claim of an American citizen who seeks justice and relief under the treaty cited. There is no law or provision of the treaty which requires the State Department to support the claim of an American citizen, the treaty only granting to the claimant the right to arbitration. Any points of difference which may arise between the parties as to facts are within the sole jurisdiction of the arbitrator who may be selected to determine the validity and merits of the claim.

The foregoing are the facts with reference to international arbitration of claims of American citizens under treaties entered into between our Nation and other governments.

It is indeed unfortunate that our State Department considers itself free from the obligations of our international treaties, disregards them as though they were not the supreme law of the land, arrogate to themselves the powers of judge and jury and deny American citizens of their rights under the law. It is because of this wanton disregard of our national obligation under our treaty with Guatemala that the resolution was submitted to this house, was sent to the Rules Committee, which has approved the resolution for an investigation of the handling of this claim by the State Department, and which I now present to you in order that the investigation may be carried forward by the Judiciary Committee.

The State Department is more interested in relief for the peoples of other nations than it is to secure the rights of American citizens under our laws and treaties. It is apparent from this particular case that we cannot depend upon our State Department to respect our international treaties and to preserve for our citizens the rights to which they are entitled under those treaties.

In my statement before the House at the time I introduced H. R. 350, I stated that the handling of this claim by the State Department had been submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate which had declared that this American citizen was entitled to arbitration of his claim under the treaty. I further stated that this particular claim had been called to the attention of the State Department by Senators WILEY, BUTLER, JENNER, and myself, but the Department refuses to act.

The purpose of this resolution is to require a thoroughgoing investigation of this claim not only in fairness to this American citizen, by the name of Soto, but because of the possibility, if this matter has been grossly mishandled, of similar action having been taken in other instances involving our own citizens. I earnestly request that whichever committee of the House of Representatives receives my resolution, will follow the matter to its conclusion. I am personally confident that an investigation is warranted.

My only interest is in obtaining redress for an American citizen who from all available facts is certainly entitled thereto. I further submit that it is the duty of Congress to extend its power for the protection of the rights of our citizens, and if it appears—as it definitely does—that the Legal Department of the State Department is so engrossed in other matters that it not only neglects but refuses to maintain and protect the rights of our own citizens, at a time when we are being called upon to assist the plight of foreign nationals, then, I say, Mr. Speaker, that something effective must be done.

The sole relief which the claimant—Soto—desires, is that the rights granted under the treaty cited, be made available to him by the State Department and that he may have his claim arbitrated under the provisions of that treaty. In other words, that the State Department be compelled to obey the law as set out in this treaty.

Truly, gentlemen, we have reached a sorry state when it becomes necessary for an American citizen to appeal to this body to investigate the State Department and to exert its power to enforce respect of our treaties and to insist that the State Deparment abide by and carry out the supreme laws of our land.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the Eightieth Congress adjourns sine die it will mark the end, for a time at least, of the services of a great American, a true Congressman and a fine statesman. I refer to my beloved colleague from Iowa, the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE. JOHN GWYNNE has served his country in the House long, faithfully, and ably, he has become known for his fearless and courageous stand for all things American. The country, the Congress, and his own State of Iowa will suffer from the loss of his influence and leadership. However, wherever he may be and in whatever he may do he will always serve his native State and country loyally and well. He is that kind of a citizen. I am sure I speak for the entire membership, and especially the Iowa delegation in Congress when I say "We all regret he will not be a Member of the Eighty-first Congress." Best wishes and good luck to the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

THE LATE JAMES I. FARLEY

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sorrow that I report the death of a former Member of Congress from Indiana, James I. Farley, of Auburn, on Wednesday, June 16, at Philadelphia, Pa. Mr. Farley died after a heart attack while visiting the home of a daughter. He was 76 years old.

Mr. Farley, a Democrat, preceded me as Representative in Congress from the Fourth Indiana District. He was elected to the House in 1932 and served three terms. He was an authority on finance and was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Surviving are the widow, Lotta; three sons, Frank and Thain, of Auburn, Ind., and Paul, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; two daughters, Mrs. J. D. Spurrier, of Philadelphia, and Mrs. Robert Shaw, of Scarsdale, N. Y.

Born near Hamilton, Ind., Mr. Farley spent his entire life in the Hoosier State and for the past 34 years had been a resident of Auburn, Ind., where he maintained a farm. Before coming to Congress he served as president of the Auburn Auto Corp. He was a thirty-second degree Mason.

Mr. Farley's passing is noted with sorrow by Members of the Indiana delegation in Congress and by former colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, who served with him during the eventful years from 1932 to 1938.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 129, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to make a study and investigation of the islands and other areas of the Pacific subject to the authority of the United States the following Members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LEMKE, Mr. FERNANDEZ.

And the following Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives: Mr. FULTON, Mr. JACKSON of California, Mr. PFEIFER.

NEW MEXICO MILITARY INSTITUTE

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2698) to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, upon the request of the institution, to transfer without reimbursement, to the New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, N. Mex., a tax-supported State institution, to Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., to Norwich University, Norwich, Vt., and to Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., all horses, except those used in the Remount breeding program, together with their records and equipment, property of the United States Army, located at and utilized by each of the said institutions for military training purposes: *Provided*, That the receiving institution in each case agrees to arrange for the proper pension and old-age care of the donated horses.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.

THE HONORABLE PETE JARMAN

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a resolution of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, a resolution of esteem and good wishes extended to the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. PETE JARMAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The resolution referred to follows:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington.

RESOLUTION OF ESTEEM AND GOOD WISHES EXTENDED TO HON. PETE JARMAN

Whereas the Honorable PETE JARMAN has served as Representative in Congress of the Sixth District of Alabama from the Seventy-sixth through the Eightieth Congress, and has demonstrated a constant devotion to the public good; and

Whereas his diligence and wisdom have been of particular value on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which he has been a member throughout his career in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas his retirement from the House of Representatives brings a sense of loss to those who appreciate the value of his faithful collaboration in the development of United States foreign policy in a fateful period of the history of this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, That an expression of esteem and good wishes be extended to the Honorable PETE JARMAN in the name of all his colleagues on the committee.

Charles A. Eaton, chairman; Robert B. Chiperfield; Sol Bloom; John M. Vorys; Karl Mundt; John Kee; Bartel J. Jonkman; J. P. Richards; Frances P. Bolton; Joseph L. Pfeifer; Lawrence H. Smith; Chester E. Merrow; Wirt Courtney; Walter H. Judd; Thomas S. Gordon; James G. Fulton; Helen Gahagan Douglas; J. K. Javits; Mike Mansfield; Thomas E. Morgan; John Davis Lodge; Wm. M. Colmer; Donald L. Jackson; Franklin J. Maloney; Boyd Crawford, administrative officer.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Burke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2877) entitled "An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended," with an amendment, as follows: Strike out "$35,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000,000."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2242) entitled "An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6771) entitled "An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 20 and 30 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) entitled "An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes."

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 691, authorizing the appointment of a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized, empowered, and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection and appointment of personnel, and in the conduct of its functions and activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest; including (but not limiting the foregoing authority) a study and investigation of the Commission's licensing and license renewal activities; the Commission's power and authority, if any, to promulgate and issue its so-called "Blue Book", and the extent to which, if any, the same has been, or is being, used as the basis or excuse for regulation by the Commission, directly or indirectly, of radio-program content at licensed radio stations; whether the Commission has licensed, or proposes to license, any radio station or stations owned or controlled by persons who are members of, or affiliated with, subversive or Communist-front organizations or who might permit the facilities of such radio stations to be used contrary to the public interest; and whether there has been, or is, any concerted movement or effort to procure the concentration of radio station licenses, including frequency modulation, amplitude modulation, and television, in the hands of a limited class of persons or concerns rather than a distribution of such licenses on a geographical and equitable basis, as provided by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at the earliest practicable date, but during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, records, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution speaks for itself. It proposes a five-member select committee of the House to make a study and investigation of the Federal Communications Commission. I doubt if there is a Member of the House who is not aware of the widespread apprehension that exists throughout the Nation of the activities of this agency of our Government.

I make no charges against this agency because I have no personal knowledge of the facts; however, if this agency is operating in the public interest and according to law, it should be as eager as any one to have this investigation made. My conception of such an investigation would be to examine the charges carefully, make a searching investigation of the agency and report to this Congress and let the chips fall where they may. If there is no foundation for the charges, then the Congress should be informed and the agency should be cleared and exonerated.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will be adopted.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Under the Reorganization Act the committees of Congress are given general powers to investigate. It is my understanding that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—and I am very fond of that committee, because I happened to be a member of it for 24 years and chairman of it for 6 years—has made some investigation. They tell me that they went as far as they could under the general powers of investigation, and in that committee

they voted out a resolution for further investigation, which resolution has been lying in the Committee on Rules for several months. I am wondering why that resolution has not been acted upon by the Committee on Rules. I am wondering why the Committee on Rules did not report that resolution and give a committee that knows about this matter, a committee that brought into existence the Federal Communications Commission under my chairmanship, or a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the power to go into these things.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is the first knowledge that I had that there was such a resolution pending.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am informed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] that such a resolution has been lying in the Committee on Rules for some weeks, if not months.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman understands that unless this resolution is adopted the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would not have the authority, after the adjournment of the Congress, to make such an investigation.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, that is, of course, what I am talking about. The committee did ask for that authority. I understand that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] was the author of the resolution. But it has been lying in the Committee on Rules for quite some time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I ask for this time for the purpose of stating that the resolution to which the distinguished minority leader refers is House Resolution 165, which I introduced at the request of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 31, 1947.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us was introduced day before yesterday, in the afternoon, I think around 2 or 2:30. At 3 o'clock a meeting of the Committee on Rules was called. The committee acted upon the resolution even before it was printed. It was reported without any hearings and in the few moments that the committee was in session, there was no testimony with the exception of a statement that was made by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. I observed that other members of the committee were not familiar with the resolution.

Now, this action to authorize an investigation is not a new matter. The Commission has been investigated by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and a select committee before, and I have the reports before me. It was in 1943 or 1944 that a resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and a special committee was appointed, and the gentleman from Georgia was made the chairman of this special committee.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Georgia will tell this House the story if the gentleman from Illinois so desires. Never in the history of this Congress was so outrageous a campaign initiated and prosecuted against a Member of this House as was that carried on against myself, in the effort to prevent the exposure of a record that would be shocking even to the gentleman that has the floor if he knew it.

Mr. SABATH. It was because of the strong personal plea of the gentleman from Georgia made at that time that the resolution was adopted and the investigation was ordered, but later the gentleman from Georgia resigned from the select committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was appointed in his place, and the final report which I now have before me does not bear out the statement of the gentleman from Georgia. It does not indicate that there was any interference in the investigation. I want to be fair with the gentleman from Georgia, being a member of the Committee on Rules, which I had the honor to serve as chairman, and he as a member for many years, but I also want to be fair with Mr. LEA, who succeeded him as chairman of the select investigating committee, and only because of the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, and in fair play, I quote in part from the report of the select committee dated January 2, 1945, as follows:

> The hearings have also emphasized the personalities involved in the matters investigated, both those connected with the Commission and those in private life who had some relation to the matters investigated. This investigation has been contemporaneous with innumerable bitter conflicts largely based on personal interests and animosities which have tended to obscure the constructive properly which were the matters of most concern to legitimate investigation. These animosities provoked exaggerated statements. Suspicions and rumors were distorted into reckless charges. This led to distortion of facts and the difficulties in the consideration and proper appraisement of the real merits of the controversies involved. Partisans of each side were parties to these bitter and vindictive activities which contributed more of confusion than enlightenment to the proceedings of the investigation.
>
> This bitterness had more of its impulse in personalities than in concern for the public good. It would be a perversion of this investigation to give undue emphasis to the personal equations involved, many of which should be charged off to personal idiosyncrasies and impetuous temperaments. The memories of these should best be charged off and placed in the discard.
>
> The committee hopes and believes, by patient and friendly cooperation and consideration, a substantial number of the difficulties that now exist can be eliminated or greatly minimized.

Mr. COX. Yes. The investigation continued under the domination and under the control of a power that the committee simply could not resist, and after every record bearing upon the whole question had been impounded at the White House and the committee denied the right to summons it.

Mr. SABATH. Personally, I am not going to contradict the gentleman from Georgia. I know he was demanding the investigation and made certain charges, and it was on those charges that the investigation was held. I was not a member of that committee and I can only go on the record. As I stated, the select committee carried on the investigation for upward of 2 years and indicated in its final report that many of the allegations, charges, and countercharges were not borne out by facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the resolution before us, I was surprised, as I have stated, with respect to the unusual introduction of the resolution, the hurried hearings, and reporting of the resolution by the Committee on Rules, especially in view of the fact that House Resolution 165 covering the same proposed investigation was introduced last year and has been pending before the committee ever since. The resolution, instead of proposing the appointment of a special select committee, gave the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the authority to make the investigation. Therefore, I cannot grasp why in the closing hours of this session this new resolution should have been reported in such extraordinary haste and rushed to the floor for consideration. I have my suspicion. My position in the meeting of the Committee on Rules was to withhold hasty action and to obtain more facts and information before passing on the resolution. It was not my desire or intent to defend anyone who might be guilty of any unfair or illegal act, but to avoid the smearing of any of the members of the Federal Communications Commission against whom charges had been made. I felt that in all justice and in the spirit of fair play they should be accorded the opportunity to explain or refute the charges that were made, but, unfortunately, that privilege was denied me and the resolution was reported out. From the brief statement that was made in the hearing before the Committee on Rules, the country would be made to believe that the membership of the Commission was composed of Reds or with men affiliated with communistic fronts.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know the members of the Commission? They are not all Reds, of course.

Mr. SABATH. I did not know any one of them. I do not know any of the employees. I do not have a single appointee in the Commission and I do not think I have been in the offices of the Commission for 10 years. I have never requested anything of the Commission and, naturally, I was not denied anything. I am disinterested in the affairs of the Commission, but, believing in fair play, believe that when men are once in the service of the Government they should not be unfairly and unjustly assailed, attacked, or investigated. Even if they are not guilty of anything an investigation in itself is a reflection on their character and good reputation. In my desire to have first-hand information, I questioned three of the members of the Commission and learned that most of them have served with the Commission for many years, with the exception

of the Chairman, Mr. Wayne Coy, and a former Republican Member of the House from Ohio, Bob Jones, who was appointed a member last year, who was charged at one time with being a member of the Black Legion, which is surely not a communistic-front organization. The remaining five members have advanced from the ranks of the Commission and have been promoted to commissionership. The Commission consists of seven members, three of whom are Republicans, three Democrats, including the chairman, and one an independent.

Mr. Speaker, mention has been made of the fact that the Commission granted several licenses to a gentleman, a Mr. Lamb, whom I do not know and to my knowledge never have met. It was charged that he has leanings to the left and it was charged that two of the stations he has operated for the past several years have carried broadcasts allegedly communistic in character or that might be deemed in advocacy of communistic-front organizations. I wish to state that if I thought for one moment that the Commission had issued these licenses to Mr. Lamb's organization without warrant or justification and without any investigation, they ought to be investigated and I would be keenly interested to know about it. The fact is that while the applications were approved a few weeks ago, one of them was filed as far back as 5 years ago. It is also a matter of record that no complaints have been filed against Mr. Lamb's two operating stations by the citizens in the cities in which the two stations are located. The issuance of the four permits was not unusual because the Commission has been investigating whether the activities and the character of the broadcasts of the two operating stations entitled his organizations to these additional permits. The record shows that the Commission, as well as the FBI, had made a thorough investigation and that the four licenses were granted conditionally. Two of the stations, I am informed, he is not in position to finance. He does not own them personally; they are held by different corporations, but he has the controlling management.

Mr. Lamb, I understand, is the same gentleman who filed the first portal-to-portal suit against a certain corporation. I wonder if that fact is not the underlying reason for the attack being made against him. Personally, I feel there is no evidence that either of his operating stations has been or will be used by left-wingers or communistic-front organizations because it is a known fact that he has been supporting Republican candidates for Congress in radio broadcasts in Ohio, and, if I am not mistaken, in broadcasts in one of his stations in Pennsylvania. Furthermore, he has advocated the loan of money to Spain and has advocated friendship with Spain. Surely he cannot be a left-winger if he has been advocating the loan to Spain and supporting Fascist Franco. Surely no one can charge that Franco is pink. If anything, from the evidence that I have been able to obtain, he is very much to the right and more conservative than many of the gentlemen who actually advocate legislation that we on the progressive side oppose.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the House unnecessarily. I think the resolution has no place here. As to the question as to whether the employees in the Commission are disloyal, I am told that the 1,300 men who are employed have been investigated by the FBI.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman referred to himself and others as progressives. Is the gentleman referring to the Progressive Party headed by Mr. Wallace?

Mr. SABATH. Again, I will say that that is not the issue at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand, but I just wanted some information.

Mr. SABATH. I am not here to pass upon whether Mr. Wallace is a progressive or whether Mr. TAFT is a pink because he introduced the housing bill that has been described as socialistic. I am not going into that. I do not want to hurt Mr. TAFT, and I do not want to boost Mr. Dewey or any of the other Republican candidates, because, as I have said before, if, unfortunately, we must have a Republican President, I would rather have JOE MARTIN than anybody else that I know of.

I hope the Speaker will not hold me out of order or hold me in contempt for what I have said.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. For fear the Speaker was engaged in something else and did not hear what the gentleman from Illinois said, I will repeat his remarks as well as I remember them, that if this country for the next 4 years must be afflicted with a Republican President, then the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] thinks it would be better for the country to have the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in that seat.

Mr. SABATH. That is about what I had intended to say. However, I think I said if the country should be so unfortunate as to have a Republican President.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Coming from Illinois, will the gentleman now proceed in the regular order and nominate the Vice President?

Mr. SABATH. I am being placed in a very embarrassing position. I did not want to make a political speech. You know I always try to keep away from politics. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] places me in this unfortunate position, that in Illinois we have an outstanding Democratic Senator, SCOTT LUCAS, and I recollect that I succeeded in obtaining his endorsement for Vice President by the Illinois State delegation in 1944. I presume he may be willing to listen to the demands of the people of Illinois and consent to be a candidate, and I believe he would not only make a strong candidate for the Vice Presidency but even for the Presidency.

However, we have in this House a gentleman from Massachusetts, the former majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], a friend of mine and whose friendship I value highly, whom a vast majority of the membership of this House and the people of his State urge as a candidate for Vice President. With his splendid record, ability, and popularity, he would add strength to any Presidential candidate that the Democrats may select, and whom I am confident the Democrats will elect in the ensuing election. Now, I am torn between love and duty. But if the lightning strikes, notwithstanding my high regard for the Senator from Illinois, I think that New England, perhaps, might be in better geographical position to succeed in obtaining the nomination for the Vice Presidency than a candidate from my State or any of the Middlewestern States. I am giving you my candid opinion for what it is worth and, as usual, I am trying to be frank.

Now, to the resolution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. On the resolution?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No. The gentleman did not quite make himself clear. I think he meant to say that the country could do no better in selecting a Vice Presidential candidate and electing one than to reach out to the City of Boston and select our beloved whip, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. Is that what the gentleman meant to say?

Mr. SABATH. That is what I intended to say. Again I am thankful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for making clear my thoughts and expressions. It is difficult for me at times at the end of a long-day's session to express myself as clearly as I would like to, but Members who have served with me know that I mean well even though I do not say it well on such occasions.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it the gentleman's intention to yield some time to some of his colleagues on the committee?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes; I always do so, even when they disagree with me, but I have not had any requests for time from Members to speak on the resolution.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has about 10 minutes left.

Mr. SABATH. Now, having stated my position, I feel that this resolution is not entitled to favorable consideration, because under the Reorganization Act which was passed last year, we have given power and jurisdiction to the legislative committees to investigate matters coming within their jurisdiction and in view of the fact that the chairman and several members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were on the select committee that conducted the last investigation of the Federal Communications Commission, I feel that by every right and precedent, they are entitled to conduct this investigation, which they originally sought under House

Resolution 165, which as I have stated was introduced and referred to the Committee on Rules last year and which has remained buried in the committee during all these months. Consequently, I wondered and have sought the underlying reason for this hastily introduced and hastily reported resolution now before us. I surmise what is behind it but I am constrained to express my suspicions. However, in view of the statement and interruption of my colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox] I strongly feel that he may have been behind the influence in urging this action. I also wonder why the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held a meeting this morning and by a nearly unanimous vote agreed to oppose this resolution and now have been obliged to reverse its position and to support the resolution. Again, I refrain to express my views because it has been my policy that if I could not do a person some good, I would not harm him.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission has doubled the number of stations since the war. It has had a work load not exceeded by any department or agency of the Government and it has done a good job. Its employees have been conscientious, faithful, and the investigations thus far conducted by the FBI have not disclosed disloyalty on the part of any one of them, and I am confident that when the investigations have been completed the record of personnel loyalty of the Commission will rank with the top governmental agencies.

I could have proceeded further, had I not yielded to the Member, and have given additional information and facts. As some Members have indicated that they desire to speak to the resolution, I shall conclude my remarks and yield them the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is before the House deals with a matter which comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Under the Reorganization Act the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is given legislative jurisdiction over matters relating to the Federal Communications Commission. The Reorganization Act lodges with each of the regular committees of Congress the responsibility of examining into the administration of the agencies of Government within their respective jurisdictions. In other words to constantly examine whether such agencies of Government were properly fulfilling their duties within the authority set forth in the statutes that created such agencies. In order that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might deal intelligently with the several agencies of the Government which come within its jurisdiction, immediately after the convening of this Congress in January of 1947, we called before our committee representatives of all of the different agencies of Government over which our committee had jurisdiction. You know how great a list that is. Practically all of the regulatory bodies within our Government come under the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The committee took approximately 6 weeks of time in examining the several commissioners, their top employees, and such others as were necessary to the end that our committee members, some of whom were new to the work of the committee, might be fully aware of the extent of its jurisdiction, that the committee might have knowledge of the manner in which the authority of these several commissions was being carried out, their procedures, and so forth. In addition to that, we brought to the attention of these commissions the complaints that had come to the attention of the committee in one way or another and they were discussed with the Commissioners. I think all of the members of the committee will agree with me when I say it was one of the most constructive things that any committee of this House has ever done. I am of the opinion, and I believe the Members of this House are, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been faithful to the duties entrusted to it. I know of no committee of Congress that has worked harder, that has spent more time in the holding of hearings on matters that related to the welfare of this Nation than has the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commrce. Today I am filing with this House a report of the wide scope of inquiries that have been made and hearings held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I hope the Membership of the House will have time to read that report. I am sure they will be astounded at the scope that has been covered by this committee and I am certain that you will feel as proud of its efforts as the committee itself.

At this point may I express a tribute of appreciation and praise to the members of that committee. When I speak of the members of the committee I draw no distinction as to whether they be majority or minority members. In each instance they have been loyal, they have been able, they have been constructive in their efforts and it has been the unanimous action of the committee that brought to the attention of this House the many important matters that the committee has had to consider during the work of this session of Congress.

Mr. SABATH. This resolution does not authorize the gentleman's committee to make the investigation, does it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, that brings me to the point that notwithstanding the wide scope that our inquiries have taken in matters within the jurisdiction of the committee and that includes the Federal Communications Commission, there are limitations to the authority of committees of the House in the Reorganization Act that, in my opinion, should not be there.

I do not think that the regular committees of this House should be restricted in their powers to investigate the matters that are within their jurisdiction. In that portion of the Reorganization Act that deals with Senate committees, by statute Senate committees have been given the right to carry on investigations of matters within the jurisdiction of the committees, with power of subpena, allocation of funds, and so forth. I think that similar authority should also have been given to the House committees, but it was not, and, therefore, it is necessary to ask for these special powers such as are provided for in the resolution which has been introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

On March 31, 1947, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at the direction of the committee after full consideration, I introduced House Resolution 165, that would have given the power and authority to the committee to go further than we had been able to do under the powers that had been granted to us under the Reorganization Act. I am convinced that a resolution for this purpose should be passed, because there is a line beyond which the committee cannot go in its investigations. Such a resolution would make any investigations more effectual.

I would have been pleased to have seen House Resolution 165 reported out long ago. However, the committee has been busy, and whatever work has to be done of a special character will have to be done during the recess. But if we are not to have House Resolution 165, which is general in character, and in accord with what I believe is expected of House committees, then, Mr. Speaker, we must accept this resolution which is presented today, because it does provide the authority which the regular committee does not have.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman feel that his committee should, if it can be given power, make this investigation?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am of the opinion that in the formation of a special committee—and maybe the wish is father of the thought—the Speaker will take into consideration the high caliber of the men on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and recognize that fact in connection with whomever he will appoint to this committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to hear the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey just before he closed. When I was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and any other committee of this House had tried to take jurisdiction away from that committee, they would have had a fight with me. Now, I was the author of the bill which brought into being the Federal Comunications Commission, the old Radio Commission, which was not doing much of anything.

We took telegraph and telephone from the Interstate Commerce Commission and put all communications together.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the gentleman understands that this resolution does not take any jurisdiction away from the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, they ask for extended authority. They do have authority to investigate and they have investigated this very thing, and all these other things, but they said they could not go as far under the general powers as they thought they should, and they asked the Committee on Rules more than a year ago, 15 months ago, to give them this additional power.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That resolution is not before the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know it is not.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And if this resolution is not adopted they will be without that power.

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, it is an easy matter for the gentleman to offer as a substitute for his resolution the resolution that was advocated by the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and this investigation to be made by somebody who knows something about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman could yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for the purpose of offering an amendment, and he could offer his substitute, and there would be no opposition.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The gentleman from Texas knows there is no one in this House for whom I have higher regard than the gentleman from Texas. It was my privilege to serve under him when he was chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I cannot find words that would adequately express the high regard I have had for him ever since he presided over that committee. I am grateful to the gentleman for having directed attention to the issue as to whether this resolution takes any jurisdiction away from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had intended to include in my remarks a reference to that subject. I am grateful to the gentleman that he has reminded me of it. I do not consider that this resolution will diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The jurisdiction of that committee was fixed by the Reorganization Act. Unfortunately it does not extend as far as this resolution does. It should in my opinion, but, as I say unfortunately it does not. However, I assure the gentleman from Texas that as long as I am chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that committee will exercise as fully as is within our power our jurisdiction in this matter or any other matter, regardless of whether or not any special resolutions such as this are passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; but the trouble about that is the gentleman does not have the authority under the general law. When I was chairman of that committee I went out and fought for that jurisdiction and I did not give it up. That is the reason I brought in about six major bills here in about 4 years.

I do not want to say something myself about this Commission. I am not in love with this Commission. I want you to understand that. I do not believe in persecuting anybody. I have had a good deal to do with this Commission. I have watched it. I think it is a better Commission now than it was several months or a year or two ago. I think then we had on that Commission some men, not a majority of them, who were cowards and weaklings. I do not know what kind of a chairman Wayne Coy is going to make. I think he is a very good and a very able man. But whatever he is, he is a better man and a better chairman than the man he succeeded was capable of being.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, what we face here today has a very important relationship to efficiency and effectiveness of the Congress. In the reorganization of Congress, after many, many months of study, and testimony by some of your leaders on your own Republican side, it was determined that special committees performing investigatory duties destroyed the jurisdiction, the authority, and the responsibility of the standing legislative committees of this House. As a result, 12 or 13 special committees, which, like Topsy, had "just growed," were lopped off in the reorganization.

Jurisdiction of the reorganized committees was clarified. Congress has been pretty good about holding the line against breaking down the new committee organization. I think there have been three or perhaps four special committees established during the 2 years of this Congress. Some of those were on matters which spread-eagled two or three jurisdictions, and perhaps accounted for a few of those special committees. But this proposed investigation here is directly the responsibility of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, make no mistake about that.

To remove this jurisdiction here and create an unneeded special committee at vast extra expense violates the spirit, if not the letter of our own Reorganization Act.

The men on the regular Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have the powers and can come here by unanimous consent and get the subpena powers if that is necessary if they wish to conduct this investigation.

A vote for this resolution today is a vote of "no confidence" in a great committee headed by a great chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], one of the greatest chairmen in the House.

With ranking members on his committee, such as the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], as well as other Members, these men understand the problem and are perfectly capable of doing this job.

You are not only destroying the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but you are weakening other legislative committees so far as their watchdog functions provided for in the Reorganization Act are concerned.

Things are beginning to take hold now where the legislative committees consider it a part of their duty to follow up legislation to find out if the bureaus under their control are carrying out their duties. When you strip a committee of its jurisdiction, as is being done here, by establishing control outside of the framework of your standing committees system, you destroy that much of the value of reorganization and you weaken all other regular committees.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Is it not true that if the previous question on the pending resolution is voted down, it will then be in order to substitute the resolution introduced by Chairman WOLVERTON of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Tennessee is exactly correct, and that is what should be done if you are in favor of living up to your own rules that you have established, if you favor keeping the jurisdictional lines of the Congress straight and clear.

If you oppose, as I do, the usurpation of the jurisdiction of the regular standing committees of the House of Representatives, by these hit-or-miss special committees, then you should vote down the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma does not surprise me, but I must confess that I was pained at my long-time and most devoted friend, the gentleman from Texas, giving the impression by the statement that he made that he is resisting the adoption of the pending resolution. My colleagues, I have labored here with you for a long time. It has been my hope that I would so conduct myself as to earn your confidence. I come to you as a party interested in the setting up of this committee and in carrying out an honest investigation of the Communications Commission and I am looking to my friends on the Democratic side who have confidence in me and who are willing to stand by me, to vote for this resolution. I do not want to rip this thing open, because to me it

would be most painful. The resolution simply proposes the naming of a committee to take up where a previous special committee left off in the business of investigating the Federal Communications Commission.

You recall that when the first committee was set up, it was my resolution, and I was named chairman. The committee engaged the services of the best people that could be found to do the work. We were able to enlist the services of a very great lawyer. He came here at enormous expense to himself and spent many months with the committee in building up a record to be used as the basis for recommendations to the House of Representatives.

Due to the fight that was made upon me, I left the committee in the hope that so doing would make it easier for the committee to carry on. I want to say to you that never in the history of this Congress was a meaner thing done to a Member than that which was done to me. I was made the object of the most terrible smear campaign that was ever built up. The thing is too painful to me for me to rest. I hate to tell you all about it. Unfortunately, the committee found itself opposed by an angry White House. All the powers attaching to that great office were brought into play against the committee. The committee had the cooperation of the Army and the Navy. The Communications Commission had been interfering with the communications of both the Army and the Navy. The committee had the benefit of the assistance of representatives of both Army and Navy. They worked with us and in some instances helped in the investigation that was being made.

As I say, the counsel for the committee was not only a great lawyer but was also a conscientious man who was seeking to do a man's job. He was persistent and through various sources of information kept informed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. COX. But this is what happened: People in the Government were directed to dishonor any summons that the committee might issue; and, to make certain that the committee would not be able to get the evidence it wanted, the records in the War Department, the Navy Department, the Communications Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and others were seized, taken to, and impounded at the White House.

After I left the committee, the smear artists then directed their attention to Gene Garey, the counsel for the committee, and to show you the extent that these people were willing to go in their effort to intimidate and smear one of the country's greatest lawyers, they searched his record from the time he was a boy selling newspapers on the streets of Chicago in order to support a widowed mother. They followed him down to that particular moment, but they were never able to get anything that might be used to intimidate, browbeat, and drive him from the committee. But here is what they resorted to, and listen to me:

When the representatives of Japan were here and our President, through the State Department, was undertaking to reach some sort of an understanding, or get some particular information, they gained knowledge that Mr. Desvernine, one of the associates of the then lawyer of the committee had at one time been the counsel of the Mikado Bank in this country. Through Mr. Baruch, as I recall, Mr. Desvernine was brought in and under the urge and direction of the White House, he obtained from the representatives of Japan information that the President wanted. At the time the committee was undertaking to prosecute the investigation, Desvernine was told that if Garey continued to represent the committee that he, Desvernine, would be charged with having, prior to Pearl Harbor, been the representative of the Mikado, and threats of prosecution were made against him.

The story, as I recall, is that Mr. Baruch, great man that he is, sought to protect Desvernine. It was, as I remember, Mr. Baruch who got Desvernine to come into the picture. Finally, and in order to save Desvernine from being smeared and ruined, Garey left the committee in disgust and the investigation fizzled out.

Let me say to you there is no Member of this House who has a greater appreciation of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee than myself, but this is a special job that ought to be done by a special committee. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has not, in view of the tremendous burden that rests upon the committee, found it possible to conduct a thorough investigation of the Commission up to the present time. The splendid chairman of that committee tells you that this is a job that ought to be done, and since that committee is not empowered to carry on the work, the resolution ought to be adopted and this special committee set up.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again that I hope the membership will find it consistent with their sense of what is right to support this resolution.

The Commission is carrying on now just as it has carried on through the several years that have gone by. You recall the disclosure made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] with reference to the issuance of five licenses to one man within 2 weeks, of whom it has been said—witnesses can be produced who will so testify—that he served in the Communist Party with him for some length of time. Think of it—five licenses to one man in 2 weeks and he a man with Communist connections. Mr. Speaker, the broadcast carriers live under a terrorism exercised by this Commission; law-abiding, high-minded, patriotic Americans always under the gun of the Commission, and yet here is a man who, the Commission was informed had Communist connections, comes in and obtains within 2 weeks' time five licenses worth millions of dollars.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia in connection with the case of this man who has Communist associations and the fact that he obtained five licenses in 2 weeks, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House and asked him to obtain an explanation from the Communications Commission. That was approximately 7 or 8 weeks ago, yet as of this date I have received no explanation and do not know what is going on about it.

Mr. COX. Let me say this, no blame should attach to any member of that committee. I understand that; but what the gentleman says argues strongly the importance of the setting up of this committee to carry on this all-important investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the membership will support the resolution.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution should be adopted. Certainly it is no invasion of the affairs of any other committee and certainly no reflection upon any other committee.

It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a number of years. I enjoyed my services there. I know of the greatness of that committee.

However, this is something that needs to be done. I recall the circumstances about which the gentleman from Georgia has just spoken, and I was as resentful at some of the tactics there pursued as he was. I take it that this resolution is not intended to go back into matters of that day but, rather, is to inquire into some of the things that are presently alleged to be going on.

For that purpose this resolution is proper and should be adopted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may reply to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. I understood he said that he had written to me and had received no reply.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HEBERT. I do not think I said that. If I did, I did not intend to do so. I said I had written to the gentleman asking for an explanation from the Federal Communications Commission and as of this day there has been no explanation, as far as I know, from the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am pleased to hear from the gentleman what he did say.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am not talking about the gentleman or about the committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Upon receipt of the information on the matter of which he complained I wrote to the gentleman under date of May 7, 1948, stating that I had received the complaint and would proceed immediately to investigate it. Upon the same day I communicated with Hon. Wayne Coy, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, asking him for an explanation. Afterward I received the explanation which I have here in my hand and which is a part of the files of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I ask on what day the reply from the Federal Communications Commission was received?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The first reply was made on the 13th.

Mr. HÉBERT. That was merely an acknowledgment. I mean the explanation.

Mr. WOLVERTON. May 13.

Mr. HÉBERT. Since May 13 the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has been in possession of an explanation of the relationship between Mr. Lamb and the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes. The committee, however, has not closed the matter.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say to the gentleman that since May 7 I have received no additional information at all, nor have I ever received any information or acknowledge that he had received a reply or explanation from the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Nor have I heard a word from the gentleman from Louisiana since that time.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say I was waiting on the gentleman replying to my letter.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think that is the easiest thing to say, you were waiting, but the fact is we acted on the gentleman's complaint. We have taken more interest in it than he has and now he is seeking to raise an issue which does not exist.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think the matter has been sufficiently explored. I am sure there is no reason for recriminations between the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from New Jersey. Probably the information which the gentleman sought is another reason why this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course, I do not care to engage in a controversy with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey except to keep the RECORD absolutely correct. His letter told me he would inform me when he had received the information, and I am still waiting on the information. To this I have not been informed.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understand the matter correctly, the gentleman from New Jersey was seeking further information that probably would complete the story. Under those circumstances the gentleman's understanding about it and his present view could be very well justified, as I am sure the view and understanding of the gentleman from New Jersey could be justified.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it desired to pass this resolution to investigate Bob Jones, one of the new members of the commission, and a former Member of this House?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, now, of course, the gentleman, I am sure, is quite facetious in his question. The resolution of inquiry is general in its terms and has to do with the commission, and I suppose any individual's action in connection with the commission would be under scrutiny so far as the committee is concerned if this resolution is adopted which again, I say, I hope shall turn out to be the case.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If this committee is no more successful in getting information than the Committee on Un-American Activities has been in getting a letter from the FBI on Dr. Condon, then I fear we are wasting our time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were—ayes 174, noes 50.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement. This statement exceeds the prescribed limit, but I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the rule it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANBORN further asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two radio addresses.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter, a statement, and certain testimony with regard to the sale of Lanham war housing.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following the passage of House Joint Resolution 433.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal.

Mr. JENSEN, Mr. D'EWART, and Mr. DONDERO asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by William T. Faricy before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news items.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD.

STEFAN MAGURA AND MICHAL MAGURA

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2709) for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stefan Magura and Michal Magura, of Donora, Pa., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of April 29, 1948, upon payment of visa fees and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for Czechoslovakia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 624 OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4816) to

amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$100,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "adjudicate" and insert "determine according to law."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "and is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may prescribe."

Page 1, line 9, after "limitation", insert "as to amount."

Page 2, line 13, strike out all after "therefrom." down to and including "case." in line 18.

Page 3, lines 3 and 4, strike out "who is otherwise resident in a foreign country" and insert "by and on behalf of any alien who on December 7, 1941, was not actually residing in the United States."

Page 3, line 13, strike out "and."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "suffering." and insert "suffering; and."

Page 3, after line 16, insert:

"(5) for loss of anticipated profits or loss of anticipated earnings."

Page 3, lines 22 and 23, strike out "Any relevant evidence having probative value shall be considered by the Attorney General in his inquiries."

Page 4, line 6, strike out all after "General." down to and including "same." in line 9.

Page 4, line 14, strike out all after "of" where it appears the second time down to and including "the" in line 17 and insert "service. The."

Page 4, line 24, strike out "dispose of" and insert "adjudicate."

Page 5, line 10, after "name", insert "and address."

Page 5, line 12, after "case", insert "and the reasons for each adjudication."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF INTERESTS IN ESTATES OF DECEASED CROW INDIAN ALLOTTEES

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2352) to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate admentments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, after line 11 insert:

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior with the consent, in writing, of the tribal council representing the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation, is hereby authorized and directed to sell and convey to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., for public purposes, to wit: A site for a county hospital for said county upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe—ten acres from the north one-half of section 30, township 2 north, range 11 west, Indian meridian, and more definitely described as follows:

"The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 30, township 2 north, range 11 west, Indian meridian: *Provided*, That out of the proceeds of such sale the sum of $1.25 per acre shall be credited to the general fund of the United States Treasury and the balance shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribal fund of Indians of the said Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Reservation.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, and to provide for the sale of certain lands to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949

Mr. PLOESER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for the Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, 8, and 21.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$30,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Corporation is authorized to pay not to exceed $1,482.90 for services actually rendered by former employees during the fiscal year 1947 and for which there is no present authority to pay, as follows: L. Brown, $120.06; W. Finch, $140.11; J. Johnson, $116.16; S. Jones, $86.31; R. Neely, $148.71; G. Sanders, $103.19; N. L. Sanders, $123.82; G. Walker, $130.78; W. Winfield, $183.37; W. Scruggs, $153.60; E. Donley, $102.63; H. Thomas, $74.11"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
F. R. COUDERT, JR.,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
CLYDE M. REED,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates to the Public Housing Administration $4,840,000, as proposed by the House, for payments of annual contributions to locally owned low-rent housing projects, instead of $6,200,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 restores the provision of the House bill requiring that no part of the appropriation to the Public Housing

Administration for annual contributions to low-rent housing projects be paid to such projects making payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such projects and the Public Housing Administration.

TITLE II

Amendment No. 6 changes the effective time when the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company are required to declare and pay a dividend to the Treasury of the United States from "immediately upon the enactment of this Act" to "prior to July 31, 1948".

Amendment No. 7 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8 restores the provision of the House bill limiting the amount of funds available for liquidation of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., and requiring this corporation to be liquidated and dissolved at the earliest practicable date without additional appropriations therefor.

Amendment No. 9, relating to the standard under which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall account for its administrative expenses, changes the requirement of the House bill so that "generally recognized" accounting principles and practices must be followed.

Amendment No. 10 authorizes not to exceed $2,300,000 for administrative expenses of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, instead of not to exceed $2,250,000, as proposed by the House, and not to exceed $2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12 authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cancel bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation as proposed by the Senate, instead of capital stock as proposed by the House, upon transfer of the capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to the Treasury.

Amendment No. 13 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 14 authorizes not to exceed $9,500,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, instead of not to exceed $9,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15 requires the capital stock of the Defense Homes Corporation to be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as proposed by the Senate, instead of to the Secretary of the Treasury, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17 authorizes not to exceed $3,000 of the funds of the Housing and Home Finance Agency available for travel expenses to be used for attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18 authorizes payment by the Federal intermediate credit banks to the Farm Credit Administration for services rendered in amount not to exceed $330,000, instead of not to exceed $373,600, as proposed by the House, and not to exceed $223,600, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 authorizes not to exceed $1,500,000 for administrative expenses of the production credit corporations, as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $1,350,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21 provide that the production credit corporations shall return Government capital of not less than $30,000,000, instead of not less than $60,000,000, as proposed by the House, and not less than $20,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and that such capital be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury, as proposed by the House, instead of being returned to the production credit corporations revolving fund authorized in title 12 of the United States Code, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22 authorizes not to exceed $146,800 for administrative expenses of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $46,800, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23 authorizes payment by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington to the Farm Credit Administration for services rendered in amount not to exceed $21,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed $12,500, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25 authorizes the Inland Waterways Corporation to pay not to exceed $1,482.90 for services actually rendered by 12 former employees who had been reemployed after having engaged in a strike against the Government, for which the Corporation has no present authority to pay, instead of not to exceed $3,918.48 for 18 such former employees, as proposed by the House, and the elimination of any such authority, as proposed by the Senate.

In recommending authority to pay certain of such former employees to the exclusion of others, it is the intention of the managers on the part of both Houses that such action shall not be construed as a bar or a limitation on the rights of any of such former employees of this Corporation to make or prosecute claims for funds alleged to be owing to them.

Amendment No. 26 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 27 provides that funds of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., shall be available in amounts not to exceed $338,000 during the fiscal year 1948 and $380,000 during the fiscal year 1949 for expenses of vocational training of prisoners as authorized by the act of May 11, 1943 (Public Law 521), as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III

Amendment No. 28 strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House bill increasing the salaries of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Amendment No. 29 changes the number of a section of the bill.

Amendments Nos. 30, 31, and 32 strike from the bill language, proposed by the House, to forbid employment by agencies included in the bill of members of labor organizations the officers of which are not in compliance with the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Amendment No. 33 changes the number of a section of the bill.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 7, relating to the requirement that the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company declare and pay a dividend of $10,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States, if not otherwise required to be turned in to the Treasury under the provisions of the proposed Federal charter: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 13, providing that the amount of bonds canceled by the Secretary of the Treasury upon receipt from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation of the outstanding capital stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation shall equal the par value of such stock plus accrued dividends thereon: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 16, relating to the effective date for the transfer of the stock, assets, liabilities, and records of the Defense Homes Corporation to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 24, authorizing the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers and to incur administrative expenses in connection therewith: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Amendment No. 26, authorizing the Virgin Islands Company to borrow $500,000 from the Treasury; appropriating $500,000 for this purpose; and enabling the company to continue its present operations until June 30, 1949: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ALBERT GORE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3, which are in disagreement, be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first three amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 5, strike out "$27,389,061" and insert "$30,972,061."

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 9, strike out "$21,689,000" and insert "$25,689,000."

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 11, after the word "dams", insert "one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GORE moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] the ranking minority member of the committee, 25 minutes, to be yielded by him as he sees fit.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman wish me to use some time now?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman will take an equal amount of time?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. And will alternate speakers?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes. We want the last 10 minutes on this side.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the closing speaker on this side will be the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and he will be recognized for 10 minutes just before the final time on the other side.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the long hours that we have been laboring together, but I trust that for a few minutes my colleagues will give me a respectful hearing on this important matter, despite the fatigue suffered by all.

The motion I have offered would concur in the Senate action, by which $400,000,000 was appropriated for a steam generating plant.

What is the purpose of the steam plant here in disagreement? The purpose of the steam plant is to firm up the vast amount of hydroelectric power which is generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority, owned entirely by the Federal Government.

The issues involved here were debated rather fully in the House and I shall not go into them in detail. I think the RECORD shows, however, that since the matter left this body the issues have been further clarified. For one thing, some Members of this body seemed to be bothered or troubled as to whether the original TVA Act was broad enough in its authority to give authorization for this appropriation. That question, however, did not seem to trouble more than one or two Members of the other body. True, the question was raised, that very point of order was made, the able lawyers of the other body debated it, but the distinguished presiding officer, President pro tempore of the other body, ruled on the point of order and he ruled that the original TVA Act did authorize appropriations for the construction of steam plants.

Suffice it to say that up until this year that question has never been raised before and Congress has previously appropriated money to build a TVA steam plant.

Some additional clarification came out in the hearings and in the debates of the other body. For instance, it was argued here that this steam plant was not needed to supply energy to preferred customers. That opinion, as set out in the committee report, seemed to be based upon testimony before the committee which Mr. Purcell Smith, the representative of the private power companies, admitted during the hearings of the Senate committee were incorrect. Omitted from preferred customers as referred to in the House committee report was the Federal Government, and in the TVA Act the Federal Government and its agencies have top priority even over the local REA's and municipalities.

I have here a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission which I shall read. When this question was before the House we did not seek to justify it on any grounds other than a necessary addition to generating capacity to meet normal peacetime growth of our demand for electricity. We did recognize, of course, and make reference to the war plants located in the valley. I did not know how much electricity the atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge used or needed now or would need in the future, and I so said in debate. Perhaps I was derelict in my duties, but I have not tried to find out too much about the atomic energy plant. Nevertheless, the senior Senator from Connecticut did seek such information. He wrote the Atomic Energy Commission and received a letter which I would like to read, and I want the Members who may contemplate voting against this to reflect on this letter written to Senator MCMAHON:

JUNE 10, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR MCMAHON: We have your letter of June 7 regarding power requirements for Oak Ridge. While we have not publicized the figures on the quantity of power furnished Oak Ridge by the Tennessee Valley Authority, we agree with you that such information does not involve classified information. The present contract between the Commission and TVA establishes an electrical power demand of 225,000 kilowatts. The present power load averages about 211,000 kilowatts. There are, however, certain particulars regarding our power requirements that do involve classified information, because these particulars, together with certain other facts, could possibly provide an index to the rate of production of fissionable materials at Oak Ridge. This information would include figures on the power generated by the Commission itself at Oak Ridge, details on type and quantity of power required by any individual facility within Oak Ridge, and records of total power consumption over an extended period of operation. If you wish, we shall be glad to send a representative of the Commission to discuss these matters with you.

At present there is no definite program for reactivating any of the facilities at Oak Ridge which are in stand-by status. However, there is always the possibility that future developments or an emergency might necessitate the start-up of these facilities. The minimum additional power required for reactivating such facilities is estimated to be in excess of 50,000 kilowatts and the maximum might be several times this figure. None of this additional power requirement could be met from the Commission's own installed power generating capacity at Oak Ridge.

Sincerely yours,

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
SUMNER T. PIKE,
Acting Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot order large generating facilities from Sears Roebuck and get them overnight. It has been estimated by responsible engineers and leaders that another great country with whom we are not always in accord may have atomic energy developed by 1952. If we start now, or on July 1, 1948, as provided by my motion, building this plant, the very first generator will not come into production until 1951.

There is in this country only two-tenths of 1 percent reserve of electric energy above that demanded. If an emergency should arise, and unless there is danger, why are we enacting a draft law? I am not one who wants to be responsible for denying this additional generating capacity in an area in which there is not only the atomic-energy plant but the largest aluminum plants, arsenals, and munition plants in the entire United States.

Though this proposed plant is important as a national-defense reserve of electric energy, it is fully justified on a peacetime basis. If there were no atomic energy plants in the valley this steam plant should be constructed. The desirable economic relationship of steam to hydro in the Tennessee Valley is 25 to 30 percent steam to 70 to 75 percent hydro. What is the ratio now? It is down to 16 or 17 percent, and with the additional hydroelectric units coming into production the ratio will sink in 2 years down to 13 or 14 percent steam. That is a wholly uneconomic relationship.

Unless there is additional generating capacity the Tennessee Valley faces an acute shortage of power. We can only look to the TVA because it is the sole supplier of power in the valley. This proposed steam plant is the practical way to augment the generating capacity.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, those of you who were present at the time this bill was originally debated at great length—in fact, it was debated over a period of 2 days—will recall that in substance this was an issue and still is an issue between those charming people who inhabit the beautiful Valley of the Tennessee, their charming Representatives in this House and the rest of the country, the taxpayers who provide them with subsidized public power that makes living so pleasant for the people of the valley and attracts to its delightful valley, hillsides, and slopes, the industry of the rest of the country at the expense of and to the detriment of communities in the rest of the country. Some of those charming peoples' Representatives, I know, have been very busy pressing for a favorable vote on this bill.

I am confident however, that Members will be governed by the fundamentals involved here and will not yield to the charming people who are appealing, very naturally, to get something more for nothing at the expense of the rest of the taxpayers of the country. In substance, as was fully debated and fully made clear when the House originally voted down the steam plant, this is an

attempt to effect a revolution in the operation of the TVA. It is, in effect, a first step in establishing the principle that the United States Government shall set up, not hydroelectric power plants as an incident to the development of a great river valley area, but shall set up steam generating public utility enterprises in competition with private industry and in competition with all of those other communities in the United States who do not have the advantages of Federally subsidized cheap power. All this talk about firming up is nothing but nonsense. Every kilowatt-hour of power that is generated by the hydroelectric facilities in the Tennessee Valley is used; not one bit of it goes to waste. It is not as though power were being lost or potential power not used.

Moreover, in this bill provision is made for additional dams, and additional generating capacities that will increase the total generating production of TVA by 400,000 kilowatts, and that without the steam plant. In addition to that, 200,000 additional kilowatt-hours of power will come to TVA through the development of the Cumberland River Dam by the Army engineers, the disposition of which is to be turned over to TVA. So that really effectively disposes of the argument which my friend from Tennessee has just made about the needs of this steam plant in a particular place in the interest of national defense. Now, a steam plant, gentlemen, as you all know, can be set up anywhere. You can set up the same plant in my district, on the island of Manhattan, and generate just as much power as that steam plant is going to generate in the valley of the Tennessee. The only difference is that the inhabitants in the Tennessee area, and the stockholders of those great industrial companies who had the sense to settle there and take advantage of cheap public power, are given the benefit of it rather than my constituents who are going to pay the bill.

So I say to you, gentlemen, the issue is the same one that we fought out once before and decided, I think, properly in this House. Until there is a clear-cut legislative determination defining the Authority's power and purpose and placing a clear-cut limitation upon the territorial area that it is to serve, then certainly we should not decide upon an appropriation bill, an issue that is as far reaching as this one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York, has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the issue here is whether we shall go ahead and waste money to build this steam plant. In the situation we are at the present time the charges for electricity in the Tennessee Valley by the Authority are below the cost of production, if you consider the cost of the installations that have been made, and the interest on the money. The issue is whether your folks and my folks back home shall pay the electric light bills of those people. Just the other day I read in the paper where the representatives of those communities that are served by the TVA were in New York making arrangements for loans from bankers for the purpose of installing steam plants of their own. Why not let them do that, instead of making a contract with them on the part of the TVA, which prohibits the customers of the TVA from putting in power plants of their own? These people can do it. Let them run their own business in their own way. There is no sense in the Government of the United States putting itself out and getting into this situation. I hope the motion will not be agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for yielding to me at this time.

This amendment providing for a steam plant in the Tennessee Valley, to firm up the power generated in that area, is one of the most important issues that has come before this Congress.

It not only means the saving of billions of kilowatt-hours of electricity for consumers within the distribution radius, but it means additional power for our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., the greatest defense project the world has ever known.

The Senate has already voted favorably on this amendment twice, and I trust the membership of this House will not cripple this great development by voting against it.

The American people who pay the electric bills, and especially the residential and commercial consumers, have a right to be alarmed at these efforts that are being made to cripple or destroy the TVA and other public power projects throughout the country.

As I have pointed out time and time again, the power business is a public business. Electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. It has become a necessity of our modern life. No home is complete without it. No business establishment can operate successfully without it. It must be handled by a monopoly. If a half dozen different concerns were engaged in distributing electricity to a given community, the overhead expense would be so great the people could not bear it.

Any monopoly of a necessity of life is a public business.

Besides, the water power of this Nation, that is, the hydroelectric power in our navigable streams and their tributaries, already belongs to the Government. The Supreme Court so held in the Appalachian Power case as well as in the Ashwander case.

The yardsticks provided by our public power projects, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration, have a tremendous effect in holding down the power rates to the American consumer.

The same thing is true of the Tacoma, Wash., public power system, which, by the way, pays a higher rate of taxation, or money in lieu of taxes, than is paid by the average power company serving a city of its size.

The Ontario Power Commission, operating just across the line from New York, is another outstanding example of the benefits the people derive from public power.

I am inserting at this point a table showing the number of power consumers in each State in 1947, the amount of electricity used, the cost of that electricity, and the savings that would have accrued if this power had been supplied at the TVA rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, or the Ontario rates.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 1.—*Total electric sales, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	528, 401	5, 480, 972, 000	$52, 872, 700	$32, 438, 173	$20, 434, 527	$26, 797, 859	$26, 074, 841	$37, 326, 851	$15, 545, 849	$34, 642, 116	$18, 230, 584
Arizona	151, 468	1, 128, 795, 000	18, 228, 700	8, 583, 322	9, 645, 378	7, 542, 687	10, 686, 013	10, 191, 477	8, 037, 223	8, 956, 061	9, 272, 639
Arkansas	336, 529	1, 116, 014, 000	25, 904, 400	13, 484, 997	12, 419, 403	11, 418, 455	14, 485, 945	15, 732, 950	10, 171, 450	14, 365, 527	11, 538, 873
California	3, 117, 788	18, 035, 720, 000	288, 979, 100	201, 144, 595	87, 834, 505	168, 137, 160	120, 841, 940	233, 303, 657	55, 675, 443	216, 347, 302	72, 631, 798
Colorado	337, 671	1, 166, 990, 000	29, 007, 200	13, 670, 595	15, 336, 605	12, 038, 603	16, 968, 597	16, 216, 270	12, 790, 930	14, 141, 525	14, 865, 675
Connecticut	595, 613	2, 945, 948, 000	70, 241, 400	32, 772, 352	37, 469, 048	27, 962, 632	42, 278, 768	38, 165, 037	32, 076, 363	34, 054, 592	36, 186, 808
Delaware	83, 970	452, 731, 000	9, 567, 800	4, 341, 148	5, 226, 652	3, 735, 020	5, 832, 780	5, 088, 025	4, 479, 775	4, 536, 123	5, 031, 677
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	637, 712	2, 363, 649, 000	63, 900, 300	26, 086, 976	37, 813, 324	23, 271, 927	40, 629, 273	31, 043, 836	32, 856, 464	26, 431, 722	37, 468, 578
Georgia	612, 635	3, 421, 552, 000	56, 635, 700	31, 966, 305	24, 669, 395	27, 892, 303	28, 743, 397	37, 698, 592	18, 937, 108	33, 000, 535	23, 635, 165
Idaho	169, 242	1, 194, 849, 000	15, 879, 300	9, 859, 890	6, 019, 410	8, 656, 935	7, 222, 365	11, 617, 941	4, 261, 359	10, 022, 988	5, 856, 312
Illinois	2, 407, 993	13, 946, 033, 000	268, 066, 500	132, 349, 440	135, 717, 060	112, 414, 144	155, 652, 356	154, 434, 196	113, 632, 304	139, 258, 220	128, 808, 280
Indiana	1, 123, 529	5, 996, 387, 000	116, 255, 900	59, 467, 245	56, 788, 655	50, 319, 196	65, 936, 704	69, 157, 645	47, 098, 255	62, 640, 512	53, 615, 388

[1] Included in Maryland data.

TABLE 1.—*Total electric sales, 1947*—Continued

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Iowa	741,812	2,564,733,000	$62,028,900	$31,040,521	$30,979,379	$27,133,113	$34,895,787	$36,649,483	$25,379,417	$32,043,780	$29,985,120
Kansas	496,353	2,040,248,000	45,178,300	22,338,963	22,839,337	19,206,203	25,972,097	26,168,105	19,010,105	23,366,004	21,812,296
Kentucky	547,419	2,578,483,000	47,368,300	25,712,700	21,655,600	21,891,503	25,476,797	29,978,220	17,390,080	26,870,359	20,497,941
Louisiana	519,260	2,472,257,000	44,065,400	20,484,896	23,580,504	17,718,967	26,346,433	24,042,533	20,022,867	21,274,184	22,791,216
Maine	275,814	1,142,871,000	22,911,300	10,971,088	11,940,212	9,426,210	13,485,090	12,809,762	10,101,538	11,306,441	11,604,859
Maryland and District of Columbia	734,648	4,995,671,000	82,199,300	45,162,229	37,037,071	38,691,783	43,507,517	53,145,018	29,054,282	48,191,938	34,007,362
Massachusetts	1,439,541	5,409,491,000	144,720,800	63,171,478	81,549,322	53,778,203	90,942,597	73,481,311	71,239,489	65,762,048	78,958,752
Michigan	1,765,974	9,956,502,000	186,239,400	93,696,512	92,542,888	81,655,236	104,584,164	110,185,486	76,053,914	95,594,399	90,245,001
Minnesota	808,590	3,069,535,000	73,562,700	36,857,025	36,705,675	32,278,312	41,284,388	43,430,295	30,132,405	37,696,451	35,866,249
Mississippi	323,945	1,078,294,000	24,587,200	11,922,107	12,665,093	10,404,956	14,182,244	14,044,062	10,543,138	12,286,071	12,301,129
Missouri	1,010,458	4,381,836,000	88,505,700	47,008,810	41,496,890	40,791,691	47,714,009	55,372,835	33,132,865	48,924,908	39,580,792
Montana	151,006	1,851,532,000	18,049,600	10,827,747	7,212,853	9,020,517	9,020,083	12,526,834	5,513,766	11,588,032	6,452,568
Nebraska	330,996	1,132,871,000	26,683,100	14,115,259	12,567,841	12,512,614	14,170,486	16,792,124	9,890,976	14,472,431	12,210,669
Nevada	41,584	394,694,000	6,236,700	3,024,534	3,212,166	2,629,502	3,607,198	3,579,633	2,657,067	3,199,234	3,037,466
New Hampshire	178,261	622,762,000	15,890,100	7,452,558	8,437,542	6,367,034	9,523,066	8,685,703	7,204,397	7,707,576	8,182,224
New Jersey	1,427,679	6,397,912,000	152,825,900	71,936,274	80,889,626	61,201,773	91,621,127	83,857,001	68,968,899	75,504,061	77,321,839
New Mexico	109,992	388,274,000	10,434,900	4,329,724	6,105,176	3,819,080	6,615,820	5,137,766	5,297,134	4,473,981	5,960,919
New York	4,458,147	22,618,807,000	457,911,900	189,435,038	268,476,862	168,271,632	289,640,268	226,318,570	231,593,330	196,511,419	261,400,481
North Carolina	747,989	4,403,786,000	66,363,200	38,059,380	28,303,820	32,232,234	34,130,966	44,239,177	22,124,023	40,000,465	26,362,735
North Dakota	110,944	286,596,000	9,755,300	4,176,700	5,578,600	3,832,613	5,922,687	5,050,294	4,705,006	4,205,484	5,549,816
Ohio	2,247,329	15,494,727,000	253,232,600	136,125,909	117,106,691	114,767,736	138,464,864	158,035,802	95,196,798	143,353,625	109,878,975
Oklahoma	508,612	1,757,374,000	40,504,700	19,717,091	20,877,609	16,978,553	23,616,147	23,108,710	17,485,990	20,572,872	20,021,828
Oregon	428,643	4,311,383,000	43,096,100	29,775,713	13,320,387	25,825,541	17,270,559	34,945,571	8,150,529	30,712,039	12,384,061
Pennsylvania	2,853,776	19,696,741,000	323,872,100	175,865,760	150,009,340	146,469,619	179,402,481	203,605,181	122,866,919	186,966,440	138,906,660
Rhode Island	237,832	951,961,000	25,121,600	10,795,158	14,326,442	9,063,150	16,058,450	12,492,490	12,629,110	11,378,727	13,742,873
South Carolina	359,988	2,120,342,000	30,235,300	17,610,758	12,624,542	14,936,097	15,299,203	20,497,695	9,737,605	18,496,231	11,739,069
South Dakota	128,214	329,142,000	10,545,100	4,404,934	6,140,166	3,981,226	6,563,874	5,294,306	5,250,794	4,492,880	6,052,220
Tennessee	603,018	7,739,687,000	58,838,700	43,707,026	15,131,674	36,729,797	22,108,903	50,597,756	8,240,944	45,914,535	12,924,162
Texas	1,663,099	7,404,697,000	143,606,600	73,232,888	70,373,712	63,366,077	80,240,523	86,306,539	57,301,041	76,998,374	66,608,226
Utah	177,458	928,265,000	16,348,200	9,374,545	6,973,655	8,120,474	8,227,726	10,968,813	5,359,387	9,629,565	6,718,635
Vermont	114,835	418,594,000	10,566,300	5,133,436	5,432,864	4,402,227	6,164,073	5,978,812	4,587,488	5,274,055	5,292,245
Virginia	642,072	3,266,181,000	61,918,400	30,827,617	31,090,783	26,680,643	35,237,757	36,199,864	25,718,536	31,948,089	29,970,311
Washington	674,769	9,694,280,000	77,118,200	55,350,295	21,767,905	47,563,860	29,554,340	64,851,753	12,266,447	57,643,748	19,474,452
West Virginia	414,823	3,568,492,000	50,719,200	27,184,528	23,534,672	21,996,275	28,722,925	31,011,000	19,708,200	29,423,062	21,296,138
Wisconsin	987,089	4,748,573,000	97,959,700	49,902,011	48,057,689	42,952,694	55,007,006	58,585,037	39,374,663	52,211,793	45,747,907
Wyoming	64,720	212,163,000	5,943,900	2,587,005	3,356,895	2,326,582	3,617,318	3,096,838	2,847,062	2,635,391	3,308,509
United States total	38,431,950	217,581,497,000	3,852,764,700	2,009,489,255	1,843,275,445	1,719,152,935	2,133,611,765	2,350,465,966	1,502,298,734	2,107,487,218	1,745,277,482

You will note that there were 38,431,950 consumers of electricity in the United States last year. That includes the residential, the commercial, and the industrial users. For that electricity they paid $3,852,764,700.

If the TVA rates had been in effect in every State in the Union, they would have paid $2,009,489,255, and the savings would have amounted to $1,843,275,445. Under the Tacoma, Wash., rates they would have saved $2,133,611,765. Under the Bonneville rates they would have saved $1,502,298,734. Under the Ontario rates they would have saved $1,745,277,432.

If it had not been for these yardsticks, I daresay that the cost of this electricity to the consumers of this Nation, would have been multiplied many times.

RESIDENTIAL CONSUMERS

Now let us take the residential consumers of electricity. In 1947 there were 31,621,959 residential users of electricity throughout the United States. They used 44,171,314,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $1,366,498,200. Under the TVA rates they would have paid $729,920,006, and would have saved $636,578,194. Under the Tacoma rates they would have paid $676,953,298, and would have saved $689,544,902. Under the Bonneville rates they would have paid $860,482,582, and would have saved $506,015,618. Under the Ontario rates they would have paid $632,044,096, and would have saved $734,454,104.

In order to show the number of residential consumers, the amount of electricity used, and the overcharges in each State, I am inserting a table which covers every State in the Union.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 2.—*Residential electric service, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	396,740	665,944,000	$14,899,100	$9,699,314	$5,199,786	$8,999,056	$5,900,044	$11,427,610	$3,471,490	$8,403,092	$6,496,008
Arizona	130,050	229,156,000	6,539,700	3,296,009	3,243,691	3,060,580	3,479,120	3,884,582	2,655,118	2,857,849	3,681,851
Arkansas	235,220	214,148,000	8,573,200	4,106,563	4,466,637	3,806,501	4,766,699	4,835,285	3,737,915	3,549,305	5,023,895
California	2,280,379	3,092,665,000	84,670,200	53,596,237	31,073,963	49,701,407	34,968,793	63,163,969	21,506,231	46,399,270	38,270,930
Colorado	263,654	318,900,000	11,196,700	5,508,776	5,687,924	5,105,695	6,091,005	6,494,086	4,702,614	4,769,794	6,426,906
Connecticut	515,186	775,997,000	25,760,800	13,034,965	12,725,835	12,081,815	13,678,985	15,353,437	10,407,363	11,283,230	14,477,570
Delaware	71,408	94,126,000	3,768,300	1,624,137	2,144,163	1,507,320	2,260,980	1,914,296	1,854,004	1,409,344	2,358,956
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	537,589	850,957,000	27,973,900	12,532,307	15,441,593	11,609,169	16,364,731	14,770,219	13,203,681	10,853,873	17,120,027
Georgia	531,778	902,045,000	21,917,700	13,391,715	8,525,985	12,427,336	9,490,364	15,780,744	6,136,956	11,594,463	10,323,237
Idaho	133,132	400,261,000	7,545,100	4,610,056	2,935,044	4,278,072	3,267,028	5,432,472	2,112,628	3,991,358	3,553,742
Illinois	1,984,258	2,587,553,000	85,214,600	46,782,815	38,431,785	43,374,231	41,840,369	55,133,846	30,080,754	40,476,935	44,737,665
Indiana	889,206	1,200,421,000	39,908,500	20,872,146	19,036,354	19,355,622	20,552,878	24,623,545	15,284,955	18,078,550	21,829,950
Iowa	576,065	730,511,000	26,516,600	13,072,684	13,443,916	12,118,086	14,398,514	15,406,145	11,110,455	11,322,588	15,194,012
Kansas	390,571	460,182,000	17,090,000	8,271,560	8,818,440	7,673,410	9,416,590	9,741,300	7,348,700	7,160,710	9,929,290
Kentucky	452,027	514,359,000	16,927,300	9,800,907	7,126,393	9,089,960	7,837,340	11,561,346	5,365,954	8,497,505	8,429,795
Louisiana	436,536	424,300,000	16,541,300	8,022,530	8,518,770	7,443,585	9,097,715	9,461,624	7,079,676	6,947,346	9,593,954
Maine	232,125	267,035,000	9,897,200	4,612,095	5,285,105	4,275,590	5,621,610	5,443,460	4,453,740	3,998,469	5,898,731
Maryland and District of Columbia	600,240	824,007,000	23,991,100	13,765,462	10,225,638	12,774,686	11,216,414	16,240,829	7,750,271	11,925,574	12,065,526
Massachusetts	1,247,213	1,302,997,000	55,041,800	24,548,643	30,493,157	22,787,305	32,254,495	28,951,987	26,089,813	21,301,177	33,740,623

[1] Included in Maryland data.

TABLE 2.—*Residential electric service, 1947*—Continued

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Michigan	1,534,886	2,575,721,000	$69,410,800	$41,577,069	$27,833,731	$38,522,994	$30,887,806	$49,004,025	$20,406,775	$35,954,794	$33,456,006
Minnesota	662,446	987,393,000	29,860,800	16,483,162	13,377,638	15,288,730	14,572,070	19,439,381	10,421,419	14,273,462	15,587,338
Mississippi	254,189	315,618,000	9,886,000	5,012,202	4,873,798	4,646,420	5,239,580	5,911,828	3,974,172	4,339,954	5,546,046
Missouri	823,305	1,040,008,000	32,946,100	18,383,924	14,562,176	17,033,134	15,912,966	21,645,588	11,300,512	15,912,966	17,033,134
Montana	128,927	206,101,000	6,195,000	3,134,670	3,060,330	2,905,455	3,289,545	3,692,220	2,502,780	2,713,410	3,481,590
Nebraska	268,209	358,268,000	11,740,600	6,257,740	5,482,860	5,799,856	5,940,744	7,373,097	4,367,503	5,412,417	6,328,183
Nevada	32,174	99,464,000	2,255,100	987,734	1,267,366	915,571	1,339,529	1,163,632	1,091,468	854,683	1,400,417
New Hamsphire	154,714	179,391,000	6,941,400	3,081,982	3,859,418	2,859,857	4,081,543	3,637,294	3,304,106	2,672,439	4,268,961
New Jersey	1,224,461	1,405,548,000	54,114,200	25,974,816	28,139,384	24,080,819	30,033,381	30,628,637	23,485,563	22,511,507	31,602,693
New Mexico	88,663	106,220,000	4,140,700	1,792,923	2,347,777	1,664,561	2,476,139	2,115,898	2,024,802	1,552,762	2,587,938
New York	3,784,189	4,307,288,000	166,409,400	76,714,733	89,694,667	71,223,223	95,186,177	90,526,714	75,882,686	66,397,351	100,012,049
North Carolina	615,559	818,932,000	24,406,000	13,130,428	11,275,572	12,178,594	12,227,406	15,473,404	8,932,596	11,373,196	13,032,804
North Dakota	87,557	122,297,000	4,403,500	2,078,452	2,325,048	1,928,733	2,474,767	2,452,750	1,950,750	1,801,032	2,602,468
Ohio	1,881,529	2,789,596,000	84,591,000	47,878,506	36,712,494	44,410,275	40,180,725	56,506,788	28,084,212	41,534,181	43,056,819
Oklahoma	405,949	581,705,000	16,143,800	7,490,723	8,653,077	6,941,834	9,201,966	8,830,659	7,313,141	6,489,808	9,653,992
Oregon	358,794	1,197,628,000	18,713,200	12,537,844	6,175,356	11,639,610	7,073,590	14,783,428	3,929,772	10,872,369	7,840,831
Pennsylvania	2,440,893	3,251,373,000	109,436,400	55,703,128	53,733,272	51,653,981	57,782,419	65,552,404	43,883,996	48,152,016	61,284,384
Rhode Island	208,113	189,226,000	8,594,700	3,678,532	4,916,168	3,412,096	5,182,604	4,340,324	4,254,376	3,188,634	5,406,066
South Carolina	296,380	394,301,000	11,119,500	6,293,637	4,825,863	5,837,738	5,281,762	7,427,826	3,691,674	5,459,675	5,659,825
South Dakota	98,892	125,990,000	4,354,100	1,994,178	2,359,922	1,850,493	2,503,607	2,351,214	2,002,886	1,724,224	2,629,876
Tennessee	532,000	1,234,766,000	20,675,000	15,609,625	5,065,375	14,472,500	6,202,500	18,400,750	2,274,250	13,521,450	7,153,550
Texas	1,314,995	1,417,829,000	51,183,400	26,154,717	25,028,683	24,260,932	26,922,468	30,863,590	20,319,810	22,674,246	28,509,154
Utah	159,210	274,991,000	6,966,900	4,117,438	2,849,462	3,817,861	3,149,039	4,848,962	2,117,938	3,567,053	3,399,847
Vermont	94,077	128,864,000	4,894,100	2,217,027	2,677,073	2,055,522	2,838,578	2,613,449	2,280,651	1,918,487	2,975,613
Virginia	537,568	756,899,000	24,538,400	12,416,430	12,121,970	11,508,510	13,029,890	14,624,886	9,913,514	10,747,819	13,790,581
Washington	572,159	2,057,145,000	29,434,200	21,604,703	7,829,497	20,015,256	9,418,944	25,460,583	3,973,617	18,690,717	10,743,483
West Virginia	339,538	361,107,000	13,282,600	6,720,996	6,561,604	6,229,539	7,053,061	7,916,430	5,366,170	5,817,779	7,464,821
Wisconsin	758,465	1,161,102,000	33,195,500	18,556,285	14,639,215	17,228,464	15,967,036	21,875,835	11,319,665	16,066,622	17,128,878
Wyoming	54,741	70,979,000	2,692,700	1,187,481	1,505,219	1,101,314	1,591,386	1,400,204	1,292,496	1,028,611	1,664,089
United States total	31,621,959	44,171,314,000	1,366,498,200	729,920,006	636,578,194	676,953,298	689,544,902	860,482,582	506,015,618	632,044,096	734,454,104

If it were not for these yardsticks, I dare say that the average user of electricity in this country would be paying many times the rates which he now pays. That would curtail his use of electricity and limit the enjoyment of those appliances that lift the burden of drudgery, and go to make the American home more pleasant and more attractive.

The same elements that are trying to destroy this public power program fought the development of rural electrification. If they had succeeded, the chances are that we would not have had 1 farm house out of 10 in this country electrified at the present time. Whereas, we now have about 70 or 75 percent of our farm homes electrified, and we are moving forward to the day when we will see electricity in every farm home in America.

It has done more for the farmers of the Nation than anything else that has ever been proposed. It takes to the farmer everything people have in the cities—except the noise and city taxes.

COMMERCIAL CONSUMERS

Now let us turn to the commercial consumers, the merchants, the hotel people, the operators of restaurants, filling stations, and so forth. There were 4,960,895 of them last year who used 38,378,995,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $1,031,335,100.

Under the TVA rates they would have paid $440,824,620 which would have given them a savings of $590,510,480.

Under the Tacoma rates they would have paid $420,878,747, which would have given them a savings of $610,456,353.

Under the Bonneville rates they would have paid $564,059,382, which would have given them a savings of $467,275,718.

Under the Ontario rates they would have paid $506,447,654, which would have given them a savings of $524,887,446.

Here is a table showing the number of commercial consumers for each State in the Union for 1947, the amount of electricity used, as well as what it cost them in each State, and showing what they would have saved.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 3.—*Commercial electric service, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	52,624	408,856,000	$8,758,400	$4,573,724	$4,184,676	$4,366,238	$4,392,162	$5,863,749	$2,894,651	$5,268,353	$3,490,047
Arizona	20,191	392,175,000	6,228,100	2,649,371	3,578,729	2,527,487	3,700,613	3,393,505	2,834,595	3,047,098	3,181,002
Arkansas	40,852	255,451,000	7,457,200	3,095,410	4,361,790	2,957,153	4,500,047	3,963,352	3,493,848	3,556,265	3,900,935
California	452,387	3,339,106,000	75,199,600	42,600,573	32,599,027	40,664,184	34,535,416	54,296,368	20,903,232	48,719,564	26,480,036
Colorado	44,995	385,119,000	9,767,100	4,174,947	5,592,153	3,983,805	5,783,295	5,321,800	4,445,300	4,768,493	4,998,607
Connecticut	69,945	470,006,000	16,236,400	5,819,775	10,416,625	5,552,196	10,684,204	7,441,954	8,794,446	6,689,397	9,547,003
Delaware	10,795	108,370,000	2,672,900	1,018,642	1,654,258	969,087	1,703,813	1,299,457	1,373,443	1,164,556	1,508,344
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	94,419	652,100,000	22,674,800	7,590,389	15,084,411	7,240,064	15,434,736	9,692,343	12,982,457	8,688,077	13,986,723
Georgia	78,396	714,115,000	17,312,100	7,988,496	9,323,604	7,614,035	9,698,065	10,217,428	7,094,672	9,165,372	8,146,728
Idaho	22,836	212,204,000	4,194,400	2,298,364	1,896,036	2,190,358	2,004,042	2,924,797	1,269,603	2,622,381	1,572,019
Illinois	302,708	1,984,472,000	65,988,300	26,847,340	39,140,960	25,623,917	40,364,383	34,459,750	31,528,550	30,993,385	34,994,915
Indiana	132,321	865,449,000	24,410,300	10,937,035	13,473,265	10,459,326	13,950,974	14,004,433	10,405,867	12,571,305	11,838,995
Iowa	196,265	579,656,000	17,516,200	7,974,425	9,541,775	7,613,591	9,902,609	10,193,553	7,322,647	9,165,177	8,351,023
Kansas	66,730	401,803,000	12,080,300	5,201,052	6,879,248	4,964,641	7,115,659	6,644,406	5,435,894	5,972,500	6,107,800
Kentucky	60,964	385,739,000	10,246,100	4,706,854	5,539,246	4,496,784	5,750,316	6,036,592	4,209,508	5,424,490	4,821,610
Louisiana	69,395	464,365,000	14,176,600	4,862,432	9,314,168	4,643,404	9,533,196	6,191,204	7,985,396	5,548,721	8,627,879
Maine	35,756	182,418,000	5,261,800	2,102,825	3,158,975	1,999,852	3,261,948	2,666,470	2,595,330	2,390,068	2,871,732
Maryland and District of Columbia	100,303	953,455,000	23,007,400	12,387,221	10,620,179	11,839,806	11,167,594	15,923,380	7,084,020	14,295,827	8,711,573
Massachusetts	180,182	810,293,000	32,727,900	11,056,794	21,671,106	10,551,148	22,176,752	14,090,670	18,637,230	12,641,152	20,086,748

[1] Included in Maryland data.

TABLE 3.—*Commercial electric service, 1947*—Continued

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Michigan	201,386	1,877,309,000	$48,312,600	$21,148,841	$27,163,759	$20,203,363	$28,109,237	$27,020,754	$21,291,846	$24,283,845	$24,028,755
Minnesota	110,070	708,425,000	22,281,900	8,904,738	13,377,162	8,491,632	13,790,268	11,337,477	10,944,423	10,167,008	12,114,892
Mississippi	38,216	272,252,000	7,616,900	3,020,482	4,596,418	2,879,264	4,737,636	3,844,249	3,772,651	3,451,979	4,164,921
Missouri	135,494	995,109,000	26,875,200	11,958,389	14,916,811	11,404,759	15,470,441	15,307,846	11,567,354	13,730,002	13,145,198
Montana	19,610	157,776,000	3,933,600	1,944,772	1,988,828	1,855,637	2,077,963	2,487,687	1,445,913	2,228,384	1,705,216
Nebraska	48,394	338,384,000	8,701,100	4,158,429	4,542,671	3,970,225	4,730,875	5,332,470	3,368,630	4,785,779	3,915,321
Nevada	7,530	135,645,000	2,515,000	958,467	1,556,533	914,429	1,600,571	1,225,283	1,289,717	1,098,351	1,416,649
New Hampshire	20,220	94,295,000	3,171,700	1,277,339	1,894,361	1,215,268	1,956,432	1,630,158	1,541,542	1,460,283	1,711,417
New Jersey	194,357	1,228,506,000	41,197,100	14,384,792	26,812,308	13,748,296	27,448,804	18,415,927	22,781,173	16,506,442	24,690,658
New Mexico	16,179	112,051,000	3,695,400	1,278,904	2,416,496	1,221,810	2,473,590	1,632,887	2,062,513	1,469,217	2,226,183
New York	652,206	6,642,641,000	188,812,400	62,815,997	125,996,403	60,093,323	128,719,077	80,707,860	108,104,540	72,539,836	116,272,564
North Carolina	88,928	649,140,000	15,205,900	7,439,487	7,766,413	7,079,259	8,126,641	9,459,895	5,746,005	8,473,184	6,732,716
North Dakota	22,023	124,930,000	4,381,500	1,642,712	2,738,788	1,565,992	2,815,508	2,094,006	2,287,494	1,877,385	2,504,115
Ohio	249,471	1,840,647,000	49,521,400	23,310,218	26,211,182	22,290,078	27,231,322	29,890,126	19,631,274	26,829,704	22,691,696
Oklahoma	66,873	355,387,000	10,966,700	4,574,759	6,391,941	4,360,140	6,606,560	5,828,582	5,138,118	5,241,205	5,725,495
Oregon	55,290	687,237,000	10,960,700	6,626,949	4,333,751	6,322,132	4,638,568	8,444,562	2,516,138	7,575,269	3,385,431
Pennsylvania	351,295	2,150,045,000	59,693,800	26,807,291	32,886,509	25,577,600	34,116,200	34,369,899	25,323,901	30,865,277	28,828,523
Rhode Island	27,634	131,085,000	5,294,000	1,788,525	3,505,475	1,706,733	3,587,267	2,268,373	3,025,627	2,033,902	3,260,098
South Carolina	42,817	312,549,000	6,927,800	3,325,206	3,602,594	3,175,357	3,752,443	4,238,566	2,689,234	3,803,293	3,124,507
South Dakota	24,939	114,791,000	4,356,200	1,606,306	2,749,894	1,534,515	2,821,685	2,054,994	2,301,206	1,839,623	2,516,577
Tennessee	69,738	596,298,000	10,251,100	6,789,201	3,461,899	6,472,442	3,778,658	8,668,638	1,582,462	7,781,712	2,469,388
Texas	216,609	1,819,369,000	44,937,800	19,764,094	25,173,706	18,838,376	26,099,424	25,272,120	19,665,680	22,726,394	22,211,406
Utah	16,200	155,294,000	4,070,200	1,903,307	2,166,893	1,819,461	2,250,739	2,435,730	1,634,470	2,188,383	1,881,817
Vermont	13,070	77,200,000	2,224,000	872,764	1,351,236	831,531	1,392,469	1,110,999	1,113,001	994,172	1,229,828
Virginia	79,493	725,901,000	17,920,900	7,180,367	10,740,533	6,848,114	11,072,786	9,173,888	8,747,012	8,214,045	9,706,855
Washington	76,176	1,333,884,000	18,489,400	11,883,508	6,605,892	11,350,272	7,139,128	15,235,266	3,254,134	13,692,695	4,796,705
West Virginia	48,506	228,134,000	6,668,500	2,884,793	3,783,707	2,754,291	3,914,209	3,695,283	2,973,217	3,310,644	3,357,856
Wisconsin	118,250	871,724,000	24,226,100	11,802,713	12,423,387	11,253,750	12,972,350	15,121,448	9,104,652	13,574,368	10,651,732
Wyoming	7,857	77,835,000	2,210,300	885,601	1,324,699	844,622	1,365,678	1,129,198	1,081,102	1,013,092	1,197,208
U. S. total	4,960,895	38,378,995,000	1,031,335,100	440,824,620	590,510,480	420,878,747	610,456,353	564,059,382	467,275,718	506,447,654	524,887,446

If the Power Trust could get rid of these yardsticks I dare say that those rates would increase by leaps and bounds until the average commercial consumer would be paying many times the rates he now pays for his electricity.

As I have said before, this power issue is the greatest economic question now before the American people. The hydroelectrical power in our navigable streams and their tributaries constitute the greatest wealth of this Nation, outside of the soil from which we live. It is our duty to see that this power is developed and supplied to the American people at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

Now let us take the industrial consumers. Last year there were 1,849,036 industrial users of electricity in this country. They used 135,031,188,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $1,454,931,400. Under the TVA rates they would have paid $838,744,629 which would have meant a saving of $616,186,771; under the Tacoma rates they would have paid $621,320,890, which would have meant a saving of $833,610,510; under the Bonneville rates they would have paid $925,924,002 which would have meant a saving of $529,007,398; under the Ontario rates they would have paid $968,995,468 which would have meant a saving of $485,935,932.

At this point I am inserting a table showing the number of industrial users of electricity in every State, the amount of electricity used, the amount paid for it, and the overcharges according to the TVA rates, the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services, 1947*

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
				Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	79,037	4,406,172,000	$29,215,200	$18,165,135	$11,050,065	$13,432,565	$15,782,635	$20,035,492	$9,179,708	$20,970,671	$8,244,529
Arizona	1,227	507,464,000	5,460,900	2,637,942	2,822,958	1,954,620	3,506,280	2,913,390	2,547,510	3,051,114	2,409,786
Arkansas	60,457	646,415,000	9,874,000	6,283,024	3,590,976	4,654,801	5,219,199	6,934,313	2,939,687	7,259,957	2,614,043
California	385,022	11,603,949,000	129,109,300	104,947,785	24,161,515	77,771,569	51,337,731	115,843,320	13,265,980	121,228,468	7,880,832
Colorado	29,022	462,971,000	8,043,400	3,986,872	4,056,528	2,949,193	5,094,207	4,400,384	3,643,016	4,603,238	3,440,162
Connecticut	10,482	1,696,945,000	28,244,200	13,917,612	14,326,588	10,328,621	17,915,579	15,360,646	12,874,554	16,081,965	12,162,235
Delaware	1,767	250,235,000	3,126,600	1,698,369	1,428,231	1,288,613	1,867,987	1,874,272	1,252,328	1,962,223	1,164,377
District of Columbia [1]											
Florida	5,704	860,592,000	13,251,600	5,964,280	7,287,320	4,421,794	8,829,806	6,581,274	6,670,326	6,889,772	6,361,828
Georgia	2,461	1,805,392,000	17,405,900	10,586,094	6,819,806	7,850,932	9,554,968	11,700,420	5,705,480	12,240,700	5,165,200
Idaho	7,274	382,384,000	4,139,800	2,951,470	1,188,330	2,188,505	1,951,295	3,260,672	879,128	3,409,249	730,551
Illinois	121,027	9,374,008,000	116,863,600	58,719,285	58,144,315	43,415,996	73,447,604	64,840,600	52,023,000	67,787,900	49,075,700
Indiana	102,002	3,930,517,000	51,937,100	27,658,064	24,279,036	20,504,248	31,432,852	30,529,667	21,407,433	31,990,657	19,946,443
Iowa	59,482	1,254,566,000	17,996,100	10,002,412	7,993,688	7,401,436	10,594,664	11,049,785	6,946,315	11,556,015	6,440,085
Kansas	39,052	1,178,263,000	16,008,000	8,866,351	7,141,649	6,568,242	9,439,758	9,782,489	6,225,511	10,232,794	5,775,206
Kentucky	34,428	1,678,385,000	20,194,900	11,204,939	8,989,961	8,305,759	11,889,141	12,380,282	7,814,618	12,948,364	7,246,536
Louisiana	13,329	1,583,592,000	13,347,500	7,599,934	5,747,566	5,631,978	7,715,522	8,389,705	4,957,795	8,778,117	4,569,383
Maine	7,933	693,418,000	7,752,300	4,256,168	3,496,132	3,150,768	4,601,532	4,699,832	3,052,468	4,917,904	2,834,396
Maryland and District of Columbia	34,105	3,218,209,000	35,200,800	19,009,546	16,191,254	14,077,291	21,123,509	20,980,809	14,219,991	21,970,537	13,230,263
Massachusetts	12,146	3,287,201,000	56,951,100	27,566,041	29,385,059	20,439,750	36,511,350	30,438,654	26,512,446	31,819,719	25,131,381
Michigan	27,702	5,503,472,000	68,516,000	30,970,602	37,545,398	22,928,879	45,587,121	34,160,707	34,355,293	35,755,760	32,760,240
Minnesota	36,074	1,374,117,000	21,420,000	11,469,125	9,950,875	8,497,957	12,922,043	12,653,437	8,766,563	13,255,981	8,164,019
Mississippi	31,540	490,424,000	7,084,300	3,889,423	3,194,877	2,879,272	4,205,028	4,287,985	2,796,315	4,494,138	2,590,162
Missouri	51,659	2,346,719,000	28,684,400	16,666,497	12,017,903	12,353,798	16,330,602	18,419,401	10,264,999	19,281,940	9,402,460
Montana	2,469	1,487,655,000	7,912,000	5,748,305	2,163,695	4,259,425	3,652,575	6,346,927	1,565,073	6,646,238	1,265,762
Nebraska	14,393	436,219,000	6,241,400	3,699,090	2,542,310	2,742,533	3,498,867	4,086,557	2,154,843	4,274,235	1,967,165
Nevada	1,880	159,585,000	1,466,600	1,078,333	388,267	799,502	667,098	1,190,718	275,882	1,246,200	220,400

[1] Included in Maryland data.

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services, 1947*—Continued

State	Sales			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
New Hampshire	3,327	349,076,000	$5,777,000	$3,093,237	$2,683,763	$2,291,909	$3,485,091	$3,418,251	$2,358,749	$3,575,154	$2,201,846
New Jersey	8,861	3,763,858,000	57,514,600	31,576,666	25,937,934	23,375,658	24,138,942	34,812,437	22,702,163	36,486,112	21,028,488
New Mexico	5,150	170,003,000	2,598,800	1,257,897	1,340,903	932,709	1,666,091	1,388,981	1,209,819	1,452,002	1,146,798
New York	21,752	11,668,878,000	102,690,100	49,904,308	52,785,792	36,955,086	65,735,014	55,083,996	47,606,104	57,574,232	45,115,868
North Carolina	43,202	2,935,714,000	26,751,300	17,489,465	9,261,835	12,974,381	13,776,919	19,305,878	7,445,422	20,214,085	6,537,215
North Dakota	1,364	39,369,000	970,300	455,536	514,764	337,888	632,412	503,538	466,762	527,067	443,233
Ohio	116,329	10,864,484,000	119,120,200	64,937,185	54,183,015	48,067,383	71,052,817	71,638,888	47,481,312	74,989,740	44,130,460
Oklahoma	35,790	1,020,282,000	13,484,200	7,651,609	5,832,591	5,676,579	7,807,621	8,449,469	5,034,731	8,841,859	4,642,341
Oregon	14,559	2,426,518,000	13,422,200	10,610,920	2,811,280	7,803,799	5,558,401	11,717,581	1,704,619	12,264,401	1,157,799
Pennsylvania	61,588	14,295,323,000	156,741,900	93,352,341	63,389,559	69,178,038	87,563,862	103,082,878	53,659,022	107,948,147	48,793,753
Rhode Island	2,085	631,650,000	11,232,900	5,328,101	5,904,799	3,944,321	7,288,579	5,883,793	5,349,107	6,156,191	5,076,709
South Carolina	20,801	1,413,492,000	12,188,000	7,991,915	4,196,085	5,923,002	6,264,998	8,831,303	3,356,697	9,233,263	2,954,737
South Dakota	4,353	88,361,000	1,834,800	804,450	1,030,350	596,218	1,238,582	888,098	946,702	929,033	905,767
Tennessee	6,280	5,908,623,000	27,912,600	21,308,200	6,604,400	15,784,855	12,127,745	23,528,368	4,384,232	24,611,376	3,301,224
Texas	131,495	4,167,499,000	47,485,400	27,314,077	20,171,323	20,266,769	27,218,631	30,169,849	17,315,551	31,597,734	15,887,666
Utah	2,048	497,980,000	5,311,100	3,353,800	1,957,300	2,483,152	2,827,948	3,704,121	1,606,979	3,874,129	1,436,971
Vermont	7,688	212,530,000	3,448,200	2,043,645	1,404,555	1,515,174	1,933,026	2,254,364	1,193,836	2,361,396	1,086,804
Virginia	25,011	1,783,381,000	19,459,100	11,230,820	8,228,280	8,324,019	11,135,081	12,401,090	7,058,010	12,986,225	6,472,875
Washington	26,434	6,213,951,000	29,194,600	21,862,084	7,332,516	16,198,332	12,996,268	24,155,904	5,038,696	25,260,336	3,934,264
West Virginia	26,779	2,979,251,000	30,768,100	17,578,739	13,189,361	13,012,445	17,755,655	19,399,287	11,368,813	20,294,639	10,473,461
Wisconsin	110,374	2,715,747,000	40,538,100	19,543,013	20,995,087	14,470,480	26,067,620	21,587,754	18,950,346	22,570,803	17,967,297
Wyoming	2,122	63,349,000	1,040,900	513,923	526,977	380,646	660,254	567,436	473,464	593,688	447,212
United States total	1,849,096	135,031,188,000	1,454,931,400	838,744,629	616,186,771	621,320,800	833,610,510	925,924,002	529,007,398	968,195,468	485,935,932

Let me remind you that in 1921 there was only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity produced and sold in this country for all purposes, including residential, commercial, and industrial, as well as for street lighting and transportation purposes.

You will note from table 1 that last year there were 217,581,497,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity sold in this country for residential, commercial, and industrial consumption alone. There were probably thirty or forty billion kilowatt-hours used for street lighting and transportation purposes.

Just the other day I called attention to the fact that the engineers of the Federal Power Commission, together with the Army engineers, have made an investigation and found that there are 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power going to waste every year in our navigable streams and their tributaries.

If that power were all harnessed and firmed up to the peak of the average year, there would be an additional supply of 510,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, which added to our present production would light every home, including every farm home, operate every industry, and every commercial enterprise, and heat every house in America.

It would make this the richest and the most powerful Nation the world has ever known.

Then, America could go on her glorious march of progress throughout the unfolding centuries as Henry W. Grady once said, holding high the torch and "making light the way up which all other nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time."

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statistics.)

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. May I say to the Members of this House in reply to the statement made by my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] in which he states that the people of the Tennessee Valley area are getting electricity at less than they ought to pay for it, that he is utterly wrong. Those dams were built for a triple purpose, for flood control, for navigation, and to translate the energy of the falling water into electric energy.

This country has spent billions of dollars elsewhere for flood control and for navigation, and this is the first time any money was ever spent in the valley of the Tennessee River and its tributaries for flood control or for navigation.

When Mr. TABER stated that he had read in the paper where people from Tennessee cities were borrowing or seeking to borrow money in New York with which to build steam plants, he was repeating a falsehood that was put in circulation by the $35,000-per-year lobbyist Purcell Smith who trailed his slimy length across the threshold of this Capitol in his effort to retard and, if possible, destroy the future growth and development of the State of Tennessee and all the other parts of the 90,000 square miles of territory and the property of the 5,000,000 people who live in the area. The people of my congressional district, who number 460,000 souls, have no other source from which to purchase electric power than the Tennessee Valley Authority, and unless this steam plant is authorized and this $4,000,000 appropriated to begin its construction, thousands of citizens of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee will be deprived of the benefits of electricity in their homes, on their farms, and in their businesses. The defeat of this project will be a deadly blow to the growth, development, and prosperity of 5,000,000 American citizens. It will be a victory for the corrupt, ruthless private power lobby that has haunted this Capitol since the day the proposal to build this steam plant came before the Congress.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we are, in a short time, to cast one of the significant votes in this session of the Congress. Mr. Speaker, the matter involved is not a local issue. I do not live in the Tennessee Valley. I live in the great Southwest. I believe in free enterprise, private business, and in fair opportunity for individual effort. But I am among those throughout the Nation who believe that this issue today must be resolved in favor of this steam plant. America must be strong within. People who, like most of you, are so interested in the aviation program and who realize that one of the vital issues before the world today is atomic energy can hardly be other than in favor of the motion made by the gentleman from Tennessee. Yes, the vote on the issue today is a significant one, particularly in view of the tense world situation and the demands of the future. It was no accident that the Senate, in voting on this issue, approved this plant in the Tennessee Valley by a vote of 47 to 37. If we should retard that development where we now have this atomic-energy plant by refusing to provide this steam plant, we would be playing havoc with the long-range aluminum and aviation program which has been adopted by the Congress. I am thinking of the 70-group Air Force program which we have put through Congress at this session.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that on a basis of broad policy it is the duty of the Congress to approve the pending motion. The vote today is going to be one that Members will look back to and say, "Yes, upon that occasion I did all I could to promote the aviation program and the cause of national defense."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Has this not been voted on twice in the other body?

Mr. MAHON. It has, and it has been voted on favorably. This is not a local issue, as I said. This vote today will be looked back upon by Members as a vote in favor of a real program of development of our own country. We have done enough—we have certainly done much to build up our friends abroad. But this Nation, if it is to be strong, must be

strong from within. We must be sure to develop our own resources in the interest of the peace and happiness of our people.

Our atomic energy plants in Tennessee represent an investment of huge magnitude. This investment should be made to yield the maximum in the interest of peace, national defense, and the promotion of our own domestic welfare.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this question has, as you know, been before the House before, and as we all know, the House voted down the provision for this steam plant in the TVA.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, do you not know that in 1941 they built one that cost $40,000?

Mr. JENSEN. When you talk about firming up power in the TVA, is it not more important to firm up the United States Treasury and keep it firmed up? I ask you in all sincerity, my colleagues on both sides of the middle path of this House of Representatives of the United States of America.

I made a short talk on the radio not long ago in cooperation with my good friend, Congressman KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. I shall read a part of that speech, but before I do that I would like to say that I have just received a letter from the Iowa Development Commission as did the other Iowa Congressmen, and I wish to read one paragraph from that letter which is signed by Mr. Rodney Selby, director:

> The commission feels that the use of Federal taxes collected from Iowa citizens and industries should not be used in the promotion of this TVA expansion which will compete with the growth of Iowa, and do so on an unfair and subsidized basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been said that we were short of aluminum cable for transmission lines because of the shortage of aluminum. The fact of the matter is, I have information from Alcoa to the effect that the bottleneck was not aluminum but it was the steel core which goes into the cable.

I humbly request your attention while I read the remarks which I recently made over a national network and which I am sure a great majority of the deep-thinking people of America will endorse.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman explain that this propaganda that was put out about a shortage of aluminum was purely and wholly a lie?

Mr. JENSEN. They said it was mainly a shortage of the steel core, and not a shortage of aluminum.

I will now read the radio talk that I referred to:

> I am glad to take part in this broadcast with my good friend and colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER.
>
> A primary function of the Federal Government is to defend the Nation and to break the will of any enemy to our free-enterprise system in peacetime as well as in time of aggression. That function in time of war is chiefly confined to the actions and activities of the armed forces. Nevertheless the activities of the military forces must be closely allied to the functions of the national economy.
>
> Fortunately, the lessons of World War II are too recent to have been forgotten. It will be recalled that prior to World War II the Nation underwent an era of preparation during which Federal agencies, dedicated to promotion of Government ownership, continually raised the cry of "power shortage," with the assertion that private enterprise was incapable of meeting the emergency of war.
>
> There were several gross miscalculations in their estimates, however. These were revealed when the industry was put to the actual test of war production. True, some additional capacity was added in Government-owned systems, but the main burden fell directly upon private industry. The capacity that was added to Federal systems could as well have been added to the installations of private enterprise, built with private funds and subject to taxation by the local, State, and Federal governments.
>
> As Mr. Krug, then Chairman of the War Production Board, and presently Secretary of the Interior, was free to state:
>
> "Electric power has been the lubrication for this tremendous war plant * * * this unique record of the electric utilites is an inspiring tribute to the men and women in the industry whose unfailing efforts made the record possible."
>
> He could well have added that TVA itself was "bailed out" on its war contract commitments through the facilities of private enterprise which during drought periods interchanged power from adjacent private power systems from distances of as far as a thousand miles away. He also could have added that under the direction of the United States Army, private enterprise built the steam plant which furnished most of the power at the Oak Ridge atomic plant.
>
> The pent-up buying power and consumptive capacity of the Nation following VJ-day released an enormous demand for increased electric capacity far greater than existed even during World War II. This placed a combined demand on the private companies and municipal facilities. Furthermore, additional capacity since installed is all now available for any emergency to an extent greater than dreamed of during World War II, and more is on the way.
>
> The private utilities' construction program is bigger than that of any other single industry in America because they have faith in the patriotism and good sense of the American people to properly protect private enterprise.
>
> The present emphasis on national defense must not be permitted to become a clinching argument in the hands of those who seek to nationalize, socialize, or communize America. The Administration's proposal to construct steam plants now carries with it a precedent affecting the time-tested principles of our Nation. With these proposals the great planners no longer hide behind what Senator Norris called the "constitution peg" of navigation and flood control as a legal basis upon which to conduct electric power business. They also appear to forget the fact that our laws provide that Federal power production from multipurpose projects must be justified on need for irrigation.
>
> They now want to embark upon a program of manufacture and sale of electric energy as an end in itself. We know now what actually is in the mind of the great planners who brazenly admit they want to put the Government in direct competition with its own citizens.
>
> If the principle is established this precedent certainly will not be confined to electric power. This can only lead to Government ownership of every industry including farming, mercantile, and all, both large and small, upon which the life and productive capacity of our Nation is dependent for its very existence.
>
> The privately owned electrical industry cannot now be a "power trust," for the reason that Congress long ago took steps under the death-sentence clause—by breaking up the large holding companies in this industry—to effectively eliminate the possibility of the existence of a private power trust.
>
> But the same cannot be said of the federally dominated power trust which is entirely different than farmer-owned REA or municipally owned or PUD-owned power facilities.
>
> Acting in obvious concord and prearranged plan, the Federal power trust fostered and aided by the policies of the Federal Government for the past 15 years, has now become a very real threat to the operation of our free economy. Let us not forget in this electric age that he who controls the electric energy of America controls America.
>
> It is noteworthy that the privately owned electric companies pay annually over $650,000,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes which would have to be paid by other taxpayers if the Federal power trust has its way.
>
> I should like to quote to you the candid statement of David E. Lilienthal, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and at present the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in an article appearing in October 1945:
>
> "* * * those who control energy, control people."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has 20 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Texas 8.

Mr. PLOESER. I have an agreement not to use 10 minutes of my time. I therefore ask the gentleman from Texas to use his time.

Mr. MAHON. I think in fairness the RECORD should show that numerous Members have requested time but that it is not possible to give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a member of the committee, the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may have the attention of every man on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I do not live in the Tennessee Valley. My home section is served by the Mississippi Power & Light Co., though a large part of my State is served by the TVA. However, I have been privileged to sit on this committee and to hear the testimony with regard to this proposed steam plant. I say to the Members on the left side of the aisle, who have been led to believe that this steam plant is a proposal to take away business from the private utilities, such is not the case. This power to be generated by this steam plant is for the purpose of firming up additional water power that is provided in this bill.

This is not a question of public power against private power. That question was decided when this region was made to depend on the TVA for power.

Insofar as the Tennessee Valley is concerned it was determined by this Congress a number of years ago that the TVA would be the sole utility serving a big area in seven States. That is the only utility to which those people can look for current, that is the only source

of supply; and here today is an amendment to provide that they have a steam plant to fill in during the dry summer months so that the hydro power will be dependable on a year-round basis, and not left as dump power, largely usable only by industry.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry, I do not have time to yield.

This Congress decided that the TVA was the only source of supply they would have.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I refuse to yield. I have only a few minutes. I wish I could.

This Congress decided that question for them, having decided that question we should see to it that the TVA is permitted to meet the needs of the area as the private utilities meet the needs in their areas. Having set the TVA system up, it belongs to the United States, the dams, the distribution system, everything. Last year we provided that the TVA repay over a period of 40 years, the Federal Government the money we have invested.

When this is done, and it will be done, the TVA system will still belong to the United States.

Owning this system, we have placed numerous war plants in the region. These take hundreds of thousands of kilowatt-hours of electricity that is not available for use by domestic users in the region. The atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge there for the defense of this Nation takes annually more than 225,000 kilowatt-hours and the record shows that in the future they are going to need 50,000 more kilowatt-hours of electricity.

This is not a new venture. The TVA today operates five steam plants. The Congress transferred one, authorized the purchase of others, and we built another.

These steam plants produce about a billion kilowatt-hours of electricity as a result of these steam plants' production. The TVA has been able to supply three or four million dollars of extra kilowatt-hours of hydro, firm dependable power that they could not sell and could not deliver to the people of this Nation in the absence of those steam plants. The record shows last year three or four million kilowatt-hours were made available to this country that is starving for electric current. Today millions of people beg for electricity. According to the Federal Power Commission there is only two-tenths of 1 percent margin of safety between the electricity used in this country today and our total capacity to produce.

The addition of this steam plant manufacturing 200,000 kilowatt-hours will make dependable 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity needed by the municipalities and REA co-ops in the region and elsewhere.

Oh, this Congress has appropriated this year and for next year $800,000,000 for the REA. We thought we were doing a whole lot for the American farmer. But as stated today there is only two-tenths of 1 percent margin of safety between the amount of electricity that we are consuming and the maximum that we can produce? We do not have the needed electricity in this Nation. Did you know that the TVA is interconnected with the private utilities, that any firm power, manufactured by the TVA, and not needed by them, goes to the private companies and helps to serve their areas too; that during the war the TVA is all that saved us.

Under the terms of this bill a number of new hydro units are provided.

For about 7 months of the year those hydro units can produce electricity. It is said you do not want to move industry from other areas to the Tennessee Valley, and I can appreciate that feeling. The TVA has made no effort to do that and the record shows industry has grown throughout the South. I believe this is wholesome for the area and the Nation. You are providing this current from hydroelectric facilities for 7 months of the year and the folks cannot get it the rest of the time unless it is firmed up. What REA cooperative could take electricity for only 7 months? How could they provide this extra energy for the people who want it in their homes, for the municipalities, unless it is firmed up and made available on a year-round basis. I would like to see it go to the homes, to the people, to the communities. I would like to see it firmed up so it will be dependable, otherwise industry is bound to be the only taker, directly or through the private utilities who would buy the hydroelectricity at dump rates.

This Congress only yesterday considered the drafting of the youth of this land to be put in the Army for the defense of this Nation. I say to you when you are willing to do that, and I know there is not a man who did not regret casting that vote, it is just as important to provide for the future national defense of this country by having power necessary for the operation of war plants in time of need. I do not come from the Tennessee Valley. I am served by a public utility. As I stated, it is just as important to provide for the future national defense of this country in this bill as it was in the other bill.

They may say that this is just starting a plant and it is not supposed to be in being until 1951. But let me tell you that the Watts Bar Dam built in 1940 and 1941 under the exigencies of the situation was completed in 18 months. We are starting that which we can call on in time of need.

Did you know that in the Tennessee Valley 51 percent of all the aluminum that was used in the last war was produced by reason of TVA electricity? That there is no other area that is able to provide that? Did you know that you just passed a bill providing for a 70-group air force and that air force will not be built unless you can get the aluminum? That the TVA is the source of power to which we must look?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that in 1941 this Congress appropriated virtually $40,000,000 for construction of the Watts Bar steam plant?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true. The Congress did that and it was a life saver during the recent war. I hope we will not have any war in the future. I hope you will see that this is just as much in the interest of the national defense as were these acts you have passed in the last few days.

The Senate has just approved this plant for the second time. The vote was by a considerable majority. A few days ago this House of Representatives provided under the Marshall plan more than $5,000,000,000 in foreign aid in an effort to provide for the national security. I believe that this Congress having provided that the people of a great part of 7 States must look to the TVA and the TVA alone for their electricity that we are obligated to make additions to the TVA system to meet the needs of the region. We cannot justify doing otherwise. We owe it to the Nation to make available the extra billion kilowatt-hours the steam plant would make firm, but above all else in this time of emergency, we should provide the maximum amount of electricity available for the very security of the Nation in time of war, badly needed by the people in time of peace. I plead with you to support this amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe this matter now before the House is of paramount importance to every Member of the House from every part of the country. We are changing the entire philosophy of the Tennessee Valley Authority. That Authority was originally authorized to build dams for flood control and navigation. Now they come in here and for the first time in this bill ask us to authorize a project, the initial cost of which will be $4,000,000, for the benefit of a group of industries and which it is estimated will cost ultimately $80,000,000.

We would like to have these power plants in our part of the country. In the daily papers we read that the private industries in the New England area and in the other great industrial areas of the country are building their own power plants at their own expense. Why then should we authorize power plants to be built in the Tennessee Valley area with public money in order that low-cost electricity may be provided for competing industries to those industries in our part of the country? I hope the pending proposition will be defeated.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is highly important that all of the Members of the House understand at this point the parliamentary situation. The situation is that the Committee on Appropriations did not allow any money and felt that it would be subject to a point of order if they authorized by any language the building of a steam-power plant at New Johnsonville in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority. When the bill came to the floor of this House there was an attempt made to amend it. The language was not offered because it was clear to both sides that such language probably could not withstand a point of order. The request here for $4,000,000

to begin construction would result ultimately in the establishment of an $84,000,000 project. The House denied that amendment by a vote of 192 to 152. The amendment was included, I should say, in a motion to recommit, and a roll call was had. The Senate restored this amount and sought to put in the language. The conference became deadlocked because the House refused to yield.

Now we are back to the House in disagreement. I have offered a motion to insist upon the House position, because I have confidence and reason to think that if this House maintains its position, which I believe to be right, that that will be the ultimate position of the Congress when the bill becomes law. There has been a preferential motion made to recede from the House position and concur in the Senate amendment. So, those who believe in the House position have the duty and the obligation to vote "no" on the motion before the House at the present time. "No" means no money for an unauthorized steam plant at New Johnsonville; "yes" means an attempt to authorize that which has not heretofore been authorized in the TVA Act.

This committee has been most liberal with TVA. We have given them $29,000,000 for the acquisition and installation of hydroelectric generators—11 in all. We have given them $15,000,000 for the completion of two dams. There has never been an attempt on the part of this committee, and I have been a member of it since its inception, to forestall in any way that part of the development of the Tennessee Valley which is legally authorized. Now the attempt is to reach out and go into the full utility business, even though it is clearly stated in the law and clearly admitted by even the advocates of the Tennessee Valley Authority that there was never any intent on the part of the organic act that hydroelectric power be anything but a surplus commodity, the original intent of the act being navigation and flood control.

As to the argument that this is a national defense project the Atomic Energy Commission refused me as chairman of this committee the very information which they gave to the former chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, and which he made public. I had to visit the Tennessee Valley Authority and Oak Ridge where the management of Oak Ridge very freely gave me the information in the presence of numerous people, even including one newspaper reporter, and said there was no secret about it.

Oddly enough, that information was available from the former head of the TVA, who in testimony in years past admitted that they had no authority to build a steam plant. Oddly enough, that testimony was readily available when they thought they had a chance to put it over in the other body. But to an official Appropriations Committee of this House it was a secret matter and could not be made available.

They did make available to me certain figures as regards the uses of power from TVA, but they were made to me as totally restricted. I have them in my possession and they have never been released, so I cannot give them to you, but I can tell you that TVA bought power from Oak Ridge. I yield to the vice chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee for a statement he might wish to make on this subject.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think it is most unfortunate that the proponents of this steam plant for TVA have seen fit to justify it upon the needs of the Atomic Energy Commission in its operations at Oak Ridge. Oak Ridge was selected by the Manhattan District for the purpose of obtaining cheap power from TVA, that is true, but in order to make sure that the Commission's activities at Oak Ridge would not be completely dependent upon TVA power during slack periods, it has constructed and is operating a steam-generating plant, and, as the gentleman said, in times past has sold its surplus power back to TVA. So the answer is that if the Atomic Energy Commission needs additional power, and there is some indication that it does, the way to get it is not to rely on TVA, but simply to expand its presently operated steam-generating plant at Oak Ridge, which I understand can be done by the installation of one additional boiler.

Mr. PLOESER. That is correct. I thank the gentleman from New York. Let me say the chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, a Senator, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] voted against this plant.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As one Member of the Congress of the United States who has felt that some curtailment of Federal spending is absolutely essential in the interest of the country, I want to say to the gentleman and the members of his Committee on Appropriations who have fought for economy and who have fought for integrity in the affairs coming before them that they have my compliments and my commendation. I know it is not an easy job to do some of the things you gentlemen on the committee have been called on to do, but you have done them and dealt with them as best you could. I am glad to have observed as we have gone along through this Congress the willingness of the Members to stand with the committee.

Mr. PLOESER. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Let me read one more thing in connection with national defense, but let me preface it by saying that when Mr. Clapp was before the committee at no point did he attempt to make any pretense of the argument of national defense. I want to quote the hearings, because this particular quotation is vitally important.

This is what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for whom I have the highest regard and who is a very able member of this committee, said during the hearing:

> It seems to me that it is very fundamental. It goes beyond the questions which have, I think, only been scratched. It goes to the very basic purposes of the TVA Act. That was my purpose. I specifically reemphasize and purposely so the fact that on yesterday Mr. Clapp stated categorically and repeatedly that this program was not related to the national defense and that he in no way was attempting to justify on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said about lobbying. Personally I am one of those fellows who do not care whether lobbyists are here or not. I do not pay any attention to them. There are more lobbyists per square foot in this town from the bureaus than you can find in the balance of the world from any place else. I just want to let you see how lobbying does go on for cheap power.

I hold in my hand an enlargement of a circular. It says:

> Be sure and write your Senator from Tennessee to see that he votes right on this steam plant.

That is lobbying for cheap power. I just show that to you. These people have a right to do that. They have a perfect right to do it. I do not blame them. All I say, and the only purpose for calling that to your attention is that it is cheap power because the balance of the United States of America is subsidizing it. Why delude ourselves?

It has been said that they need this to firm up power. I doubt that argument. I could deny the argument, but let us concede it for the sake of controversy. Why cannot these various communities put in their own steam plants? The reason is very simple—because the TVA has negotiated and completed with them monopoly contracts that prohibit them from purchasing power from any other source or developing it themselves. Talk about monopolies? Is a monopoly any less damnable because it is operated by government? In my conception of free enterprise, you can be equally as oppressive so far as the progress of a nation is concerned by the deadening monopoly hand of government as you can by any other monopoly.

I have before me an article from the New York Herald Tribune which announces on its financial page that—

> The four cities of Memphis, Chattanooga, Nashville, and Knoxville have been reported in financial and utility circles as drawing plans for the possible construction of a steam generating plant in the event that the Senate should not grant the authority to TVA.

I compliment those cities for doing that. That is the way we do it in good old Missouri—we do it ourselves. When I was in the Tennessee Valley I was asked by a newspaperman, "Well, what are we going to do if we want to bring more industry into Tennessee?" I said, "Do it as we do it in Missouri." He said, "How is that?" "Well," I said, "we get the lead out of your energy and go out and build it yourselves."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And we pay for it.

Mr. PLOESER. Yes; and we pay for it ourselves.

Now, I have no objection to the development of hydroelectric power, but I do have a very definite objection to the creation of a corporate state which like an octopus keeps reaching, and reaching, and reaching socialistically until it engulfs and monopolizes and controls everything within its vicious, oppressive grasp.

I do not mind telling you that I think, if we allow these things to go on until they expand and cover the entire 48 States, you will have by that time completely crushed freedom in America, because you will have crushed free enterprise.

I ask this House again to stand by its conferees and vote down this motion to recede and concur, and vote for the motion to stand firm in the conference for the elimination of this item from the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, after thorough study and deliberation the Senate has passed favorably upon the TVA request for funds with which to commence construction of a steam powered electric generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. Much detailed discussion of great length and complexity has been heard on this subject but the basic question is clear and simple. Is the TVA to be allowed to continue its vitally important development? There is no question but that this great project which has met its many obligations, has served the people and has stimulated private industry to a higher peak of development than this area has ever before known. TVA must be allowed to continue.

I submit that the continued development of TVA is linked directly with our national preparedness and our Nation's industrial strength which is the main artery of our military strength.

I wish to make three fundamental points concerning the need for the New Johnsonville steam plant.

First. I submit that TVA power is the only source of supply in this area and failure to allow the construction of this much needed new source with which to firm up power during the summer months will adversely affect the 5,000,000 people and hundreds of industries in the Valley.

Second. I submit that the entire Nation is faced with a power shortage and that to deny the right of expansion of power anywhere in the Nation at this time would be an ill-conceived move. Demand for power in the Tennessee Valley has increased 60 percent since the war and those who distribute TVA power expect a 60-percent increase on top of that.

Third. I submit that in the face of the billions we are spending to rehabilitate foreign countries and reestablish their economies we must not overlook the reasonable needs of the people of our own country.

The full weight of the validity of the claim we make as to the serious need for this new steam plant as wholly necessary to TVA in carrying on its power supply and over-all development of the resources of this region has been underscored by the approval given this appropriation in the Senate. I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the House will review the facts and carefully consider the voluminous evidence in favor of allowing TVA to construct the New Johnsonville steam plant. This matter is of deep concern to the millions of people who live in this area. They are anxiously awaiting the answer of the House.

The territory served by the TVA is fixed by contract. We are not asking this appropriation for the purpose of competing with any utility in any other section. It is for the service of the people in the Tennessee Valley. Remember that Congress has decreed that the people of the Tennessee Valley must rely upon the TVA for power. It is the sole supplier. In good faith Congress should allow this further development. It is not fair to any section to put an economic lid on their further progress. The TVA is only asking for authority to do for the people of the Tennessee Valley the very things that private power companies are seeking to do for people in other sections—that is to increase their electric supply.

We are operating on a dangerous margin of available electric energy. These different plants, such as the atomic energy plant and the aluminum plants have been located in the Tennessee Valley recently. They cannot be moved. If we are to carry out our program of preparedness we cannot in good faith deny available electricity for these plants.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the taxpayers of the rest of the Nation will pay for this investment. This is not true. Under the law the TVA investment will be amortized in 40 years. It will be paid for by the users of electricity in the Tennessee Valley and our vital defense plants will have electric power available.

I have served here for 9 years. I have made many pleas to my colleagues but I have never been more concerned or more vitally interested in a project than I am in this one. I urge you to consider it on the basis of its merits. I wish to make a personal plea to my colleagues to not put an economic ceiling on the development of the great Tennessee Valley region. I urge you personally to vote for the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the vote in order to stand by the conferees of the House?

The SPEAKER. The vote will come on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 143, noes 157.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 201, answered "present" 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—186

Abbitt	Anderson, Calif.	Battle
Abernethy	Andrews, Ala.	Beckworth
Albert	Angell	Bland
Allen, Calif.	Earden	Blatnik
Andersen, H. Carl	Barrett	Bloom
	Bates, Ky.	Boggs, La.
Bonner	Gregory	Norton
Boykin	Hardy	O'Brien
Brown, Ga.	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Bryson	Hart	O'Toole
Buchanan	Havenner	Pace
Buckley	Hill	Patman
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Peterson
Burleson	Hobbs	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Philbin
Camp	Horan	Phillips, Tenn.
Cannon	Huber	Pickett
Carroll	Hull	Poage
Celler	Isacson	Poulson
Chapman	Jackson, Wash.	Powell
Chelf	Jarman	Preston
Cole, Mo.	Javits	Price, Fla.
Colmer	Jennings	Price, Ill.
Combs	Johnson, Calif.	Priest
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Cooper	Karsten, Mo.	Rankin
Courtney	Kee	Rayburn
Cox	Kefauver	Redden
Cravens	Kelley	Richards
Crosser	Kennedy	Riley
Curtis	Keogh	Rockwell
Davis, Ga.	Kerr	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Rooney
Deane	Kirwan	Sabath
Delaney	Klein	Sadowski
Dingell	Lanham	Sasscer
Donohue	Lea	Sheppard
Dorn	Lesinski	Sikes
Doughton	Lucas	Smathers
Douglas	Lusk	Smith, Va.
Eberharter	Lyle	Somers
Elliott	McCormack	Spence
Ellsworth	McDonough	Stefan
Engle, Calif.	McMillan, S. C.	Stockman
Evins	Mack	Stratton
Fallon	Madden	Teague
Feighan	Mahon	Thomas, Tex.
Fernandez	Manasco	Tollefson
Fisher	Mansfield	Trimble
Flannagan	Marcantonio	Vinson
Fogarty	Meade, Ky.	Welch
Folger	Meade, Md.	West
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Garmatz	Miller, Nebr.	Whitaker
Gary	Mills	Whitten
Gathings	Monroney	Whittington
Gearhart	Morgan	Williams
Gordon	Morris	Wilson, Tex.
Gore	Morrison	Winstead
Gorski	Morton	Wood
Gossett	Multer	Worley
Granger	Murdock	
Grant, Ala.	Murray, Tenn.	

NAYS—201

Allen, Ill.	Dague	Jackson, Calif.
Allen, La.	Davis, Wis.	Jenison
Andresen, August H.	Dawson, Utah	Jenkins, Ohio
	Devitt	Jenkins, Pa.
Andrews, N. Y.	D'Ewart	Jensen
Arends	Dirksen	Johnson, Ill.
Arnold	Dolliver	Johnson, Ind.
Auchincloss	Domengeaux	Jones, N. C.
Bakewell	Dondero	Jones, Wash.
Bates, Mass.	Ellis	Jonkman
Beall	Elsaesser	Judd
Bell	Elston	Kean
Bender	Engel, Mich.	Kearney
Bennett, Mich.	Fenton	Kearns
Bishop	Foote	Keating
Blackney	Fuller	Keefe
Bolton	Fulton	Kersten, Wis.
Bradley	Gamble	Kilburn
Bramblett	Gavin	Kunkel
Brehm	Gillette	Landis
Brooks	Gillie	Latham
Brophy	Goff	LeCompte
Buck	Goodwin	LeFevre
Buffett	Graham	Lewis, Ohio
Burke	Grant, Ind.	Lichtenwalter
Busbey	Griffiths	Lodge
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Love
Canfield	Gwinn, N. Y.	McConnell
Carson	Gwynne, Iowa	McCowen
Case, N. J.	Hagen	McCulloch
Chadwick	Hale	McDowell
Chenoweth	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGarvey
Chiperfield		McGregor
Church	Halleck	McMahon
Clark	Hand	McMillen, Ill.
Clason	Harness, Ind.	MacKinnon
Clevenger	Harris	Macy
Clippinger	Harrison	Maloney
Coffin	Harvey	Martin, Iowa
Cole, Kans.	Hébert	Mason
Cole, N. Y.	Hedrick	Mathews
Corbett	Herter	Merrow
Cotton	Heselton	Meyer
Coudert	Hess	Michener
Crawford	Hoeven	Miller, Conn.
Crow	Hoffman	Miller, Md.
Cunningham	Hope	Mitchell

Muhlenberg	Rogers, Mass.	Stevenson
Murray, Wis.	Rohrbough	Sundstrom
Nicholson	Ross	Taber
Nixon	Russell	Talle
Nodar	Sadlak	Taylor
Norblad	St. George	Tibbott
Norrell	Sanborn	Towe
O'Hara	Sarbacher	Twyman
Passman	Schwabe, Mo.	Vail
Patterson	Schwabe, Okla.	Van Zandt
Phillips, Calif.	Scott, Hardie	Vorys
Ploeser	Scrivner	Vursell
Potter	Seely-Brown	Walter
Potts	Shafer	Welchel
Ramey	Short	Wigglesworth
Reed, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.	Wolcott
Rees	Smith, Ohio	Wolverton
Rich	Smith, Wis.	Woodruff
Riehlman	Snyder	Youngblood
Rizley	Stanley	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wadsworth

NOT VOTING—42

Banta	Hays	Peden
Bennett, Mo.	Heffernan	Plumley
Boggs, Del.	Hendricks	Reeves
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Regan
Butler	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Dawson, Ill.	King	Scoblick
Durham	Knutson	Scott,
Eaton	Lane	Hugh D., Jr.
Fellows	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Fletcher	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Gallagher	Lewis, Ky.	Stigler
Hall,	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Leonard W.	Lynch	Thompson
Hartley	Mundt	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Bennett of Missouri against.

Mr. Peden for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Lemke for, with Mr. Wadsworth against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Banta against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Scoblick against.

Mr. Stigler for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Gallagher, against.

Mr. King for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

General pairs until further notice.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Ludlow.

Mr. Fellows with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Mundt with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Regan.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. Fletcher with Mr. Larcade.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded in the negative. I have a pair with the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. LEMKE. Had he been present he would have voted in the affirmative. I therefore withdraw my vote and ask to be recorded as present.

Mr. KEARNEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BRADLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] to insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 7: On page 8, line 17, insert "if not otherwise required to be turned into the Treasury under the provisions of the proposed Federal charter."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Before the period at the end thereof, insert ": *Provided further*, That section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (Public Law 248, approved December 6, 1945), shall not be applicable with respect to the Panama Railroad Company until after June 30, 1949."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13: Page 6, line 24, insert "plus accrued dividends thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 of the funds of said Corporation shall be available until June 30, 1952, for the payment of such expenses as the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board or his designee or designees may find necessary for winding up the affairs and effecting the dissolution of the United States Housing Corporation and the United States Housing Corporation of Pennsylvania."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: after "plus accrued dividends thereon" insert "which, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall be computed at a rate approximating the average interest cost incurred by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation on its total borrowings during each respective fiscal year."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Texas delegation in Congress, and in behalf of the delegation, I have asked for this time in order to take note of the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], who has recently been in the hospital, is back on the House floor. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. Speaker, the Members have indicated by their standing and applause the high regard which Members have for MILTON WEST. Few will have an opportunity to speak but the spontaneous applause of Members on both sides of the aisle will mean more to MILTON WEST than any number of rhetorical speeches. For him I want to thank you for the tribute you have paid him.

When that great Texan, John Nance Garner, went from the speakership of the House of Representatives to the Vice Presidency, MILTON WEST was elected in his district to succeed him. MILTON WEST has served faithfully and well through the years. He has occupied a position of power and usefulness on the Ways and Means Committee, the major committee of the House. He is retiring voluntarily from Congress after the end of this term, and this may be the last day that he will be on the floor with us in an official capacity; and in behalf of my colleague from Texas and the others who love MILTON WEST I wanted to say this word of tribute and good cheer.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the distinguished Democratic leader of the House and former Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am not going to delay the proceedings, but I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying something about one of the loveliest men I have ever known, a man of sterling character, of stout heart, a great friend, and a fine American.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Of all the men with whom I have served in Congress, MILTON WEST is one of the finest fellows I have ever known in or out of Congress. He is a gentleman of the highest order and I am glad to call him a real friend and a fine Congressman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I would just like to add my word of appraisal of MILTON WEST, a fine friend, a great man, one of the true western type. MILT WEST will be missed by his many friends in this House.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I just want to say on behalf of the Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee that we have enjoyed the companionship of MILTON WEST and his fine character. We are sorry to see him go.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I wish to inform the House that the gentleman from Texas comes from the neighborhood of Mission, McAllen, and that area of Texas where I served in 1916. Since I became a Member of the House I have come to know MILTON WEST personally and I want to say that when he retires a real American will leave this House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I realize there are many who want to speak, many who have asked me to yield to them, but in view of the limitation of the time I will not be able to. Yet, I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I think MILTON WEST comes nearer to being the typical American that will keep this country safe than any man with whom I am acquainted. I have a great affection and respect for him. I am sorry he is leaving.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, on June 19, 1948, and was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means:

RESOLUTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the Honorable MILTON H. WEST, of Texas, has been a Member of Congress since 1933 and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means since 1939; and

Whereas the said MILTON H. WEST has by his diligence and ability made a lasting contribution to the work accomplished by the Ways and Means Committee in the preparation and passage of important legislation; and

Whereas the said MILTON H. WEST has gained the respect, admiration, and affection of all the members of the committee for his devotion to the highest principles of public service to his country; and

Whereas the said MILTON H. WEST is resigning from Congress at the end of his present term: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives hereby express its sorrow over the loss to us of the intelligent, farsighted, and statesmanlike services of Mr. MILTON H. WEST, and that a copy of this resolution be presented to him as a tangible token of our high esteem for him and as evidence and recognition of our appreciation for his services on our committee.

At this time I wish to add my own personal sentiments on the retirement of my friend and colleague. It was a pleasure and a privilege for me to have served on the Ways and Means Committee with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. His advice and his constructive thinking on the legislation which came before us was always of the greatest value and assistance to the committee. His retirement from Congress is both a personal loss to me and to the membership of the Ways and Means Committee.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] is an outstanding public servant, and I know I speak for every member of the Ways and Means Committee in wishing him continued success and happiness.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all of us are happy to see MILTON WEST on the floor again. We regret he is retiring. No man in the House is more respected and admired more.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with his many other friends in the House who regret to see MILTON WEST retire from Congress. As a member of the Texas Legislature and during his tenure in Congress, MILT was a real public servant and a great American. We hate to see him leave.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as one of Mr. WEST's colleagues from Texas, I desire to pay tribute to him. It was my privilege to serve in the Texas Legislature after MILTON had served there. He was recognized as one of the most able members of the Texas House of Representatives. This was demonstrated by the fact the the people of the congressional district in which he lived chose him to succeed Hon. John Nance Garner when Mr. Garner was elected Vice President.

When I came to Congress 10 years ago, one of the Members of Congress who helped me most was MILTON WEST. Always he has been and is considerate of and helpful to new Members who consult him as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, on committee assignments. The people of MILTON'S district and of Texas as well as the membership of the House know about and are aware of the faithful and efficient job of work MILTON has done here. It is known well that he is competent, conscientious, courageous, and able. We are not happy that MILTON is leaving Congress. We all shall miss him and his effective and constructive work; however, as he leaves Congress voluntarily, we wish for him every success and happiness.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever known any Member of the House to "go WEST" without causing me profound sorrow.

This afternoon the entire membership of the House has gone "WEST" in a glorious outpouring of affectionate regard the like of which these walls have rarely, if ever, heard or witnessed.

It was genuine. Spontaneous. Heartwarming. Never to be forgotten. Such popularity must be deserved. It is. Our joy in paying these tributes is tinged with sorrow, only our sense of loss that we share with the district, State, and Nation he served so well till he voluntarily laid the burden of that service down.

He can leave us, but never our love.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words to those already spoken in praise of MILTON WEST. Before I came to Congress I had heard many times of the great stature of the man and now that I have served with him I know that his reputation, as I had known it, and his stature, is even greater and higher than I had expected. He has served this House and our country well and diligently and his retirement from this body will create a vacancy among us which will be keenly felt. We all regret that he has chosen to leave us but we wish him restored health and happiness among his people in the southern tip of Texas. God speed you, MILTON. You take with you our best wishes, always.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is losing a valuable and able Member, the Honorable MILTON WEST. He has made a wonderful record in Congress and has as many friends in this House as any Member I have ever known. He has always been constructive in his efforts and no district has had a truer and more effective Representative than MILTON WEST.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the applause of his fellow Members attests the high regard in which MILTON WEST is held. I served with MILT in the legislature of Texas 15 years ago. I admired his character and ability then. For 10 years I have been his neighbor on the fifth floor of the House Office Building. All those years I have known him as a good neighbor. He enjoys the friendship and the respect not only of his Texas neighbors but of the entire House. He is retiring of his own volition. We all wish him well. We regret the parting, but those of us who know his "magic valley" will understand why he might prefer a home there instead of the tumult of Washington. Adios, mi amigo.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting here to say that the people of the Fifteenth District of Texas are losing a fine Representative with the departure from Congress of MILTON WEST. This hard-working and conscientious Congressman from Brownsville served his people and his Nation well. I know I echo the regret of all in his leaving.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress I sought advice from the elder members of the Texas delegation and I sincerely appreciate the helpful counsel given me by the Honorable MILTON WEST. He has been an able Representative for his Texas district here in Congress and is deserving of the rest and relaxation of retirement he looks forward to after this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely wish that Mr. WEST will enjoy good health which all of us pray he has regained and we will long remember our pleasant association with him in Congress.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I, of course, joined in the resolution unanimously adopted by the committee and presented by Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman, on June 19, 1948. However, I desire to add my own personal comment on the retirement of this splendid public servant.

It has been my pleasure to serve with him throughout the years and although I have served with many men since I have been a Member of this body, I have not served with any person who has made a more favorable impression on me than has MILTON WEST. He is a rugged individual and a credit to the great State of Texas from whence he comes. I have found him to be a man of strong personal convictions and possessing at all times the courage of his convictions. I have never known a more kindly individual, a more loyal friend, or a more modest public servant than MILTON WEST. I think his autobiography in the Congressional Directory is expressive of the modesty of this outstanding individual. It simply states: MILTON H. WEST, Democrat, of Brownsville, Tex.

It is with deep regret that I learned of his voluntary retirement but I know that he has longed for the wide open spaces of Texas, and, as he returns to the land of his nativity and the soil he loves so well, he carries with him the affection, the high esteem, and the best wishes for health, happiness, and prosperity of every Member of this body.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with keen regret that I learned of the determination of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. MILTON WEST, to retire from public life. The Congress, the country, and the congressional district which he has served so well during the past 15 years will lose a valuable and distinguished Representative.

It was my good fortune to have served with him on the Committee on Ways and Means for the past 6 years. His quiet humor, his logical thinking, the cheerful presentation of his views won for him the admiration and respect of his colleagues on the committee.

I wish him many years of happiness and good health down along the Rio Grande.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 20, line 14, strike out "within 30 days after the date of enactment hereof" and insert "as of June 30, 1948."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: "not later than July 30, 1948, as of June 30, 1948 (the corporate records for the fiscal year 1948 to be closed by Defense Homes Corporation prior to actual transfer thereof)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 25, line 11, after "$25,000,000" insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, in addition to the foregoing the Corporation is authorized to utilize, from the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1148a), such sums as may be necessary (a) to make loans, during a period of 5 years, to bona fide fur farmers in accordance with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148), the aggregate principal amount of which loans shall not exceed $4,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and (b) not to exceed $50,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration in connection with such loans."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, in addition to the foregoing the Corporation is authorized to utilize, from the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (12 U. S. C. 1148a), such sums as may be necessary (a) to make loans, during a period of 5 years, to bona fide fur farmers in accordance with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148), all such loans to carry full personal liability of the borrowers and to be secured by such collateral as is deemed by the Corporation to be necessary to afford reasonable assurance of repayment, the aggregate principal amount of which loans shall not exceed $4,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and (b) not to exceed $25,000 for administrative expenses of the Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration in connection with such loans, which amount and the aforesaid item of $146,800 may be combined for accounting purposes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: On page 27, line 1, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

"There is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000 to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be made available by him, as a loan, to The Virgin Islands Company, upon request of the President of the Company, for the purpose of enabling the Company to continue its present operations until June 30, 1949. The loan shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan to the Company."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: Mr. PLOESER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the said amendment, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

Section 304 (b) of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (Public Law 248, approved December 6, 1945) shall not be applicable with respect to The Virgin Islands Company until after June 30, 1949.

"The Virgin Islands Company is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States not to exceed $500,000, for which purpose there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $500,000. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such loans to the Company for repayment not later than 1 year after the making thereof, at rates of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of any such loan to the Company.

"Not to exceed $97,880 of the funds available to the Company shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis), including salaries of officers, Washington officer personnel, and the accounting, purchasing, and pay-roll departments; clerical services; traveling, automobile, office, and sundries expenses; stationery and office supplies; telephone and telegraph; postage, dues and subscriptions, repairs and maintenance of office buildings and equipment; employees' welfare, and public relations: *Provided*, That such total sum shall be inclusive of the gross amounts of the foregoing categories of expenses before apportionment of any part thereof to manufacturing or other expenses: *Provided further*, That such administrative expenses shall be exclusive of salaries of the engineering and shipping departments, storekeepers, and plant clerical personnel, interest expense, bank service charges, audit fees, and depreciation."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6935) the second deficiency appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, CANNON, KERR, and MAHON.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND OFFICES, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 12, and 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$511,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert "$7,744,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For the purpose of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation shall not be considered avocational or recreational"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

"Effective February 28, 1949, the Office of War Assets Administrator is abolished and the War Assets Administration shall cease to exist as an agency of the Government and its affairs, functions, and responsibilities shall thereafter be disposed of and liquidated in accordance with the following:

"(1) All powers, authority, functions, and responsibilities of the War Assets Administrator and of the War Assets Administration pertaining to surplus real property, which as used herein shall mean land and interests in land together with buildings, fixtures, facilities, utilities, equipment, and other property located thereon or adapted to use in connection with such property for its highest and best use, and all right, title, and interest in notes, mortgages, and contracts of sale or lease in connection with surplus real property shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to be held and disposed of by such Corporation in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

"(2) All aircraft and aircraft parts shall be transferred to the Department of the Air Force to be held and disposed of by such Department in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

"(3) All personal property (other than aircraft and aircraft parts), except such as may be necessary to the liquidation of the War Assets Administration or the exercise of the functions transferred herein, shall be transferred to the Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department, to be held and disposed of by such Bureau in accordance, except as provided herein, with the terms of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

"(4) Except as necessary to the administration of the functions herein transferred to the Department of the Air Force, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Bureau of Federal Supply, all administrative property, records, and accounts of the War Assets Administration shall be transferred to the Treasury Department for liquidation of the affairs of the War Assets Administration;

"(5) Such administrative property, records, and personnel of the War Assets Administration as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary to the administration of any of the functions herein transferred shall be transferred to the agency to which such function is transferred: *Provided*, That the right to retention in employment by the Government of the personnel so transferred shall be neither greater nor less than such right would have been had the War Assets Administration continued as an independent agency of the Government;

"(6) The provisions of section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong.) shall apply to the transfers effected by this paragraph in like manner as if such transfer were a reorganization of the agencies and functions concerned under the provisions of that act;

"(7) Priorities and preferences provided for in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall not continue beyond August 31, 1948, as to the disposal of personal property but shall continue as to the disposal of real estate;

"(8) The agencies herein authorized to dispose of surplus personal property may, after the date of enactment hereof, transfer any of such property without charge to any other agency of the Government if such property, by such transfer, can be put to public use by the transferee agency;

"(9) The agencies herein authorized to dispose of surplus property shall proceed with due diligence and use all reasonable means within the purview of this Act and the Surplus property Act of 1944, as amended, to accomplish such purpose at the earliest practicable date and shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at the end of each month as to progress made;

"(10) The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may authorize the abandonment, destruction, or donation to public bodies of personal property herein transferred to their respective agencies which has no commercial value or the estimated cost of care and handling of which would exceed the estimated proceeds from its sale;

"(11) The Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall not apply to property of the Government which has not been declared surplus under the terms of such Act as of the date of enactment hereof and any such property determined to be surplus shall be disposed of in accordance with the terms of other existing law.

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION SPECIAL FUND

"Salaries and expenses: There is hereby appropriated from the special fund account in the Treasury as provided for in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, not to exceed $65,000,000, which may be apportioned for obligation during the period ending February 28, 1949, for necessary expenses of the War Assets Administration established by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1947; for allocation or reimbursement by the War Assets Administrator to Government agencies designated by the Administrator as disposal agencies by or pursuant to law, and for payment to Government agencies designated by the Administrator for rendering special services in connection with the disposal of surplus property, in such amounts as shall be approved by the Bureau of the Budget; and for allocation or reimbursement to owning agencies for the care and handling (including pay and allowances and subsistence of military and naval personnel) of surplus property subsequent to the filing of a declaration of surplus covering such property with a disposal agency designated by the Administrator, or, if the Administrator prescribes procedures whereby declarations of surplus are made at approximately the time of disposal or removal, subsequent to notice by the owning agency to the disposal agency that property has been determined to be surplus and is subject to such procedures, such funds to be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; fees and mileage of witnesses at rates provided by law for witnesses attending in the United States courts (28 U. S. C. 600c); payment of claims pursuant to Section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and other special services and reports by contract without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, including real estate brokers and appraisers at rates of pay or fees not to exceed those usual for similar services; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), (not to exceed $73,000); acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; printing and binding; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; procurement of supplies, equipment, reports, and services in connection with the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon determination by the Administrator or by any official designated by him for this purpose that such method of procurement is necessary; purchase and procurement of reports of experts or consultants or organizations thereof; advertising, including radio time; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft in the Territories and possessions in connection with disposal activities and, in the continental limits of the United States in connection with the disposition of aircraft and airports; acquisition of buildings, lands, leaseholds, and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof for the care, handling, and disposition of surplus property; payments to States or political subdivisions thereof of sums in lieu of taxes accruing against real property declared surplus to the Administration by Government corporations; advance of funds to Administration cashiers and collection officials upon furnishing bond, for the purpose of handling cash transactions and making change at surplus property sales: *Provided*, That any employee of the War Assets Administration is authorized, when designated for the purpose by the Administrator, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit, when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of the War Assets Administration: *Provided further*, That the Administration may procure by contract or otherwise and furnish to governmental employees and employees of Government contractors at the reasonable value thereof food, meals, subsistence, and medical supplies, emergency medical services, quarters, heat, light, household equipment, laundry service, and sanitation facilities, and erect temporary structures and make alterations in existing structures necessary for these purposes, when such employees are engaged in the disposal of surplus property, or in the preparation for such disposal, at locations where such supplies, services, equipment, or facilities are otherwise unavailable, the proceeds derived therefrom to be credited to this appropriation.

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4 and 8.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
GUY CORDON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 inserts the provision of the Senate limiting the purchase of newspapers and periodicals by the Atomic Energy Commission to not to exceed $8,000.

Amendment No. 2 inserts the provision of the Senate limiting travel expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission and limits the amount at $1,500,000, instead of $1,842,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 appropriates $511,850,000 for expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, instead of $501,850,000, as proposed by the House, and $521,850,000, as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House and the Senate have agreed that no part of the increase above the original House figure shall be available for administrative expenses.

Amendment No. 4 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5 relating to the Rural Electrification Administration is eliminated.

Amendment No. 6 relating to the United States Maritime Commission appropriates $68,360,775 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House, instead of $69,360,775, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7 provides a limitation of $10,600,000 for administrative expenses, United States Maritime Commission, as proposed by the House, instead of $11,600,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $7,744,000 for Maritime training, instead of $8,133,080, as proposed by the House, and $6,943,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $75,000 shall be available for restoration or repair of buildings at the maritime training station at Pass Christian, Miss., as proposed by the Senate. It is understood and agreed between the House and Senate conferees that of the reduction from the above mentioned House proposal, no decrease is to be made in the number of students anticipated to be trained under the House proposal.

Amendment No. 10 relating to the conversion of C–4 type vessels of the United States Maritime Commission, as proposed by the Senate, is eliminated.

Amendment No. 11 eliminates language carried in the House and Senate bills and substitutes therefor, the following language:

For the purpose of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation, shall not be considered avocational or recreational.

The language as finally agreed upon is intended to permit all training which will contribute to bona fide use in the veteran's present or future business or employment.

Amendment No. 12 inserts the provision of the Senate permitting payment from the fund "veterans' miscellaneous benefits" to certain veterans as authorized by law in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities.

Amendment No. 13 provides for liquidation of the War Assets Administration, as proposed by the House, but makes such liquidation effective February 28, 1949, instead of August 31, 1948, and appropriates $65,000,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $50,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $90,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14 inserts the provision of the Senate making funds available for examination of appropriation estimates in the field.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 4 clarifies the intent of Congress in regard to rent control violators and continues their right to go to the Emergency Court of Appeals: The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 8 allows the United States Maritime Commission, as required for the development and maintenance of the commerce of the United States and for use in time of war, to expend amounts to acquire the vessels *Mariposa* and *Monterey*: The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
JOE HENDRICKS,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6829 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 5, line 8, after the word "Expediter", insert the following: ": *And Provided further*, That as to cases involving the functions transferred to the Office of the Housing Expediter by Executive Order 9841, section 204 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be considered as remaining in full force and effect during fiscal year 1949."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 6, line 23, after "1948", insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the Commission may expend amounts to acquire the vessels *Mariposa* and *Monterey* and materials and equipment in conjunction therewith on hand or committed for and expend the amounts necessary to complete the vessels, if required for the development and maintenance of the commerce of the United States and for use of the United States in time of war and national emergency, from any amounts available within this limitation."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star, by David Lawrence.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in these closing days of Congress I desire to pay tribute to the magnificent service the Honorable J. HARRY MCGREGOR has rendered as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Public Works Committee of the House. He has been courageous and courteous. He has worked hard and brought forth much needed legislation, and at the same time worked diligently to save the taxpayers' money. As a member of his committee I am proud of and commend his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, as chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, has performed an outstanding service during the Eightieth Congress. He is courteous, capable, and efficient, and as chairman of a complex committee has been responsible for much beneficial legislation, and at the same time protected the economy of our Nation. He believes in economy but is forward looking when the need arises. It has been a pleasure for me to serve under his leadership.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2877) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and move that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to bill of the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted the following conference report and statement on

the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for five years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert "June 30, 1951"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended title proposed by the House, amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend for two years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domesic tin-smelting industry."; and the House agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
WAYNE MORSE,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill extended for a period of 5 years, or until June 30, 1954, the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry. The amendment of the House extended the authority for a period of only 1 year, or until June 30, 1950. The conference agreement provides for the extension of the authority for a period of 2 years, or until June 30, 1951.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference on the bill (S. 2830) to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That subsection (1) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following provision at the end thereof:

"'Any Federal savings and loan association may convert itself into a savings and loan type of institution organized pursuant to the laws of the State, district, or Territory (hereinafter referred to in this section as the State) in which the principal office of such Federal association is located: *Provided*, (1) That the State permits the conversion of any savings and loan type of institution of such State into a Federal savings and loan association; (2) that such conversion of a Federal savings and loan association into such a State institution is determined upon the vote in favor of such conversion cast in person or by proxy at a special meeting of members called to consider such action, specified by the law of the State in which the home office of the Federal association is located, as required by such law for a State-chartered institution to convert itself into a Federal association, but in no event upon a vote of less than 51 per centum of all the votes cast at such meeting, and upon compliance with other requirements reciprocally equivalent to the requirements of such State law for the conversion of a State-chartered institution into a Federal association; (3) that notice of the meeting to vote on conversion shall be given as herein provided and no other notice thereof shall be necessary; the notice shall expressly state that such meeting is called to vote thereon, as well as the time and place thereof, and such notice shall be mailed, postage prepaid, at least 20 and not more than 30 days prior to the date of the meeting, to each member of record of the Federal association at his last address as shown on the books of the Federal association and to the General Manager of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Washington, District of Columbia; (4) that, upon the effective date of the conversion, the association has repurchased the total amount invested in its shares by the Secretary of the Treasury; and (5) that if, upon the effective date of conversion, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will hold of record shares of the association, its approval of the conversion has been obtained; (6) that, in the event of dissolution after conversion, the members or shareholders of the association will share on a mutual basis in the assets of the association in exact proportion to their relative share or account credits; (7) that such conversion shall be effective upon the date that all the provisions of this act shall have been fully complied with and upon the issuance of a new charter by the State wherein the association is located; it being provided that its act of converting into a State-chartered institution shall constitute an agreement to be bound by all the requirements that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation may legally impose under section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, and the association shall upon conversion and thereafter be authorized to issue securities in any form currently approved at the time of issue by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for issuance by similar insured institutions in such State, District, or Territory.

"'In addition to the foregoing provision for conversion upon a vote of the members only any association chartered as a Federal savings and loan association, including any having outstanding shares held by the Secretary of the Treasury or Home Owners' Loan Corporation, may convert itself into a State institution upon an equitable basis, subject to approval, by regulations or otherwise, by the Home Loan Bank Board and by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: *Provided*, That if the insurance of accounts is terminated in connection with such conversion, the notice and other action shall be taken as provided by law and regulations for the termination of insurance of accounts.'

"SEC. 2. Section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby each amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'All necessary expenses in connection with the making of supervisory or other examinations (except examinations of Federal home loan banks), including the provision of services and facilities therefor, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY P. CAIN,
JOHN BRICKER,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the bill strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute amendment. The committee of conference recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contain provisions for the conversion of any Federal savings and loan association into a comparable State association. The Senate amendment also permitted conversion into a State mutual savings bank. The provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to the procedure for conversion were

more detailed than the provisions of the House bill.

The Senate amendment contained a provision not contained in the House bill amending section 19 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and subsection (c) of section 402 of the National Housing Act, to provide that all neccssary expenses in connection with the making of supervisory or other examinations (except examinations of Federal home loan banks), including services and facilities therefor, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

The conference substitute, while following the more detailed procedural provisions of the Senate amendment, permits the conversion of a Federal savings and loan association into a comparable State association but not into a State mutual savings bank. The conference substitute also contains the provisions of the Senate amendment referred to above with respect to expenses in connection with the making of supervisory or other examinations.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
FREDERICK C. SMITH,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Prof. Claude Horack.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great issues facing us at this time is the high cost of living. The prices of necessaries of life are bounding into the inflationary stratosphere. Commodity prices have skyrocketed. Things which manufacturers and businessmen utilize to keep business and employment at a high level are not only scarce and difficult to procure in all too many instances, but prices thereof are excessive. What is even more disturbing to a great many of us, the prices of food, clothing, and essentials of life have risen to new high peaks.

These inflationary features operating in the economic system are causing great hardship to the rank and file of the American people who have to pay heavy taxes and who are burdened down with the utterly crushing current costs of necessaries like meat, groceries, provisions, clothing, household accessories, and the like, which are indispensable to the ordinary American family to provide comfort and a decent living standard to breadwinners and children, indeed to the American family.

This threat of the inflational spiral was manifest to me some time ago. Right after VJ-day I urged that wages and prices be brought into a proper equitable relationship and held at that level. As long ago as February 1947 I introduced a resolution in this House calling for a study of the prices of necessaries of life and problems facing the purchasing public as the result of price advances and to take remedial action looking toward increased production, efficient distribution, lower prices for consumer goods, and increase in consumer purchasing power.

Although I urged favorable action along these lines to check inflation, very unfortunately the resolution was never reported from the Rules Committee and consequently no effective steps have been taken to try to hold back the onrushing tide of inflationary pressure that is bringing such high prices and such great hardship to the people.

There are many causes for current high prices. In the first place exceptional pent-up domestic demand for goods, commodities, and materials of every kind has tended to create serious shortages. Secondly, the impact of ERP and other foreign-aid programs upon the American economy has augmented these shortages. The related gigantic military program channeling billions of dollars of essentials out of uses of the consumer into uneconomic purposes of the military—necessary though some of them may be—is of course a very material factor in the advance of the general price level and will continue to exert even greater influence as military expenditures grow beyond the huge figure of twenty-two billion as is contemplated for fiscal year 1949.

I feel strongly that Congress should have dealt with this basic question affecting so vitally the well-being of the Nation long ago.

Most assuredly Congress should deal with this question of the high cost of living before adjournment. I hope it will not be too presumptuous on my part to express the wish that Congress had acted on my House Resolution 121 many months ago and I utter the hope that vigorous, forthright, decisive action along these lines will not be further delayed.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the managers on the part of the House, I ask unanimous consent that they be permitted to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4044) by midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

DONATION OF EXCESS AND SURPLUS ARMED FORCES PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5882) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "facilities."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCCOWEN, LANDIS, BREHM, KEARNS, BARDEN, and LUCAS.

PROVIDING EXPENSES FOR CONDUCTING THE INVESTIGATION INCURRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 691

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 697) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 691, Eightieth Congress, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures (a) for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and (b) for necessary expenses incurred by advisers to such committee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on

vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AND BINDING OF A REVISED EDITION OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Line 4, strike out "of a revised edition."

Line 11, strike out "such revised edition."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes:

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the 'Selective Service Act of 1948.'

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the armed forces and the Reserve components thereof should be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both Ground and Air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

"To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the Ground Forces and the Air Forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both Ground and Air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

"(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTHS

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorized active duty personnel strength of the armed forces, exclusive of personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, officer candidates, personnel of the armed forces employed in the Selective Service System, and persons paid under the appropriations for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, is hereby established as follows: (1) Of the Army of the United States, eight hundred thirty-seven thousand plus one hundred ten thousand one-year enlistees; (2) of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present authorized statutory strength of six hundred sixty-six thousand, eight hundred and eighty-two, plus thirty-six thousand one-year enlistees; and (3) of the Air Force of the United States, five hundred two thousand plus fifteen thousand one-year enlistees. The strength herein established for each of the armed forces shall mean the daily average number of persons on active duty therein during the fiscal year.

"REGISTRATION

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

"TRAINING AND SERVICE

"SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of nineteen after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the armed forces of the United States. Any citizen of a foreign country, who is not deferable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the armed forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the armed forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the personnel strengths (other than one-year enlistee personnel strengths) of the respective armed forces authorized by section 2 of this title.

"No person shall be inducted for training and service under this title unless and until he is acceptable to the armed forces for such training and service and his physical and mental fitness for such training and service has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"No persons shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations, for such persons, as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense to be essential to public and personal health.

"The persons inducted into the armed forces for training and service under this title shall be assigned to stations or units of such forces. Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.

"No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service under this title, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.

"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve in the armed forces for a period of twenty-one consecutive months, unless sooner discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(c) (1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section.

"(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of department concerned: *And provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component.

"(3) The passing requirement for the General Classification Test shall be fixed at seventy points.

"(d) (1) Each person who hereafter is inducted, enlisted, or appointed (except a person enlisted under subsection (g) of this section) and serves for a period of less than three years in one of the armed forces and meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed force in which he serves, shall be transferred to a reserve component of such armed force, and until the expiration of a period of five years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law for such reserve component: *Provided*, That any such person who completes at least twenty-one months of service in the armed forces and who thereafter serves satisfactorily (1) on active duty in the armed forces under a voluntary extension for a period of at least one year, which extension is hereby authorized, or (2) in an organized unit of any reserve component of any of the armed forces for a period of at least thirty-six consecutive months, shall, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, be relieved from any further liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such person, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces.

"(2) Each person who hereafter is enlisted under the provisions of subsection (g) of this section and who meets the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in a reserve component of the armed forces shall, upon discharge from such enlistment under honorable conditions, be transferred to a reserve component of the armed forces of the United States and shall serve therein for a period of six years or until sooner discharged. Each such person shall, so long as he is a member of such reserve component, be liable to be ordered to active duty, but except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress no such person shall be ordered to active duty, without his consent and except as hereinafter provided, for more than one month in any year. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force determines that enlistment enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can without undue hardship be filled by, any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program and to serve satisfactorily therein for a period of four years. Any such person who fails or refuses to perform such duty may be ordered to active duty, without his consent, for an additional period of not more than twelve consecutive months. Any such person who enlists or accepts appointment in any such organized unit and serves satisfactorily therein for a period of four years shall, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, be relieved from any further liability under this subsection to serve in any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such persons, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the transfer of such persons within and between reserve components of the armed forces and determining, for the purpose of the requirements of the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the credit to be allowed any person so transferring for his previous service in one or more reserve components.

"(e) With respect to the persons inducted for training and service under this title there shall be paid, allowed, and extended the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability, and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other enlisted men of like grades and length of service of that component of the armed forces to which they are assigned. Section 3 of the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following: 'Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148, ch 166), as amended.' The Act of March 7, 1941 (56 Stat. 143–148), as amended, is hereby made applicable to persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this title.

"(f) Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed as forbidding the payment of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation to persons inducted into the armed forces of the United States for training and service under this title, or to members of reserve components of such forces now or hereafter on any type of active duty, who, prior to their induction or order to active duty, were receiving compensation from such persons, firm, or corporation.

"(g) Subject to the authorized one-year enlistee active duty personnel strengths established by section 2 of this title for the respective armed forces, the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are authorized and directed to accept enlistments for periods of one year in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively, from among qualified male persons between the ages of eighteen and nineteen.

"(h) No person who is enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection (g) shall be permanently assigned to duty at any place outside of the continental limits of the United States; and no person who is enlisted under the provisions of such subsection in the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, or the Air Force of the United States shall be assigned to duty at any naval or air force installation which is located on land outside of the continental limits of the United States.

"SELECTION

"SEC. 5. (a) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations.

"(b) Quotas of men to be inducted for training and service under this title shall be determined for each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia and for subdivisions thereof, on the basis of the actual number of men in the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and the subdivisions thereof, who are liable for such training and service but who are not deferred after classification, except that credits shall be given in fixing such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who are in the armed forces of the United States on the date fixed for determining such quotas. After such quotas are fixed, credits shall be given in filling such quotas for residents of such subdivisions who subsequently become members of such forces. Until the actual numbers necessary for determining the quotas are known, the quotas may be based on estimates, and subsequent adjustments therein shall be made when such actual numbers are known. All computations under this subsection shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

"DEFERMENT AND EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy, members of the reserve components of the armed forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President, residing in the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4 (b).

"(b) (1) No person who served honorably on active duty between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment of this title for a period of twelve months or more, or between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, for a period in excess of ninety days, in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, or the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

"(2) No person who served honorably on active duty between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment of this title for a period of ninety days or more but less than twelve months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, or the armed forces of any country allied with the United States in World War II prior to September 2, 1945, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, if—

"(A) the local board determines that he is regularly enlisted or commissioned in any organized unit of a reserve component of the armed force (or the Coast Guard) in which he served, provided such unit is reasonably accessible to such person without unduly interrupting his normal pursuits and activities (including attendance at a college or university in which he is regularly enrolled), or in a reserve component (other than in an organized unit) of such armed force or the Coast Guard in any case in which enlistment or commission in an organized unit of a reserve component of such armed force or the Coast Guard is not available to him; or

"(B) the local board determines that enlistment or commission in a reserve component of such armed force or the Coast

Guard is not available to him or that he has voluntarily enlisted or accepted appointment in an organized unit of a reserve component of an armed force other than the armed force in which he served or in the Coast Guard. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to be applicable to any person to whom paragraph (1) of this subsection is applicable.

"(3) No person who after the date of enactment of this title is honorably discharged upon the completion of a period of three years or more of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

"(4) No person who is honorably discharged upon the completion of an enlistment pursuant to section 4 (c) or section 4 (g) shall be liable for induction for training and service under this title, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.

"(5) For the purposes of computation of the periods of active duty referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, no credit shall be allowed for—

"(A) periods of active duty training performed as a member of a reserve component pursuant to an order or call to active duty solely for training purposes;

"(B) periods of active duty in which the service consisted solely of training under the Army specialized training program, the Army Air Force college training program, or any similar program under the jurisdiction of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard;

"(C) periods of active duty as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of such academies; or

"(D) periods of active duty in any of the armed forces while being processed for entry into or separation from any educational program or institution referred to in paragraphs (B) or (C).

"(c) (1) Persons who, on the effective date of this title, were members of organized units of the federally recognized National Guard, the federally recognized Air National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, or the Public Health Service Reserve, shall, so long as they continue to be such members and satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, be exempt from training and service by induction under the provisions of this title, but shall not be exempt from registration unless on active duty.

"(2) (A) In any case in which the Governor of any State determines and issues a proclamation to the effect that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of his State cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons referred to in subsection 6 (b) (2) or persons who are not liable for training and service under this title, any person who prior to attaining the age of eighteen years and six months enlists or accepts appointment in any such organized unit shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such organized unit.

"(B) Except as provided in subsection (b) or clause (A) of this paragraph, no person who shall become a member of a reserve component after the effective date of this title shall thereby be exempt from registration or training and service by induction under the provisions of this title.

"(d) (1) Any person, who on the effective date of this title, is enrolled in the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or is a member of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and has entered upon the junior or senior year, or is a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until the completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration.

"(2) Within such number as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who, (A) on or after the effective date of this title, is selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' training Corps, or who, on or after the effective date of this title, is appointed a midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, and (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission if tendered and to serve, subject to call by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration.

"(e) Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, or Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period covered by the agreement but not to exceed four months, from induction for training and service under this title but shall not be exempt from registration.

"(f) The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the Several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States.

"(g) Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, as defined in this title, and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools, or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, shall be exempt from training and service (but not from registration) under this title.

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States of any or all categories of persons who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board.

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this title prior to his graduation from such school or institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, have his induction under this title postponed (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest. The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this paragraph beyond the date so determined.

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, have his induction under this title postponed (A) until the end of such academic year or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate.

"(j) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being

involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections whose claim is sustained by the local board shall, if he is inducted into the armed forces under this title, be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or shall, if he is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, be deferred. Any person claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections shall, if such claim is not sustained by the local board, be entitled to an appeal to the appropriate appeal board. Upon the filing of such appeal, the appeal board shall refer any such claim to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing. The Department of Justice, after appropriate inquiry, shall hold a hearing with respect to the character and good faith of the objections of the person concerned, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department of Justice shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend to the appeal board that (1) if the objector is inducted into the armed forces under this title, he shall be assigned to noncombatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such noncombatant service, he shall be deferred. If after such hearing the Department of Justice finds that his objections are not sustained, it shall recommend to the appeal board that such objections be not sustained. The appeal board shall, in making its decision, give consideration to, but shall not be bound to follow, the recommendation of the Department of Justice together with the record on appeal from the local board. Each person whose claim for exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections is sustained shall be listed by the local board on a register of conscientious objectors.

"(k) No exception from registration, or exemption or deferment from training and service, under this title, shall continue after the cause therefor ceases to exist.

"(l) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person between the ages of 18 and 21 shall be discharged from service in the armed forces of the United States while this title is in effect because such person entered such service without the consent of his parent or guardian.

"(m) No person shall be relieved from training and service under this title by reason of conviction of a criminal offense, except where the offense of which he has been convicted may be punished by death, or by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

"(n) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment made under subsection (h) of this section may, within 5 days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public.

"(o) Where one or more sons or daughters of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this title.

"ACTIVE DUTY FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this title, the President is hereby authorized to order into the active service of the armed forces of the United States, without their consent and for a period not to exceed 21 consecutive months each, members (other than those exempted or deferred from training and service under the provisions of section 6 (c)) of any or all reserve components of the armed forces of the United States who shall have had less than 90 days' continuance active service in the armed forces of the United States, exclusive of periods of active training duty. No member of the National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia shall be ordered into the active service of the armed forces of the United States under this section unless the governor of such State or Territory, or the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard in the case of a member of the District of Columbia National Guard, has consented to the ordering into active service of the armed forces of the United States of members of the National Guard of his State, Territory, or District, as the case may be, in accordance with such program or programs as may have been mutually agreed upon. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or abridge any existing law which authorizes the ordering of members of reserve components of the armed forces into active service.

"BOUNTIES; SUBSTITUTES; PURCHASES OF RELEASE

"SEC. 8. No bounty shall be paid to induce any person to enlist in or be inducted into the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That the clothing or enlistment allowances authorized by law shall not be regarded as bounties within the meaning of this section. No person liable for training and service in such forces shall be permitted or allowed to furnish a substitute for such training and service; no substitute as such shall be received, enlisted, enrolled, or inducted into the armed forces of the United States; and no person liable for training and service in such forces under section 4 shall be permitted to escape such training and service or be discharged therefrom prior to the expiration of his period of such training and service by the payment of money or any other valuable thing whatsoever as consideration for his release from such training and service or liability therefor.

"SEPARATION FROM SERVICE; REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

"SEC. 9. (a) Any person inducted into the armed forces under this title for training and service, who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, satisfactorily completes his period of training and service under section 4 (b) shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect upon the completion of such period of training and service, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. In addition, each such person who is inducted into the armed forces under this title for training and service shall be given a physical examination at the beginning of such training and service, and upon the completion of his period of training and service under this title, each such person shall be given another physical examination and, upon his written request, shall be given a statement of physical condition by the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, That such statement shall not contain any reference to mental or other conditions which in the judgment of the Secretary concerned would prove injurious to the physical or mental health of the person to whom it pertains.

"(b) In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such training and service, has left or leaves a position (other than a temporary position) in the employ of any employer and who (1) receives such certificate, and (2) makes application for reemployment within ninety days after he is relieved from such training and service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year—

"(A) if such position was in the employ of the United States Government, its Territories, or possessions or political subdivisions thereof, or the District of Columbia, such person shall—

"(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

"(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case;

"(B) If such position was in the employ of a private employer, such person shall—

"(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored by such employer or his successor in interest to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

"(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of such employer or his successor in interest, be restored by such employer or his successor in interest to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case.

unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

"(C) if such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that such person should—

"(i) if still qualified to perform the duties of such position, be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or

"(ii) if not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case.

"(c) (1) Any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of training and service in the armed forces, shall be so restored without loss of seniority, shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time such person was inducted into such forces, and shall not be discharged from such position without cause within one year after such restoration.

"(2) It is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that any person who is restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) should be so restored in such manner as to give him such status in his

employment as he would have enjoyed if he had continued in such employment continuously from the time of his entering the armed forces until the time of his restoration to such employment.

"(d) In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) or subsection (c) (1), the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business shall have power, upon the filing of a motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading by the person entitled to the benefits of such provisions, specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action: *Provided*, That any such compensation shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions. The court shall order speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney or comparable official for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business, by any person claiming to be entitled to the benefits of such provisions, such United States district attorney or official, if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, shall appear and act as attorney for such person in the amicable adjustment of the claim or in the filing of any motion, petition, or other appropriate pleading and the prosecution thereof specifically to require such employer to comply with such provisions: *Provided*, That no fees or court costs shall be taxed against any person who may apply for such benefits: *Provided further*, That only the employer shall be deemed a necessary party respondent to any such action.

"(e) (1) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, by any agency in the executive branch of the Government or by any Territory or possession, or political subdivision thereof, or by the District of Columbia, shall be so restored by such agency or the successor to its functions, or by such Territory, possession, political subdivision, or the District of Columbia. In any case in which, upon appeal of any person who was employed immediately before entering the armed forces by any agency in the executive branch of the Government or by the District of Columbia, the United States Civil Service Commission finds that—

"(A) such agency is no longer in existence and its functions have not been transferred to any other agency; or

"(B) for any reason it is not feasible for such person to be restored to employment by such agency or by the District of Columbia,

the Commission shall determine whether or not there is a position in any other agency in the executive branch of the Government in the government of the District of Columbia for which such person is qualified and which is either vacant or held by a person having a temporary appointment thereto. In any case in which the Commission determines that there is such a position, such person shall be restored to such position by the agency in which such position exists or by the government of the District of Columbia, as the case may be. The Commission is authorized and directed to issue regulations giving full force and effect to the provisions of this section insofar as they relate to persons entitled to be restored to positions in the executive branch of the Government or in the government of the District of Columbia, including persons entitled to be restored under the last sentence of paragraph (2) of this subsection. The agencies in the executive branch of the Government and the government of the District of Columbia shall comply with such rules and regulations and orders issued by the Commission pursuant to this subsection. The Commission is authorized and directed whenever it finds, upon appeal of the person concerned, that any agency in the executive branch of the Government or the government of the District of Columbia has failed or refuses to comply with the provisions of this section, to issue an order specifically requiring such agency or the government of the District of Columbia to comply with such provisions and to compensate such person for any loss of salary or wages suffered by reason of failure to comply with such provisions, less any amounts received by him through other employment, unemployment compensation, or readjustment allowances: *Provided*, That any such compensation ordered to be paid by the Commission shall be in addition to and shall not be deemed to diminish any of the benefits of such provisions, and shall be paid by the head of the agency concerned or by the government of the District of Columbia out of appropriations currently available for salary and expenses of such agency or government, and such appropriations shall be available for such purpose. As used in this paragraph, the term "agency in the executive branch of the Government" means any department, independent establishment, agency, or corporation in the executive branch of the United States Government.

"(2) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, in the legislative branch of the Government, shall be so restored by the officer who appointed him to the position which he held immediately before entering the armed forces. In any case in which it is not possible for any such person to be restored to a position in the legislative branch of the Government and he is otherwise eligible to acquire a status for transfer to a position in the classified (competitive) civil service in accordance with section 2 (b) of the Act of November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1212), the United States Civil Service Commission shall, upon appeal of such person, determine whether or not there is a position in the executive branch of the Government for which he is qualified and which is either vacant or held by a person having a temporary appointment thereto. In any case in which the Commission determines that there is such a position such person shall be restored to such position by the agency in which such position exists.

"(3) Any person who is entitled to be restored to a position in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (A) of subsection (b) and who was employed, immediately before entering the armed forces, in the judicial branch of the Government, shall be so restored by the officer who appointed him to the position which he held immediately before entering the armed forces.

"(f) In any case in which two or more persons who are entitled to be restored to a position under the provisions of this section or of any other law relating to similar reemployment benefits left the same position in order to enter the armed forces, the person who left such position first shall have the prior right to be restored thereto, without prejudice to the reemployment rights of the other person or persons to be restored.

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this title and while it is in effect, enlists in the armed forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) or the Coast Guard (other than in a reserve component) for not more than three years shall, if such enlistment is his first enlistment in the armed forces or the Coast Guard subsequent to the date of enactment of this title, be entitled, upon the expiration of his enlistment (including any extension thereof by law but not including any voluntary extension thereof) or upon his discharge under honorable conditions prior to the expiration thereof, to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to the effective date of this title and while it is in effect, enters upon active duty in the armed forces of the United States, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than three years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such three years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(h) The Secretary of Labor, through the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, shall render aid in the replacement in their former positions of persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty in the armed forces of the United States, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service. In rendering such aid, the Secretary shall use the then existing Federal and State agencies engaged in similar or related activities and shall utilize the assistance of volunteers.

"(i) Any person inducted into the armed forces for training and service under this title shall, during the period of such service, be permitted to vote in person or by absentee ballot in any general, special, or primary election occurring in the State of which he is a resident, whether he is within or outside such State at the time of such election, if under the laws of such State he is otherwise entitled so to vote in such election; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require granting to any such person a leave of absence or furlough for longer than 1 day in order to permit him to vote in person in any such election. No person inducted into, or enlisted in, the armed forces for training and service under this title shall, during the period of such service, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, be required to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

"(j) The Secretaries of Army, Navy, or Air Force shall furnish to the Selective Service System hereafter established a report of separation for each person separated from active duty.

"THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM; CONSTRUCTION; CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 10. (a) (1) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Selective Service System, and a Director of Selective Service who shall be the head thereof.

"(2) The Selective Service System shall include a national headquarters, at least one State headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia, and the local boards, appeal boards, and other agencies provided for in subsection (b) (3) of this section.

"(3) The Director shall be apopinted by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,500 per year.

"(4) The functions of the Office of Selective Service Records (established by the Act of March 31, 1947) and of the Director of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service

System and the Director of Selective Service, respectively. The personnel, property, records and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Office of Selective Service Records are hereby transferred to the Selective Service System. The Office of Selective Service Records shall cease to exist upon the taking of effect of the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That, effective upon the termination of this title and notwithstanding such termination in other respects, (A) the said Office of Selective Service Records is hereby reestablished on the same basis and with the same functions as obtained prior to the effective date of this title, (B) said reestablished Office shall be responsible for liquidating any other outstanding affairs of the Selective Service System, and (C) the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such reestablished Office of Selective Service Records.

"(b) The President is authorized—

"(1) to prescribe the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title;

"(2) to appoint, upon recommendation of the respective governor or comparable executive official, a State director of the Selective Service System for each headquarters in each State, Territory, and possession of the United States and for the District of Columbia, who shall represent the governor and be in immediate charge of the State headquarters of the Selective Service System; to employ such number of civilians, and to order to active duty with their consent and to assign to the Selective Service System such officers of the selective-service section of the State headquarters and headquarters detachments and such other officers of the federally recognized National Guard of the United States or other armed forces personnel (including personnel of the Reserve components thereof), as may be necessary for the administration of the national and of the several State headquarters of the Selective Service System;

"(3) to create and establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other civilian agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out its functions with respect to the registration, examination, classification, selection, assignment, delivery for induction, and maintenance of records of persons registered under this title, together with such other duties as may be assigned under this title. He shall create and establish one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and possession of the United States, and in the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials: *Provided*, That an intercounty local board consisting of at least one member from each component county or corresponding subdivision may be established for an area not exceeding five counties or political subdivisions corresponding thereto within a State or comparable jurisdiction when the President determines, after considering the public interest involved and the recommendation of the Governor or comparable executive official or officials, that the establishment of such local board area will result in a more efficient and economical operation. Any such intercounty local board shall have within its area the same power and jurisdiction as a local board has in its area. No member of any local board shall be a member of the armed forces of the United States, but each member of any local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction, and each intercounty local board shall have at least one member from each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto included within the intercounty local board area. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have the power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized, all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption of deferment from, training and service under this title, of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local board shall be final, except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. There shall be at least one appeal board for each State. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States and who are not members of the armed forces. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal, unless modified or changed by the President. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from training and service under this title, and the determination of the President shall be final. No person who is a civilian officer, member, agent, or employee of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, or of any local board or appeal board or other agency of such Office or System, shall be excepted from registration or deferred or exempted from training and service, as provided for in this title, by reason of his status as such civilian officer, member, agent, or employee;

"(4) to appoint, and to fix, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the compensation of, such officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That the compensation of employees of local boards and appeal boards may be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided further*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the armed forces, or any reserve component thereof with his consent, or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this title (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 10 (b) (3)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the armed forces or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States;

"(5) to utilize the services of any or all departments and any and all officers or agents of the United States, and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and subdivisions thereof, and the District of Columbia, and of private welfare organizations, in the execution of this title;

"(6) to purchase such printing, binding, and blank-book work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 12, 1895, as amended, and to obtain by purchase, loan, or gift such equipment and supplies for the Selective Service System, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, with or without advertising or formal contract;

"(7) to prescribe eligibility, rules, and regulations governing the parole for service in the armed forces, or for any other special service established pursuant to this title, of any person convicted of a violation of any of the provisions of this title;

"(8) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purpose, to procure such space as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and Public Law 26, Eightieth Congress, approved March 31, 1947, by lease pursuant to existing statutes, except that the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended by section 15 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517; 40 U. S. C. 278a), shall not apply to any lease entered into under the authority of this title;

"(9) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, to determine the location of such additional temporary installations as he may deem essential; to utilize and enlarge such existing installations; to construct, install, and equip, and to complete the construction, installation, and equipment of such buildings, structures, utilities, and appurtenances (including the necessary grading and removal, repair or remodeling of existing structures and installations), as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title; and, in order to accomplish the purpose of this title, to acquire lands, and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, for temporary use thereof, by donation or lease, and to prosecute construction thereon prior to the approval of the title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended;

"(10) subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes, to utilize, in order to provide and furnish such services as may be deemed necessary or expedient to accomplish the purposes of this title, such personnel of the armed forces and of Reserve components thereof with their consent, and such civilian personnel, as may be necessary. For the purposes of this title, the provisions of section 14 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress) with respect to the maximum limitations as to the number of civilian employees shall not be applicable to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

"(c) The President is authorized to delegate any authority vested in him under this title, and to provide for the subdelegation of any such authority.

"(d) In the administration of this title, gifts of supplies, equipment, and voluntary services may be accepted.

"(e) The Chief of Finance, United States Army, is authorized to act as the fiscal, disbursing, and accounting agent of the Director in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"(f) The Director is authorized to make final settlement of individual claims, for amounts not exceeding $50, for travel and other expenses of uncompensated personnel of the Office of Selective Service Records, or the Selective Service System, incurred while in the performance of official duties, without regard to other provisions of law governing the travel of civilian employees of the Federal Government.

"EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE

"SEC. 11. Under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, funds available to carry out the provisions of this title shall also be available for the payment of actual and reasonable expenses of emergency medical care, including hospitalization, of registrants who suffer illness or injury, and the transportation, and burial of the remains of registrants who suffer death, while acting under orders issued under the provisions of this title, but such burial expenses shall not exceed $150 in any one case.

PENALTIES

"SEC. 12. (a) Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this title,

or the rules or regulations made or directions given thereunder, who shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform such duty, and any person charged with such duty, or having and exercising any authority under said title, rules, regulations, or directions who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making, of any false, improper, or incorrect registration, classification, physical, or mental examination, deferment, induction, enrollment, or muster, and any person who shall knowingly make, or be a party to the making of, any false statement or certificate regarding or bearing upon a classification or in support of any request for a particular classification, for service under the provisions of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant thereto, or who otherwise evades or refuses registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title, or of said rules, regulations, or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in the execution of this title, or rules, regulations, or directions made pursuant to this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way, by force or violence or otherwise, with the administration of this title or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses, shall, upon conviction in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, or if subject to military or naval law may be tried by court martial, and, on conviction, shall suffer such punishment as a court martial may direct. No person shall be tried by court martial in any case arising under this title unless such person has been actually inducted for the training and service prescribed under this title or unless he is subject to trial by court martial under laws in force prior to the enactment of this title. Precedence shall be given by courts to the trial of cases arising under this title, and such cases shall, upon request of the Attorney General, be advanced on the docket for immediate hearing.

"(b) Any person (1) who knowingly transfers or delivers to another, for the purpose of aiding or abetting the making of any false identification or representation, any registration certificate, alien's certificate of nonresidence, or any other certificate issued pursuant to or prescribed by the provisions of this title, or rules or regulations promulgated hereunder; or (2) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, has in his possession any such certificate not duly issued to him; or (3) who forges, alters, or in any manner changes any such certificate or any notation duly and validly inscribed thereon; or (4) who, with intent that it be used for any purpose of false identification or representation, photographs, prints, or in any manner makes or executes any engraving, photograph, print, or impression in the likeness of any such certificate, or any colorable imitation thereof; or (5) who has in his possession any certificate purporting to be a certificate issued pursuant to this title, or rules and regulations promulgated hereunder, which he knows to be falsely made, reproduced, forged, counterfeited, or altered; or (6) who knowingly violates or evades any of the provisions of this title or rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto relating to the issuance, transfer, or possession of such certificate, shall, upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $10,000 or be imprisoned for not more than five years, or both. Whenever on trial for a violation of this subsection the defendant is shown to have or to have had possession of any certificate not duly issued to him, such possession shall be deemed sufficient evidence to establish an intent to use such certificate for purposes of false identification or representation, unless the defendant explains such possession to the satisfaction of the jury.

"NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS

"SEC. 13. (a) Nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99), in section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 119 (e)), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title or the regulations made pursuant thereto, as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections.

"(b) All functions performed under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) except as to the requirements of section 3 of such Act.

"(c) In computing the lump-sum payments made to Air Force reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 16, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 300a), and to reserve officers of the Navy or to their beneficiaries under section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1942, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 850k), no credit shall be allowed for any period of active service performed from the effective date of this title to the date on which this title shall cease to be effective. Each such lump-sum payment shall be prorated for a fractional part of a year of active service in the case of any reserve officer subject to the provisions of either such section, if such reserve officer performs continuous active service for one or more years (inclusive of such service performed during the period in which this title is effective) and such active service includes a fractional part of a year immediately prior to the effective date of this title, or immediately following the date on which this title shall cease to be effective, or both.

"CIVIL RELIEF

"SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 604 of the Act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1191), and the provisions of section 4 of the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, Eightieth Congress), all of the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, including specifically article IV thereof, shall be applicable to all persons in the armed forces of the United States, including all persons inducted into the armed forces pursuant to this title, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service, until such time as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, is repealed or otherwise terminated by subsequent Act of the Congress: *Provided*, That, with respect to persons inducted into the armed forces while this title is in effect, wherever under any section or provision of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, a proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction has been authorized or provided with respect to military service performed while such Act is in force, such section or provision shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect so long as may be necessary to the exercise or enjoyment of such proceeding, remedy, privilege, stay, limitation, accounting, or other transaction.

"NOTICE OF TITLE; VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS

"SEC. 15. (a) Every person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this title upon publication by the President of a proclamation or other public notice fixing a time for any registration under section 3.

"(b) It shall be the duty of every registrant to keep his local board informed as to his current address and changes in status as required by such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President.

"(c) If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"(d) Except as provided in section 4 (c) or section 4 (g), nothing contained in this title shall be construed to repeal, amend, or suspend the laws now in force authorizing voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, except that no person shall be accepted for enlistment after he has received orders to report for induction and except that, whenever the Congress or the President has declared that the national interest is imperiled, voluntary enlistment or reenlistment in such forces, and their reserve components, may be suspended by the President to such extent as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 16. When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six' shall refer to men who have attained the eighteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

"(b) The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, shall be deemed to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"(c) The term 'armed forces' shall be deemed to include the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force.

"(d) The term 'district court of the United States' shall be deemed to include the courts of the United States for the Territories and possessions of the United States.

"(e) The term 'local board' shall be deemed to include an intercounty local board in the case of any registrant who is subject to the jurisdiction of an intercounty local board.

"(f) The term 'Director' shall be deemed to mean the Director of the Selective Service System.

"(g) The term 'duly ordained minister of religion' means a person who has been ordained, in accordance with the ceremonial, ritual, or discipline of a church, religious sect, or organization established on the basis of a community of faith and belief, doctrines and practices of a religous character, to preach and to teach the doctrines of such church, sect, or organization and to administer the rites and ceremonies thereof in public worship, and who as his regular and customary vocation preaches and teaches the principles of religion and administers the ordinances of public worship as embodied in the creed or principles of such church, sect, or organization.

"(2) The term 'regular minister of religion' means one who as his customary vocation preaches and teaches the principles of religion of a church, a religious sect, or organization of which he is a member, without having been formally ordained as a minister of religion, and who is recognized by such church, sect, or organization as a regular minister.

"(3) The term 'regular or duly ordained minister of religion' does not include a person who irregularly or incidentally preaches and teaches the principles of religion of a church, religious sect, or organization and

does not include any person who may have been duly ordained a minister in accordance with the ceremonial, rite, or discipline of a church, religious sect or organization, but who does regularly, as a vocation, teach and preach the principles of religion and administer the ordinances of public worship as embodied in the creed or principles of his church, sect, or organization.

"(h) The term 'organized unit', when used with respect to a reserve component, shall be deemed to mean a unit in which the members thereof are required satisfactorily to participate in scheduled drills and training periods as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(i) The term 'reserve components of the armed forces' shall, unless the context otherwise requires, be deemed to include the federally recognized National Guard of the United States, the federally recognized Air National Guard of the United States, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Regular Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, and the Marine Corps Reserve, and shall include, in addition to the foregoing, the Coast Guard Reserve and the Public Health Service Reserve when serving with the armed forces.

"TERMINATION OF TITLE

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this title shall be in force.

"(b) All of the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 2, the second sentence of section 4 (a), section 4 (b), sections 4 (d), 4 (e), 4 (f), 9, 10 (a) (4), 10 (b) (10), 13 (c), 14, and 17 (b), shall become inoperative and cease to apply on the second anniversary of the date of enactment of this title or on such earlier date as may be specified in a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

"SEC. 18. (a) Whenever the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the armed forces of the United States, or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section. Under any such program of national procurement, the President shall recognize the valid claim of American small business to participate in such contracts, in such manufactures, and in such distribution of materials, and small business shall be granted a fair share of the orders placed, exclusively for the use of the armed forces or for other Federal agencies now or hereafter designated in this section. For the purposes of this section, a business enterprise shall be determined to be "small business" if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated.

"(b) It shall be the duty of any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may prescribe, and (2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible.

"(c) In case any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) refuses or fails—

"(1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may have prescribed;

"(2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible as determined by the President;

"(3) to produce the kind or quality of articles or materials ordered; or

"(4) to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as shall be negotiated between such person and the Government agency concerned; or in the event of failure to negotiate a price, to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at such price as he may subsequently be determined to be entitled to receive under subsection (d);

the President is authorized to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility of such person and to operate it, through any Government agency, for the production of such articles or materials as may be required by the Government.

"(d) Fair and just compensation shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to render inapplicable to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession is taken pursuant to subsection (c) any State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, or employment standards of employees.

"(f) Any person, or any officer of any person as defined in this section, who willfully fails or refuses to carry out any duty imposed upon him by subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years, or by a fine of not more than $50,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine.

"(g) (1) As used in this section—

"(A) The term 'person' means any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or other form of business organization.

"(B) The term 'Government agency' means any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation in the Executive branch of the United States Government.

"(2) For the purposes of this section, a plant, mine, or other facility shall be deemed capable of producing any articles or materials if it is then producing or furnishing such articles or materials or if the President after consultation with and receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board determines that it can be readily converted to the production or furnishing of such articles or materials.

"(h) (1) The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, to require all producers of steel in the United States to make available, to individuals, firms, associations, companies, corporations, or organized manufacturing industries having orders for steel products of steel materials required by the armed forces, such percentages of the steel production of such producers, in equal proportion deemed necessary for the expeditious execution of orders for such products or materials. Compliance with such requirement shall be obligatory on all such producers of steel and such requirement shall take precedence over all orders and contracts theretofore placed with such producers. If any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refuses to comply with such requirement, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to take immediate possession of the plant or plants of such producer and, through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the armed forces, to insure compliance with such requirement. Any such producer of steel or the responsible head or heads thereof refusing to comply with such requirement shall be deemed guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

"(2) The President shall report to the Congress on the final day of each six-month period following the date of enactment of this Act the percentage figure, or if such information is not available, the approximate percentage figure, of the total steel production in the United States required to be made available during such period for the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials required by the armed forces, if such percentage figure is in excess of 10 per centum.

"SAVING PROVISION

"SEC. 19. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to amend any provision of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495).

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 20. This title shall become effective immediately; except that unless the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares a national emergency after the date of enactment of this Act, no person shall be inducted or ordered into active service without his consent under this title within ninety days after the date of its enactment. The Secretary of the Army, for the Army and the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy, for the Navy and Marine Corps, are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strengths.

TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The Articles of War (41 Stat. 787 to 811, as amended) are hereby amended as follows:

"Article 1 is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The word "officer" shall be construed to refer to a commissioned officer.

"'(b) The word "soldier" shall be construed as including a noncommissioned officer, a private, or any other enlisted man or woman.

"'(c) The word "company" shall be construed as including a troop, battery, or corresponding unit of the ground or air forces.

"'(d) The word "battalion" shall be construed as including a squadron or corresponding unit of the ground or air forces.

"'(e) The word "cadet" shall be construed to refer to a cadet of the United States Military Academy.'

"SEC. 202. Article 2, subparagraph (a), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) All officers, warrant officers, and soldiers belonging to the Regular Army of the United States; all volunteers, from the dates of their muster or acceptance into the military service of the United States; and all other persons lawfully called, drafted, or ordered into, or to duty or for training in, the said service, from the dates they are required by the terms of the call, draft, or order to obey the same;'

"SEC. 203. Article 4 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 4. Who May Serve on Courts-Martial: All officers in the military service of the United States, and officers of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be

competent to serve on courts-martial for the trial of any persons who may lawfully be brought before such courts for trial.

"'All warrant officers in the active military service of the United States and warrant officers in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of warrant officers and enlisted persons, and persons in this category, shall be detailed for such service when deemed proper by the appointing authority.

"'Enlisted persons in the active military service of the United States or in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of enlisted persons when requested in writing by the accused at any time prior to the convening of the court. When so request no enlisted person shall, without his consent, be tried by a court the membership of which does not include enlisted persons to the number of at least one third of the total membership of the court.

"'When appointing courts-martial the appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command and when eligible those enlisted persons of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for the duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament; and officers and enlisted persons having less than two years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the service, be appointed as members of courts-martial in excess of minority membership thereof. No person shall be eligible to sit as a member of a general or special court-martial when he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution.'

"SEC. 204. Article 5 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 5. General Courts-Martial: General courts-martial may consist of any number of members not less than five.'

"SEC. 205. Article 6 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 6. Special Courts-Martial: Special courts-martial may consist of any number of members not less than three.'

"SEC. 206. Article 8 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 8. General Courts-Martial: The President of the United States, the commanding officer of a Territorial department, the Superintendent of the Military Academy, the commanding officer of an Army group, an Army, an Army corps, a division, a separate brigade, or corresponding unit of the Ground or Air Forces, or any command to which a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department is assigned as staff judge advocate, as prescribed in article 47, and, when empowered by the President, the commanding officer of any district or of any force or body of troops may appoint general courts-martial; but when any such commander is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried, the court shall be appointed by superior competent authority, and may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable.

"'The authority appointing a general court-martial shall detail as one of the members thereof a law member who shall be an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States and certified by the Judge Advocate General to be qualified for such detail: *Provided*, That no general court-martial shall receive evidence or vote upon its findings or sentence in the absence of the law member regularly detailed. The law member, in addition to his duties as a member, shall perform the duties prescribed in article 31 hereof and such other duties as the President may by regulations prescribe.'

"SEC. 207. Article 9 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 9. Special Courts-Martial: The commanding officer of a district, garrison, fort, camp, station, or other place where troops are on duty, and the commanding officer of an Army group, an Army, an Army corps, a division, brigade, regiment, detached battalion, or corresponding unit of Ground or Air Forces, and the commanding officer of any other detached command or group of detached units placed under a single commander for this purpose may appoint special courts-martial; but when any such commanding officer is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried, the court shall be appointed by superior authority, and may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable.'

"SEC. 208. Article 11 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 11. Appointment or Trial Judge Advocates and Counsel: For each general or special court-martial the authority appointing the court shall appoint a trial judge advocate and a defense counsel, and one or more assistant trial judge advocates and one or more assistant defense counsel when necessary: *Provided*, That the trial judge advocate and defense counsel of each general court-martial shall, if available, be members of the Judge Advocate General's Department or officers who are members of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States: *Provided further*, That in all cases in which the officer appointed as trial judge advocate shall be a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department, or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State, the officer appointed as defense counsel shall likewise be a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department or an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States: *Provided further*, That when the accused is represented by counsel of his own selection and does not desire the presence of the regularly appointed defense counsel or assistant defense counsel, the latter may be excused by the president of the court: *Provided further*, That no person who has acted as member, trial judge advocate, assistant trial judge advocate or investigating officer in any case shall subsequently act in the same case as defense counsel or assistant defense counsel unless expressly requested by the accused: *Provided further*, That no person who has acted as member, defense counsel, assistant defense counsel, or investigating officer in any case shall subsequently act in the same case as a member of the prosecution: *Provided further*, That no person who has acted as member, trial judge advocate, assistant trial judge advocate, defense counsel, assistant defense counsel, or investigating officer in any case shall subsequently act as a staff judge advocate to the reviewing or confirming authority upon the same case.'

"SEC. 209. Article 12 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 12. General Courts-Martial: General courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense made punishable by these articles, and any other person who by the law of war is subject to trial by military tribunals: *Provided*, That general courts-martial shall have power to adjudge any punishment authorized by law or the custom of the service including a bad-conduct discharge.'

"SEC. 210. Article 13 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 13. Special Courts-Martial: Special courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided*, That the officer competent to appoint a general court-martial for the trial of any particular case may, when in his judgment the interests of the service so require, cause any case to be tried by a special court-martial notwithstanding the limitations upon the jurisdiction of the special court-martial as to offenses herein prescribed.

"'Special courts-martial shall not have power to adjudge dishonorable discharge or dismissal, or confinement in excess of six months, nor to adjudge forfeiture of more than two-thirds pay per month for a period of not exceeding six months: *Provided*, That subject to approval of the sentence by an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and subject to appellate review by The Judge Advocate General and appellate agencies in his office, a special court-martial may adjudge a bad-conduct discharge in addition to other authorized punishment: *Provided further*, That a bad-conduct discharge shall not be adjudged by a special court-martial unless a complete record of the proceedings of and testimony taken by the court is taken in the case.'

"SEC. 211. Article 14 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 14. Summary Courts-Martial: Summary courts-martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law, except an officer, a warrant officer, or a cadet, for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided*, That noncommissioned officers shall not, if they object thereto, be brought to trial before a summary court-martial without the authority of the officer competent to bring them to trial before a special court-martial: *Provided further*, That the President may, by regulations, except from the jurisdiction of summary courts-martial any class or classes of persons subject to military law.

"'Summary courts-martial shall not have power to adjudge confinement in excess of one month, restriction to limits for more than three months, or forfeiture or detention of more than two-thirds of one month's pay.'

"SEC. 212. Article 16 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 16. Persons in the Military Service—How Triable: Officers shall be triable only by general and special courts-martial and in no case shall a person in the military service, when it can be avoided, be tried by persons inferior to him in rank. No enlisted person may sit as a member of a court-martial for the trial of another enlisted person who is assigned to the same company or corresponding military unit.

"'No person subject to military law shall be confined with enemy prisoners or any other foreign nationals outside of the continental limits of the United States, nor shall any defendant awaiting trial be made subject to punishment or penalties other than confinement prior to sentence on charges against him.'

"SEC. 213. Article 22 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 22. Process to Obtain Witnesses: Every trial judge advocate of a general or special court-martial and every summary court-martial shall have power to issue the like process to compel witnesses to appear and testify which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue; but such process shall run to any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions. Witnesses for the defense shall be subpenaed, upon request by the defense counsel, through process issued by the trial judge advocate, in the same manner as witnesses for the prosecution.'

"SEC. 214. Article 24 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 24. Compulsory Self-Incrimination Prohibited: No witness before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before any officer conducting an investigation, or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in

evidence before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before an officer conducting an investigation, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to answer any question the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue or when such answer might tend to degrade him.

" 'The use of coercion or unlawful influence in any manner whatsoever by any person to obtain any statement, admission, or confession from any accused person or witness, shall be deemed to be conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, and no such statement, admission, or confession shall be received in evidence by any court-martial. It shall be the duty of any person in obtaining any statement from an accused to advise him that he does not have to make any statement at all regarding the offense of which he is accused or being investigated, and that any statement by the accused may be used as evidence against him in a trial by court-martial.'

"SEC. 215. Article 25 is amended to read as follows:

" 'ART. 25. Depositions—When Admissible: A duly authenticated deposition taken upon reasonable notice to the opposite party may be read in evidence before any military court or commission in any case not capital, or in any proceeding before a court of inquiry or a military board, if such deposition be taken when the witness resides, is found, or is about to go beyond the State, Territory, or district in which the court, commission, or board is ordered to sit, or beyond the distance of one hundred miles from the place of trial or hearing, or when it appears to the satisfaction of the court, commission, board, or appointing authority that the witness, by reason of age, sickness, bodily infirmity, imprisonment, or other reasonable cause, is unable to, or, in foreign places, because of nonamenability to process, refuses to, appear and testify in person at the place of trial or hearing: *Provided*, That testimony by deposition may be adduced for the defense in capital cases: *Provided further*, That a deposition may be read in evidence in any case in which the death penalty is authorized by law but is not mandatory, whenever the appointing authority shall have directed that the case be treated as not capital, and in such a case a sentence of death may not be adjudged by the court-martial: *And provided further*, That at any time after charges have been signed as provided in article 46, and before the charges have been referred for trial, any authority competent to appoint a court-martial for the trial of such charges may designate officers to represent the prosecution and the defense and may authorize such officers, upon due notice, to take the deposition of any witness, and such deposition may subsequently be received in evidence as in other cases.'

"SEC. 216. Article 31 is amended to read as follows:

" 'ART. 31. Method of Voting: Voting by members of a general or special court-martial upon questions of challenge, on the findings, and on the sentence shall be by secret written ballot. The junior member of the court shall in each case count the votes, which count shall be checked by the president, who shall forthwith announce the result of the ballot to the members of the court. The law member of a general court-martial or the president of a special court-martial, shall rule in open court upon interlocutory questions, other than challenge, arising during the proceedings: *Provided*, That unless such ruling be made by the law member of a general court-martial, if any member object thereto, the court shall be cleared and closed and the question decided by a majority vote, viva voce, beginning with the junior in rank: *And provided further*, That any such ruling made by the law member of a general court-martial upon any interlocutory question other than a motion for a finding of not guilty, or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may in any case consult with the court, in closed session, before making a ruling, and may change any ruling made at any time during the trial. It shall be the duty of the law member of a general or the president of a special court-martial before a vote is taken to advise the court that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, and that in the case being considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in the accused's favor and he shall be acquitted; if there is a reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower degree as to which there is no such doubt; that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused is upon the Government.'

"SEC. 217. Article 36 is amended to read as follows:

" 'ART. 36. Disposition of Records—Special and Summary Courts-Martial: After having been acted upon by the officer appointing the court, or by the officer commanding for the time being, the record of each trial by special court-martial and a report of each trial by summary court-martial shall be transmitted to the headquarters of the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command, there to be filed in the office of the staff judge advocate: *Provided, however*, That each record of trial by special court-martial in which the sentence, as approved by the appointing authority, includes a bad-conduct discharge, shall, if approved by the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction under the provisions of article 47, be forwarded by him to The Judge Advocate General for review as hereinafter in these articles provided. When no longer of use, records of summary courts-martial may be destroyed as provided by law governing destruction of Government records.'

"SEC. 218. Article 38 is amended to read as follows:

" 'ART. 38. President May Prescribe Rules: The President may, by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, prescribe the procedure, including modes of proof, in cases before courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and other military tribunals, which regulations shall, insofar as he shall deem practicable, apply the principles of law and rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the district courts of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing contrary to or inconsistent with these articles shall be so prescribed: *Provided further*, That all rules and regulations made in pursuance of this Article shall be laid before the Congress.'

"SEC. 219. Article 39 is amended to read as follows:

" 'ART. 39. As to Time: Except for desertion or absence without leave committed in time of war, or for mutiny or murder, no person subject to military law shall be liable to be tried or punished by a court-martial for any crime or offense committed more than two years before arraignment of such person: *Provided*, That for desertion in time of peace, rape or for any crime or offense punishable under articles 93 and 94 of this code the period of limitations upon trial and punishment by court-martial shall be three years: *Provided further*, That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused shall not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid periods of limitation: *Provided further*, That this article shall not have the effect to authorize the trial or punishment for any crime or offense barred by the provisions of existing law: *And provided further*, That in the case of any offense the trial of which in time of war shall be certified by the Secretary of the Department of the Army to be detrimental to the prosecution of the war or inimical to the Nation's security, the period of limitations herein provided for the trial of the said offense shall be extended to the duration of the war and six months thereafter.'

"SEC. 220. Article 43 is amended to read as follows:

" 'ART. 43. Death Sentence—When Lawful; Vote on Findings and Sentence: No person shall, by general court-martial, be convicted of an offense for which the death penalty is made mandatory by law, nor sentenced to suffer death, except by the concurrence of all the members of said court-martial present at the time the vote is taken, and for an offense in these articles expressly made punishable by death; nor sentenced to life imprisonment, nor to confinement for more than ten years, except by the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members present at the time the vote is taken. Conviction of any offense for which the death sentence is not mandatory and any sentence to confinement not in excess of ten years, whether by general or special court-martial, may be determined by a two-thirds vote of those members present at the time the vote is taken. All other questions shall be determined by a majority vote.'

"SEC. 221. Article 44 is amended to read as follows:

" 'ART. 44. Officers—Reduction to Ranks: When a sentence to dismissal may lawfully be adjudged in the case of an officer the sentence may in time of war, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, adjudge in lieu thereof reduction to the grade of private.'

"SEC. 222. Article 46 is amended to read as follows:

" 'ART. 46. Charges; Action Upon:

" 'a. Signature; oath: Charges and specifications must be signed by a person subject to military law, and under oath either that he has personal knowledge of, or has investigated, the matters set forth therein and that the same are true in fact, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

" 'b. Investigation: No charge will be referred to a general court-martial for trial until after a thorough and impartial investigation thereof shall have been made. This investigation will include inquiries as to the truth of the matter set forth in said charges, form of charges, and what disposition of the case should be made in the interest of justice and discipline. The accused shall be permitted, upon his request, to be represented at such investigation by counsel of his own selection, civil counsel if he so provides, or military if such counsel be reasonably available, otherwise by counsel appointed by the officer exercising general courts martial jurisdiction over the command. At such investigation full opportunity shall be given to the accused to cross-examine witnesses against him if they are available and to present anything he may desire in his own behalf, either in defense or mitigation, and the investigating officer shall examine available witnesses requested by the accused. If the charges are forwarded after such investigation they shall be accompanied by a statement of the substance of the testimony taken on both sides.

" 'c. Forwarding charges; delays; service of charges: When a person is held for trial by general court-martial, the commanding officer will, within eight days after the accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and furnish the accused a copy of such charges. If the same be not practicable, he will report to superior authority the reasons for delay. The trial judge advocate will cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had, and a failure so to serve such charges will be ground for a continu-

ance unless the trial be had on the charges furnished the accused as hereinbefore provided. In time of peace no person shall, against his objection be brought to trial before a general court-martial within a period of five days subsequent to the service of charges upon him.'

"SEC. 223. Article 47 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 47. Action by Convening Authority:

"'a. Assignment of judge advocates; channels of communication: All members of the Judge Advocate General's Department will be assigned as prescribed by The Judge Advocate General after appropriate consultations with commanders on whose staffs they may serve; and The Judge Advocate General or senior members of his staff will make frequent inspections in the field in supervision of the administration of military justice. Convening authorities will at all times communicate directly with their staff judge advocates in matters relating to the administration of military justice; and the staff judge advocate of any command is authorized to communicate directly with the staff judge advocate of a superior or subordinate command, or with The Judge Advocate General.

"'b. Reference for trial: Before directing the trial of any charge by general court-martial the convening authority will refer it to his staff judge advocate for consideration and advice; and no charge will be referred to a general court-martial for trial unless it has been found that a thorough and impartial investigation thereof has been made as prescribed in the preceding article, that such charge is legally sufficient to allege an offense under these articles, and is sustained by evidence indicated in the report of investigation.

"'c. Action on record of trial: Before acting upon a record of trial by general court-martial or military commission, or a record of trial by special court-martial in which a bad-conduct discharge has been adjudged and approved by the authority appointing the court, the reviewing authority will refer it to his staff judge advocate or to The Judge Advocate General for review and advice; and no sentence shall be approved unless upon conviction established beyond reasonable doubt of an offense made punishable by these articles, and unless the record of trial has been found legally sufficient to support it.

"'d. Approval: No sentence of a court-martial shall be carried into execution until the same shall have been approved by the convening authority: *Provided*, That no sentence of a special court-martial including a bad-conduct discharge shall be carried into execution until in addition to the approval of the convening authority the same shall have been approved by an officer authorized to appoint a general court-martial.

"'e. Who may exercise: Action by the convening authority may be taken by an officer commanding for the time being, by a successor in command, or by any officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction.

"'f. Powers incident to power to approve: The power to approve the sentence of a court-martial shall include—

"'(1) the power to approve or disapprove a finding of guilty and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty or a lesser included offense;

"'(2) the power to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence; and

"'(3) the power to remand a case for rehearing under the provisions of article 52.'

"SEC. 224. Article 48 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 48. Confirmation: In addition to the approval required by article 47, confirmation is required as follows before the sentence of a court-martial may be carried into execution, namely:

"'a. By the President with respect to any sentence—

"'(1) of death, or

"'(2) involving a general officer:

Provided, That when the President has already acted as approving authority, no additional confirmation by him is necessary;

"'b. By the Secretary of the Department of the Army with respect to any sentence not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, when The Judge Advocate General does not concur in the action of the Judicial Council;

"'c. By the Judicial Council, with the concurrence of The Judge Advocate General, with respect to any sentence—

"'(1) when the confirming action of the Judicial Council is not unanimous, or when by direction of The Judge Advocate General his participation in the confirming action is required, or

"'(2) involving imprisonment for life, or

"'(3) involving the dismissal of an officer other than a general officer, or

"'(4) involving the dismissal or suspension of a cadet;

"'d. By the Judicial Council with respect to any sentence in a case transmitted to the Judicial Council under the provisions of article 50 for confirming action.'

"SEC. 225. Article 49 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 49. Powers Incident to Power to Confirm: The power to confirm the sentence of a court-martial shall be held to include—

"'a. The power to approve, confirm, or disapprove a finding of guilty, and to approve or confirm so much only of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense:

"'b. The power to confirm, disapprove, vacate, commute, or reduce to legal limits the whole or any part of the sentence;

"'c. The power to restore all rights, privileges, and property affected by any finding or sentence disapproved or vacated;

"'d. The power to order the sentence to be carried into execution;

"'e. The power to remand the case for a rehearing under the provisions of article 52.'

"SEC. 226. Article 50 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 50. Appellate Review:

"'a. Board of review; judicial council: The Judge Advocate General shall constitute, in his office, a Board of Review composed of not less than three officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department. He shall also constitute, in his office, a Judicial Council composed of three general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department: *Provided*, That the Judge Advocate General may, under exigent circumstances, detail as members of the Judicial Council, for periods not in excess of sixty days, officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department of grades below that of general officer.

"'b. Additional boards of review and judicial councils: Whenever necessary, the Judge Advocate General may constitute two or more Boards of Review and Judicial Councils in his office, with equal powers and duties, composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article.

"'c. Branch offices: Whenever the President deems such action necessary, he may direct The Judge Advocate General to establish a branch office, under an Assistant Judge Advocate General who shall be a general officer of The Judge Advocate General's Department, with any distant command, and to establish in such branch office one or more Boards of Review and Judicial Councils composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article. Such Assistant Judge Advocate General and such Board of Review and Judicial Council shall be empowered to perform for that command under the general supervision of The Judge Advocate General, the duties which The Judge Advocate General and the Board of Review and Judicial Council in his office would otherwise be required to perform in respect of all cases involving sentences not requiring approval or confirmation by the President: *Provided*, That the power of mitigation and remission shall not be exercised by such Assistant Judge Advocate General or by agencies in his office, but any case in which such action is deemed desirable shall be forwarded to The Judge Advocate General with appropriate recommendations.

"'d. Action by board of review when approval by President or confirming action is required: Before any record of trial in which there has been adjudged a sentence requiring approval or confirmation by the President or confirmation by any other confirming authority is submitted to the President or such other confirming authority, as the case may be, it shall be examined by the Board of Review which shall take action as follows:

"'(1) In any case requiring action by the President, the Board of Review shall submit its opinion in writing, through the Judicial Council which shall also submit its opinion in writing, to the Judge Advocate General, who shall, except as herein otherwise provided, transmit the record and the Board's and Council's opinions, with his recommendations, directly to the Secretary of the Department of the Army for the action of the President: *Provided*, That the Judicial Council, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General shall have powers in respect to holdings of legal insufficiency equal to the powers vested in the Board of Review by subparagraph (3) of this paragraph.

"'(2) In any case requiring confirming action by the Judicial Council with or without the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, when the Board of Review is of the opinion that the record of trial is legally sufficient to support the sentence it shall submit its opinion in writing to the Judicial Council for appropriate action.

"'(3) When the Board of Review is of the opinion that the record of trial in any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the Judicial Council is legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, or that errors of law have been committed injuricusly affecting the substantial rights of the accused, it shall submit its holdings to the Judge Advocate General and when the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, such findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in accord with such holding and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the appropriate convening authority for a rehearing or such other action as may be proper.

"'(4) In any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the Judicial Council in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the Board of Review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action or for other appropriate action in a case in which confirmation of the sentence by the President is required under article 48a.

"'e. Action by board of review in cases involving dishonorable or bad-conduct discharges or confinement in penitentiary: No authority shall order the execution of any sentence of a court-martial involving dishonorable discharge not suspended, bad-conduct discharge not suspended, or confinement in a penitentiary unless and until the appellate review required by this article shall have been completed and unless and until any confirming action required shall have been completed. Every record of trial by general or special court-martial involving a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad-conduct discharge, whether such discharges

be suspended or not suspended, and every record of trial by general court-martial involving a sentence to confinement in a penitentiary, other than records of trial examination of which is required by paragraph d of this article, shall be examined by the Board of Review which shall take action as follows:

"'(1) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, and confirming action is not by the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review deemed necessary, the Judge Advocate General shall transmit the holding to the convening authority, and such holding shall be deemed final and conclusive.

"'(2) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, but modification of the findings of guilty or the sentence is by the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review deemed necessary to the ends of justice, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action.

"'(3) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, the findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in whole or in part in accord with such holding, and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the convening authority for rehearing or such other action as may be appropriate.

"'(4) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the Board of Review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action.

"'f. Appellate action in other cases: Every record of trial by general court-martial the appellate review of which is not otherwise provided for by this article shall be examined in the Office of the Judge Advocate General and if found legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, shall be transmitted to the Board of Review for appropriate action in accord with paragraph e of this article.

"'g. Weighing evidence: In the appellate review of records of trials by courts-martial as provided in these articles the Judge Advocate General and all appellate agencies in his office shall have authority to weigh evidence, judge the credibility of witnesses, and determine controverted questions of fact.

"'h. Finality of court-martial judgments: The appellate review of records of trial provided by this article, the confirming action taken pursuant to articles 48 or 49, the proceedings, findings, and sentences of courts-martial as heretofore or hereafter approved, reviewed, or confirmed as required by the Articles of War and all dismissals and discharges heretofore or hereafter carried into execution pursuant to sentences by courts-martial following approval, review, or confirmation as required by the Articles of War, shall be final and conclusive, and orders publishing the proceedings of courts-martial and all action taken pursuant to such proceedings shall be binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States, subject only to action upon application for a new trial as provided in article 53.'

"SEC. 227. Article 50½ is rescinded.

"SEC. 228. Article 51 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 51. Mitigation, Remission, and Suspension of Sentences:

"'a. At the time ordered executed: The power of the President, the Secretary of the Department of the Army, and any reviewing authority to order the execution of a sentence of a court-martial shall include the power to mitigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part thereof, except that a death sentence may not be suspended. The Judge Advocate General shall have the power to mitigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part of a sentence in any case requiring appellate review under article 50 and not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, but the power to mitigate or remit shall be exercised by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army. The authority which suspends the execution of a sentence may restore the person under sentence to duty during such suspension; and the death or honorable discharge of a person under suspended sentence shall operate as a complete remission of any unexecuted or unremitted part of such sentence.

"'b. Subsequent to the time ordered executed:

"'(1) Any unexecuted portion of a sentence other than a sentence of death, including all uncollected forfeitures, adjudged by court-martial may be mitigated, remitted or suspended and any order of suspension may be vacated, in whole or in part, by the military authority competent to appoint, for the command, exclusive of penitentiaries and the United States disciplinary barracks, in which the person under sentence may be, a court of the kind that imposed the sentence, and the same power may be exercised by superior military authority or by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army: *Provided*, That no sentence approved or confirmed by the President shall be mitigated, remitted, or suspended by any authority inferior to the President: *And provided further*, That no order of suspension of a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad conduct discharge shall be vacated unless and until confirming or appellate action on the sentence has been completed as required by articles 48 and 50.

"'(2) The power to suspend a sentence shall include the power to restore the person affected to duty during such suspension.

"'(3) The power to mitigate, remit or suspend the sentence or any part thereof in the case of a person confined in the United States disciplinary barracks or in a penitentiary shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Department of the Army or by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of the Army.'

"SEC. 229. Article 52 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 52. Rehearings: When any reviewing or confirming authority disapproved a sentence or when any sentence is vacated by action of the Board of Review or Judicial Council and the Judge Advocate General, the reviewing or confirming authority or the Judge Advocate General may authorize or direct a rehearing. Such rehearing shall take place before a court-martial composed of members not members of the court-martial which first heard the case. Upon such rehearing the accused shall not be tried for any offense of which he was found not guilty by the first court-martial, and no sentence in excess of or more severe than the original sentence shall be enforced unless the sentence be based upon a finding of guilty of an offense not considered upon the merits in the original proceeding.'

"SEC. 230. Article 53 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 53. Petition for New Trial: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the Judge Advocate General is authorized, upon application of an accused person, and upon good cause shown, in his discretion to grant a new trial, or to vacate a sentence, restore rights, privileges, and property affected by such sentence, and substitute for a dismissal, dishonorable discharge, or bad conduct discharge previously executed a form of discharge authorized for administrative issuance, in any court-martial case in which application is made within one year after final disposition of the case upon initial appellate review: *Provided*, That with regard to cases involving offenses committed during World War II, the application for a new trial may be made within one year after termination of the war, or after its final disposition upon initial appellate review as herein provided, whichever is the later: *Provided*, That only one such application for a new trial may be entertained with regard to any one case: *And provided further*, That all action by the Judge Advocate General pursuant to this article, and all proceedings, findings, and sentences on new trials under this article, as approved, reviewed, or confirmed under articles 47, 48, 49, and 50, and all dismissals and discharges carried into execution pursuant to sentences adjudged on new trials and approved, reviewed, or confirmed, shall be final and conclusive and orders publishing the action of the Judge Advocate General or the proceedings on new trial and all action taken pursuant to such proceedings, shall be binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States.'

"SEC. 231. Article 70 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 70. Charges; Action Upon, Unnecessary Delay: When any person subject to military law is placed in arrest or confinement immediate steps will be taken to try the person accused or to dismiss the charge and release him. Any officer who is responsible for unnecessary delay in investigating or carrying the case to a final conclusion shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.'

"SEC. 232. Article 85 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 85. Drunk on Duty: Any person subject to military law, who is found drunk on duty, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.'

"SEC. 233. Article 88 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 88. Unlawfully Influencing Action of Court: No authority appointing a general, special, or summary court-martial nor any other commanding officer, shall censure, reprimand, or admonish such court, or any member thereof, with respect to the findings or sentence adjudged by the court, or with respect to any other exercise, by such court or any member thereof, of its or his judicial responsibility. No person subject to military law shall attempt to coerce or unlawfully influence the action of a court-martial or any military court or commission, or any member thereof, in reaching the findings or sentence in any case, or the action of an appointing or reviewing or confirming authority with respect to his judicial acts.'

"SEC. 234. Article 89 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 89. Good Order To Be Maintained and Wrongs Redressed: All persons subject to military law are to behave themselves orderly in quarters, garrison, camp, and on the march; and any person subject to military law who commits any waste or spoil, or wrongfully destroys any property whatsoever or commits any kind of depredation or riot, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct. Any commanding officer who, upon complaint made to him refuses or omits to see reparation made to the party injured, insofar as the offender's pay shall go toward such reparation, as provided for in article 105, shall be dismissed from the service, or otherwise punished, as a court-martial may direct.'

"SEC. 235. Article 92 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 92. Murder—Rape: Any person subject to military law found guilty of murder shall suffer death or imprisonment for life, as a court-martial may direct; but if found guilty of murder not premeditated, he shall be punished as a court-martial may direct.

Any person subject to military law who is found guilty of rape shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct: *Provided*, That no person shall be tried by court-martial for murder or rape committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia in time of peace.'

"SEC. 236. Article 93 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 93. Various Crimes: Any person subject to military law who commits manslaughter, mayhem, arson, burglary, housebreaking, robbery, larceny, perjury, forgery, sodomy, assault with intent to commit any felony, assault with intent to do bodily harm with a dangerous weapon, instrument, or other thing, or assault with intent to do bodily harm, shall be punished as a court-martial may direct: *Provided*, That any person subject to military law who commits larceny or embezzlement shall be guilty of larceny within the meaning of this article.'

"SEC. 237. Article 94 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 94. Frauds Against the Government: Any person subject to military law who makes or causes to be made any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"'Who presents or causes to be presented to any person in the civil or military service thereof, for approval or payment, any claim against the United States, or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"'Who enters into any agreement or conspiracy to defraud the United States by obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the allowance or payment of any false or fraudulent claim; or

"'Who for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or against any officer thereof, makes or uses, or procures, or advises the making or use of, any writing or other paper knowing the same to contain any false of fraudulent statements; or

"'Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, makes or procures, or advises the making of, any oath to any fact or to any writing or other paper knowing such oath to be false; or

"'Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, forges or counterfeits, or procures, or advises the forging or counterfeiting of any signature upon any writing or other paper, or uses, or procures, or advises the use of any such signature, knowing the same to be forged or counterfeited; or

"'Who, having charge, possession, custody, or control of any money or other property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, knowingly delivers, or causes to be delivered, to any person having authority to receive the same, any amount thereof less than that for which he receives a certificate or receipt; or

"'Who, being authorized to make or deliver any paper certifying the receipt of any property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof, makes or delivers to any person such writing, without having full knowledge of the truth of the statements therein contained and with intent to defraud the United States; or

"'Who steals, embezzles, knowingly and willfully misappropriates, applies to his own use or benefit, or wrongfully, or knowingly sells or disposes of any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, money, or other property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof: *Provided*, That any person, subject to military law, who commits larceny or embezzlement with respect to property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, or with respect to other property within the purview of this article, steals said property within the meaning of this article; or

"'Who knowingly purchases or receives in pledge for any obligation or indebtedness from any soldier, officer, or other person who is a part of or employed in said forces or service, any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, or other property of the United States, such soldier, officer, or other person not having lawful right to sell or pledge the same; or

"'Who enters into any agreement or conspires to commit any of the offenses aforesaid;

"'Shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine or imprisonment, or by such other punishment as a court martial may adjudge, or by any or all of said penalties. If any person, being guilty of any of the offenses aforesaid or who steals or fails properly to account for any money or other property held in trust by him for enlisted persons or as its official custodian while in the military service of the United States, receives his discharge or is dismissed or otherwise separated from the service, he shall continue to be liable to be arrested and held for trial and sentence by a court martial in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had not been so separated therefrom.'

"SEC. 238. Article 104 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 104. Disciplinary Powers of Commanding officers: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the commanding officer of any detachment, company, or higher command, may, for minor offenses impose disciplinary punishments upon persons of his command without the intervention of a court-martial, unless the accused demands trial by court-martial.

"'The disciplinary punishments authorized by this article may include admonition or reprimand, or the withholding of privileges, or extra fatigue, or restriction to certain specified limits, or hard labor without confinement or any combination of such punishments for not exceeding one week from the date imposed; but shall not include forfeiture of pay or confinement under guard; except that any officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction may, under the provisions of this article, also impose upon a warrant officer or officer of his command below the rank of brigadier general a forfeiture of not more than one-half of his pay per month for three months.

"'A person punished under authority of this article, who deems his punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense, may, through the proper channel, appeal to the next superior authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged. The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, and superior authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment. The imposition and enforcement of disciplinary punishment under authority of this article for any act or omission shall not be a bar to trial by court-martial for a serious crime or offense growing out of the same act or omission, and not properly punishable under this article; but the fact that a disciplinary punishment has been enforced may be shown by the accused upon trial, and when so shown shall be considered in determining the measure of punishment to be adjudged in the event of a finding of guilty.'

"SEC. 239. Article 108 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 108. Soldiers—Separation From the Service: No enlisted person, lawfully inducted into the military service of the United States, shall be discharged from said service without a certificate of discharge, and no enlisted person shall be discharged from said service before his term of service has expired, except in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, or by sentence of a general or special court-martial.'

"SEC. 240. Article 110 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 110. Certain Articles of War To Be Read or Explained: Articles 1, 2, 24, 28, 29, 54 to 97, inclusive, 104 to 109, inclusive, and 121 shall be read or carefully explained to every soldier at the time of his enlistment or muster in, or within six days thereafter, and shall be read or explained once every six months to the soldiers of every garrison, regiment, or company in the service of the United States. And a complete text of the Articles of War and of the Manual for Courts-Martial shall be made available to any soldier, upon his request, for his personal examination.'

"SEC. 241. Article 116 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 116. Powers of Assistant Trial Judge Advocate and of Assistant Defense Counsel: An assistant trial judge advocate of a general or special court-martial shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon the trial judge advocate of the court. An assistant defense counsel shall be competent likewise to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon counsel for the accused.'

"SEC. 242. Article 117 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 117. Removal of Civil Suits: When any civil or criminal prosecution is commenced in any court of a State of the United States against any officer, soldier, or other person in the military service of the United States on account of any act done under color of his office or status, or in respect to which he claims any right, title, or authority under any law of the United States respecting the military forces thereof, or under the law of war, such suit or prosecution may at any time before the trial or final hearing thereof be removed for trial into the district court of the United States in the district where the same is pending in the manner prescribed by law, and the cause shall thereupon be entered on the docket of such district court, which shall proceed as if the cause had been originally commenced therein and shall have full power to hear and determine said cause'

"SEC. 243. Section 1 of article 121 is amended to read as follows:

"'ART. 121. Complaints of Wrongs: Any officer or soldier who believes himself wronged by his commanding officer, and, upon due application to such commander, is refused redress, may complain to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the officer against whom the complaint is made. That officer shall examine into said complaint and take proper measures for redressing the wrong complained of; and he shall, as soon as possible, transmit to the Department of the Army a true statement of such complaint, with the proceedings had thereon.'

"SEC. 244. This title shall become effective on the first day of the eighth calendar month after approval of this title.

"SEC. 245. All offenses committed and all penalties, forfeitures, fines, or liabilities incurred prior to the effective date of this title, under any law embraced in or modified, changed or repealed by this title, may be prosecuted, punished, and enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if this title had not been passed.

"SEC. 246. Section 8 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 61), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 8. Judge Advocate General's Corps: The Judge Advocate General's Corps shall consist of one Judge Advocate General with

the rank of major general, one assistant with the rank of major general, three officers with the rank of brigadier general, and an active list commissioned officer strength to be determined by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, but such strength shall not be less than 1½ per centum of the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the Armed Services of the National Military Establishment who are subject to the Articles of War, and in addition warrant officers and enlisted men in such numbers as the Secretary of the Department of the Army shall determine.'

"SEC. 247. Regular Army officers shall be permanently appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the commissioned officer grades of major general, brigadier general, colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and first lieutenant. The names of commissioned officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps below the grade of brigadier general shall be carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list. The Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be established by entering thereon the names of the officers concerned without change in their order of precedence on the existing promotion list. The authorized numbers in each of the several grades in the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Department of the Army, but the numbers thus authorized shall not exceed the following percentages of the total strength authorized for that list: 8 per centum in the grade of colonel; 14 per centum in the grade of lieutenant colonel; 19 per centum in the grade of major; 23 per centum in the grade of captain; and 36 per centum in the grade of first lieutenant: *Provided*, That numbers may be authorized for any grade in lieu of authorization in higher grades: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not operate to require a reduction in permanent grade of any officer now holding permanent appointment.

"Officers whose names are carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be promoted to the several grades as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers generally and the authorized numbers in grades below colonel on such list shall be temporarily increased from time to time in order to give effect to the promotion system now or hereafter prescribed by law for promotion-list officers.

"Within the authorized strength of the Judge Advocate General's Corps additional officers may be appointed by transfer of qualified officers from other branches of the Army, by appointment of Reserve judge advocates or qualified civilian graduates of accredited law schools. Those originally appointed in the Regular Army in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with an amount of service for the purpose of determining grade, position on promotion list, permanent-grade seniority, and eligibility for promotion as now or hereafter prescribed by law.

"SEC. 248. The Judge Advocate General shall, in addition to such other duties as may be prescribed by law, be the legal adviser of the Secretary of the Department of the Army and of all officers and agencies of the Department of the Army; and all members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall perform their duties under the direction of the Judge Advocate General.

"SEC. 249. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General and general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps who are recommended for such positions by the Secretary of the Department of the Army. Upon the appointment of an officer to be the Judge Advocate General or Assistant Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, he shall at the same time if not then holding permanent appointment in such grade be appointed a permanent major general of the Regular Army."

CHAN GURNEY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

W. G. ANDREWS,
W. STERLING COLE,
GEORGE J. BATES,
CARL VINSON,
P. J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the reserve components thereof, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTHS

Senate bill, Army, 790,000 plus 110,000 one-year trainees.

House amendment, 837,000.

Senate bill, Navy (including Marine Corps), 666,882, plus 36,000 one-year trainees.

House amendment, 666,882.

Senate bill, Air Force, 453,000, plus 15,000 one-year trainees.

House amendment, 502,000.

The conference agreement provides for authorized active duty personnel strengths for the armed forces as follows:

Army: 837,000 plus 110,000 one-year enlistees.

Navy (including Marine Corps): 666,882 plus 36,000 one-year enlistees.

Air Force: 502,000 plus 15,000 one-year enlistees.

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS

The Senate bill authorized the Secretary of the Army until June 30, 1950 to accept enlistments in the Regular Army, for periods of not less than 5 years, of not more than 25,000 qualified aliens between the ages of 18 and 35. The House amendment contains no comparable provision. The conference agreement eliminates the provision for enlistment of aliens.

REGISTRATION

The Senate bill provided for the registration of male persons between the ages of 18 and 26, and contained no specific provision authorizing registration by age groups. The House amendment provided for the registration of male persons between the ages of 18 and 31, and specifically authorized the President to provide for registration by age groups. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to registration.

LIABILITY OF ALIENS FOR SERVICE

The Senate bill provided that citizens of a foreign country should be relieved from liability for training and service upon application for such relief, but provided that any person who sought relief should thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The House amendment excluded from liability for service those aliens who have not declared their intentions to become citizens of the United States. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to liability for training and service of aliens but insuring that properly deferrable aliens may be relieved from liability for induction without debarment from citizenship.

MORATORIUM ON INDUCTIONS

The House amendment contained provisions prohibiting inductions under the Act until the President proclaims not earlier than 75 days after the date of enactment (1) that a sufficient number of persons is on active service in the armed forces to maintain an adequate national defense, and (2) that a sufficient number of such persons cannot, in his judgment, be attained by voluntary enlistment and by voluntary request for call to active duty. The amendment did not delay the registration, classification, et cetera, of persons. The amendment further provided that upon the issuance of such a proclamation the provisions authorizing inductions should come into effect but that no person should be inducted prior to 90 days after the date of enactment of the legislation. The amendment further provided that no induction should be made before January 31, 1949 and that no induction should be made after that date unless the President found that the requisite manpower strengths could not be obtained or maintained by an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign which was directed to be carried out. The amendment further provided for original enlistments in the armed forces for periods of two years and for reenlistments for periods of either one or two years.

The Senate bill contained no provisions comparable to those described in the preceding paragraph.

The conference agreement requires that involuntary inductions under the Act be delayed for 90 days after the date of its enactment unless the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, declares a national emergency after the date of enactment of the Act. The conference agreement requires the armed forces to initiate and carry on an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strength.

PERIOD OF SERVICE

The Senate bill provided that persons inducted under the legislation should serve for a period of 24 consecutive months. The House amendment provided that persons inducted should serve for a period of 12 months. The conference agreement provides that persons inducted shall serve for a period of twenty-one consecutive months.

SPECIAL CALLS FOR DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

The Senate bill provided for the special registration and calling for service of members of the medical and dental professions and allied specialist categories who have not attained the age of 45. It established an order of priority for the induction of persons in medical and dental categories and contained provisions designed to prevent the induction or call to active duty for more than 1 month in any calendar year of any doctor of medicine or dental surgery, established in his profession in the community in which he resides, if the local board determined that the health of the community in which he resides would be unduly jeopardized as a result of his induction or service on active duty.

The House amendment contained no provisions providing for the special registration of and calling for service of persons in medical and dental categories.

The conference agreement eliminates the provisions of the Senate bill providing for the special registration and calling for service of persons in medical and dental categories.

SHORT-TERM ENLISTMENTS

The House amendment contained a provision requiring the acceptance of enlistments in the Regular Army of persons between the ages of 19 and 26 for enlistment

periods equal to the periods of service required of inductees. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement includes the provision of the House amendment relative to enlistments in the Regular Army.

ARMY GENERAL CLASSIFICATION TEST SCORE

The House amendment contained a provision prohibiting the establishment of a passing score on the Army General Classification Test higher than 70 points. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement provides that the passing score on the Army General Classification Test shall be 70 points.

ONE-YEAR TRAINEES

The Senate bill contained provisions providing for the enlistment in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for 1-year periods of limited numbers of qualified male persons between the ages of 18 and 19. Persons enlisting for the period of one year would, upon completion of their enlistments, be transferred to the reserve components for periods of 6 years and would be under strong compulsion to accept assignment to organized units of the reserve components or to officer training programs of the armed forces.

The House amendment also provided for the enlistment in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for 1-year periods of qualified male persons between the ages of 18 and 19 but placed no limit on the number who could be so enlisted. The House amendment, while providing for the transfer of such persons to reserve components for periods of six years, did not impose any compulsion upon them to join organized units of the reserve components.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill relative to enlistments for 1-year periods of persons between the ages of 18 and 19.

DEFERMENTS AND EXEMPTIONS

The Senate bill exempted from liability for induction those persons who served for more than 18 months, either in the armed forces of the United States or allied countries, between September 16, 1940, and the date of enactment. It also provided for the exemption of those veterans who served for more than 90 days between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945. The Senate bill provided that those veterans who served for 90 days or more but less than 18 months in the period September 16, 1940, to the date of enactment should be exempt from liability for induction if they should be determined by the local board to have taken on certain reserve obligations. The House amendment provided for the exemption of those veterans who served for 12 months or more subsequent to September 16, 1940, and also provided for the exemption of those veterans who have been awarded the purple heart or any badge, award, or decoration evidencing exceptional valor, bravery in combat, or continued service in combat. The House amendment also provided for the exemption from liability for induction of those veterans who served for 90 days or more but less than 12 months subsequent to September 16, 1940, if the local boards should determine that they had assumed certain reserve obligations which might be assumed without interrupting their normal pursuits and activities.

The conference agreement is that veterans with 12 months or more of service shall be exempt from induction. It was further agreed that veterans who served between Pearl Harbor Day and V-J Day for more than 90 days shall be exempt.

The conference agreement also was that veterans with less than 12 months of service shall be exempt if they assume certain reserve obligations which might be assumed without interrupting their normal pursuits and activities.

The Senate bill provided for the exemption from liability for service of those persons who joined the national guard before attaining the age of 18½ only in cases in which the governor of the State determined that the strength of the national guard could not be attained by the registration of persons not liable for training and service under the bill. The House amendment provided for the exemption from liability for training and service of all persons joining organized units of the reserve components, which participate in scheduled drills and training periods throughout the year, if such persons join before attaining the age of 18½. The House amendment also provided for the deferment of persons who, at any time prior to the date they are ordered to report for induction, join reserve components and who serve in such components for a total period of 6 years during which they satisfactorily participate in scheduled drills and training periods.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to the matters discussed in this paragraph.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contained exemptions for a limited number of persons enrolling in the Reserve Officers Training Programs of the armed forces subsequent to the effective date of the legislation. The Senate bill conditioned such exemption upon those persons agreeing to serve, after being commissioned, for a period of 2 years. The House amendment conditioned the exemption upon an agreement to serve, after being commissioned, for a period of time equal to the period of service of inductees.

The conference agreement requires persons who are deferred from induction while undergoing training in the Reserve Officers Training Programs to agree to serve on active duty for a period of 2 years.

The Senate bill provided for the exemption from training and service of regular or duly ordained ministers of religion and of theological and pre-theological students. The House amendment broadened this exemption to include Christian Science Readers and practitioners and those persons who have been recognized by the officials of their church, synagogue, or sect as having given definite and acknowledged intention of entering into full-time religious work.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to exemption of ministers and theological and pre-theological students, for the reason that it was felt that to include any specific sect or religion by name in this provision would logically compel the inclusion of many others or, by interpretation, indicate that other such sects would be excluded were the original House provisions accepted.

The Senate bill specifically provided the President with authority to defer from induction those persons whose activity in study, research, or medical or scientific endeavors was found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The House amendment, although giving the President sufficient authority to defer such persons, contains no specific provisions relating to such persons.

The conference agreement adopts the specific provisions of the Senate bill with respect to deferment of those whose activities in study, research, or medical or scientific endeavors are found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

The Senate bill provided that those conscientious objectors who were found to be opposed to participation in noncombatant service should be assigned to work of national importance under immediate civilian direction. The bill extended to persons who might be so assigned and who might suffer disability or death while performing such work the benefits of the Employees Compensation Act of September 7, 1916. The House amendment provided that conscientious objectors found to be opposed to participation in noncombatant service should be deferred from induction for service under the legislation.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment providing for the deferment from induction of those conscientious objectors who are found to be opposed to participation in noncombatant service.

SOLE SURVIVING SON EXEMPTION

The House amendment added a provision to the effect that where one or more members of a family have been killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the armed forces of the United States, the sole surviving son of such family should not be inducted for service under the legislation. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the provision of the House amendment with a clarifying amendment.

PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO HEALTH AND MORALS

The House amendment contained a provision requiring that the training under the Act be administered and carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane. It also prohibited the maintenance, within distances specified by the Secretary of Defense, of any military installation utilized for training purposes of any house of ill fame or place of entertainment constituting a public nuisance. The conference agreement eliminates the provisions of the House amendment because of the fact that the conferees determined that the Act of May 15, 1946 (60 Stat. 182) had made permanent the provisions of the Act of July 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 583) which contains substantially the same provisions with respect to prohibition of prostitution within the vicinity of military and naval establishments as does the provision of the House amendment.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

The Senate bill provided that persons completing their periods of service under the Act and securing restoration to their former positions in accordance with the terms of the Act should be restored without loss of seniority. The bill contained a declaration by the Congress to the effect that persons so restored should be restored in such manner as to give them the status in their employment which they would have enjoyed if they had continued in their employment continuously. The Senate bill contained detailed provisions with respect to the enforcement of the reemployment rights of Federal Government employees and gave the Civil Service Commission the power to issue necessary rules, regulations, and orders to assure that the restoration rights would be effective. It contained no specific provisions with respect to court proceedings for restoration to positions in the Federal Government. The Senate bill designated the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights, as the Federal official to render aid to veterans in obtaining restoration to their former employment. The bill also contained a provision authorizing and requesting the President to formulate and recommend to Congress plans for the rehabilitation and retraining of veterans serving after the date of enactment of the legislation.

The House bill provided that those restored to positions pursuant to the terms of the act should be entitled to all promotions, increases in pay, vacation rights, and accumulations of seniority to which they would have been entitled if they had been working in their old positions during their periods of service. The House amendment, unlike the Senate bill, did not specifically prohibit the layoff, within 1 year after his

restoration, of a person restored to employment under the provisions of the legislation. The House amendment also contained detailed provisions with respect to the restoration to their positions of those veterans who held positions under the Federal Government prior to the beginning of their periods of service. These detailed provisions included specific authority for such persons to obtain court orders requiring their restoration to positions under the Federal Government. The House amendment designated the Director of Selective Service as the Federal official charged with the duty of rendering aid to veterans in obtaining restoration to their former positions.

The conference agreement adopts the language of the Senate bill with respect to reemployment rights, except that (1) the provision of the Senate bill authorizing and requesting the President to formulate and recommend to Congress plans for the rehabilitation and retraining of veterans was eliminated, and (2) the provision of the House amendment deleting the prohibition against lay-offs of restored veterans was adopted.

CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

The Senate bill provided specific penalties for those forging or altering certificates issued under the Act and for persons possessing or using any such forged or altered certificates. The House amendment contained no comparable provisions. The conference agreement adopts the provision of the Senate bill with respect to this matter.

LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS TO RESERVE FLYING OFFICERS

The Senate bill contained a provision having the effect of preventing Reserve flying officers from obtaining the lump-sum payments of $500 per year for the periods of active duty which they might perform during the time the legislation would be effective. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to lump-sum payments.

UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

The Senate provisions with respect to the placement of mandatory orders for articles and materials required that mandatory orders be placed by the President only after receiving advice from the National Security Resources Board. The bill authorized the placement of mandatory orders to obtain articles or materials for the use of the armed forces of the United States or the Atomic Energy Commission.

The provisions of the House amendment relating to the placement of mandatory orders differed considerably in wording but not so much in substance from the corresponding provisions of the Senate bill. The House amendment authorized the President, through the Secretary of Defense, to place mandatory orders only for products or materials required by the armed forces. The House amendment contained a provision, which had no counterpart in the Senate bill, empowering the President to require producers of steel to make available to manufacturers having orders for steel products or steel materials required by the armed forces the necessary steel to enable such manufacturers to execute their orders. It provided for enforcing compliance with the allocation of steel by authorizing the President to take possession of the plants of steel producers failing to comply with the required allocations. The amendment further required the President to report to the Congress at the end of each 6 months' period the percentage of steel production in the United States required in the execution of orders for steel products and steel materials for the armed forces, if such requirement was in excess of 10 per centum of production.

The conference agreement adopts the provision of the House amendment empowering the President to require producers of steel to make steel available to persons having orders from the armed forces for materials requiring steel products or materials in their manufacture. The conference agreement otherwise adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to mandatory orders.

MILITARY JUSTICE

The Senate bill contained provisions incorporating the substance of the bill H. R. 2575, as previously passed by the House during this Congress, revising the articles of war and making changes in the status of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army. The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference agreement incorporates the provisions of H. R. 2575 with respect to military justice together with certain clarifying amendments.

W. G. ANDREWS,
W. STERLING COLE,
GEORGE J. BATES,
CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2655) to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve component thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order, and I ask the indulgence of the Speaker so that I may argue the point.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the document which has just been presented is not the report of any conference. It is not the product of a full and free conference as required in Jefferson's Manual. I make my point of order based on the proposition that there has never been a valid conference—specifically, that there has never been a valid meeting on the part of the managers on the part of the House.

I would like at this time, first, to present the facts chronologically.

Yesterday the House voted, under suspension of the rules, to send the bill to conference, and the House conferees were appointed. A motion was made in the other body for the same purpose. Extended debate was had on that motion. This morning the motion to send the Senate bill to conference and disagree with the House amendments and authorizing the appointment of conferees was adopted. Immediately, before there was any time for a meeting, a physical meeting to take place between the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate, this document before you, Mr. Speaker, was filed and acted upon in the Senate. Physically there were some meetings. The meetings that took place yesterday, Mr. Speaker, all of the meetings that took place yesterday were prior to the adoption of the motion in the other body to send this bill to conference. How could they have been valid meetings? They could not have been valid meetings because there were no managers in existence on the part of the Senate. The Members of the other body who met with the House conferees were not managers on the part of the other body, therefore those meetings had no validity whatsoever. It is true that at those meetings the provisions of the document which we have before us were agreed upon. It is likewise true that the people who participated in those meetings on behalf of the other body were Members who were subsequently appointed as managers for the other body, but throughout those meetings they were not there as managers who had been appointed; in fact all the while they were participating in those meetings they had not as yet been authorized by the other body to be there. They had no authority to act.

After the motion was adopted to send the bill to conference, and before the Senate adopted this document as a conference report, and before this document had been filed in the other body there was no meeting. A meeting took place after that.

The question is whether or not that ex post facto meeting constituted a valid meeting, pursuant to the various sections of Jefferson's Manual that define a free and full conference. That meeting that took place after the Senate had adopted this document as a conference report could not have been a valid meeting; it has no validity, because the managers on the part of the other body had no longer anything to discuss. They no longer had any duties to perform. Whatever was said at that meeting or whatever was done at that meeting could not have any validity because action had already been taken by the other body.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the argument will be made that the House cannot go across the Capitol and review what has happened in the other body. I know that it will be said that the illegal action on the part of the other body in accepting this document as a report on which the conferees never formally met as conferees is conclusive and binding as far as the House is concerned. However, that action is absolutely illegal and void, and, in my humble judgment, places in jeopardy the legality of this entire legislation.

I know that the argument will be made that we in the House cannot go into the legality of any Senate action. That is a debatable question and I do not press it.

The argument that I do make, Mr. Speaker, is against the action not of the Senate conferees but the actions of the House conferees. My point of order is that they did not attend a valid conference, that the meetings that they attended yesterday were not valid conferences because the persons with whom they were meeting had not been appointed managers for the Senate; that the meeting they had subsequent to the adoption of this document as a conference report or subsequent to the filing of this document as a conference report in the Senate cannot be considered a valid meeting. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the document that is presented here presumably as a report of a conference is not the

report of a valid conference. It is not a report of a full and free conference. Since there has been no valid conference this document has no validity before this House.

I press this point of order in all earnestness, Mr. Speaker, being fully cognizant of the seriousness and far-reaching consequences of our action here tonight on the peace and future of the youth of our Nation. It is because I am aware of the disastrous consequences that will flow from the action you will take tonight that I make this effort to prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, there is one further point I should like to make for the purpose of reemphasis, and that is that the chairman of the committee, Mr. ANDREWS, and the other House conferees can never establish that there was ever a valid meeting. Since there was never a valid meeting there was never a valid conference as required in Jefferson's Manual. This document not being the product of a valid conference is, therefore, not in order before the House.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I shall make a short and factual statement.

The conferees duly appointed on the part of the House met informally after their appointment yesterday to consider this subject matter. At a later time the House conferees met with the Senate conferees and agreed upon the terms of the conference report in a full committee meeting. The Senate conferees then presented the conference report to the Senate this morning and the Senate subsequently adopted that conference report as shown by the message from the Senate which the House has received.

There is no dispute whatever among the conferees as to what was agreed to in the conference, and the Chair will note that the conference report is signed by all of the Senate conferees and by six of the seven House conferees.

Out of an abundance of caution, having learned that some question might be raised in the House as I had been informed was raised in the Senate, I called another meeting of the full conference committee including the managers on the part of the Senate today to approve the conference report. The conference report was then agreed to by the committee of conference and it is now properly before the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard briefly further on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, said there was a conference later. I think that word "later" is the key to the question.

What does he mean by "later"? If by "later" he means after this document was filed as a conference report in the Senate then definitely that meeting was not a conference.

The only "later" that could validate this report would be a meeting between the moment the motion to send this bill to conference was adopted in the Senate and the moment this document was filed in the Senate as a conference report. Such a meeting, I repeat, never took place. That statement is not being challenged. Such a meeting could not take place, could not physically take place because not enough time elapsed between the motion to send to conference and the filing of this document as a report, for such a meeting to take place. There never was any such meeting and the chairman and every conferee of the House knows that my statement is true.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

On page 770, volume 5, of Hinds' Precedents, section 6497 states:

> A conference report is received if signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

The Chair has examined the report and the papers and finds that it is signed by five of the managers on the part of the Senate and six of the seven managers on the part of the House.

The Chair has no knowledge, of course, how this report was reached, but the Chair cannot impeach the names of the managers on the part of the two Houses. Furthermore, the Senate having already received the report, and according to a message heretofore received by the House has officially adopted it, the Chair feels that under the circumstances the report is properly before the House for such action as the House may see fit to take. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the House has been attentive to the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House, I believe they know more about it now than they will after hearing most of the speakers who will address them in the next hour.

I intend to yield one-half of the time insofar as I am able to to the minority side and on the minority side to those in opposition. Throughout the entire consideration of this bill I have tried to be fair. Also, on the majority side I will yield time to those in opposition. As I understand it, the yielding rests solely with me. I shall try to recognize everybody who has requested time and will try to divide the time evenly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the managers on the part of the House is, I am sure most will agree, clear in expressing what has been agreed upon in the conference. I think it is far clearer than the average conference report that comes before us. There were numerous changes made, of course, and I think I shall address myself to what I regard as the two major changes made by the committee of conference in the original House bill.

The first major change has to do with the effective date of the act. The bill as reported by the House committee provided that the act should become effective upon its approval by the President, but that induction should be deferred for a period of 90 days. On the floor the committee offered a committee amendment which provided that not sooner than 75 days after the approval of the act the President could place inductions into effect by issuing a proclamation and thereafter inductions should not take place sooner than 90 days after the approval of the act.

The conference report has practically the same provision that was originally brought in by the House committee. A provision was adopted which would have delayed inductions and registrations until January 31, 1949.

I want to make clear the difference between the provision in the conference report and the provision requiring the President to "pull the trigger," you might say, is one of form and not of substance. Under the bill as it is now reported to you from conference, nothing can be done—you cannot have a registration—until the President issues a proclamation for registration. The bill is not self-enacting. The President must take the affirmative action of fixing the date of registration; then the President must issue the call for the quotas of the persons to be inducted. That is the way it was done under the Selective Training and Service Act in the recent war; that was the provision of the law in the First World War. So, as I say, it is mostly a matter of form and not substance.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Is there any limitation as to how soon after the call of the President for registration he may direct that these boys be called into service?

Mr. KILDAY. There is not.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman said that the President must issue this proclamation. Is that right? The law requires that?

Mr. KILDAY. No; it does not require him to do so.

Mr. JUDD. He must do it to bring it into effect?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. If there is to be any induction the President must take affirmative action.

Mr. JUDD. If the situation should improve and there might be an avalanche of enlistments, it would not have to be done?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. The bill places an absolute ceiling on the number that can be taken in the Army, the Navy, and Air Force. If that is reached then necessarily he cannot direct the induction of

anyone and an appropriation bill for anything in excess of those ceilings would be subject to a point of order because there would be no authorization.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand the conference report provides for men between 21 and 35 for 21 months?

Mr. KILDAY. The 21 months is correct. That is the point I am coming to next. It provides for registrations 18 to 25, inclusive, and inductions 19 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. DONDERO. For 21 months?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why was it that the committee did not include in its report the things that were embodied in the vote of the membership of the House in committee? Why did the committee not give consideration to those things and retain them in the bill?

Mr. KILDAY. We were sent to conference for the purpose of reconciling the differences between the two Houses. We did make a sincere effort to sustain the House provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to include in my remarks a summary of the instances in which the House yielded and in which the Senate yielded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

1. House provisions accepted by Senate.

(a) Elimination of enlistment of 25,000 aliens (Lodge amendment).

(b) Postponement of inductions for 90 days and requirement for intensified enlistment campaign.

(c) Elimination of doctors provision.

(d) Short-term enlistments for period of induction.

(e) ACCT score of 70 points.

(f) Exemption of veterans with 12 or more months of service.

(g) Require that veterans' reserve obligation be undertaken only if it is not unduly inconvenient.

(h) Exemption of conscientious objectors who are opposed to any service.

(i) Sole surviving son provision.

(j) Elimination of "laid off or" in reemployment provisions whereby discharged draftee could displace World War II veteran.

(k) Elimination of requirement on President in Senate bill to establish large-scale rehabilitation and retraining program for veterans.

(l) Steel allocations to small business.

(m) Authorized strengths.

2. Senate provisions accepted by House.

(a) Limitation on numbers of 1 year enlistees from among the 18-year-olds.

(b) Top registration age limit of 25.

(c) Exemption of aliens from induction with subsequent debarment from citizenship if induction exemption is requested.

(d) Compulsion on 1-year enlistees (18-year-olds) to enter Reserve units after discharge.

(e) Exemption of 18½-year-olds if they join National Guard (House bill permitted their entrance into other Reserve units).

(f) Two-year active-duty obligation on ROTC graduates (House bill required service so long as induction period only).

(g) Senate provisions on ministers.

(h) Senate provisions on scientists.

(i) Elimination of provision in respect to maintenance of health and morals in vicinity of Army camps (excluded because present law already covers the subject).

(j) Labor Department to administer veteran reemployment provisions instead of Director of Selective Service.

(k) Penalties for those forging or altering certificates issued under the Selective Service Act.

(l) Elimination of $500 per year lump-sum payments to Air Reserve officers called to duty under the act.

(m) Senate provisions on mandatory orders to industry.

(n) Senate provisions relating to military justice.

(o) Exemption of all veterans who served between Pearl Harbor day and VJ-day (House amendment deferred only those who served in combat).

3. Compromises between House and Senate.

(a) Insuring that aliens requesting exemption from induction be not thereafter debarred from American citizenship unless exemption is based solely on grounds of the person being an alien.

(b) Ninety-day induction postponement was compromise of Shafer amendment postponing inductions until January 31, 1949, and no comparable provision in Senate bill.

(c) Twenty-one months required service in place of 24-months in Senate bill, 12-months in House bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said it would require affirmative action on the part of the President before this would be put into effect?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true this action would be taken immediately on the effective date of the act or shortly thereafter as distinguished from the affirmative action that was contemplated in the bill passed by the House which required that affirmative action be taken at the end of 90 days?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. It being the idea that in that time the situation might be so altered in the world or in the country as to eliminate the necessity for this action at all?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. The other provision put a time limitation on the President. This provision does not, but he must take some affirmative action before there can be any inductions under the act.

Mr. HALLECK. It takes affirmative action before the registration starts. After that is done then, of course, the provisions of the act apply and it would become effective without any subsequent further action by the President?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. They apply within the ceilings placed in the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I want to point out the further provision in the bill that if voluntary enlistments are not up to the regular quota, which they should be for the current authorized strength of the Regular Army in any one month, only in that case can selective service become effective.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. To keep the record clear in this case, as I understand the bill coming from the Senate, this is automatic and does not shift the burden to the President of the United States; is that true?

Mr. KILDAY. The burden has always been there. It has been in each act that we have passed.

Mr. CARROLL. I am asking whether or not this bill is automatic.

Mr. KILDAY. It becomes effective on the date that it is signed, and then the President can direct registration at any time, or he need not direct registration.

Mr. CARROLL. But the Senate and this body assume their responsibilities.

Mr. KILDAY. That is true.

Mr. CARROLL. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman address himself to the proposition as to what provisions there are in the bill to compel voluntary action before the bill goes into effect and the induction starts.

Mr. KILDAY. Before we get to that, may I say that we adopted an amendment in the House that fixed the tour of duty at 12 months. The Senate had an amendment fixing the tour of duty at 24 months. We made a sincere effort to secure a lesser period of time. I never felt that 18 months was the proper time, but I did know that my burden here in attempting to secure agreement of the conference report would be much lighter if we adopted the 18-month period. So, we had reached the compromise stage. We were sent there to compromise, and we did the best we could.

I believe, in answer to the gentleman from New York, that we have in here every possible inducement for voluntary enlistment, in addition to a positive direction to the departments to carry on an active enlistment campaign. We also provide here for the building up of our Reserve components, the National Guard and the organized Reserves. We have maintained the position that the House took that a man who served for 12 months during the recent war would have fully discharged his obligation; if less than 12 months, that he should enter the National Guard or the Organized Reserves. Those matters are all in the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. But that is only true on the effective date of this act; is that not correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. That does not give the Reservists and the Guard members much time to enlist.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, probably not, but they do have the right to enlist, those up to 18½ years of age, after the effective date of the act. In that way we do believe that it will build up the National Guard and the Organized Reserves.

Of course, we have come now to this point: The bill has been argued thoroughly here in the House; it has passed the Senate; we have reached the compromise stage. I assure you that the conferees have done the best they could with the conferees in the other body and I sincerely trust that the report will be accepted.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

If there was ever a bill at any time in the history of this country that really should benefit the National Guard, it is this bill. It benefits it in four directions. All veterans who served 12 months or more are exempted from this bill, if they are not otherwise exempted, provided they enlist in the National Guard. There are 161,000 provided for at 17 and 18 years of age who may enlist in the Regular Army for 1 year and then come into the National Guard at the end of the year. Any young man up to the point he is 18 years and 6 months old may enlist in the National Guard and be exempt from the draft. As far as I can see, I know of no bill that has ever benefited the National Guard to this extent.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was simply asking as to the effective date of this act. If this act goes into effect tomorrow or next week, the gentleman knows as well as I do that the National Guard or the Organized Reserves are not going to benefit very much by it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. They have been benefiting by it for 2 months. If the gentleman will make a study of his own National Guard in New York State, he will understand that.

Mr. KEARNEY. We have today 14,000 and should have 62,000 for the two divisions in the State of New York, namely, the Twenty-seventh Division and the Forty-second Division, besides the Air Corps. I sincerely hope that this act will bring full strength to the guard of the United States. They should be taken into consideration in all plans for the proper defense of our country. They are too valuable and in this thought I include all the civilian components of our armed forces.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill when it passed this body and I voted against the motion to recommit. As much as I dislike it, I feel that it is in the best interest of our country. It is my feeling that 1 year's service is long enough. This is not a universal training bill, it is a bill where we reach in and take some boys and pass up others. Those that we take should not be required to serve for more than 1 year. If you take them for longer than that, the danger is much greater that you will disastrously and permanently interfere with their education and life plans. It should be for 1 year only.

It is not my purpose to delay or defeat this measure. But I would suggest that this conference report be voted down, so that a preferential motion may be offered directing the managers on the part of the House to insist on the Coudert amendment, which fixes the period of service at 12 months. If the conference report is voted down, it is my understanding such a motion will be offered, and I shall support it.

If this conference report is voted down the legislation is not killed, it merely means that managers must confer further.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the atmosphere of the National Capital today is filled with military propaganda. Earlier in the day I listened to a radio broadcast of a review of General Stillwell's recently published book. The reviewer quoted the retired general as criticizing a former President of the United States for "meddling too much in military affairs." Here is a concise illustration of the arrogance of militarism, which would denounce even the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of this Nation if he presumed to say how he thought the Military Establishment should be conducted.

In a news dispatch from Denver published today the present Chief of Staff of the Army, General Bradley, is reported to have delivered a prepared speech in that city last night in which he criticized this Congress for "vacillation, timidity, and for blundering into a costly retreat."

Regardless of the merits of this criticism, I think that the spectacle of the head of the Army making a political speech directed against this Congress is a proper subject for an investigation by the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That subcommittee has recently issued a well-deserved rebuke to the officials and employees of the War Department for expending tax funds in publicity and propaganda campaigns designed to influence public sentiment in favor of compulsory military service. I suggest that this committee ascertain whether the cost of General Bradley's trip to Denver to make a political speech was paid for out of tax funds, and if not, whether a general of the Army is authorized by law to devote his official time, which is paid for by the taxpayers, to such a political junket.

My colleagues of the House, you will be called upon in a very short while to cast one of the most fateful votes in the history of the Congress of the United States—a vote on the question whether permanent peacetime compulsory military training service shall become the law of the land.

I want to emphasize now that the bill which is here presented to you does not resemble in many essential provisions the bill which was passed by the House this week after many hours of debate and amendments. I call your attention to the fact that the Shafer amendment, which was adopted by the House by a three to two vote, has been thrown out the window. Indeed almost the whole House bill was thrown out of the window, and our conferees have accepted, instead, as the recent reading of the report of the managers indicated to you—our conferees have accepted in almost every important instance the Senate bill in toto.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill has never been considered in the House until this time, but that is the bill which the military high command prefers; and that is the bill which will be crammed down our throats tonight unless the House of Representatives exercises its constitutional authority and rejects it. By your votes on this measure tonight, my colleagues, you will decide whether the historic policy of Thomas Jefferson, that civil authority shall be superior to military authority in time of peace, shall continue to be the policy of the United States of America, or whether this traditional free government shall adopt for the first time in its glorious career a policy of peacetime compulsory militarism for all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have said before on two previous occasions: This bill is intended to put into effect a permanent policy of the Government of the United States. I want to illustrate again my statement. The record of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee is filled with statements by the spokesmen for the Military Establishment that, if this bill is enacted, it will remain in effect until you get universal military training.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to become vindictive in the statement I make tonight. My heart goes out to the House conferees on this bill.

I understand the conferees have come back to us and, according to the reading of the report, after one of the most gruelling conferences ever held in the history of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, it was a knock-down, drag-out fight. There is no question about it. Our conferees punched and they punched and they exerted every effort to keep the House amendments in this draft bill. There is no doubt about that. But, Mr. Speaker, our friends met a superior force, and they

have had to return to us with heads bloody but unbowed.

I understand my good friend and colleague, one whom I love, the gentleman from Missouri, DEWEY SHORT, was the only conferee standing at the end of this vicious battle. He was somewhat saddened, but he was not beaten. His signature was not on the conference report.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I foresaw the result of this bloody conflict even before it was staged. That is the reason I voted "no," even after my amendment to delay inductions until the Army had made an honest effort to obtain recruits was agreed to.

While I am sure the House conferees battled hard to keep my amendment in the bill, I anticipated the victory of the more numerous forces. In throwing out the Shafer amendment the managers on the part of the Senate—the Senate, if you please—flagrantly disregarded the will of the House, especially as to the Shafer and the Coudert amendments. I think we should give our House conferees a good rubdown, a little shot in the arm, and anything else that is necessary, and send them back into the fray. We should insist upon the Shafer and the Coudert amendments.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our conferees do not want the Army and the Navy to have the best football teams again. This draft act goes into effect immediately. The boys are registered right away; inducted in 90 days, and by the time the football season opens all of our good stars will be out of our best teams, with only the IV–F's left. Michigan, Illinois, Southern California, as well as other great teams will be without first-class players while all the good ones will remain at West Point and Annapolis, as happened during the war.

Again, the Army and Navy may proclaim the greatest teams. Mr. Speaker, let us make it possible—and we will do so under this bill—to keep Notre Dame and Michigan in the same standard as the Army and the Navy.

Do not let anybody fool you about the Presidential procamation, for it has been taken out of the bill.

The Shafer amendment that won by a vote of 135 to 90 in the House was given no consideration by this conference.

Mr. Speaker, I would not for a moment oppose this draft if I thought it were necessary. If I thought it were needed I would be the first one to say: "Go ahead, boys, put it into effect." But there is not a Member of this House; there is not a high official of the Army or Navy, or the State Department, who can come here today and make a case for this act. Every Member of this House knows this as well as a great many of our news commentators. Just tonight I asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a commentary by David Lawrence which appeared in last night's Washington Star, stating that neither the Army nor the State Department have made a case for enactment of this draft legislation.

The draft is unnecessary. Mr. Speaker, let us return this report to the conference committee.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York yield to permit a bill to be sent to conference?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, insist upon the House amendments, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, SMITH of Ohio, KUNKEL, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps I would get a little more time, but I understand the difficulties with which the chairman is confronted. Three minutes is a mighty short time to even touch on this subject.

I enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], and I think they were rather appropriate.

The House does not want this bill to be effective for 24 months. The House does not want this bill to be effective for 21 months. I think the great majority of Members expected the conferees to bring back a report carrying not more than 18 months.

So far as I am concerned I was and am so thoroughly of the conviction that the draft is not needed, not necessary, that I voted against the bill before and I will vote against it tonight.

The War Department has not made out a case, but the membership has been called upon to take this drastic step on rumors, hearsay, and conclusions reached by men definitely and directly interested.

On yesterday, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee would not even tell us what Mr. Marshall testified to before his committee because it was a secret. Why should this secret information be withheld from the membership of this body and yet at the same time those in high position tell us to assume responsibility for this drastic legislation? It is not fair, it is not right, it is not safe, and is not to the best interest of good government.

We want protection, yes; and we can get all the men we want if we are willing to pay them fairly. Just as we can get airplanes by paying a fair wage to the workmen.

The young men may be physically able to render the active service. But that does not relieve the rest of us from the responsibility of paying them. Every American should be willing to do his part toward defending this Nation and in my opinion they are.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no consideration given the school systems of this country. Where are we to get our doctors? Where are we going to get our scientists? What provision, if any, has been made to give any consideration to farming-agricultural colleges, engineering, etc? For 150 years we have been working and striving to try to lift the standard of education in this country, and we have done a pretty job of it, but tonight with a smile on the War Department's face we draft these boys and think nothing of it.

I do not know. I wish that we could feel satisfied about this case. But we know what the War Department wants. I have always had the feeling that all strong men were ambitious and sooner or later must have certain safeguards to keep them from going too far. The man who wants too much power should not have it, and a man who loves to exercise power should not be trusted with it. I feel that way about this. If the War Department had given enlistments a fair chance, you know the War Department would have the men.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. May I ask the gentleman if the reading of this report and the contemplation of all this legislation does not lead to the inevitable conclusion that this establishes a military hierarchy in the United States?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct and I fear this will be a case of the camel's nose under the tent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I was prepared to vote in favor of selective service. But I have always reserved my right to make a decision on important legislation until such time as I have heard the debate pro and con. I listened with a great deal of interest to the debate in the House for the last 3 days, and I have arrived at the one conclusion, and that is that the State Department and the administration have furnished the Committee on Armed Services with misinformation right down the line.

No one can accuse me of being an isolationist or pacifist. I say there are three to four million veterans, who recently completed a shooting war, here in the United States, all combat veterans, all in good shape. We veterans, I being one of them, will be happy to meet any emergency. We will go forward and do what we can to keep enemies from our shores.

I cannot find where the Army has done anything but discourage enlistments. They have done nothing to encourage them. I have talked to high-ranking generals, admirals, captains in the Navy, in the Army, and Marine Corps, and the Air Force, particularly. They say that there is only one group that wants this draft, and that is the Army. The brass hats, Mr. Speaker, want this draft, and they want it badly.

I want to tell you, and tell you sincerely, that I voted against this bill, and

I will vote against it again. I feel that the greatest fraud is being perpetrated on the American people in this draft legislation that has ever been heaped upon them. It has been repeatedly stated, and correctly so, that our standing Army, Navy, and Air Force is adequate to defend our shores. If an emergency exists, as has been pointed out by the Armed Services Committee, then let us draft everyone; let us put a ceiling on profits; let us take the profits out of war; let us, as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said the other day, put a ceiling on wages and prices; let us freeze ourselves into a war economy; let us bring ourselves up to strength so that Soviet Russia will know we mean business, and let us not have this token draft. It is similar to bringing a ham sandwich to a banquet.

Members of the House, I implore you, vote this insidious legislation down, and if we need it, for God's sake let us put in a draft that will protect our country and not just deprive our 18- and 19-year-old boys of an education and a chance to be free and honest and not have to worry where they are going from day to day.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of grief to follow in opposition, my able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL]. During the course of this debate we have seen and heard the highest and the lowest expressions of comedy, pathos, and deep sincerity. We have heard ridicule heaped upon a committee of the house which committee has put a considerable amount of effort, thought, and work in bringing out this piece of vitally needed legislation. We have seen artists in poesy and prose rise to the heights of histrionics and to the depths of abuse. I, for one, am for this legislation, and I intend to vote for it.

The point that is to be decided here tonight is only this: Do you want an adequate defense for the United States of America or do you not? No matter how flowery or how adequate your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the 140,000,000 people of this country are going to render their decision on your individual vote on this matter. In spite of what the President has said about "Dear Old Joe" Stalin, that same dear old Joe is playing for keeps; he is not playing for marbles, money, or chalk. He has a blueprint for conquest, and oratory may be expected to leave him cold. There is no adequate national defense in high comedy and there is no defense in low comedy. Gay repartee, while amusing, wins no battles. The only way to impress "Dear Old Joe" is in an adequate force of trained men equipped and ready to maintain the peace.

If this legislation is voted down, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow there will be smiles of derisive satisfaction in the Kremlin, and all that we have attempted to do in the way of building a stronger and a finer world will have come to naught, and, indeed, you can then say that all of the billions that we have spent will have been poured down the rat hole.

There is only one question, and that is, Are you for national defense or are you against it?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is just a little encouraging and heartening to hear the young patriotic American, veteran of this last global conflict, who volunteered for extra-hazardous service, and who has received two Presidential citations for the dangerous missions he carried out as one of the demolition divers—I am referring to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL]—who has spoken here very frankly and very courageously. He is not the only one of his kind who opposes this draft bill. I know, of course, there are Members of this body who can speak with an air of dogmatic finality on all matters pertaining to foreign affairs. They even know more about our national defense and military affairs than the members of our committee. At least they admit it.

It is too bad I did not have my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], on my team yesterday as I went forth to that bloody, prolonged battle. I merely want to say now what I said shortly following the roll-call vote yesterday:

> Mr. SHORT. I merely wish to repeat what I said in general debate yesterday: I know I am going to be a lonely figure; I am going to be here alone. My hands are tied, but I will fight over there. And then they will bring it back and throw the conference report into your laps. I hope that you have enough conscience, and courage, and conviction to rise up and vote on that conference report when it is returned to you.

I knew, I think, pretty well in advance, and I am no seer or prophet or a son of a prophet, but anyone with a thimbleful of brains could have prognosticated rather accurately the kind of conference report you would receive today.

We opened the conference informally and not altogether legally at 11 o'clock yesterday morning, and we sat there from 11 until 6 o'clock, seven long hours. I remarked at the beginning of the conference that if I wanted to be nasty and mean I could delay and prolong the conference. I could object until one or two Senators had finally run down, taking the whole night, of course, to do it. But I did not try to be too stubborn or obstreperous. Of course, I could not in clear conscience and in my best judgment sign the report. We did not have a compromise, we had a capitulation, and as is always the case, the lonely figure that I was then, I come back to hand this report to you today.

What is the rush in passing it tonight? We are not going to adjourn sine die, we are going to be brought back here. You know why they want to vote on this report at this late hour, when we are all tired and worn, irritable and suffering with the jitters due to hard work, little sleep, and much-debated differences of opinion on many pieces of legislation. They do not want you to go back home and hear from your farmers and organized labor. They do not want you to hear from the churches and schools and the educators. They do not want you to hear from the fathers and mothers or the youths themselves about this bill. They are afraid. When you get back on the stump in September and October this fall, and you are telling your people about the grave emergency that we are in, while Harry has been riding back and forth across the country on his nonpolitical tour at the taxpayers' expense, when Congress is going to recess or adjourn for several months, some of them to take trips all over the country or to go abroad, I am afraid that these mothers and fathers are not going to be greatly impressed by your argument about the great emergency that we are in. Gentlemen, you who have read the minority views on this legislation know that our reasoning is fundamentally sound and our logic is unanswerable. Some of you have not read that report, but you are going to hear more about it, perhaps from your opponents when you get into the thick of the fight. You have to search your own consciences and vote your own convictions. I cannot add much to what already has been said. This measure is unnecessary, expensive, and dangerous. It will regiment our people and our industry, lower our standard of living and threaten our private enterprise. It strikes a blow at our liberty.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I gladly yield to my good friend.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman speaks about conscience. I supported this bill. We have always spoken about tolerance in the Congress of the United States. Why did the conferees discriminate against the Christian Scientists in the conference?

Mr. SHORT. I do not believe they did. All of us, I think—at least I hope—are against religious intolerance and bigotry. I know that the gentleman from Ohio, Judge RAMEY believes in and practices religious liberty. He is always fair and just. Being a devout believer in Christian Science, I am glad to see him alert to see that no discrimination is made against them. All denominations will be given equal justice under this bill. The conferees thought it best not to mention specifically any one particular faith, sect, or creed. In justice to the conference, I think this matter was handled satisfactorily.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The Christian Scientists fall within the terms of the bill as it now comes to us. There is no discrimination. The gentleman's statement is quite incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

INCORPORATING VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the

Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CRAWFORD, LECOMPTE, LEFEVRE, FERNANDEZ, and ENGLE of California.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the minority leader on our committee [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, of course the House was very much entertained by the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] in his vein of ridicule of the conference and the conferees. Of course, that is old tactics for anyone who cannot meet an argument. It is tactics that oftentimes we ourselves engage in with our opponents. When we are unable to answer arguments and facts and a reasonable position, then we seek to ridicule.

My mind goes back, if I am not in error, to the time that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] some years ago, in 1940, was also one who signed a a minority report against the draft bill at that time. So we find the gentleman from Michigan today occupying in this crisis which now confronts the country, the same position which he occupied when a crisis confronted the country in 1940. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the leopard never changes his spots.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. No; I do not yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Now you have made a statement.

Mr. VINSON. I do not yield. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman from Michigan has made his bed. Let him lie in it.

Mr. SHAFER. I made my bed; yes.

Mr. VINSON. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHAFER. The situation is not the same today as it was in 1940, and the gentleman knows it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TWYMAN. The point is, Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] the point, or is it the matter under discussion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not state a point of order.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I trust the Speaker does not allow that kind of a statement to be made, using the time of the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will protect the time of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, the logic of this conference report, reducing it down to 21 months, after our inability to get 18 months, was due, and I particularly call this to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], to the fact that it saves $500,000,000. It is far more economical to the taxpayers of America to have a draft of 21 months than a draft of 12 months. It is $500,000,000 in the taxpayers' pockets in that length of time.

Now, let us see if the gentleman from Michigan, who is so concerned about economy, is willing now to try to save the taxpayers some money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You will never save $500,000,000 when you take the boys away from their homes against their will and put them into the Army. That is not saving money. It is doing the very thing that the Constitution of the United States does not permit.

Mr. VINSON. Now, the gentleman has made a speech.

If this House tonight adopts the 1-year term of enlistment or induction, then you will have to pay $500,000,000 more to support the draftees than you would if you had the 21-month provision.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. And further than that, it would be necessary to induct some 400,000 additional American youth.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the few remaining minutes that I have, I wish to say this is an important bill. The security of the Nation is involved in whether or not you have a sufficient Army. The thing that led to World War I—and I was right here—was the unpreparedness of your country. Some of you served here before World War II.

You saw the unpreparedness that led to World War II. If you continue the policy in 1949 and 1950 that we followed in those years, you will be sowing the seed for the third world war.

If you adopt the stern policy and let the world know that this country is ready to back up her arguments when she is confronted with questions, you can keep the peace. You cannot negotiate when you are weak but you can negotiate when you are strong. Let this world know that we are strong. This will insure and guard a lasting peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill even though I am against a peacetime draft.

I sat in this Congress back in the days of 1939 and 1940 and voted against selective service at that time. Many of you will recall when I left this House and reported to active duty, and it took me to the North Atlantic and then to Pearl Harbor. There I saw the remains of our battleships, the *Utah*, the *Oklahoma*, the *Arizona*, the *California*, the *Pennsylvania*, several destroyers, and smaller craft; and then saw them lift the bodies of sailors and officers from the holds of those ships. Then I went on into the Pacific and took part in 26 invasions under General MacArthur, sending one assault wave after another ashore. Boys died at my right and at my left, but the good Lord took care of me and returned me to this Congress.

When I landed in San Diego with my ships in January of 1946, the newspapers asked me for a statement, and I stated then and there that I would never again vote against national defense, but would always be for preparedness. It is for that reason that I am for preparedness tonight and intend to support this preparedness bill.

Mr. Speaker, last January, when discussion began on this bill, I was opposed to it. I listened to others who opposed it, and was told by them the veterans, the church people, the college people, and the fathers and mothers were opposed to it. The majority of you know that almost every week end I am somewhere in the United States addressing groups of veterans and others. Therefore, I visited with the church people, the college people, I rubbed elbows with the veterans, and talked to the fathers and mothers; and, frankly, did not find the opposition to preparedness they who oppose this bill have preached about for the past several months.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I wish to say that I have several hospitals in my district where there are hundreds and thousands of veterans of the criminal negligence of this country on their backs today. They are not opposed to it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am sorry, I cannot yield further.

Mr. Speaker, as you know I served in World War I and when that war was won like others I took a solemn pledge that everything in my power would be done never again to let this country find itself unprepared. Well in 1941 we were again caught unprepared and could have lost the war were it not for our friends who held the lines until we built the world's greatest fighting machine.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national defense measure and I say approve it. Give to our national defense adequate manpower so we, the American people, have a defense capable of giving to all of us the security we are entitled to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the foreword of this bill reads in part as follows:

> To provide for the common defense, for increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the minds of some of the opponents of this legislation, it seems we are coming down to the real issue as to whether it should be 18 or 21 months. Our good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], said that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House believe it ought to be 18 months. Mr. Speaker, we did struggle with that issue in the com-

mittee, and the plain fact is that if we are going to train these boys, it will ordinarily take about 8 months to do that. If we ship them overseas it takes another month and a half. That makes 9½ months. There is another month and a half to get back, which is 11 months. If we provide 18 months' service, that will allow 7 months' actual service overseas.

The question is whether or not in the interest of the boys who are serving over there, both in the European and Asiatic areas, whether they have the right to have some replacements.

Mr. Speaker, some of us are quite personally interested in this legislation. We know from bitter experience what war means and the tragedy of war in some of our homes. I said yesterday and say again today, that I have three of my own in the service today and another one going in. I therefore have some interest, from a personal standpoint, as to just what this legislation means from the standpoint of the father and mother. We are also interested in the broader question as to whether or not this legislation is in the interest of the security of these great United States of America. Some question has been raised by certain of the speakers as to what the emergency is, whether or not any of the witnesses appearing before the committee have stated that an emergency does exist. Well, the President of the United States appointed a Commission to investigate the advisability of the institution of a universal-military-training program. Among those appointed was Professor Compton, chairman of the Commission, also president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and an outstanding citizen of this country. When he appeared before the Armed Service Committee I asked him the question as to whether or not in his opinion there was a critical situation in the world today. Professor Compton, of the President's Commission, said that in his opinion the situation is more serious today that what it was in 1938 when we instituted the 20-percent expansion in the Navy, in 1940 when we instituted the draft, and in 1941 when we extended the draft.

Rev. Father Walsh, another member of that commission, and an outstanding student and authority on world affairs, said in answer to the same question that he believes there is a greater menace today than what there was during the period I mentioned a moment ago.

Secretary Forrestal states that the situation is critical.

Are we to believe those men or are we to believe some of these people who are giving advice but know nothing about the international situation? We should in the interest of world peace and our own future security approve the legislation now before us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am following the schedule I have prepared in that I am dividing the time between those who are in favor of the bill and those who I understand are opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, like my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], I am for this bill. You know it is a strange procedure that we saw in this House the last several days—a strange spectacle that alarms me. After World War I we sank our battleships, we dismantled our fortifications, and we placed our trust in people that we thought were as right-minded as we were. We listened to the pacifists. We thought we had fought a war to end all wars. What happened? Did we bring peace to the world? No. Out of it came the Trotzkys, the Lenins, the Stalins, the Hitlers, the Goerings, the Himmlers, and Mussolinis and if you believe you can curb the ambitions of periodic dictators who arise to disturb the equilibrium of the world unless you stand prepared you are mistaken. So, again, after World War II, what happened; we listened to the pacifists and propaganda—the war is over, so we rushed to demobilize our Army, our Navy, and our Air Corps, and we paved the way again for this world unrest that is giving us grave convern. Today we have the spectacle here in the House of men, who actually have been over there, holding this program rather lightly. They have seen the utter destruction and devastation, they know the critical situation that exists. They have seen what has happened. They know that the world is in a desperate plight and that any slight incident may be upon us at any time that would catapult us into another war, and still we are going down the pathway of pacifist peace that may ultimately lead us into another world catastrophe, wishfully thinking and praying to God that conditions will right themselves. We have had over 1,300,000 casualties in two wars. We have spent $400,000,000,000. Is it not about time that we wake up and build up our national security to protect this great Nation of ours and all that it represents? Let us be practical realists. I am sick and tired of sacrificing each generation of American youth in the futile wars of Europe, and therefore preparedness is one of the paramount issues in world affairs today. We should stand back of our national defense program. As General Smuts, that great South African leader, said, "Peace without the power to back it up becomes but an empty dream."

I would like to ask my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who has a distinguished record as a combat soldier and one who has suffered the cruelties of war, to express his opinion on what he thinks about national preparedness.

Mr. POTTER. The gentleman knows what I think.

Mr. GAVIN. You, my very good friend, tell this House what you think.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished and able gentleman. I cannot be facetious; I cannot joke; I cannot ridicule any Member of the House or committee of this great body or our military leaders who won us a great victory in World War II. This is too serious a proposition to treat lightly. I feel very keenly about this legislation. Well do I remember Pearl Harbor. I was in a little cottage near my home town in Michigan when the news reached us of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. I remember after that bombing news commentators quoting Members of Congress bragging that the war would not last 6 months. In 6 months we would be running the Japs back to their islands and into the ocean. We know what happened. We know that many thousands of men lost their lives in a long war. We found out that we were not prepared to protect ourselves. The disabled veterans in our hospitals favor a strong national defense program, and if they had this opportunity they would certainly vote for this measure to provide a strong national defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the fateful hour is at hand when this House must determine an issue that will gravely affect the future of our country. We must decide whether America will continue as a great dynamic democracy or whether we will henceforth indenture the youth of the land into military enslavement.

This report should be voted down. It completely emasculates the House bill which contained a 1-year service limitation and which would suspend the operation of the draft until next January. Other vital amendments put into the bill in the committee were also eliminated. The result of the conference—if it was indeed a legal conference—was not to compromise with the Senate but to capitulate completely to the other body on virtually every important point incorporated into the bill by the expressed will of the House.

Let no one vote for this bill on the theory that it is necessary to effect national preparedness. Practically all the opponents of this bill favor strong national defense. I favor—I strongly favor and have worked for—a strong, vigorous national defense, on land, sea, and in the air, a great Navy which can continue to command the high seas, a scientifically-trained Army, comprised of volunteers, trained in modern technical skills, adapted to modern inventions and weapons. I favor an overwhelming Air Corps so thoroughly equipped with manpower and latest types of aircraft and equipped with the atomic bomb and every other new scientific weapon and agent.

I believe this kind of force can be built and based upon the voluntary system. The Navy has no difficulty getting enlisted personnel. The Air Corps is turning away men. Only the land Army—massed Army—claims that compulsion is necessary. This is true militarism.

The National Guard and the Organized Reserve have been woefully neglected. They should be brought to full

strength, ROTC units should be expanded; disaster components organized and trained; industrial coordination and training perfected; scientific research and development promoted.

There is no true present national emergency. There is no imminent danger of war. If there is an emergency, this draft is not enough. If there is no emergency it is too much, because it inevitably abandons the traditional American system and adopts the continental Prussian system of regimentation which has invariably led to bankruptcy and war. Let no one deceive himself that the American people will believe there is a present crisis and emergency when they behold the spectacle of this Congress passing a draft bill and then recessing for the political conventions.

Three million or ten million men in massed armies cannot match Russia with manpower. America will protect the Nation and win future wars, not with massed manpower alone, but by utilizing our superior industrial potential and by the quality of our young men, their training, their courage, and their willingness to sacrifice and die, if necessary, for their country, and their scientific arms and equipment.

The conference report negates the action of the House in Committee. It should be defeated. I will vote against the report and against the bill and against every other measure which would threaten or destroy precious American individual liberty. This bill means ultimate military dictatorship in the United States, possible bankruptcy, and war. It will come back to plague not only the Nation but those who by their votes may make its adoption possible tonight.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this may well prove to be a historic moment. What the historian of the future will say we cannot predict with absolute certainty, but I think no one within the sound of my voice will deny that we are facing an exceedingly important issue. It is not the first critical issue that we have faced in the Congress of the United States in the last 10 or 12 years. We have faced others in the past. Upon one or two occasions, if my memory is correct, we had some very, very narrow escapes from fatal error.

What is our situation today? I shall not indulge in any personalities or criticize any person here present, any Member of this great body, for the expressions of opinion which he has uttered, but what is our situation today? Actually, the whole world is looking at us. No one will deny that. The Tass news service will carry the story that is written here tonight, and what goes on here tonight will be known tomorrow and the day after in country after country. The decision we make here tonight may bring encouragement to some people who are a potential menace to freedom, and discouragement or encouragement, as the case may be, to millions who are devoted to freedom and look to us as their champion. One result or the other will come out of this debate and from this vote.

What does this legislation propose to do? It proposes the organization of an efficient military force which will command respect. The military force which is inefficient or shallow, undisciplined, untrained, does not command respect despite its numbers. It is for that reason that I believed that the 2-year term of enlistment would provide a much more efficient force than the 12-month term of enlistment, which I am positive cannot do such a thing. The turn-over would be too great. You cannot have efficiency in a military force in which you teach men, we will say, to be good soldiers and sailors, and then discharge them and bring in raw recruits all over again. It just cannot be done.

I will not deny for one moment that the perfection of our defense involves sacrifice.

Reading history, I have never yet found an instance in which the defense of liberty and its preservation did not involve some sacrifice—sometimes terrific sacrifice, and of course this bill involves some sacrifice from the American people. I think it is a sacrifice very well worth making. If we hesitate, if we draw back for some of the sentimental reasons expressed in this debate, people in other countries will get the idea that we do not care to sacrifice. I hope that the House of Representatives this night will show the world that America intends to be strong in support of righteousness.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS of New York) there were—ayes 232, noes 114.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 136, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—259

Abbitt	Canfield	Engle, Calif.
Abernethy	Carroll	Evins
Albert	Case, N. J.	Fallon
Allen, Calif.	Chadwick	Fellows
Allen, La.	Chapman	Fenton
Anderson, Calif.	Chelf	Fernandez
Andrews, Ala.	Clason	Fisher
Andrews, N. Y.	Coffin	Flannagan
Angell	Cole, Kans.	Fletcher
Arends	Cole, N. Y.	Fogarty
Auchincloss	Combs	Foote
Bakewell	Cooley	Forand
Bates, Ky.	Cooper	Fuller
Bates, Mass.	Corbett	Fulton
Battle	Cotton	Gamble
Beall	Coudert	Garmatz
Beckworth	Courtney	Gary
Bell	Cox	Gathings
Bennett, Mich.	Cravens	Gavin
Blackney	Crow	Gearhart
Bland	Dague	Gillette
Boggs, La.	Davis, Ga.	Goff
Bonner	Davis, Tenn.	Goodwin
Boykin	Deane	Gordon
Bramblett	Devitt	Gore
Brooks	Dingell	Gorski
Brown, Ga.	Dirksen	Gossett
Bryson	Domengeaux	Graham
Buchanan	Dondero	Grant, Ala.
Buck	Donohue	Gregory
Bulwinkle	Dorn	Gwinn, N. Y.
Burke	Durham	Hale
Burleson	Eaton	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Byrne, N. Y.	Eberharter	Hall, Leonard W.
Byrnes, Wis.	Elston	
Camp	Engel, Mich.	
Halleck	Lynch	Redden
Hardy	McConnell	Reeves
Harless, Ariz.	McCormack	Richards
Harris	McDonough	Riehlman
Harrison	McDowell	Riley
Hébert	McMahon	Rizley
Hedrick	McMillen, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Hendricks	Mack	Rogers, Mass.
Herter	MacKinnon	Rohrbough
Heselton	Mahon	Ross
Hess	Manasco	Russell
Hinshaw	Mathews	Sadlak
Hobbs	Meade, Md.	St. George
Holmes	Merrow	Sarbacher
Hope	Meyer	Sasscer
Huber	Michener	Scrivner
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Seely-Brown
Jackson, Wash.	Miller, Md.	Sheppard
Jarman	Mills	Sikes
Jenkins, Pa.	Monroney	Smathers
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Smith, Va.
Jones, Ala.	Morrison	Spence
Jones, N. C.	Morton	Stanley
Jones, Wash.	Muhlenberg	Stockman
Jonkman	Multer	Sundstrom
Judd	Mundt	Taber
Karsten, Mo.	Murdock	Taylor
Kean	Murray, Tenn.	Teague
Kearney	Nixon	Thomas, Tex.
Kearns	Norblad	Thompson
Kee	Norrell	Tibbott
Kefauver	O'Brien	Tollefson
Kelley	Pace	Towe
Kennedy	Pasman	Trimble
Kersten, Wis.	Patman	Van Zandt
Kilburn	Patterson	Vinson
Kilday	Peterson	Vorys
King	Phillips, Calif.	Wadsworth
Kirwan	Pickett	Walter
Kunkel	Ploeser	Wheeler
Lanham	Plumley	Whitaker
Larcade	Poage	Whitten
Latham	Potter	Whittington
Lea	Potts	Wigglesworth
LeFevre	Poulson	Williams
Lesinski	Preston	Wilson, Tex.
Lichtenwalter	Price, Fla.	Winstead
Lodge	Price, Ill.	Wolcott
Lucas	Priest	Wolverton
Lusk	Rains	Woodruff
Lyle	Rayburn	Worley

NAYS—136

Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Miller, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant, Ind.	Mitchell
	Griffiths	Morris
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Murray, Wis.
	Gwynne, Iowa	Nicholson
Arnold	Hagen	Nodar
Barden	Hand	O'Hara
Barrett	Harness, Ind.	O'Konski
Bender	Hart	O'Toole
Bennett, Mo.	Harvey	Pfeifer
Bishop	Havenner	Philbin
Blatnik	Hill	Phillips, Tenn.
Bloom	Hoeven	Powell
Bolton	Hoffman	Ramey
Bradley	Holifield	Rankin
Brehm	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Brophy	Hull	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Isacson	Rees
Busbey	Javits	Rich
Butler	Jenison	Rockwell
Cannon	Jenkins, Ohio	Rooney
Carson	Jennings	Sabath
Case, S. Dak.	Jensen	Sadowski
Celler	Johnson, Ill.	Sanborn
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe, Mo.
Chiperfield	Keating	Schwabe, Okla.
Church	Keefe	Scoblick
Clevenger	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
Clippinger	Kerr	Shafer
Cole, Mo.	Klein	Short
Crawford	Landis	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Cunningham	Lewis, Ohio	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Love	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McCowen	Snyder
Delaney	McCulloch	Somers
D'Ewart	McGarvey	Stefan
Dolliver	McGregor	Stevenson
Doughton	Macy	Talle
Douglas	Madden	Twyman
Elliott	Maloney	Vail
Ellis	Mansfield	Vursell
Ellsworth	Marcantonio	Weichel
Elsaesser	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Mason	Wood
Folger	Miller, Conn.	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—35

Banta	Buckley	Dawson, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Clark	Dawson, Utah
Brown, Ohio	Colmer	Gallagher

Granger	Lewis, Ky.	Scott,
Hartley	Ludlow	Hugh D., Jr.
Hays	McMillan, S. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Heffernan	Meade, Ky.	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Okla.	Norton	Stigler
Johnson, Tex.	Peden	Stratton
Knutson	Regan	Thomas, N. J.
Lane	Rivers	Welch
Lemke	Robertson	West

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of Texas for, with Mr. Ludlow against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Knutson against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Banta against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Peden.

Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Lemke with Mr. Hays.

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Stigler.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the House would like to know just what is involved in this bill, or at least some Members of the House would like to know.

Mr. REES. I will say to the gentleman that the House approved the bill, H. R. 6916, which provided for certain increases in postal rates and made a further provision for increases in the salaries of postal employees across the board of $450 per year. Then there is a percentage increase for the fourth-class postmasters and a smaller increase for those who are employed on a per diem basis. The bill went to the other body for consideration, and that body has seen fit to strike out that portion of the bill providing for an increase in postage rates, and has attached among other things a reclassification act.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the cost involved in each of those two categories?

Mr. REES. The approximate cost on the first category is $206,000,000. The approximate cost on the second category is between $300,000,000 and $350,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The number of Federal employees is presently increasing at the rate of 600 a day so that the annual cost would be approximately $600,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. REES. The gentleman can figure it out. There are about 850,000 employees in the classified service. If you multiply that by the amount of increase in their salaries, then you can figure it out and can know just what the amount is.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This House has had no opportunity whatever to consider the matter.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. May I remind the gentleman that pursuant to the rule under which we are operating we can get the bill to conference. May I say to the gentleman I am convinced that the bill must go to conference. There are certain other provisions that have been inserted by the other body which I do not think will be found in the bill when it comes back.

I believe a satisfactory arrangement can be worked out. I have asked for this opportunity to make this suggestion only to express the hope that in the interest of expedition of the work we may proceed with this matter of the conference.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I ask this question: The bill goes to conference. When it returns from conference, will the same opportunity be provided for considering the matter?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course not. If the conference report comes back in agreement, then the motion is on agreeing to the conference report, and it would be in order, under the rules under which we are operating, and the vote would be up or down on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not care at this late hour to detain the House, of course, or cause any more inconvenience than is absolutely necessary. I do want to state, however, that the manner in which this legislation is being handled is hardly what the people of this Nation expected from a Republican Congress.

I withdraw my reservation to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. REES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, and Mr. LYLE.

EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 201, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints the following Members on the part of the House to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association to be held in Bermuda beginning November 15, 1948: Mr. TALLE, of Iowa, chairman; Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania; Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; Mr. WORLEY, of Texas.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, after the adjournment of this Congress, there is going to be a lot of talk by the Republicans about what this Congress has done for the people. Minor accomplishments are going to be blown up into something of major significance. Major legislation which aids the special interests and which really is detrimental to the interests of the common people is going to be distorted into accomplishments for all the people.

The reasons for magnifying small accomplishments and distorting the benefits of the important legislation which has been passed are obvious. The Republican Party will have to do these things, for it can honestly point to precious few accomplishments which are of benefit to the common man. Rather, its record in this Congress is one of doing things to the common man and precious little for him. The Republican Party has bowed to the will of the powerful special interests and has turned a deaf ear to the voice of the people.

Whenever bills which suit the special-interest lobbies have come before Congress they have received sympathetic and prompt attention of the Republican-dominated committees and have been pushed through the Congress under the whip of Republican leadership. Only the veto of the President has prevented the enactment of some of the most vicious legislation. But legislation which is in the interest of the common people, such as bills providing health and sound education programs and extending social security has received hostile attention and inaction in committees. Their advocates have been bullied and harrassed by the Republicans for even suggesting that the Congress do the things which the people need, while their selfish opponents have been accorded the courtesy characteristic of fellow members of an exclusive club. Even when, under the insistent demands of the people, such legislation as housing has been reported for action in this House, the Republican leadership has cracked the whip and has prevented the members from having the opportunity to vote.

Before examining what this Congress has not done, let us take a look at its accomplishments and see whether they do things for the people or to the people.

I am quite confident that the tax reduction voted in this session is going to be proclaimed throughout the country as a major accomplishment of the Republicans for the people. It is quite true that in making a $7,500 gift to the typical family with a $50,000 income that this Congress threw a $114 sop to the $3,000 family. That small saving may look good on the small taxpayer's income-tax return. But he would have been a lot better off if the Republican Congressmen who wailed so much about the inflationary effects of deficit financing when we were at war had applied these gifts for the rich to deflationary reduction of the public debt in these times of high incomes and high prices. The President's tax program which would have reduced taxes for the typical family, rich and poor, by $160, and which would have raised corporate taxes would have done more for most people in both their tax bills and the cost of living.

The bipartisan foreign-aid program is, in my judgment, the only major constructive legislation which has been enacted by this Congress. Quite aside

from the humanitarian aspects, the common people have a real interest in this, because it means the protection of democratic institutions at home and abroad and, with an effective international organization, holds the major hope for peace in our time. Yet when it came to implementing this program in these times of peril, the Republican record is unbelievably bad. Under the lash of the Republican leadership, this House passed a bill which would have chopped off 25 percent of the money which this Congress, after long deliberation, had determined would be the minimum needs of our fellow democracies for postwar recovery. The amounts that have been restored will not undo the harm which this meat-ax philosophy or the intemperate remarks of the Republican diehards have done to the preservation of democratic governments abroad.

And then there is the reciprocal trade program, which for many years has become the symbol of this country's willingness to do business abroad. Despite the dependence of foreign democracies on these reciprocal trade pacts for their survival, despite the interests of the common man in this country in a healthy foreign trade for jobs and reasonable prices, the Republicans in this House yielded to the pressure of the high-tariff lobbies which think more of profits than of world security. In extending the authority for reciprocal trade agreements for only 1 year and imposing unworkable restrictions, this House would have all but wrecked this program. Fortunately the Senate eliminated the worst restrictions, but the crisis precipitated by the Republican leadership in this House serves notice to the people of the kind of special-interest legislation which can be expected if the Republicans are returned to power. The actions taken and not taken show the Republicans in the House of Representatives are essentially isolationist.

Another accomplishment of the Republicans is the crippling of the services of the Federal Government to the people. They have done this by meat-axe appropriations methods and by driving out of Government service thousands of conscientious and efficient officials and employees. They are going to distort this accomplishment by bragging about how they have reduced Government expenses. Actually the total reductions they have accomplished over and above the budget estimates submitted by the Democratic Administration are a mirage, compounded of country bookkeeping. The facts are that while the Republicans have been very generous with the taxpayers' money and with the assets of this Government when the special interests have been involved, they have wielded the meat axe on services to the common people.

The exodus of capable people from the Government service and the demoralization of those who remained are due to failure of the Congress to adjust salaries to the costs of living, by irresponsible and trumped-up charges, and by the constant threats of insecurity. By these tactics the Republicans have threatened one of the foundations of democratic government—that of sound and efficient administration.

Any review of the accomplishments of the Republican Congress would be inadequate if it did not include the curtailment of the right of the laboring man to organize and have free political expression which was accomplished under the Taft-Hartley Act. Another accomplishment of the Republican Party is returning the Atomic Energy Commission to partisan politics, despite the earlier determination of Congress that the development of this resource, on which the fate of the world depends, should be free of political maneuvering. This Congress reversed that decision by renewing the appointments of the members of the Commission for only 2 years.

These are the accomplishments of this Republican Congress. Now, let us take a look at the much larger list of things which this Congress has failed to do for the people.

What has the Congress done about the rising cost of living which, day by day, is reducing the pay checks and savings of workers? Early this session the President outlined a 10-point program, aside from the reduction of the Federal debt—to control inflation. Congress has done nothing on most of these recommendations and enacted inadequate measures on the others. It has done nothing on credit controls, on regulation of commodity exchanges, on regulating marketing practices for livestock and poultry, on allocation and inventory controls, on selective rationing, and on authorizing price ceilings on products in short supply. It has done something about export controls. It has done something about encouraging conservation practices for foreign agriculture, but nothing for domestic agriculture. It extended rent control, but failed to remove those weakening provisions which this Congress enacted last year. The inaction of this Congress, according to economists, will result in a continuing spiral of inflation.

The President recommended a program of health insurance, in order that workingmen would be able to afford adequate medical and hospital service. The accomplishment of the Congress is exactly nothing.

For a while this year it looked as if at long last this Nation was to have a long-term, comprehensive housing program that would eliminate the accumulated housing deficit by which 3,000,000 families are denied homes and clean out the slums in which over 5,000,000 families live. The comprehensive housing bill was passed by the Senate under bipartisan sponsorship; after extended hearings a few Republicans joined with the Democrats on the Banking and Currency Committee of this House to recommend passage of similar legislation. But when the real estate lobby put on the pressure, the Republican leadership cracked the whip. Six men sitting on the Rules Committee denied the Members of the House the opportunity to vote on this bill. The results on housing—nothing.

The plight of education in this country, which has previously held up its head with pride for its accomplishments in this field, is a disgrace. Average salaries of teachers are less than $2,000, many are under $1,000. Some 350,000 teachers have given up the fight for public service to enter more lucrative avocations. Classes are overcrowded and school facilities are wholly inadequate. Particularly because of higher prices, many States and local communities are unable to do anything and have come to the Federal Government for help. A bill providing $300,000,000 in Federal aid to education was passed by the Senate, but it never came out of committee in this House. The Republican accomplishment in education—exactly nothing.

Several years ago, this Government enacted a minimum wage law, to assure American workers at least enough money to eke out a bare existence. This was established at 40 cents an hour. It is obvious that an income of $16 a week is inadequate today with $3 shirts and $10 shoes. The President recommended that minimum wages be raised from 40 cents to 75 cents. The Republican accomplishment—nothing.

The President, on frequent occasions, has recommended an extension of the Social Security system to include several million workers, such as farm laborers, employees of Federal, State, and local governments, domestic workers and self-employed people. The legislative program enacted by the Republican Congress was a small increase in benefits to the aged, blind, and dependent children, a reduction in the number of employees eligible for further benefits. The Republican accomplishment is for all practical purposes meaningless.

The overhauling of the Nation's agricultural program has been a necessity in the interest of both the farmers and consumers. The President recommended a program calling for a flexible system of price supports, an expansion of soil conservation, the strengthening of consumption of agricultural productions, assistance to farmers' cooperatives and an extension of crop insurance. Instead of acting on this program, Congress merely extended the present aids to agriculture. The Republican accomplishment—nothing.

One of the gravest dangers to democracy in America today is the increasing control over our economy by monopolies. Antitrust legislation needs to be strengthened to give the Government more effective means of breaking up monopolies and control public utilities. But instead of legislating for the people and small business, this Congress enacted legislation which removes the railroads from liability under the antitrust laws. The Republican accomplishment—less than nothing.

Summing up, this Republican Congress has been a Congress of the special interests who make up campaign contributions and not of the common people. It has cut taxes for the rich in an era of record profits, and thrown a few crumbs to wage and salary earners. It has crippled the Federal service by irresponsible and unjustified attacks on honest and capable public servants, by failure to raise Government salaries to meet higher living costs, by creating insecurity and by meat-ax appropriations

methods which have not effectively reduced Government costs. It has returned the Nation's most powerful and dangerous resource, atomic energy, to the realm of partisan politics. It has failed to do most of the things necessary to stop inflation. It has done nothing about the health, housing, and education of the people. It has failed to increase minimum wages and has reduced, rather than increased, the number of workers eligible for the benefits of social security. It has failed to bring the farm program up to date. Instead of strengthening the laws to deal with the growing power of monopolies, it has removed one important industry, the railroads, from the reach of existing legislation.

This Congress' only accomplishment for the people was its cooperation in a foreign-aid program. And then it turned right around to nullify much of the effect by threatening to apply the meat-axe to appropriation and by weakening the reciprocal-trade program which is the symbol of America's willingness to do business with other countries.

And lastly, the leadership has refused to bring to the floor the bill that would permit the United Nations to begin building their permanent home in New York. How will this be interpreted by the rest of the world. I wonder.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5734) entitled "An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the City of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration Center at Cheyenne, Wyo."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. O'CONOR to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 6527) entitled "An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMITH, Mr. DONNELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) entitled "An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to the above-entitled bill; and that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 7, 13, 16, 24, and 26 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) entitled "An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a Commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases."

PURCHASE OF LANDS ON THE FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a resolution from the affiliated tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., with reference to the proposed Garrison Dam:

THE THREE AFFILIATED TRIBES
OF THE FORT BERTHOLD
RESERVATION, N. DAK.,
Elbowoods, N. Dak., June 16, 1948.

A resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to take action on a contract for the purchase of certain Indian lands by the United States from the Three Affiliated Tribes of Ft. Berthold Reservation:

"Whereas the Tribal Business Council of the Three Affiliated Tribes has negotiated a contract with the United States Army Engineers, acting for the United States, covering the proposed taking of approximately 155,000 acres of trust allotted and tribal lands within the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., for the Garrison Reservoir; and

"Whereas a majority of the adult members of the tribes has approved the contract; and

"Whereas the contract was submitted to the Congress before the first day of June 1948 as required by an item in the War Department's Civil Appropriations Act, 1948 (Public Law 296, 80th Cong., approved July 31, 1947); and

"Whereas in a hearing before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate on June 5, 1948 to consider S. J. Res. 224 to ratify the contract it was suggested by the chairman, Senator WATKINS, that since the tribes state in the language of the contract that they will seek additional relief legislation that there should be added enough provisions to the ratifying resolution to make a complete and full settlement in one piece of legislation; and

"Whereas a resolution was drafted as suggested in the preceding clause; and

"Whereas the construction of the Garrison Dam is going on with the result that with the passage of each day the flooding of our lands and homes is brought nearer and nearer and the members of the Tribes are having less and less time to relocate themselves, to salvage their timber, lignite and buildings, and to take advantage of the provisions of the contract so long as it is not ratified by the Congress; and

"Whereas each day that goes by without ratification of the contract by the Congress means a financial loss to the members of the Tribes; and

"Whereas the majority of th adult members of the tribes approved the contract in good faith and to prevent the taking of their lands by condemnation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the tribal business council of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, in special session assembled,* That the appropriate committees of the Congress be, and are hereby, respectfully requested to give the earliest possible consideration to the ratification of the contract and the passage of additional provisions in the ratifying resolution by the Congress to compensate the members of the Three Affiliated Tribes for the lands to be taken from them within the Fort Berthold Reservation for the Garrison Reservoir; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who is hereby respectfully requested to attempt to have it introduced in the records by the appropriate committees of the Congress."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the tribal business council of the Three Affiliated Tribes in a special session on June 16, 1948.

GEORGE GILLETTE,
Chairman.
MARK MAHTO,
Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANBORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CUBA

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this body sitting in joint session with the Senate on April 19 celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cuba. Addresses were delivered by the President of the United States and the Cuban Ambassador to this country, Guillermo Belt.

Over the years the American people have paid little attention to the political and economic developments in our sister countries of Latin America. The recent explosion in Colombia and the complete unpreparedness of our own people to the shocking facts of life in this country is clear evidence of how little we know of what is going on at our very doorstep. The fact is that in practically every country in Latin-America today there exists tremendous ferment and unrest among the common people. Only a thin crust covers this volcano and it can erupt suddenly as we saw in Colombia a few weeks ago. Misery and poverty is the lot of the common man in all of these countries.

Cuba is no exception to this general state of affairs.

The reality of life in Cuba today is that of extremes—of great wealth for the few, of extreme poverty for the many.

And the reality of Cuban independence from the United States is worth examining. I would like to review briefly some of the high points in the political and economic history of our sister republic. I feel that it is evidence of the sort which I intend bringing forth here today which will stand as a warning to all of us of what might happen in this country.

Cuba is sugar.

More than 30 percent of the territory is in sugar production. In a country with a population of less than 5,000,000, more than 500,000 workers are employed in the sugar industry; and sugar accounts for 81 percent of the exports of the country.

As the price of sugar goes, so goes the economic well-being of the economy of Cuba. It is a fact that only when sugar prices are high and profits are large that the workers of Cuba enjoy—if one can use this word—a better standard of living. This means that in 1946, for example, when the price of sugar was the highest then on record and the sugar industry was earning the greatest profits in history that the Cuban sugar workers were averaging about $2.00 a day. And it must be remembered that for the greater number of these workers employment in the industry exists only for 3 or 4 months in each year. When we go back to the early 30's when the bottom had fallen out of the sugar market these workers were receiving a dirty hovel, a pair of overalls and sack of rice for their work in the sugar fields and sugar mills.

The fact is that despite the tremendous profits that have been earned by the sugar industry it has never furnished a livelihood much less a decent standard of living to the Cuban sugar workers. Surveys made in Cuba on housing, nutrition and the prevalence of diseases show how badly off these people are.

But this is only one side of the Cuba that is sugar. This is only the side of the workers. There is another side of the story and that is the side of the owners of these tremendous sugar plantations and sugar factories.

In 1946 there was $1,050,000,000 invested in the entire sugar industry of Cuba. United States interests accounted for more than one-half of this or over $600,000,000.

Or look at it from another point of view. The centrales or mills control the sugar industry. Farmers or colonos, all of whom are Cubans, rent land from the centrales, hire workers, and grow a crop of sugarcane. They receive a return on every 100 pounds of sugar delivered to the mills. This is a practice which in many ways is similar to the tenant-farmer system which exists in some of our southern States.

In 1946 there were 173 centrales in Cuba. Although the United States companies owned but 58 of these—about one-third—these United States mills produce more than one-half of the entire sugar crop.

Although recent figures on the ownership of land by Americans are not available, before World War II the four biggest sugar companies in Cuba had the following properties:

Cuban American Sugar, 6 factories, 770 square miles of land.

Cuban Cane Sugar Co., 12 factories, 562 square miles of land.

General Sugar Co., 9 factories, 465 square miles of land.

United Fruit Co., 2 factories, 444 square miles of land.

These four American corporations alone owned about 25 percent of all the sugar land in Cuba. In fact, it was estimated that before the war—and these holdings certainly must have grown since then—the American centrales or mills owned directly or partially about 75 percent of all the sugar land in Cuba. And with this ownership of land went ownership of villages and roads, of seaports and railways.

The United States domination goes even further however. For most of the companies which are nominally Cuban in ownership are financed by the Cuban branches of Wall Street banking houses. It would be no exaggeration to say that over 80 percent of the entire Cuban sugar industry is under United States control—either directly or indirectly.

The financial domination of Cuba by large Wall Street banking houses—at one time by the Chase National Bank of New York alone—is euphemistically described as "cooperation" between American bankers and Cuban industry. It is interesting to note however that when the Cubans try to move out on their own and finance their own industry they are warned that they are harming themselves. A nationally circulated commercial newspaper said on October 20, 1947, in regard to this:

> Efforts by the United States to widen the area of cooperation between itself and Cuba are likely to be partly thwarted as Cuba presses forward with plans to make itself more financially and industrially independent.

This is an amazing statement. It reveals for all of us to see that not only is the Cuban economy dominated by American financial interests but those controlling groups in our own country intend to continue this domination despite any attempts by the Cubans themselves to break away.

Though the Cuban Republic is but 50 years old, in this brief span of years the country has had many bitter experiences because of its domination by American financial interests.

While Cuba was still a colony in the Spanish Empire the United States already had what was then considered to be a huge financial stake in that country. And because of this our country has always played a dominant role in Cuban politics.

It is no secret that no government has ever come into power in Cuba—or stayed there—without United States approval. And history shows that United States troops have helped remove some governments not to the liking of the United States.

When the battleship *Maine* was blown up in the harbor of Habana in 1898 it was anchored there to protect the American interests in that country. As early as 1895 United States companies already had over $50,000,000 invested in Cuba.

For about the first 25 years in the life of the Cuban Republic—up to the early years of the twenties—United States marines occupied Cuba almost without a break. In fact, although Cuban independence was finally proclaimed in 1902, during the political disturbances that broke out in that country between 1906 and 1909 the United States Government appointed an American governor for this so-called free country. A United States citizen, William Howard Taft, later succeeded by Charles Magoon, ruled Cuba after the Cuban President was removed, and the United States could find no satisfactory substitute.

Violent fluctuations in the price of sugar have inevitably brought about political as well as economic crises in Cuba. In 1921 when the world sugar price collapsed and Cuba faced bankruptcy, and internal revolt, it was the United States that sent General Crowder down there to keep things under control. Crowder remained in Cuba until 1927, and when he retired practically the entire economy of Cuba was completely in the hands of American corporations. The former holdings of Spanish, French, and British interests had been squeezed out.

What was the technique through which this seizure of power took place? It was obvious and it was simple. Cuba, facing bankruptcy, required foreign credit to keep the Government functioning. General Crowder had the whip-hand and after he exacted the concessions he desired the "House of Morgan" lent Cuba $5,000,000 in 1921 and another fifteen million in 1923. And like any other banking house these bankers demanded security on their loans; increased American control of the political and economic life of Cuba would guarantee the "stability" of the country and of course guarantee the interest and principal of the loans. Thus American control was even more firmly established.

By the middle twenties the total United States investments in Cuba for sugar, tobacco, and public utilities amounted to almost a billion dollars. The dictator, Machado, came to power in 1927. And when, in 1933, the people revolted and he was overthrown the United States was hard put to control the situation. Machado was succeeded by Grau San Martin, the present President of Cuba.

The people's revolution that overthrew the dictator Machado swept into power a group of liberals who attempted to do something about the living conditions and the miserable poverty of the Cuban workers.

Wages in the sugar industry were ordered to be increased. The hours of the workers were ordered cut. The public utilities rates were reduced. American investors shouted loudly about communism as some high-placed people shouted a few weeks ago about communism in Colombia.

In 1933 the United States Government reacted promptly to the situation in Cuba by immediately sending 30 warships on a "good-will mission" to Habana. The State Department refused to recognize the new Cuban Government and when Grau asked that Sumner Welles, special American Ambassador to Cuba, be recalled for "holding communications and dealings with the enemies of the Government" his request was refused.

Four months after coming into office Grau was removed and a new President, Mendieta, who met the approval of the State Department was put in his place. Five days later this Government was recognized by the United States. And things were back on a peaceful keel again. The reforms of the liberal government were speedily repealed. Mendieta prohibited all strikes, dissolved the unions, and went about to create "confidence" in the new Cuban regime.

This is an expression we hear much these days. In the course of the debate on ERP we were told repeatedly that the recipient countries must establish conditions of "stability and confidence." It is a sad fact that to our State Department these words invariably mean wiping out the social advances of the workers and their attempts to improve living conditions.

In 1934 and 1935 a special American commission was sent to Cuba to survey the political and economic situation there. They reported back:

> The fundamental obstacle to good relations between Cuba and the United States is the widespread belief in Cuba that the American State Department attempts to make and unmake governments, and that the present—1934—disturbed situation is an outgrowth of a plan for provisional government which Washington induced the Cubans to accept.

Since the midthirties, United States control of Cuba has increased and, although the political domination has become less open and more disguised, it still remains the main fact of Cuban economic and political life.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

The current situation in Cuba is a continuation of this stormy past and the result of continued interference by the United States in the internal affairs of this Republic.

The sugar industry—or, to be more exact, its American owners—are today facing a period of retrenchment. The industry is overexpanded in terms of profitable sales to this country and the future price outlook is not too certain. As a first step of this retrenchment—as employers seem to do everywhere—Cuban trade-unions are being attacked.

Over the past 6 or 8 months the country has been strife-torn. There have been kidnapings, shootings, assassinations, and bombings. The Government has quite openly taken over the entire trade-union movement. On October 15 last the Cuban Federation of Labor called a strike in Habana to defend the free trade-union movement. The strikers were charged by the Government with a conspiracy to overthrow the present regime and 2,000 workers and 150 trade-union leaders were jailed as a result of this action. Their releases came only after world-wide protest and a 2-day hunger strike by the prisoners. Protest meetings were held all over Cuba.

Grau San Martin, the present President of Cuba, and the same man who was removed by American interference in 1933, was elected to power in 1942 through a coalition of all of the liberal groups in Cuba. But in the past year he has increasingly repudiated the support of the trade-union movement and the progressive parties and has utilized the most brazen and open techniques of intimidation and force against his former allies. The Cuban constitution forbids the President from running for office after he has served two terms. Grau San Martin's present term is his second and unless the country is in such a state of chaos that an election would be impossible he will be out of office this year. Anyone familiar with politics in Cuba would not be hard put to imagine some groups in that country are quite willing to see riot and confusion develop in Cuba if the result would mean the postponement of the elections.

On January 22 of this year Jesus Menendez, leader of the Cuban Sugar Workers Union, with some 350,000 members, and an elected member of the house of representatives of the Republic of Cuba was assassinated by a captain in the Cuban Army. Menendez who had been on a speaking tour in one of the outlying provinces was shot in the back three times because he insisted that his congressional immunity prevented his arrest.

Five hundred thousand sorrowing people turned out in the streets of Habana at the funeral of Menendez. A beloved leader of the poorest and most poverty stricken workers in that country had been shot down in cold blood.

Since the assassination of Menendez violence and terror in Cuba has increased so that today the country whose independence this House celebrated a few weeks ago is in a barely concealed turmoil which breaks forth openly in some violent action almost every day.

The Cuban people are proud and fine. They bitterly resent being treated as a colony of the United States.

Only last year this Congress sitting in its first session passed the Sugar Act of 1948, Public Law 388. It contained in section 202E an open insult to the Cuban people, in providing that their increased share in United States sugar consumption could be withdrawn if the Secretary of State found that they discriminated against nationals of the United States.

This clause was introduced to aid a few American bankers who were suing the Cuban Government in an aged litigation over a relatively small amount of money. So the United States Congress told Cuba, in effect, unless you pay this claim exactly as demanded by these private United States interests we will choke off your sugar sales in the United States.

I have introduced an amendment to the Sugar Act of 1948 repealing section 202E outright. This Congress is not a collecting agency. And the Cuban people should not be so insulted. American nationals have never yet complained about the Cuban courts. The reason why is clear from what I have already said.

At the same time I would amend title III of the Sugar Act of 1948 to include among the conditions to be met before the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make payments under the act the payment of a minimum wage of $5 per day to all persons employed on the farm in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugar beets or sugarcane.

Such an amendment—in many producing areas wages are above this minimum—would go a long way toward raising wage standards in Cuba and in Puerto Rico.

In both Cuba and Puerto Rico today the sugar industry has grown fat on the backs of misery and poverty stricken workers. This Congress has reviewed legislation guaranteeing the profits of the industry; a minimum wage provision would help raise the standard of living of the workers who grow and harvest the sugar cane.

Although Cuban growers are not eligible for payments under the act, the floor on wages, once established in Puerto Rico, would result in a similar wage floor in Cuba.

Before concluding I must mention the recent presidential elections in Cuba

which resulted in the victory of Carlos Prio Socarras, recent convert to the brand of democracy practiced by Grau. Mr. Prio is a member of Grau's party and was elected on a platform of continuing the present way of doing things.

With the price of sugar continuing to fall, and with an abundant sugar crop, the Cuban people again face the tragedy of wage cutting, unemployment, and sharp reductions in production. At a time when the world demand for sugar has increased sharply over World War II levels, with the world's population greater and people everywhere hungry for the high nutritional sugar food—with world production still one and a half million tons below prewar—at such a time Cuba is embarking on a program of crop reductions, discharges of sugar workers, and wage reductions.

The new regime of President Prio will, I feel sure, use every force in its power to put through such a program in the interests of the sugar monopolists and their henchmen. The people will suffer and go hungry.

These are some of the facts of life in Cuba today. We would do well to see the ills so close to our own shores before waxing so wrought about what some claim to see in other countries of the world.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the island of Puerto Rico is small, its population is great, and the working people lead a life of poverty and privation which is not duplicated in any other part of the United States. And because this is so, and because the politicians now in power are trying to ape the reactionary leaders on the mainland, this United States possession has recently produced the most outrageous spectacles of violence against workers and students; the most unrestrained of antidemocratic demonstrations have taken place in Puerto Rico.

We in Congress, in looking at Puerto Rico, can see the hysteria, the terror, and intimidation spreading like wildfire. And what is happening there will certainly take place in our own cities and towns if our reactionaries and witch hunters have their way.

In all of this the rough hand of certain misguided Puerto Rican political leaders cloaks the direction that comes from the American financial and sugar interests on the mainland. For it is these groups who are attempting to make Puerto Rico into a "paradise" for American businessmen; and a purgatory for the poor people of that island.

A recent item in the New York Herald Tribune—June 10, 1948—described Puerto Rico as "the last frontier of free enterprise, where business has a better run for its money than on the prosperous mainland."

The story goes on to quote an industrialist as saying:

> You can practically write your own ticket. They'll build you a modern factory. Plenty of labor at half the scale back home; hydroelectric power; government cooperation; and no taxes for 12 years.

Behind this pleasant picture—and an essential part of it—has been the manner in which the so-called New Deal Popular Democratic Party has moved steadily away from its original program and swung further and further to the right side of big business. Convinced, according to the New York Herald Tribune story already referred to, that "private enterprise is best" Senator Muñoz-Marín, head of the Popular Democratic Party, has replaced the old theme of "state enterprise for the people" with the slogan of "private enterprise for profit."

The recent political crises reflect the strains of imposing such a callous program on a people crying desperately for social and economic reforms along the lines of our own New Deal; greater security for the poor and aged, wage increases, housing, medical care, and the eventual establishment of a balanced and stable economy.

RECENT CRISIS

The fundamental fact is that Puerto Rico has a one-crop economy. Sugar is the key to Puerto Rico.

During World War II the high demand for sugar and the high prices created some little improvement in the economic condition of the workers. And economic stability—if it could be called so—did develop in Puerto Rico.

But since the war's end and the steady stream of people moving to the mainland has been proof of how rapidly the economic situation has deteriorated.

Since the beginning of 1948 the price of sugar—both in the United States and on the world market—has slumped sharply. To the economy of Puerto Rico this spells disaster. To the workers it spells wage cutting, unemployment, less purchasing power, and a decrease in their already pitifully low standard of living. It will probably mean an island-wide economic collapse.

Politically this economic development will add up to greater poverty for the many of Puerto Rico; and as this develops the false promises and platitudes of the politicians will fall on empty ears. Already unrest and dissatisfaction has been developing among the common people of Puerto Rico. The people want action and results.

Dr. Pedro Albiza Campos, head of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico, has recently returned to Puerto Rico. He has spent 11 years in exile and imprisonment. He has been Puerto Rico's No. 1 victim of Wall Street imperialism.

The antidemocratic outbursts have become intensified since Campos returned to Puerto Rico.

UNIVERSITY RIOTS

Early in April of this year Campos was invited to speak at the University of Puerto Rico. The university officials denied him a meeting place—and as students have always in the past—the students of the University of Puerto Rico protested this denial of academic freedom and free speech.

From such a seemingly inocuous incident there developed violence, arrests, and the eventual closing down of the university itself.

The 1-day student strike on April 13 was described as an outbreak of violence by the university rector. He immediately closed the university grounds to the students, and the police, armed with clubs and guns, were called upon to enforce this ruling.

Although some weak-kneed political figures—forgetting their own past and their own promises—backed the rector in this action, the students, prominent faculty members and leaders of Puerto Rico from every walk of life, unanimously condemned the police interference and the decision to close the university.

Many students were jailed. Protest meetings were broken up by police clubs and tear gas. Students were expelled from the university in wholesale lots. Even faculty members who expressed sympathy with the students were dismissed from their positions.

On May 7 the shut-down of the university was made permanent and the 1948 commencement exercises were never held.

What is really behind this action on the part of the university authorities?

In Puerto Rico the students have always participated actively in politics. From their ranks have come many of the island's political leaders. And this crack-down is not merely an isolated student escapade. It is in reality a blow at a substantial part of the progressive movement in Puerto Rico.

It is the result of fear and hysteria on the part of the present political leaders. Little men who are bent on establishing a paradise of free private enterprise are ruthlessly suppressing the student movement and every other progressive force in Puerto Rico.

The national guard has been called out to reinforce the police and judiciously planted rumors about insurrection and revolution have been planted to justify this action by the Governor.

And the students? They have refused to be provoked into violence. They have insisted upon their right to assemble peacefully and to protest. Beyond that the trouble has come from the police and the national guard.

Since then the university has continued to be an armed camp. The general tension among the people has increased.

The entire situation demands immediate investigation.

THE NEW GAG LAWS

Part and parcel of the situation in the university, and reflecting the crack-down on all civil rights in Puerto Rico, was the passage on May 22 of three bills designed "to control all activities aiming at destroying the insular government, and so forth."

The Mundt-Nixon technique has its counterpart in the three laws, H. R. 23, 24, and 25. The laws were rushed through Puerto Rican Legislature at 5:30 on the morning of May 22.

It is interesting to notice that these legislative monstrosities—cloaked in the hysteria which we in this House have recently experienced—were introduced shortly after the recent visit of President Truman to Puerto Rico. In the President's party was Admiral Leahy, former Governor of Puerto Rico, and still a shadowy background figure in the political life of the Islands.

I have learned on unimpeachable authority that these gag laws—in their original version—came to Puerto Rico in English. An import from the mainland. And they were translated into Spanish and then passed through the legislature.

The insular government was ordered to pass these laws to get at any individual or group refusing to fall in line behind the program acceptable to the mainland masters.

The gag laws specifically vest the district courts with jurisdiction and explicitly provide for trial by the court without jury.

Like the infamous Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 24 in defining a felony under the acts enumerates the illegal actions and concludes that these are proscribed as well as organizations formed to accomplish these ends or formed "for other purposes."

The unanimity with which the legislature passed these laws is a true reflection of the pressure that has been put on them. Certainly there is no threat to the government of Puerto Rico today; excluding the threat to continued office that comes to any official in a democracy who has forgotten the needs of their constituents. But called to the heel by the political leaders who do not speak in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, the legislators cast their vote against freedom and against their own good conscience.

The bills were passed without hearings and after but one day of debate.

This legislative development in Puerto Rico, like similar actions we have seen in other countries in Latin America during the past year are clearly the result of United States pressure. In Cuba, in Chile, in Peru, in Brazil, and also in Puerto Rico the crack-down against the progressive forces, against the trade-union leaders, against every possible group which speaks for the down-trodden people has developed even as the people in power in these areas have drawn closer to the United States. It is a sad realization that is forced upon the people of these countries—that today everywhere the United States Government pushes its hand—there the ordinary man feels the increased weight of oppression while the man of privilege and wealth becomes more powerful.

LAND MEASURES

When 2,000,000 people must make a living on a 3,435 square-mile agricultural island—of which only 47 percent was reported as crop land in 1940—widespread land hunger is to be expected. Such is the situation in Puerto Rico. And because of this there is a deep and emotional intensity attached to the land tenure problem by the people of the island.

Since the American Government took over Puerto Rico in 1898 the concentration of land holdings and the development of absentee ownership has developed at a rapid pace.

Land concentration probably reached its peak around 1930. The large sugar mills and related interests constituted over 50 percent of all land in the farms growing sugarcane. The big four American-owned companies themselves operated or controlled 46 percent of all the land under the control of the sugar companies.

The concentration of land control is not the only grievance of the people of Puerto Rico against the sugar industry. There has always been widespread discontent over the distribution of the proceeds of the sugar industry among the various factors cooperating in its production. The people have always demanded that the land should be operated in order to produce wider social benefits.

Although land reform was the key plank in the platform of the Popular Democratic Party in the 1940 elections the fact is that to June 30, 1943, land reform in Puerto Rico had affected a perceptible but not considerable area of farm land. For example, less than 9 percent of the total holdings of the sugar companies as of 1934–35 have been affected by the land reform bills. I mention all of this in order to emphasize the importance of land holdings to the Puerto Rican people.

And what are we doing to solve this problem?

In the same manner that it drove the natives off Bikini, the United States Navy is depopulating the Puerto Rican island of Vieques and turning it into a military training base. But where Bikini was only a sparsely inhabited barren Pacific atoll the island of Vieques is a fertile spot and one of the oldest communities in the Western Hemisphere. Despite the frantic opposition of the Puerto Ricans, the Navy has already ordered the complete evacuation of the inhabitants of Vieques by the early part of this year. This order will affect some 5,000 people and will cripple an agricultural economy which supported 4 sugar mills—producing 20,000 tons of sugar annually—and an extensive grazing industry.

To the people of Puerto Rico who do not have nearly enough arable land to support their dense population the removal of Vieques as a source of agricultural products is a national calamity.

Professors and students of the University of Puerto Rico have condemned the removal of these islanders in these words:

> The case of Vieques is one of the gravest events that have taken place since the beginning of the United States occupation. It is the first time that action has been taken to eliminate an important nucleus of the social and cultural community of Puerto Rico and a part of the geographical patrimony of our fatherland."

The General Confederation of Labor has condemned the Navy Department's action as "an unjustifiable act of aggression."

We can well ask with the Puerto Rican people what has become of article 73 of the United Nations Charter dealing with non-self-governing territories, which stipulates that the "interests of the inhabitants are paramount."

At the same time the small island of Culibre is reported to be purchased by the United States Navy. The island of Culibre has a natural harbor, and the Navy obviously intends to use it for its own purposes.

It is interesting to notice that the United States only recently filed a report with the UN in regard to Puerto Rico. Our Government pointed out in this report to the Secretary-General of the UN, as follows:

> The pressure of population upon land resources in Puerto Rico is very severe. There is only 1 acre of land area per person in Puerto Rico as compared to 7.1 acres per person in the United States. On page 11 it is stated that there are 1,053,000 acres of crop land. Thirty-one percent of this is devoted to sugar. This report says that 0.6 of 1 percent of the farmers own 25 percent of the crop area in holdings above 500 acres, that 5 percent of all farmers own 27 percent of the land in holdings between 100 and 500 acres, and that 73.2 percent of the farmers own 20.1 percent of the crop land.

One can search through the entire report and find no data furnished on the amount of land used by the United States for military bases in Puerto Rico.

CONCLUSION

There is no need to summarize the facts which have already been brought forth in this brief outline of the current situation in Puerto Rico.

There is a pressing need for a complete and thorough investigation of the political and economic situation in Puerto Rico today. Unless a prompt investigation takes place and unless the drift toward undemocratic and militaristic developments is stopped at once the people of Puerto Rico will be further despoiled and impoverished.

Before the Spaniards came to the New World the Indians called this island Borinquen. This name survives in poetry. This means the garden of flowers. Puerto Rico today is no garden for the greater mass of the people who live there.

Only complete independence of the Puerto Rican people and their freedom to develop their country and their lives as they wish will remove them from the curse of American intervention.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as we await the hour of adjournment I want to utter a word of caution to the Republican leadership of the House, upon whom rests the responsibility for the completion of a worth-while legislative program.

You may be disposed to abandon the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, who deserve a pay increase and who were led to believe that they would be treated on par with their fellows of the postal service. Seemingly they were forgotten, or—worse—they were betrayed. The postal workers were only partially compensated for their service, but all others in the great family of Uncle Sam's Federal workers were thus denied even that consideration. It is not too late to bring in a last-minute token award or pay raise and thus redeem ourselves before adjourning.

But why all this rush to get away, all the hubbub about adjournment, when there is so much that is left undone? We are all weary and anxious to go home, to get some rest, to renew our acquaintances, to build or to mend our political fences, but I warn you to beware of what we may leave undone. We are the servants of the people, paid on an annual basis. Maintaining a 24-hour-a-day office, as has always been my custom over the years for the benefit of my constituents, I cannot reconcile myself with the idea of adjourning prematurely because of the party convention, or because I want to go to the seashore. The legislative docket has not been cleared.

Unsolved to date is the most important question of prices, ever-increasing and higher and higher prices. Inflation, like an all-consuming and devastating fire, is destroying our savings and endangering our Nation's financial safety. Our low-income families are the greatest victims of this scourge of inflation, yet this Congress, in the face of this obvious threat, has not made the effort to throttle or even to control the menace.

The civil-rights program has been all but forgotten by the Republicans, who always posed as the champions of the proposal expressed so forcefully by President Truman.

Housing seemingly will be abandoned or be so totally inadequate as to be almost worthless. Coastal oil lands, upon which rests the country's security, and many other important matters have not been satisfactorily settled, or repose in pigeon holes.

Let me say as a final, parting shot, do not vote to adjourn until the job is done and done right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE LATE J. FREDERICK RICHARDSON

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great and good man, an efficient public servant, a friend of every person in this House, a fine Christian gentleman has passed away. I refer affectionately to J. Frederick Richardson, Coordinator of Information of the House.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that each Member of the House, if he or she so desires, may extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with reference to this fine man.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE MILTON WEST

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each member of the Ways and Means Committee may have an opportunity to extend his remarks with reference to the retirement of the Honorable MILTON WEST, and that the Ways and Means Committe may have consent to insert resolutions with reference to the retirement of the gentleman from Texas covering his distinguished service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR DISABILITIES INCURRED IN ACTIVE MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE OTHER THAN IN A PERIOD OF WAR SERVICE

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 595, to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective the first day of the first month following the passage of this act, paragraph II of part II of Veterans Regulation No. I (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"II. For the purposes of part II, paragraph I (a) hereof, if the disability results from injury or disease, the compensation shall be equal to 80 percent of the compensation now or hereafter payable for the disability, had it been incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service during a period of war service as provided in part I of this regulation."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPLIMENTS TO THE MEMBERSHIP

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, this is probably my last appearance in the House of Representatives. I had always hoped that when I left my last remarks would be something complimentary to the membership of this House. For that reason I now ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read a resolution into the RECORD which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress has been faced with some of the gravest issues in the history of this Nation, and has worked diligently to resolve these issues; and

Whereas the Members of the House of Representatives appreciate the assistance given by appointees, attachés, and employees; and

Whereas the Members of the House of Representatives recognize the important role played by the press and radio in keeping the public informed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this body that in the House of Representatives of this, the world's greatest legislative assembly, elected directly by a majority of the finest people in the greatest country in the world, are 435 of the most able, sincere, honest, and intelligent men and women of this country;

That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the appointees, attachés, and employees of this body are most courteous, capable, and efficient;

That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the press, with rare exception, carries on the great tradition of enlightening the people. The press guards and is worthy of that freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; and

That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that in the radio galleries are the representatives of the world's greatest and most progressive and enlightening radio system.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for 10 minutes in which to discuss this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I did not introduce this resolution with any intention of having it passed. I knew that it would be a self-serving declaration upon the part of the House if they did pass it. I introduced it by way of saying that I have enjoyed being associated with you.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this resolution by way of saying how much I feel that our attachés and employees, our pages, everyone with whom we associate have been courteous, kind, efficient, and capable. I feel that the press has always been here ready to praise or criticize according to the dictates of their conscience. I have felt that our radio system was the greatest system of the world that carries the every act of this Congress to the entire world.

When I have finished here tonight I will not say anything more on the floor of the House, because I wanted my last words to be complimentary to the people here with whom I have been associated.

I am going back to the empire of the sun, going back to the great State of Florida. I am going to live with my people there. Many people have asked me: "What are you going to do?" I would reply the same as General Eisenhower replied to someone who asked him what he was going to do when he retired from military service. He said: "Well, I am going out in the country and find me a nice house. I am going to find one with a porch on it and get a good rocking chair, put it on the porch, and I am going to stay on the porch in the rocking chair, and after about 2 months I am going to commence to rock slowly."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back to Daytona Beach, Fla., where we have that remarkable 25-mile beach, which is from 200 to 300 yards wide at low tide and as smooth as the surface of a road. I am going to get the maid, the yard man or manager or somebody to put a rocking chair out on the terrace overlooking that ocean and the great beach there; I am going to sit down first for about 2 months, then I will commence to rock slowly. After that I shall decide what I am going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot be as magnanimous as Will Rogers was when he said he never met a man he could not like. I will say this, however: I have never met a Member of this House, man or woman, that I disliked in any way.

Mr. Speaker, I hope in future years I will have the pleasure of seeing you again. I have future political aspirations and it may be that some day I may or may not have the opportunity of having associations again with you in an official capacity; but whether I do or whether I do not, I hope to see you from time to time here in the Capitol and I hope to see you from time to time in the State of Florida. I hope you will all come down there and visit me in that great State.

Let me say that I have been extremely fond of all of you. These have been trying years. I came here as a young man and I served for 12 years in this House of Representatives. It has taught me that this is a great country, even though times have been trying. I served through an economic depression and a military crisis. I feel this association with you has been one of the richest experiences in my life and to each and every one of you I say, I want to see you again and God bless each and every one of you.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I want to ask the gentleman if he could put two rocking chairs out on that terrace?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will be delighted to.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I want to say to the Members of the House that I have served with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] upon the same subcommittee, that I have a great admiration for him, that I have gone through some very difficult arguments with him, but he stands like the Rock of Gibraltar. He has ability, he has been outstanding and it has always been a pleasure to work with him. He will be missed very much by all of us, particularly myself.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I know that every Member of this House shares my regret at the fact that our distinguished and able colleague is leaving the Congress. When I came to this House 8 years ago, JOE HENDRICKS was then a veteran in the service and a man who had gained much stature, much recognition, for the outstanding quality of his work. He has added to that record during each succeeding year he has served here. His service to our great State of Florida and to this Nation will go down as one of the outstanding records in the history of this country.

He has been uniformly helpful to each of us in his own delegation and to many Members of Congress who needed his help.

Wherever JOE HENDRICKS finds himself in the future, he will carry the good wishes of the men and women who have served with him, and I am confident that in whatever undertaking he may engage he will gain additional recognition and will carry on in the same splendid manner that we have been accustomed to see him carry on in this House of Representatives.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Florida delegation will lose two good men, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], and the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE]. Both of these gentlemen have made a contribution to the workings of the Congress while they have been here.

They are real public servants; they are loyal, capable, honest, and sincere, and I am sure that the membership of this House will miss the value of their services.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the hour is late and much is to do. I know many of the gentleman's colleagues would like to say a word of praise about him, and I certainly do want to pay tribute to his fine personality and his splendid statesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincerest regret that we learn of the retirement from Congress of our distinguished colleague, JOE HENDRICKS.

I did not personally know JOE HENDRICKS before I was elected to Congress in November of 1946, but since that time I have come to know him well and admire him greatly. His long and useful career in Congress and as a member of the Appropriations Committee has made his always generous advice invaluable to me, and I feel a deep sense of loss at his retirement.

JOE has served his district, the State of Florida, and this Nation with sincerity and ability, and I am confident that the people of his district and the State of Florida are well aware of that fact. His record of accomplishment here will serve as an inspiration to those of us who will carry on.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of everyone who knows JOE HENDRICKS when I say that we wish him Godspeed and outstanding success in all that he undertakes in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest as well as one of the ablest Members of the Congress is my distinguished friend and colleague from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]. While we respect the reasons which prompt him to voluntarily retire, we regret his decision. At anytime, but particularly in these trying days, the country can ill afford to lose the services of such an able, experienced, and courageous legislator.

I know that I express the thoughts and sentiments of my colleagues in extending to him my very best wishes for every future happiness and success.

I hope his voluntary retirement from public life will not be permanent, and in the not far future he will again in some capacity, elected or otherwise, give the public the benefit of his outstanding ability and experience. In any event, I know his deep interest in public affairs, and in good government, and from a political angle, in the best interest, progress, and success of our great party, the Democratic Party, founded by the immortal Thomas Jefferson, will never be dimmed, and will always be strong and active.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many Members on both sides of the aisle in expressing regret over the voluntary retirement of Representative JOE HENDRICKS.

Last November a testimonial dinner was given him at Orlando, Fla., by admiring friends and I was honored with an invitation to attend. Circumstances were such that my attendance was impossible, but I addressed a letter to Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON to be read at the dinner which expressed my affection for JOE. I desire to incorporate in these remarks a copy of this letter which expressed my feeling at that time and at the present time:

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I wish I could attend the testimonial dinner for our mutual friend, JOE HENDRICKS. I think it is most appropriate and a further evidence of the deep affection his friends have for him.

JOE and I entered Congress at the same time in January 1937, and it was my good fortune to become intimately acquainted with him in the early days of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

It was with deep regret that I learned some time ago of his intention to return to private life, but regardless of the direction of our paths in years to come I shall always remember him for his fine character, sincerity of purpose, loyalty, and devotion to duty, as well as the personal friendship I have enjoyed which has ripened with the passing years.

In his departure from public life the Nation, the State, and his own district will lose a valuable public servant whose place will be hard to fill.

He has my best wishes for health, happiness, and prosperity which he so richly deserves.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to revise and extend my remarks to include a radio address delivered at a testimonial dinner in my honor at Orlando, Fla., on November 12, 1947. While this is not a complete record of my service in Congress, it gives a brief view:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished hosts, and friends of the radio audience, I do not know how you will classify the speech I shall deliver tonight. It is not my swan song, for, in announcing that I would not be a candidate to succeed myself in the 1948 election, so far as I am concerned, I very clearly left the gate open for my return to the political arena at any time. This, then, is not a farewell address. It might reasonably be considered the closing chapter of book 1, only.

What I have to say may sound more like a speech opening a new campaign—than like one closing a long-standing political career. However, my real reason for talking to you is to express my appreciation, which I shall

never quite be able to do adequately, for the great honor you have bestowed on me for 12 years. It is indeed a great honor, an honor which 99 out of every 100 men would envy. It is the greater honor to me because of the miraculous way in which I attained it. My whole career has been the typical American dream, concrete evidence of the opportunity this country offers to those who have the will to do something. Not for one moment could I claim all the credit, for I have been blessed with the finest friends in the world, and the guidance and protection of a divine providence. I think you will agree when you hear my story.

I was born at Lake Butler, in north Florida. The son of Joseph and Mary Andrews Hendricks, good and intelligent parents, parents of noble birth and good blood. My father died and left mother with five little children, and I arrived 23 days later, making the sixth. Mother struggled to take care of us, and later married again and had six more children. I was, therefore, 1 in a family of 12.

Mother passed away when I was only a boy and left me with very little of this world's goods, but she did leave me her determination and stamina with which to carry on. Until 1 was 14 years old, I was ill 6 months of each year and had not yet completed the fourth grade in a rural school. I soon came to the realization that I needed an education if I were to compete with my chosen associates. I was able to improve my health somewhat by strenuous processes and proceeded to work during summers and in the evenings to further my education.

In the summer of 1921, I happened to be in Umatilla and saw a show put on at a small theater by students of the Montverde School—a very fine school. Mr. and Mrs. H. P. Carpenter were then the heads of the school. To make a long story short, I contacted them through friends and entered the school in 1922. With the aid of Jesse Hunter and others I worked my way through and graduated in 1925. The school has thoroughly justified its existence in what it has done for me and for many, many others.

I worked for the Montverde School in 1926 in order to pay some debts and in the fall of that year entered Stetson University where I again worked to earn all I could and called on my good friends, Mr. H. J. Carpenter, Jesse Hunter, Karl Lehman, and others, and the divine providence, for additional help. I graduated with an AB in 1930, worked for a year, and returned to study law. I received my LL. B. degree in 1934, after which I went to work for the State as an attorney for the tax survey directed by Bill Anderson, the son of lovable Mrs. F. L. Anderson, of Orlando, who is here with us tonight.

I resigned this position and became head of the insurance and tax department of the American Oil Co. in Jacksonville. This position I held until the 1935 session of the legislature created the new Fifth Congressional District of Florida. I immediately decided that this was my opportunity to fulfill an ambition which I had nurtured for many years—to become a Member of the Congress of the United States. I returned to Deland and the practice of law. Early in 1936, I announced that I would be a candidate for Congress from this district. Never did a political announcement create less enthusiasm and excitement that I can recall. There were, at that time, nine prominent men in the race—judges, representatives, senators, State's attorneys, and others. Nevertheless, in June of 1936, with the aid of you fine friends and the divine providence, 2 years after I had finished school, I was elected a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and the first Representative of this district.

Friends, if I could review this picture with you, if you could look back with me as I see myself in 1918 when mother passed away, a frail boy, with neither health, funds, nor education, and during the period of 18 years until I took my seat in Congress, you would understand why I say I appreciate this great honor. But may I say from the depths of my heart, I am grateful to God, to my country, and to you.

Have I shown that appreciation by my acts? I have tried to honestly. It is not for all Members of Congress to author broad and sweeping legislation which will place their names in headlines; some of us are the plodders.

I was on a legislative committee for only a short time. The Appropriations Committee does not sponsor general legislation. General legislative committees sometimes change a bill which you have introduced, even to the point of inserting another name, and, therefore the public may not give you the credit which you deserve. DWIGHT ROGERS is a case in point. He introduced the terminal leave pay bill and it came out of committee with another man's name on it. In spite of this, we, in Congress, are able to recognize our bills even though the public does not and therefore we get no credit.

I introduced the bill for a postwar economic planning committee. The bill was passed and the committee has done excellent work in assisting the Administration in its long-range economic planning. Many of the public projects which will benefit you in later years will be the result of this committee's work. I got none of the credit because a member of the Rules Committee had changed the bill slightly and placed his name on my bill. Those things happen.

I sponsored legislation for variable grants in old-age assistance. That principle was adopted over a year ago.

I sponsored and passed legislation—when I was a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee—for the benefit of postal employees throughout the Nation. They remembered me.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that it was my action on the floor of the House which brought the case of Watson, Dodd, and Lovette—three Government employees—communistic sympathizers—to the Supreme Court.

It was my bill which set up a system of offsets against the credits of foreign countries for debts that they owed to companies in this country for carrying the mail on our flag ships. This amounted to millions of dollars.

I could go on and name many others. But time will not permit.

It is a sad commentary that people judge their Congressman more by what he brings to the district in dollars and cents than by his legislative record—which is much more important.

But this is an understandable, human error.

My vote has never been radical or reactionary—always progressive. I wil stand on my record.

As far as the dollars-and-cents column is concerned, I think I can qualify with the best in the State: In the years that I have represented you in Congress—the 12 counties, comprising the Fifth District, have received more revenue than at any time in the previous history of the State. We have received around $300,000,000 in Federal funds for construction of schools, sewer systems, roads, gymnasiums, armories, rural electrification lines, air fields, waterways projects—and many other projects of permanent benefit to you and your children.

I have secured employment for constituents whose aggregate salaries are about $250,000 per year, or $3,000,000 for the time that I have been in Congress.

I have, by direct appointments, secured educational benefits for young men in the amount of about $400,000.

I have passed claim bills for counties and individuals ranging from $100 to $30,000.

I have aided the citrus men, the cattlemen, the dairymen, the businessmen, the farmer, sent out bulletins, baby books.

I have done yeoman service for my district—and I am happy that I have been able to do it.

It may surprise you to hear that I think one of the most important accomplishments of my years in Congress is my work in getting the approval of the Army engineers and the appropriation of money for the deepening—to 12 feet—and the widening—of the St. John's River channel—from Jacksonville to Sanford. You may wonder why I feel this is so important. It is, my friends, because this is an excellent channel and opens a very desirable artery of commerce—and Sanford thus will become an inland port.

But this is not the only reason. It is the end-result that makes this project important: From my observation of the development of waterways—and I am an ardent exponent of them—I am sure that once the St. John's channel is completed, the natural result will be approval of the Sanford-Titusville Canal to connect with the East Coast Canal—which is also to be deepened and widened to 12 feet—and will be an inland waterway all the way from Miami to Boston, Mass., for commercial and pleasure craft. The final result will be flood control on the upper St. John's Valley—and the net result of that will be flood control on the Kissimmee River Valley—so sorely needed in the past. And so on and on until central Florida, incorporated—an interlocking system of canals through lakes and streams throughout central Florida—will be approved and completed. This is my dream for the St. John's and central Florida. I hope I will be permited to see it come true.

This, briefly, my friends, is my record. I know you approve, because I have never had serious opposition since my first election, in 1936. I am glad I could serve you.

What about my future as a private citizen? Up until the last few months I asked myself that question many times: I have observed—during my period in Congress—so many Members of the House who had either been defeated or had refused to run again, and so many of them came back to Washington asking for employment. Some obtained positions and others did not. I knew, from my personal relations with many of the Members, that they were barely living on a shoestring and when they had left Congress they had no funds to rely on. You may be interested to know that when Senator Park Trammel passed away, his estate was valued at $200. I have seen so many sad cases of this sort. I have seen so many Members desperately trying to stay in the House when, because of health, age, or for other reasons, they should have been retired. (Parenthetically, I think Congress should be commended for passing a pension system for these Members so that they may retire, when necessary, with dignity and some income. Incidentally, I did not take advantage of the pension system and will receive no benefits.)

After I had been in Congress for a number of years, and because of these observations, I began to ponder my own future. I can personally testify to the striking truthfulness of the statement made by Franklin D. Roosevelt in an inaugural speech, that: "All we have to fear is fear itself!". It upsets a man and decreases his efficiency.

I had wondered if some day I might be turned out after dissociating myself from all possibilities of a profession at home, and without funds become more or less a despondent shadow.

I came to the conclusion before 1942 that I wished to retire, but war was declared in 1941 and I could not retire. And even now, though I thought we would have settled world affairs by the time by present term expired, I have grave apprehension.

In regard to my financial possibilities as a private citizen, I am not at all concerned. After announcing that I would not be a candidate to succeed myself, I had many offers: I was first approached to take over a job which I promptly declined because I did not feel I was temperamentally qualified. There are those here who can testify to that. I next had an offer of a position which I declined because I did not think it would work out to my advantage or to the advantage of the person involved. And then I was approached by a man in behalf of certain interests in this State to take a job which, in his words, "is the biggest job in the State." I am sure that would agree (if I were at liberty to disclose what it is) that if that job were well done, it would be the biggest job in the State. I neither accepted nor declined, and the proposition has not been pushed further.

Recently, I was offered a part-time job with a New York corporation which would pay me more than my present salary in Congress. I actually signed the contract and worked for 2 weeks, at which time I took advantage of a revocation clause and terminated my services for two reasons: First, I was not convinced that I approved certain things the corporation was doing; and, second, I found that it would require my presence in New York at the very time of the year when I would much prefer to be in Florida.

I may say, that in addition, I have a small business which I have developed, which will, in the coming year, pay me a great deal more than my present salary in Congress.

I studied for years to prepare myself for a profession—the practice of law. I have good opportunities in that field.

Then, too, I was raised on a farm, and if it becomes necessary I can make a living farming. So the future looks bright to me and I have no fear of fear. I look to the future with great anticipation—and I have you, my good friends, to thank for that.

And now, will you permit a few words of parting advice: I would like to say that it will be the responsibility of you people to elect the right man to represent you in the Eighty-first Congress. I, myself, will have no further interest in the matter other than that of a voter and a citizen. There are a number of potential candidates present here. All of them are close friends of mine, some of them schoolmates and others fraternity brothers. It would be an impossible situation for me to attempt to favor one as against the other. Therefore, if any candidate thinks I am committed to support him, I must here and now revoke such commitment, because you, the voters, must make the decision.

So, to you voters, I say: We are facing grave world problems, no less grave than when Hitler invaded Poland in 1939. Your present representative has, at all times, been keenly aware of international affairs and problems. In most matters affecting you, I have followed the will of the majority. In foreign affairs this was not always possible: There were times when I possessed more information than you, and felt it incumbent upon me to exercise my own judgment, based on information which I had and therefore did the best thing for my country.

I voted for the first conscription bill. I definitely voted my judgment and not the wishes of the majority of my constituents. When I voted for the extension of the act, the same situation obtained, and though criticized at the time, I was vindicated a few weeks later when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. I have always made a close study of our relations with the rest of the world, and the effects thereof, and in regard to foreign policy, I have, on occasion, had to vote as I believed best.

This requires self-assurance, conviction, and a good deal of personal courage, and it is a large responsibility.

My advice to you is to elect a man who will study, in order to inform himself on foreign affairs; convince himself, and then vote his best judgment. Elect a man who is neither a nationalist or internationalist, but a man who is keenly conscious of the rest of the world and the neighborhood of nations. That kind of man will serve you best in these critical times.

The Hawaiians have a word which, when it comes to the finer attributes of mankind, those which so closely resemble God, is all-inclusive. The word is "aloha." Aloha means:

I welcome you.
I am happy because you are here.
I hope you are happy.
I hope you like me.
The sun is bright and all is love.
I am sad because you are leaving.
I hope you will return.
I love you.
Farewell until we meet again.
May God bless you.

And all the finer sentiments. So, in the true meaning of the word, I say, thank you, and aloha.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2217) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine on the merits and to render, in accordance therewith, judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States which are embodied in the petition of the said companies filed in the Court of Claims May 1, 1939, as amended February 14, 1940, and therein docketed as No. 44,659, excepting from such jurisdiction, however, the claims set out as causes of actions Nos. 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, and 31 in the said petition and excepting therefrom that part of the claim set out as cause of action No. 14 in the said petition for which judgment was rendered by the court in No. 44,659 on October 1, 1945, in the amount of $1,099.80. The Court of Claims is directed to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the said claims notwithstanding any prior determination, any statute of limitation, or any abandonment of, nonconformance with, or deviation from the protest and appeal provisions and procedure of the said contract, including but without limitation to article 15 of the contract and paragraph 14 of specifications No. 570 involved in such claims, and without regard to any provisions of the said contract or specifications purporting to confer finality upon the decisions of questions arising under the contract by any officer of the United States.

SEC. 2. Adjudication of the said claims by the Court of Claims is directed to be made without reference to the decision by the court in the case of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States on October 1, 1945, No. 44659; but the court shall consider as the evidence in such suit any and all evidence heretofore taken by the parties in the said case of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., Atkinson-Kier Co. against the United States; and the court may use as a basis for its findings of fact the report of its commissioner, Ewart W. Hobbs, filed January 11, 1944, upon such evidence subject to the exceptions thereto filed by the petitioners and by the defendant United States both on May 1, 1944.

SEC. 3. Any suit upon such claims brought under the provisions of this act shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VITO ABARNO

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a committee report.

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CARS FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentlewoman wish to make a valedictory speech?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a request and plea for the House to take action on the amputee car bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sympathizes with the gentlewoman but cannot recognize her for that purpose at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the Chair recognize me to submit a unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration and passage of the bill (S. 1391)?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it has been the practice that all

legislation taken up by unanimous consent shall have the approval of the majority and minority leaders. Has the gentlewoman secured that permission?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have been talking to them, but the hour is getting late. May I ask, is the Congress going to adjourn tonight?

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes he could answer the gentlewoman to that effect, and would like to be able to say so, but he is inclined to think it will not.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If we have a recess, will there be a chance later to get legislation through?

The SPEAKER. There will be a chance to get legislation through later.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have spent millions of dollars for foreign countries and millions on everything else, and this is such a small bill for the amputees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sympathizes entirely with the gentlewoman.

REPRESENTATIVES ANTON JOHNSON AND JOHN FLANNAGAN

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to make a valedictory address?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on this evening we all think of some of those who will not be in the next Congress. There are many whose parting we regret. Most of us find that there is some particular individual whose retirement from official life will leave its mark of sadness upon our feelings. I find myself especially distressed to lose the company of one of the majority members who has served with me on the Committee on Agriculture for a number of years, one whom I have come to trust and love and to look upon as a fine personal friend as well as an outstanding public servant, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ANTON JOHNSON.

This House has no finer Member than ANTON JOHNSON. There just are no finer men than ANTON JOHNSON. Of course, he and I disagree on many matters, but I never knew Anton to take a position which he thought was wrong, and I have never had occasion to fall out with that kind of man. If we had more of his kind on both sides of the aisle we would have a finer Congress. The Congress and the country will be the poorer by reason of the fact that he will not be with us this coming year. His history is one of the finest in the American tradition. He is a self-made man who has gone to the top by hard work, honesty, loyalty to his friends, his family, and his country, and a fine fund of common sense. Our committee is going to miss him. It is also going to miss our former chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable JOHN FLANNAGAN, who is not a candidate for reelection. So I want to say to Anton and to John that we are going to miss you both in the next Congress and that we are sorry you are leaving us, but we hope you will be happy and prosperous wherever you are.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOBLICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to adress the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. CANFIELD.) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOBLICK. Mr. Speaker, on these the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress, I ask you to bear with me for a few minutes so that I might extend to you one and all a fond farewell.

In leaving these halls I bid adieu to the sanctums that have been made hallowed by men and women who have been fired with a patriotism that this Nation shall live, that this Republic shall never be excelled in the family of nations; that right shall ever be our aim and wrong our challenge adversary.

I came to the Eightieth Congress inspired with the opportunity of service and I leave it with the conviction that so long as the fires of patriotism burn brightly in the men and women in this Nation and continues to be reflected by their Representatives in the Congress, then the Republican form of Government that was founded here shall continue to be the beacon light for the freedom-loving peoples of the world and the United States shall continue to be the greatest Nation ever permitted by divine providence to be born and flourish.

It is to the credit of the House that the Members have ever held sacred the fundamentals of our Republic.

This House has faced with courage and has refused to turn its head from the principle that when an inalienable right has been menaced, then it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it.

I leave this House with the utmost respect for its Members, for many reasons but above all that it has remained true to the principles which caused us to be founded and that its Membership reflects the spirit of neighborliness to other peoples of the world and in this connection I believe our hero dead from their "Valhalla" will say Amen.

However, there are some who will detract from the best effort we have put forth but they cannot successfully challenge the pureness of our motives, the sincerity of our aims or the patriotism that has moved us.

To them we may with confidence examine their motives and let history translate them with finality.

It has not been my good fortune to win renomination to the Eighty-first Congress, however, may I say without bitterness, no man can ever deserve to win who does not know how to lose, and furthermore please believe me that when the people go to the polls to name a Representative for the Tenth Pennsylvania District for the Eighty-second Congress, I will be there and I shall expect to return here and continue the work I have come to know and the finest service an humble citizen can give to his country.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOBLICK. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I commend the gentleman on his outstanding service as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I am only going to say "so long" to you because I know you will be back 2 years hence.

Mr. SCOBLICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for several minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, and colleagues, I know that those of us who look forward to serving in the Eighty-first Congress would like to pay tribute to many of our retiring colleagues. I feel that I would be untrue to the feelings in my own heart if I did not on this occasion pay at least a brief tribute to two of the finest men it has ever been my pleasure to know, who are voluntarily retiring from Congress at the end of the present session, Hon. J. BAYARD CLARK, of North Carolina, and Hon. JOHN H. FOLGER, of North Carolina.

Both of these distinguished North Carolinians have served in this House for many years. They have with great ability and becoming dignity served their country. They are outstanding Members of Congress, gentlemen of sterling character and great patriotism. I know that we shall miss them, and we shall look forward to the time when they shall visit these Halls, in which they have served so well and faithfully.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of the friendships that are made in this House and of the separations that will occur at the end of this session, I can think of nothing more appropriate to say than to quote the last verse of a little poem which I think was written by Thomas Moore, called Farewell:

Let fate do her worst, there are relics of joy,
Bright dreams of the past, which she cannot destroy,
Which come, in the nighttime of sorrow and care,
And bring back the features that joy used to wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled!
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled—
You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,
But the scent of the roses will cling round it still.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House when I say we all deeply regret the decision of our fellow-member of that committee and our respected colleague, Hon. JOHN H. FOLGER, to retire as a Representative in Congress from North Carolina. His ability, his industry, and his intense interest in the problems affecting the welfare of our country, I am sure, have deeply impressed all of his col-

leagues and especially those on the Banking and Currency Committee where for a long time he has served with distinction and been a valuable member. No man has been more assiduous in his attendance at committee meetings and his deep study of the problems presented. His sound judgment and sensible conclusions were always eagerly sought by the members of the committee. His colleagues will miss him and the State of North Carolina and the Nation have sustained a loss in the retirement of this patriotic, public-spirited Representative. We wish him success and happiness in all his undertakings.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, it was with genuine regret that I learned that the Honorable JOHN HAMLIN FOLGER, who has so admirably represented the Fifth District of the great State of North Carolina, had decided to retire to private life. I know that this is not in keeping with the desire of his fellow Members in Congress or of his constituency at home.

I was privileged to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee during the first session of the Eightieth Congress along with Judge FOLGER. When Judge FOLGER spoke in the committee or on the floor of the House, he always made a valuable contribution toward the solution of the problem involved. He took his job seriously. He is in the true sense of the word a southern gentleman.

I wish to express to him sincerest good wishes for his health and happiness in the days to come.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HINSHAW submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'War Claims Act of 1948'.

"WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the War Claims Commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') and to be composed of three persons to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. At least two of the members of the Commission shall be persons who have been admitted to the bar of the highest court of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 a year. The terms of office of the members of the Commission shall expire at the time fixed in subsection (d) for the winding up of the affairs of the Commission.

"(b) The Commission may, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, and employees, and may make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Officers and employees of any other department or agency of the Government may, with the consent of the head of such department or agency, be assigned to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The Commission may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the Government, utilize the facilities and services of such department or agency in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, and may delegate functions to any member, officer, or employee of the Commission. The Commission shall give public notice of the time when, and the limit of time within which, claims may be filed, which notice shall be published in the Federal Register. The limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission shall in no event be later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(d) The Commission shall wind up its affairs at the earliest practicable time after the expiration of the time for filing claims, but in no event later than three years after the expiration of such time.

"JURISDICTION OF COMMISSION

"SEC. 3. The Commission shall have jurisdiction to receive and adjudicate according to law claims as hereinafter provided.

"EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS

"SEC. 4. (a) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any person specified in section 101 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended, or by the legal representative of any such person who may have died, for the amount by which (1) the total sum which would have been payable to such person by his employer (not including any payments for overtime), if such person's contract of employment had been in effect and he had been paid under it for the entire period during which he was entitled to receive benefits under section 101 (b) of such Act, exceeds (2) the entire amount creditable to such person's account for such period under the provisions of such section plus any amounts paid to such person by such employer for such period or recovered by such person in any legal action against such employer based upon such person's right against such employer for such period under the contract of employment, including payments in settlement of the liability of the employer arising under or out of such contract. No claim shall be allowed to any person under the provisions of this section unless such person executes a full release to the employer and to the United States in respect to the liability of the employer arising under or out of the contract of employment, except liability for workmen's compensation benefits under the Act of August 16, 1941, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1651 and the following), or detention or other benefits paid under the Act of December 2, 1942, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1751 and the following). Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act.

"(b) (1) The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to cancel any obligation to the United States of any person specified in section 101 (a) of such Act of December 2, 1942, to pay any sum which may have been advanced to or on behalf of any such person by the Department of State for the purpose of paying the costs of food and medical services furnished to such person during his period of internment by the Imperial Japanese Government or for the purpose of paying transportation or other expenses of repatriation.

"(2) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any person specified in section 101 (a) of such Act of December 2, 1942, for the repayment of any sum which may have been paid by such person to the Department of State in settlement of any obligation of the type referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this paragraph shall be certified by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act.

"(c) Section 102 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the proviso in such subsection and by substituting the following: *'Provided*, That the total compensation payable under this title for injury or death shall in no event exceed the limitations upon compensation as fixed in section 14 (m) of such Act as such section may from time to time be amended except that the total compensation shall not be less than that provided for in the original enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That any amendment to such Act, the effect of which is to increase the amount of benefits payable for injury or death, shall be applied in the administration of this section as if the amendment had been in effect at the time of the particular injury or death and the compensation (except funeral and burial expenses) in any case previously determined shall be adjusted accordingly in respect to the beneficiary entitled thereto under the Act.'

"INTERNEES

"SEC. 5. (a) As used in this section, the term 'civilian American citizen' means any person who, being then a citizen of the United States, was captured by the Imperial Japanese Government on or after December 7, 1941, at Midway, Guam, Wake Island, the Philippine Islands, or any Territory or possession of the United States attacked or invaded by such government, or while in transit to or from any such place, or who went into hiding at any such place in order to avoid capture or internment by such government; except (1) a person who at any time voluntarily gave aid to, collaborated with, or in any manner served such government, or (2) a person who at the time of his capture or entrance into hiding was (A) a person within the purview of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes', approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or (B) a person within the purview of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or (C) a person within the purview of the Missing Persons Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat.

143), as amended; or (D) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by, or on behalf of, any civilian American citizen for detention benefits for any period of time subsequent to December 6, 1941, during which he was held by the Imperial Japanese Government as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity, or remained in hiding to avoid being captured or interned by such Imperial Japanese Government.

"(c) The detention benefit allowed to any person under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be at the rate of $60 for each calendar month during which such person was at least eighteen years of age and at the rate of $25 per month for each calendar month during which such person was less than eighteen years of age.

"(d) The detention benefits allowed under subsection (b) shall be allowed to the person entitled thereto, or, in the event of his death, only to the following persons:

"(1) Widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(2) Widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children in equal shares; and

"(3) Child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband.

"(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act, and shall be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one.

"(f) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions of titles I and II of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended, are extended and shall apply with respect to the injury, disability, or death resulting from injury of a civilian American citizen occurring while he was held by or in hiding from the Imperial Japanese Government, to the same extent as if such civilian American citizen were an employee within the purview of such Act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

"(2) For the purpose of determining the benefits extended and made applicable by paragraph (1)—

"(A) the average weekly wage of any such civilian American citizen, whether employed, self-employed, or not employed, shall be deemed to have been $37.50;

"(B) the provisions of such Act shall be applicable whether or not any such civilian American citizen was employed;

"(C) notice of injury or death shall not be required; and limitation provisions with respect to the filing of claims for injury, disability, or death shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this section; and

"(D) the monthly compensation in cases involving partial disability shall be determined by the percentage the degree of partial disability bears to total disability and shall not be determined with respect to the extent of loss of wage earning capacity.

"(3) the following provisions of such Act of December 2, 1942, as amended, shall not apply in the case of such civilian American citizens: Section 101 (b), section 104, and section 105.

"(4) Rights or benefits which, under this subsection, are to be determined with reference to other provisions of law shall be determined with reference to such provisions of law as in force on January 3, 1948.

"(5) The money benefit for disability or death shall be paid only to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall not upon death of the person so entitled survive for the benefit of his estate or any other person.

"(6) The benefit of a minor or of an incompetent person who has no natural or legal guardian may, in the discretion of the Federal Security Administrator, be paid, in whole or in such part as he may determine for and on behalf of such minor or incompetent directly to the person or institution caring for, supporting, or having custody of such minor or incompetent.

"(7) No person, except a widow or a child, shall be entitled to benefits for disability with respect to himself, and to death benefits on account of the death of another.

"(8) If a civilian American citizen or his dependent receives or has received from the United States any payments on account of the same injury or death, or from his employer, in the form of wages, or payments in lieu of wages, or in any form of support or compensation (including workmen's compensation) in respect to the same objects, the benefits under this section shall be diminished by the amount of such payments in the following manner: (A) Benefits on account of injury or disability shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the injured person on account of the same injury or disability; and (B) benefits on account of death shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the dependents of the deceased civilian American citizen on account of the same death.

"(9) This subsection shall take effect as of December 7, 1941, and the right of individuals to benefits shall be held to have begun to accrue as though this subsection had been in effect as of such date.

"PRISONERS OF WAR

"SEC. 6. (a) As used in this section, the term 'prisoner of war' means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the military or naval forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which the United States has been at war subsequent to such date.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation for the violation by the enemy government by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, of its obligation to furnish him the quantity or quality of food to which he was entitled as a prisoner of war under the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929. The compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under the provisions of this subsection shall be at the rate of $1 for each day he was held as a prisoner of war on which the enemy government or its agents failed to furnish him such quantity or quality of food. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act.

"(c) Claims pursuant to subsection (b) shall be paid to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall in case of death of the persons who are entitled be payable only to or for the benefit of the following persons:

"(1) widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(2) widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares;

"(3) child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband; and

"(4) dependent parents (in equal shares) if there is no widow, dependent husband, or child.

"RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 7. The Commission is authorized to receive, adjudicate according to law, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any religious organization functioning in the Philippine Islands and affiliated with a religious organization in the United States, or by the personnel of any such Philippine organization, for reimbursement of expenditures incurred, or for payment of the fair value of supplies used, by such organization or such personnel for the purpose of furnishing shelter, food, clothing, hospitalization, medicines and medical services, and other relief in the Philippines to members of the armed forces of the United States or to civilian American citizens (as defined in section 5) at any time subsequent to December 6, 1941, and before August 15, 1945. Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this Act.

"REPORT WITH RESPECT TO PERSONAL INJURY AND PROPERTY CLAIMS

"SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall inquire into and report to the President, for submission of such report to the Congress on or before March 31, 1949, with respect to war claims arising out of World War II, other than claims which may be received and adjudicated under the preceding sections of this Act, and shall present in such report its findings on—

"(1) the estimated number and amount of such claims, classified by types and categories; and

"(2) the extent to which such claims have been or may be satisfied under international agreements or domestic or foreign laws.

"(b) The report of the Commission shall contain recommendations with respect to—

"(1) categories and types of claims, if any, which should be received and considered and the legal and equitable bases therefor;

"(2) the administrative method by which such claims should be considered, and any priorities or limitations which should be applicable; and

"(3) any limitations which should be applied to the allowance and payment of fees in connection with such claims.

"(c) The Commission shall include in such report—

"(1) such other recommendations as it deems appropriate; and

"(2) such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out the recommendations made in such report.

"(d) Such report, with accompanying evidence, shall be printed as a public document when received by the Congress.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to imply that the Congress will enact legislation—

"(1) adopting any recommendations made under this section with respect to the consideration or payment of any type of claim; or

"(2) making any moneys, including moneys remaining in the war claims fund after the making of payments from such fund provided for by this Act, available for the payment of such claims.

"REPORT TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 9. Not later than six months after its organization, and every six months thereafter, the Commission shall make a report to the Congress concerning its operations under this Act.

"REMUNERATION FOR SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH CLAIMS

"SEC. 10. No remuneration on account of services rendered or to be rendered to or on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the administering agency under this Act shall exceed 10 per centum (or such lesser per centum as may be fixed by the administering agency with respect to any class of claims) of the amount allowed by the administering agency on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, pays or offers to pay, or promises to pay, or receives, on account of services rendered or to be rendered in connection with any such claim, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both, and, if any such payment shall have been made or granted, the administering agency shall take such action as may be necessary to recover the same, and, in addition thereto any such claimant shall forfeit all rights under this Act.

"HEARINGS WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS

"SEC. 11. The Commission shall notify all claimants of the approval or denial of their claims, and, if approved, shall notify such claimants of the amount for which such claims are approved. Any claimant whose claim is denied, or is approved for less than the full allowable amount of such claim, shall be entitled, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, to a hearing before the Commission or its representatives with respect to such claim. Upon such hearing, the Commission may affirm, modify, or revise its former action with respect to such claim, including a denial or reduction in the amount theretofore allowed with respect to such claim. The action of the Commission in allowing or denying any claim under this Act shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact and not subject to review by any other official of the United States or by any court by mandamus or otherwise, and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for payments in accordance with such action.

"AMENDMENT TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

"SEC. 12. The Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 39. No property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the Government at any time after December 17, 1941, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, shall be returned to former owners thereof or their successors in interest, and the United States shall not pay compensation for any such property or interest therein. The net proceeds remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of this Act of any such property or interest therein shall be covered into the Treasury at the earliest practicable date. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of the provisions of section 32 of this Act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946.'

"WAR CLAIMS FUND

"SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby created on the books of the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the War Claims Fund. The War Claims Fund shall consist of all sums covered into the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended. The moneys in such fund shall be available for expenditure only as provided in this Act or as may be provided hereafter by the Congress.

"(b) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount which will be required to pay all benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 5 (f) of this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount so certified by the Federal Security Administrator.

"(c) The Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to estimate and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount which will be required to pay all additional benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 4 (c) of this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the war claims fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount so certified by the Federal Security Administrator.

"(d) The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the total amount of all obligations canceled pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (b) (1) of this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the war claims fund to the general fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the local amount so certified.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the war claims fund, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this Act.

"PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS

"SEC. 14. In any case in which any money is payable as a result of the enactment of this Act to any person who is prevented from accepting such money by the rules, regulations, or customs of the church or the religious order or organization of which he is a member, such money shall be paid, upon the request of such person, to such church or to such religious order or organization.

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL HINSHAW,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the bill and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which differed from the House bill in a number of respects.

The substitute agreed to in conference differs from both the House bill and the Senate amendment, but follows in general the provisions of the Senate amendment. The principal differences between the House bill and the conference substitute are explained briefly below:

Section 2 of the House bill, suspending payment of debt claims under section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, has been omitted.

The report of the War Claims Commission, created by the bill, is to be made on or before March 31, 1949.

The conference substitute contains provisions, taken from the Senate amendment, which are to be administered by the Commission, relating to the adjudication and payment of claims by former members of the armed forces, held as prisoners of war by the enemy during the recent war, based upon failure to furnish the quantity and quality of food required by the Geneva Convention. It also provides for the adjudication and payment of claims filed by any religious organization functioning in the Philippine Islands and affiliated with a religious organization in the United States, or by personnel of any such Philippine organization, on account of expenditures incurred by them in furnishing shelter, food, clothing, and other relief in the Philippines to members of the armed forces of the United States or to civilian internees.

The provisions of the conference substitute relating to payment of benefits for detention are to be administered by the Commission, and the detention benefit is to be at the rate of $60 for each calendar month during which the individual was at least 18 years of age and at the rate of $25 per month for each calendar month during which such person was less than 18 years of age. Under the House bill, detention benefits (as well as disability and death benefits) would have been administered by the Federal Security Administration, and determined in accordance with titles I and II of the Act of December 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 1028), as amended, as though the individual suffering detention were an employee within the purview of that Act; and it was provided that the average weekly wage of such individual, for such purpose, whether employed, self-employed, or not employed, should be deemed to have been $37.50.

The conference substitute contains provisions, taken from the Senate amendment, but changed so that they would be administered by the Federal Security Administrator, authorizing adjudication and payment of claims of individuals who were employed by contractors of the Government on Wake, Guam, and Cavite, for amounts equal to the difference between what they would have received under their contracts and what they actually received.

The conference substitute contains a section, taken from the Senate bill, limiting the amount of remuneration any person may receive on account of services rendered to or on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission or the Federal Security Administrator under the Act.

The conference substitute, as did the Senate amendment, p. vides for the creation of a trust fund in the Treasury to be known as the War Claims Fund. The fund is to consist of all sums covered into the Treasury pursuant to section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. The moneys in the fund are to be available only for carrying out the provisions of this legislation or as may be provided hereafter by the Congress.

CARL HINSHAW,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
HUGH D. SOCTT, JR.,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE AND TRAINING FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2730) to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended by adding to the last sentence *"Provided*, That in the case of employees who have been separated from the field service of the Post Office Department to transfer under war service regulations to private industry or another department or independent establishment or agency of the Federal Government, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding such transfer as well as the time engaged in military service shall be construed as allowable service and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service."

SEC. 2. Any person who prior to the enactment of this act received any amount the payment of which is authorized for the first time by this act is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any such amount; and in the audit and settlement of the amounts of any postmaster, or of any other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, such amount shall be considered to have been authorized. Any amount heretofore credited to the employee or refunded by him to the United States on account of any such overpayment shall be repaid out of any money available for the payment of salaries of employees in the service in which he is employed.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect as of July 1, 1945.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 6734, as amended.

"That section 25 of the act entitled 'An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes', approved July 6, 1945 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 39, sec. 875), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 25. Allowable service under the provisions of this act shall be only such continuous active service as has been rendered and shall not include previous periods or terms of employment, except that in the case of employees who have been separated or shall hereafter be separated from the field service of the Post Office Department for military duty, or to comply with a war transfer as defined by the Civil Service Commission, the periods or terms of such service immediately preceding entry into military service or immediately preceding such transfer, as well as the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer, shall be construed as allowable service, and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer for each year of such service."

SEC. 2. Any person who prior to the enactment of this act received any amounts the payment of which is authorized for the first time by this act is hereby relieved of all liability to refund such amounts to the United States; and in the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster, or of any other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the payment of such amounts shall be considered to have been authorized. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to repay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated pursuant to the authority of this act, any amounts heretofore credited to the employee or refunded by him to the United States on account of such receipt by him of unauthorized payments.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The amendment made by the first section of this act to section 25 of the act of July 6, 1945, shall take effect as of July 1, 1945.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 11 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PLAN—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 7, 12, 22, 32, 40 and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34 and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "June 30, 1949: *Provided*, That the entire amount may be apportioned for obligation or may be obligated and expended, if the President, after recommendation by the Administrator, deems such action necessary to carry out the purposes of said Act, during the period ending April 2"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount inserted in said amendment insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number inserted by said amendment insert "fifty"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "hire of aircraft;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not less than 5 per centum of each special local currency account established pursuant to section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government for expenditure for strategic materials where available or for other local currency requirements of the United States of America"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, that not to exceed $58,000,000 may be expended for administrative and other expenses including not to exceed $12,000,000 for direct administration and not to exceed $3,000,000 for technical assistance authorized under section 111 (a) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 117 (c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, the Administrator shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to any participating foreign country, regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but

this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That guaranties of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media provided for under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, or otherwise, shall not exceed $10,000,000 in the first year"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That there shall be included within the local currency administrative expenditures of the United States such sums as may be necessary to meet expenditures of members and staff of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation in the course of performance of committee functions within respective participating countries"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$225,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "$400,000,000, of which not to exceed $1,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses and of which $125,000,000 shall be available exclusively as provided in subsection 404 (b) of said Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished, and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $1,300,000,000,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "*Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the Secretary of the Army shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to Japan, Korea, or the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals:"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed 60 per centum of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for contribution to the International Refugee Organization until such time as there are effected agreements providing for a caloric diet for the occupants of refugee camps in Europe that is no higher than that prevailing in the country in which such camps are located"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 202. No funds made available under the authority of this Act shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended), at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment: *Provided*, That no funds available under this Act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 203. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to purchase farm machinery, including tractors, in the United States in an amount which will bring the total exports of such machinery and tractors during the period for which this appropriation is made, from the United States, by or for the benefit of the countries participating in the European recovery program, to more than $75,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Whenever an export license for a commodity, the production or shipment of which to a nonparticipating country was contracted for in good faith prior to March 1, 1948, is denied or cannot be obtained under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, the Administrator shall provide for the procurement of such commodity to transfer to a participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, at not less than the contract price of such commodity to the producer or exporter, as the case may be, including any cost incurred in converting the commodity to meet the requirements of the participating country."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 205. Not less than 50 per centum of the United States export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) for nonoccupied areas shall come from production of plants operated by or for the Department of the Army.

"In addition, the Department of the Army shall make available, for the commercial production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for domestic use, 10 per centum of the total anhydrous ammonia produced in the United States in plants operated by or for the Department of the Army, said anhydrous ammonia to be distributed as directed by the Department of Commerce, which shall give preference, in distributing said anhydrous ammonia, to producers of ammonium sulphate who were producing ammonium sulphate during the six months preceding the enactment of this Act or who shall have ceased to produce, or shall be faced with an imminent shutdown in the production of, ammonium sulphate for want of anhydrous ammonia, to the extent necessary to permit such producers to operate. The Department of the Army is hereby authorized to produce and sell, in addition to its production for occupied areas, such nitrogenous fertilizer materials or nitrogenous compounds (including anhydrous ammonia) required for United States exports to nonoccupied areas or for the production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for domestic use and to credit the proceeds of such sales to the appropriation for Government and Relief in Occupied Areas to the extent of the cost of such production for such sales and any balance to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The House agrees to the title of the bill as amended by the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
CARL HAYDEN,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6801) making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Clarifies the period of time for which appropriations included in the bill are made available, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Restores language of the House providing for the availability of funds to June 30, 1949, instead of April 2, 1949, as proposed by the Senate, and adds language authorizing apportionments, obligations, and expenditures of appropriated funds by April 2, 1949, if the President deems such action necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act.

Amendment No. 3: Limits the amount that may be expended for attendance at meetings to $60,000, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the House, and $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Eliminates the Senate provision for the purchase of typewriters and similar machines without regard to provisions of the Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1949, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Limits the purchase of automobiles to 50, instead of 40, as proposed by the House, and 60, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Amends the provision of the Senate to provide for the hire, rather than the purchase and maintenance of aircraft.

Amendment No. 7: Deletes the provision of the Senate providing for deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Provides language and the amount of not to exceed $20,000,000 for assistance to the Free Territory of Trieste, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Eliminates the provision of the House limiting to $65,000,000 the amount to be expended for the purchase in the United States of nonfat dried milk solids, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Eliminates the provision of the House limiting administrative expenditures to $68,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Restores the provision of the House providing for the allocation to the use of the United States of a certain portion of funds deposited in the special local currency account of each participating country; reduces the amount of such allocations from 10 to 5 per centum; and limits the expenditure of funds so allocated for purchases of strategic materials to countries where such strategic materials are available.

Amendment No. 12: Restores the provision of the House providing that allocations of funds provided pursuant to provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for Austria and any other occupied country shall be made to the United States military government of such countries.

Amendment No. 13: Deletes the provision of the House providing for the expenditure of Economic Cooperation Administration funds for economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Provides for reimbursement to military authorities by the Economic Cooperation Administrator for administrative expenses incurred in connection with the program, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Limits the amount that may be expended for administrative and other expenses to $58,000,000 instead of $63,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and adds additional limitations of not to exceed $12,000,000 for direct administration and $6,000,000 for technical assistance.

Amendment No. 16: Inserts in slightly amended form provision of the Senate providing for uniform payments for ocean transportation of relief packages.

Amendment No. 17: Clarifies language of the Senate which limits the amount to be expended for guarantees of investments in enterprises producing or distributing informational media to $10,000,000.

Amendment No. 18: Inserts a provision of the Senate providing for certain expenditures of members of staff of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation from the local currency funds of each participating country.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $35,000,000 for the International Children's Emergency Fund, instead of $60,000,000, as proposed by the House and $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $225,000,000 for assistance to Greece and Turkey, instead of $200,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $250,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Provides for assistance to China until April 2, 1949, as proposed by the Senate, instead of June 30, 1949, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22. Deletes language of the Senate providing for deposits in the Treasury for penalty mail, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $400,000,000 for assistance to China of which not to exceed $1,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $460,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; and makes $125,000,000 of the appropriation available exclusively for carrying out the provisions of subsection 404 (b) of the China Aid Act of 1948.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes the provision of the House providing for administration of the assistance to China program to conform with the objectives of assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $1,300,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas under the Department of the Army, instead of $1,250,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,325,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; restores House language, and adds clarifying language covering purchases of supplies, commodities, and equipment, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Inserts provision of the Senate authorizing the use of funds appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas, Department of the Army, for economic rehabilitation in Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus.

Amendment No. 27: Inserts provision of the Senate making available funds unexpended at the time of termination of occupation in any country for further procurement of commodities and services under direction of the President and for the fulfillment of previously negotiated contracts.

Amendment No. 28: Inserts provision of the Senate making certain assistance in formerly occupied areas contingent on agreements between the President and such government that is established upon termination of occupation by the United States.

Amendment No. 29: Inserts provision of the Senate providing that requirements of certain contracts with foreign governments correspond to requirements contained in specific sections of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947.

Amendment No. 30: Inserts provision of the Senate authorizing the payment of transportation charges incurred by voluntary nonprofit relief agencies in connection with shipment of relief packages from the United States to Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyus.

Amendment No. 31: Inserts in slightly amended form provision of the Senate providing for a uniform rate, fixed by the Secretary of the Army, for ocean transportation of relief packages.

Amendment No. 32: Deletes the provision of the Senate providing for certain exemptions from existing law pertaining to the employment of experts, consultants, and technicians, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Restores the provision of the House making contingent the use of funds for the International Refugee Organization upon the execution of certain agreements relating to diet, amended to set the limitation at 60 percent of such funds for Europe.

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Strike from the bill language proposed by the House to forbid employment of members of labor organizations which are not in compliance with the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Amendment No. 36: Restores provision of the House establishing price limitations on commodities purchased with funds provided for in the act and providing for the purchase of wool from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, amended to provide for certain price adjustments.

Amendment No. 37: Eliminates provision of the House limiting expenditures for farm machinery and farm tractors to $50,000,000, and amends substitute language of the Senate which provides for a total export limitation of farm machinery of $75,000,000 by including in the language of the Senate, "tractors", and changing the period of applicability of the limitation to the period for which the appropriation is made rather than to fiscal year 1949.

Amendment No. 38: Restores language of the House providing for purchase by the Economic Cooperation Administration of commodities for which contracts were entered into in good faith prior to March 1, 1948, but for which export licenses are denied and cannot be obtained, and changes the word "and" to "or" for purposes of clarification.

Amendment No. 39: Eliminates language of the House governing the production and sale of nitrogenous fertilizer materials and inserts a substitute provision setting forth conditions for the production and sale of nitrogenous fertilizer materials by the Department of the Army.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Correct section numbers.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6801), and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are presenting a complete report on this bill. It carries a provision in title I with reference to ECA; I think I should read it to you in full, because it was not set out completely in the statement that was read in lieu of the conference report. I refer to amendment No. 2 where we carried the funds in the House to run to the 30th of June. This is the amendment:

Until June 30, 1949, provided that the entire amount may be apportioned for obligation or may be obligated and expended if the President after recommendation by the Administrator deems such action necessary to carry out the purposes of said act during the period ending April 2, 1949.

Frankly, I believe they have ample money to carry through all that they can honestly and legitimately spend until that date.

The amount of $4,000,000,000 which was carried in the House bill was not changed by the Senate so that remains as it was, $245,000,000 below the budget.

The other major changes were to the House figure of $400,000,000 for China, which was retained, and the date was left as the Senate placed it, April 2, 1949.

The item for IRO was changed so that not more than 60 percent of the funds appropriated might be available unless an agreement is made providing that the caloric ration would be no higher than that prevailing in the country in which the camps were located.

The item for Greece and Turkey was made $225,000,000 as against $250,000,000 in the Senate and $200,000,000 in the House.

The item for relief in occupied areas was made $1,300,000,000 as against $1,250,000,000 in the House and $1,325,000,000 in the Senate.

There was carried into that provision an authorization for expenditures along the line of the ECA in occupied territories and that provision which had been incorporated in the ECA was deleted.

I think that concludes the story of about what happened to the bill.

I just want to call attention to one thing as I close. While there has been insufficient time in which to complete a tabulation of total budget estimates and total appropriations for this session of the Eightieth Congress, my preliminary information is that the reduction in the total budget estimates will be nearly $3,000,000,000.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. I call the attention of the gentleman to amendments Nos. 16 and 31 dealing with the payment of ocean freight charges on relief packages by the Administrator, and ask if he will explain the provisions of the conference report and in what respect they differ from the bill as passed by the other body.

Mr. TABER. We have made some changes in the language there, and I believe we have left it where these profiteers cannot declare a dividend out of the operations. We have not provided subsidies for anybody in connection with the operations.

Mr. DEVITT. I will say to the gentleman that section 117 (c) of the European Recovery Act makes provision by the terms of which the Administrator is required to pay the ocean freight charges on these relief packages for persons who ship packages to individuals overseas. I would like to ask the gentleman if under the terms of this bill now it is applicable to commercial organizations that operate for profit.

Mr. TABER. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin to answer that.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important question and one that should be clarified in the RECORD so that we may have an understanding as to just what the conferees have done. You will recall that the enabling legislation provides for the payment of ocean freight to be paid out of ECA funds. There are a large number of nonprofit organizations engaged in the business of sending relief packages abroad. Among them is CARE, Inc., which you all know about, and which General Clay said was doing one of the greatest works that any organization could possibly do to establish proper relations with the people in Europe. They have a unique method of distribution. They ship their food and other materials in bulk by ocean shipment to warehouses abroad, thus obtaining a very low ocean-freight rate on the bulk shipments. They assemble these packages over in the foreign countries and when an order comes in for a CARE package and payment is made here, that order is sent abroad and is filled in the country abroad. Thus, they are able to get a lower ocean-freight rate than anybody else engaged in the business.

Now, the individual in your town and mine who is sending a package to a foreign country by parcel post has complained to you and to me that when he pays the established parcel-post rate the rate is so high that it sometimes is more than the value of the goods that he sends. The demand has been made upon you and me to try to get relief to the individual shipper of individual packages consigned to individuals in Europe. The only thing that is authorized to be paid to such an individual is the ocean-freight carriage under the basic law. That requires that the Administrator of ECA enter into an agreement with the Post Office Department by which the Post Office Department will accept individual parcel-post packages for shipment to individuals abroad and give to that individual a reduced parcel-post rate equivalent to the ocean-carriage freight on that individual package. That has been accomplished by virtue of the language in this bill—the exception that was written into it.

As to the argument that many concerns have gotten into this relief business for profit and are making money on the deal and want to obtain a subsidy of this ocean freight rate as provided in the ECA law, after some consideration some people felt that if you give a subsidy to these profit takers in that field you will have to raise the subsidy to CARE, because CARE gets, for example, a 2-cent rate, and, for the purposes of illustration, the other rate is 8 cents or 7.5 cents. If you gave the other people the benefit of the ocean rate by way of subsidy and CARE is able to ship at a 2-cent rate, the story was that that would hurt this great nonprofit organization. So the conferees agreed that they would leave the situation exactly as it is, leave CARE with its 2-cent rate, and would pay the lowest freight rate, so that all of the nonprofit organizations and profit organizations would be in the same classification, but proposed to give the benefit to the individual shipper.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. What I am interested in finding out is if any of these private groups that are in the business of shipping packages overseas for profit are going to be able under the present provision of the conference report to get ECA funds to help defray the expenses of shipping the packages overseas?

Mr. KEEFE. In my opinion they will not be able to get anything, because their freight charges are much higher than those enjoyed by CARE.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the language of the Senate amendment, which we accept with a proviso, provides for the payment of a uniform rate, so that they will get in cents or dollars the same amount per pound that CARE will get, but we provide that this limitation should not apply to shipments from individuals to individuals?

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly right. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The limitation does not apply from individuals to individuals, it lets individuals get whatever the cost may be determined by the Administrator to be.

Mr. DEVITT. Can the gentleman answer this question yes or no? May a private organization in business for profit use some of these funds in order to defray freight costs on these packages going overseas?

Mr. KEEFE. They cannot get any more than CARE gets.

Mr. DEVITT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. CARE is on a very low bulk shipment rate that these people are not on, and it seems to me that you have language under which they cannot possibly get a subsidy.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What was done in reference to the funds for feeding children in occupied areas?

Mr. TABER. That was raised from $20,000,000, which was the Senate figure, to $35,000,000, and it appeared from the testimony that was available to us that there was a $12,000,000 balance, which made $47,000,000, which is $7,000,000 more than was available this year.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that we were unable to keep the fund for feeding children in Europe to the figure allowed by the House which was the full amount requested. Your House committee kept in the full amount $60,000,000 and the House voted to keep in the full amount. The Senate cut this amount to $20,000,000 and your House committee was able to restore only $15,000,000. In order to get some increase for feeding of children we had to compromise. I fought to the best of my ability to restore the amount requested by the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. The Senate, among some other reasons, cut the amount because it was believed some of the children of Communist parents may be getting some food from this relief program.

My stand on this matter is no contradiction.

The provision of $60,000,000 for UNICEF is part of the Economic Cooperation Administration appropriations bill, fiscal year 1949. I have opposed—and I will continue to oppose—many of the expenditures called for in this bill. I never have—and I never will oppose—expenditures expressly earmarked to save the lives and guarantee the future of children.

By far the greater majority of the items in the ECA appropriation bill are not there because of any commitment of this Government. UNICEF is the result of an agreement between 21 nations, approved by the Senate, and an integral part of American foreign policy.

My conscience would never permit me to vote for the support of the multimillion-dollar tobacco monopolies of foreign socialist states. My conscience demands that I vote for the full continuance of the most efficient international group concerned with keeping the breath of life in children, regardless of the political affiliations of their parents.

The provisions of ECA which permit strategic war materials to sift through western European countries, united by trade treaties with Moscow, to the Soviet Union by devious and indirect routes—these I abhor and decry. I champion the direct dealings which UNICEF has had with eastern European countries, where their inspectors make sure that food and other necessities go to anti-Communist and Communist alike, where the only criteria of giving aid is that a child is in want.

This Congress has not been given any reason to extend unlimited confidence to ECA personnel. Too many of ECA's keymen can only wear service stripes from defunct WPA and discredited UNRRA. Mr. Pace, Executive Director of UNICEF, is a Nebraskan. His integrity and ability are beyond question, and he is a field general rather than a swivel-chair autocrat. His staff, and the results of the downright hard work of his staff, are a credit to his talents and his efficient management.

It has been a habit of ECA propagandists to shame Members of Congress into voting for their pet projects by screaming that Europeans would feel let down if those projects were defeated. It is my well-defined purpose to work for the defeat of luxury-supplying projects, projects which add nothing to the possibility of eventual reconstruction and flagrantly waste the money of the American taxpayer. It makes no difference to me how much the European luxury-lover screams or how loudly the ECA propagandist howls.

It does make a difference to me that, somewhere in this world, there are children who cannot speak because they are hungry. It does make a difference to me that UNICEF, with necessary appropriation, could see to it that some of those children were fed.

Christ said: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me."

Christ did not say: "Suffer the non-Communist children to come unto Me and suffer the Communist children to stay away."

If one out of a hundred Communist children who might be fed by UNICEF learned that America was playing a big part in keeping them alive, that knowledge would prove an insurmountable barrier to communism. If one out of a hundred Communist children who might be fed UNICEF learned that they would not be fed because of an action of the Senate, this could well create a million future enemies of this Nation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, since title 2 of this bill providing $60,000,000 was my amendment for the children, may I ask whether the fund is to be used for the relief of children wherever they may be?

Mr. STEFAN. Wherever they may be. Yes, sir. And that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. FULTON. That is whether they are behind the "iron curtain" or in occupied areas or in countries that have been overrun.

Mr. STEFAN. It makes no difference. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr TABER. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will bear with me while we discuss for 1 minute the diet of 650,000 people for next year. It is worth 1 minute of our time. I had a minute and a half while this was on the floor before. As chairman of the Displaced Persons and Refugee Special Committee, I would like to hear about this, because I have disagreed with my worthy friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I would like to hear how the displaced persons should be fed—whether they should simply be fed 1,550 calories, which the people that oppress them are fed, which the victors who had put them in concentration camps are fed, or are they going to be fed just a little more than 450 calories, which is below, much below, the average person's normal consumption. What has been done on that?

Mr. TABER. The way this has worked out, 60 percent of what is available of the $70,000,000 is without restriction. The rest of it is only available in case that organization agrees that the caloric rations shall be limited to what is available in the country. Unless that is done, it is absolutely impossible ever to get these people out of the camps.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents a complete victory for the Senate program. It provides ample appropriations for the effective administration of the Marshall plan, now so successfully operated with the preliminary funds already provided. The report is highly satisfactory to the minority. We have all signed it and we urgently recommend its adoption.

But the proceedings attending the settlement of the disagreement between the House and Senate serve to lighten, with a happy spirit of levity, the monotonous grind attending the closing days of the session.

The majority managers on the part of the House, after sabotaging the program for foreign aid, by cutting the appropriation of approximately $2,000,000,000, found themselves in an uncomfortable position as soon as the Senate announced its amendments. From that time down to tonight there has been a wild foot race upon the part of the House conferees, in a scurrying search for a loophole through which to escape from the trap in which they had snared themselves.

There were two primary differences between the two Houses.

One was the amount of the appropriation and the other was the date to which the appropriation would be available—determining whether the appropriation would be spread over a period of 12 months, as originally provided, or over a period of 15 months, as the House managers insisted. In short the question was whether the money would suffice for 12 months or 15 months. Of course, the change in date was merely a subterfuge. It was a device to cut the amount available by 20 percent, instead of cutting the appropriation in so many words. All familiar with the program agree that such a drastic cut would make the bill a bare relief measure and abandon the recovery features upon which the principal success of the program depends.

In their efforts to save face, the majority Members clung to that date throughout the conference like shipwrecked sailors to an empty barrel. And they finally saved the date.

But they sacrificed everything else to retain it and then find it meaningless as the Senate amendment as adopted authorizes the President to ignore it. In other words, this report amounts to a complete recapitulation to the Senate program.

In their desperate efforts to find some device which would conceal the fact that they were making every concession, they agreed that the money should be spent in 12 months, instead of 15 months, "if the President * * * deems such action necessary."

That amounts to a complete surrender as the President has already recommended the use of the entire appropriation in 12 months. So the verbiage of the agreement is simply a smoke screen resorted to to conceal the fact that they were yielding abjectly and completely. The language insures the expenditure of the appropriation as originally planned.

But their endeavor to escape the consequences of their rash attempt to hamstring the Marshall plan involves a matter of even deeper significance—the independence of the legislative branch of the Government.

The proposal to thus delegate to the President of the United States legislative functions of the Congress amounts to an abdication of constitutional authority in favor of the Chief Executive. It is a transfer of power and duties from the legislative branch of the Government to the executive branch of the Government. And to that extent it is in effect an abandonment of the rights and prerogatives so jealously maintained by able and eminent Members of both the House and the Senate ever since the adoption of the Constitution. That is an appalling price to pay to extricate the House conferees from the consequences of their folly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman consider that as a compliment to the President and as an expression of confidence in the President?

Mr. CANNON. They could have paid him no greater compliment. They could have written no more eloquent testimonial of the confidence Congress places in the President than this action by which they propose to delegate to him the discharge of duties vested in the Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISACSON. I wish to ask the gentleman whether, after the amendments changing some of the appropriations, the specific appropriation to Great Britain of $1,200,000,000 with which to arm the hordes of King Abdullah of Trańsjordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt remains intact?

Mr. CANNON. I leave that to the chairman of the committee who is explaining the technicalities of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the situation would be comic if it were not tragic. We have delayed this bill unnecessarily. It should have been enacted long ago. The world has been waiting to learn what America proposes to do. They have been waiting to know if we intend to carry out our commitments as embodied in the authorization bill which passed both Houses of Congress by such overwhelming majorities.

While the world has been waiting—while international relations have been deteriorating—while Russia has been gaining in prestige and military strength—while our friends over there have been losing heart—we have been quibbling. And now we wind up by adopting the bill in practically the form first presented. Why did we not do it before this and help our friends and confound our enemies and merit the respect of the world and future generations?

The future peace of the world, the hope of halting the march of communism around the globe, depend on strengthening our allies in western Europe to a point where they can withstand Russian pressure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. This bill merely shows, with the passage of the draft bill earlier this evening, that the power of America is going to be used determinedly for good and to assist freedom-loving nations throughout the world in resisting tyranny and aggression. This is one of the most important bills that is to pass the Congress, and I think there ought to be a roll-call vote on this bill on passage, and at the proper time I am going to ask for a roll-call vote.

Mr. CANNON. I heartily agree with the gentleman. No more important bill has been considered by the House in recent years. At the suggestion of the gentleman I shall ask for a record vote.

The bill carries funds to fully administer the Marshall plan. It is a part of our rearmament program, a measure for national defense. Every minority member of the committee of conference has signed the conference report. For the sake of its influence on our foreign relations, both friend and foe, I trust the conference report, so ably dictated by the Senate, will have the unanimous approval of every Member of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], with regard to a roll-call vote on this measure. I am sure the proponents of this bill are just as anxious to be recorded as those of us who are in opposition to the bill and in all fairness to everyone I think we should have a roll-call vote on this bill and I hope the committee will insist on it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the Members on final vote upon this conference report. But I think it is unfortunate that we should leave the statement with respect to this conference report with a sour note. The gentleman from Missouri sat all through this very arduous conference. I did not hear him make any suggestions during the conference. We struggled long and hard to come to an agreement and to try to iron out differences that seemed almost insoluble when we started, and that is the duty of the conference committee. When we had concluded that conference, of which the gentleman from Missouri was a party, he signed the conference report, and it was unanimous. Every Member signed the conference report on both sides of the aisle. It would have been much better for anyone who is interested in this program to have devoted some time in explaining some of the provisions in the conference report more minutely, perhaps, than to attempt to cast aspersions upon the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has made a most gallant fight to bring the facts to the attention of the American people. You people will live to see the day when the people of America will pay tribute to the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, for the courageous fight that he has made under the most difficult conditions to get the truth to the American people. How many people in America are there tonight who know that when this Congress passed this bill, this legislative authority, that they wrote into that law, "Nothing in this title is intended, nor shall it be construed, to be an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether for funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries."

And, it was the language written into the bill by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and yet the people of America have been told, as has been stated by the gentleman from Missouri here tonight, that there was a commitment when that bill was passed to not cross a "t" or dot an "i" or examine a single estimate by the Committee on Appropriations. Shame, tommyrot on such an argument.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and who helped write this bill.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to say that when the ERP authorization bill came to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, it was an open-end bill with very few limitations and without the language the gentleman from Wisconsin has just read. The committee carefully prepared the language and wrote it in on my motion, for the express purpose of preventing anyone from taking the authorization as a promise. One of the members of the minority moved to strike out the word "funds" from the amendment and the House committee voted to retain it.

In all the news stories and columns that have appeared chastizing the Committee on Appropriations and this House for allegedly breaking a commitment, I have seen no mention of the plain language of the law itself that "nothing in this title is intended nor shall it be construed to be an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any country or countries." It is not the figures of the gentleman's committee that are irresponsible; it is those who have taken it upon themselves to write or speak about this matter without even reading the law.

As the gentleman knows, I voted against these so-called cuts on every occasion, because I thought the psychological effect would be bad and I preferred to err on the side of too much rather than too little when the stakes are so great. So nobody can accuse me of trying to deny adequate funds for ECA. But I resent intensely the completely irresponsible and misleading propaganda and misrepresentations of the committee's action over the radio and in the press, and the equally inaccurate charges by the President and various candidates for the Presidency. They are either ignorant of or have chosen to ignore the plain language of the law, of the committee report, and numerous statements made in the debate in both Houses setting forth the clear intention of the Congress.

Furthermore such loose talk has been thoroughly mischievous to the interests of the United States. It was to be expected that the Communist press in Paris or Rome would charge that we were letting down our friends. Most Europeans would not believe them. But what are they to think when promiment American newspapers and officials make charges that the United States is breaking faith? If damage has been done it is due more to misrepresentations by people who ought to know better, than to the actions themselves if examined soberly.

I want to pay tribute to your committee and your chairman the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for sticking to the facts despite all the abuse heaped on you. I opposed some of the so-called reductions you made even though the economic facts you had might justify them, because I feared they might jeopardize the success of the program through weakening the confidence of some European countries.

But I knew that your committee had many more facts available to it than we had in the Committee on Foreign Affairs at the time when we were considering

the enabling legislation last winter before anyone could know what kind of a growing season Europe would have this year, and a dozen other important factors.

At that time there was an attempt to cut down the authorization as everyone will recall. Many of us resisted it, urging that a maximum be set high enough to take care of any probable emergency; let it be high enough to provide a cushion. Then if Europe should have good crops and other favorable developments, the gentleman's committee could cut down the next appropriation accordingly. That is exactly what you did on the basis of the evidence you had in June and which we could not have in March.

Your committee would have been derelict in its duty if it had not carefully scrutinized the facts and held the amount down to what you deemed necessary to carry on the program successfully. I am willing to predict that the amount of money you have provided cannot be well used in less than the 15 months, although you have rightly made it available for 12 months if it proves necessary and if they get the program going so that they can use it effectively.

In short, you did not break a commitment, for no commitment had been made. You did not go back on the word of the United States. You did not fail to carry out any agreement or promise made by the Congress. You did not reverse a policy. What you did was to change the figure, which the more recent facts indicated to you was necessary to carry out the policy voted by the Congress. I congratulate the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota for that very lucid and splendid contribution to the thinking on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, we worked hard on this bill. We should not be abused and castigated by anyone who is a member of the conference committee that signed the conference report. That should not be. We came here in full agreement on this conference report. We came here presenting a solid front to say to the world, "We are united on this thing now, and here is the action of the Congress of the United States."

Let me call your attention to this. I think we have taken a great step forward. Everybody who is familiar with the language we have written into this bill to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate knows that we have taken a great step forward, because those who know the facts, instead of those who are just emotionally inspired politically, realize that the ECA will not be able effectively to spend the amount of money we have given it by April 3, 1949. So we have left the door open and we have said to the ECA administration, "Do not throw this money away. You are not forced to get rid of this money by the 3d of April. You can take until the 30th of June. Make a decent, proper screening of the necessities before you spend this money. If you take a little more time, the impact upon the economy of America with its resultant inflation may not be so great as though you were forced under the original action of the other body to spend the entire amount by April 3, 1949."

Everybody agrees that the action that finally resulted as a result of this conference makes available every single dollar, the entire $4,000,000,000, but we say to the Administrator, "Use some judgment in spending this money, and if you have any money that is unexpended by the 3d of April you may continue the availability of those funds until the 30th day of June."

If that is not good, common sense, then I think the gentleman from Missouri is the only man on the floor of this House or in the Senate or among the conferees that has offered even the slightest objection to the action the conference unanimously agreed upon.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. At that point, in connection with the rate of commitment, it might be well to point out that at the present rate of commitment the ECA will probably by the end of this month not have committed as much as $450,000,000, which would be the average rate of the original request on a 12-month basis.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly. They have obligated only $300,000,000. Let me call your attention to this. The gentleman from Missouri said that we have delayed and delayed this thing. He seems to forget that the original law gave to the ECA administration $1,000,000,000, and they have been operating on it. The last word that I have had is that they have only been able to obligate $300,000,000 of the billion dollars. They have plenty of money to lend. They have this money yet without any additional funds. There has been no delay in this program. The Congress saw to it when it passed the basic legislation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, there is a $503,000,000 reduction in this appropriation below the budget estimates, and the report recommending this reduction in such appropriations was signed by all the conferees, including the minority members.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It should be borne in mind that the $503,000,000 applies to all of the various items on foreign aid in the bill and is not limited to ECA.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what I want to say. The total reduction is not specifically limited to the ECA program proper, because this bill contains a large number of other items, as you well know, other than those included in the program.

There is an over-all reduction in the total amount of substantially that amount, and the gentleman from Missouri signed the conference report, and it is a unanimous report. Why should we have any more argument about this situation?

DIFFICULT DECISION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the vote on this conference report presents to me, at this late hour, a most difficult decision.

I am opposed to the granting of any subsidies or loans or credits to Great Britain as long as that country pursues its present anti-American, antidemocratic course, as long as Great Britain continues to encourage Arab aggression against Israel, as long as Great Britain continues to carry on a two-faced policy of world exploitation.

I am equally opposed to cutting funds for the Economic Administration's work in Europe proper.

If I voted for the European recovery program with a certain skepticism, aside from my opposition to continuing to follow in the perfidious footsteps of Great Britain and sharing her world guilt, at least I believe that ECA should have the funds to work with to try to make the plan a success.

This is a characteristic Republican procedure—to grant funds just far enough below the efficiency level to insure failure of any agency to achieve a true level of efficiency. It is part of the ridiculous paradox of Republican claims to economy; it is a wasteful and extravagant fiscal policy.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, to vote against the report is to vote for chaos, and that I cannot do. With reluctance, and impelled only by the exigencies of the international situation and the fact that we cannot hope for anything better, I shall vote to adopt the report.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the pending conference report on foreign aid with greatest of misgivings but it is the only rational course to follow at this point.

I opposed authorization of this program for what I still regard as good reasons, stated to the House at the time. The program was authorized, however, and became at once recognized throughout the world as our foreign policy. I believe in a bipartisan foreign policy although I reserve the right to differ on its details and to oppose any of these phases of its development which I regard as dangerous or unsound. Once agreed upon and authorized by Congress, however, we must close our ranks and present a united front to the world. Much of that world, the free part of it, depends upon us. It has been having a hard time keeping up with the variations in our foreign policy, due to inept administration of it. Congress cannot afford and must not at this hour add to that confusion by rejecting this appropriation to implement a policy it has previously authorized. The course to follow now is to watch to see that the funds we provide are spent with a proper regard for our own welfare as well as of that of those we seek to help abroad. It might well be added that some of the funds in the conference report are to support our occupation of enemy territories until the peace treaties are concluded. There can be no good, patriotic reason for not supporting the job our armed forces are doing in that regard.

I did not speak awhile ago on the selective service bill which will draft young Americans for 21 months of military service in peacetime. I voted against it. How can we in peacetime, in absence of a great military crisis, adopt such a policy conscripting our youth when UMT calls only for 1 year of training and most of the boys in World War II had less training than that?

If I was convinced the national security required it I would support the bill. But we are not undefended. We have the biggest standing Army in our peacetime history, 1,500,000 men. We have authorized a 70-group air force, and I voted for it. We have a Navy bigger than all of the other navies of the world combined. Most of our expenditures are for defense. The armed services, as the debates showed, have deliberately discouraged volunteer enlistments, the National Guard and the Reserves, in order to get a peacetime draft, to militarize America. If we need such legislation to meet an emergency Congress can set it up at any time. I favor a national training program but not one such as this which will discourage education, will not apply equally to all and which makes no effort to take the profits out of war or put the munitions makers under laws which will separate iron, blood, and profits, dealt in by the merchants of death who have propagandized this Congress and country for this legislation in peacetime after we have just gone through a war allegedly to put an end to such things.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 318, nays 62, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—318

Abbitt	Burke	Dawson, Utah
Abernethy	Burleson	Deane
Albert	Butler	Delaney
Allen, Calif.	Byrne, N. Y.	Devitt
Andersen, H. Carl	Brynes, Wis.	D'Ewart
Anderson, Calif.	Camp	Dingell
Andrews, Ala.	Canfield	Dirksen
Angell	Cannon	Dolliver
Arends	Carroll	Domengeaux
Auchincloss	Carson	Dondero
Bakewell	Case, N. J.	Donohue
Barrett	Case, S. Dak.	Dorn
Bates, Ky.	Celler	Douglas
Bates, Mass.	Chadwick	Durham
Battle	Chapman	Eberharter
Beall	Chelf	Elliott
Beckworth	Chenoweth	Ellsworth
Bell	Clason	Elsaesser
Bennett, Mo.	Coffin	Elston
Blackney	Cole, Kans.	Engel, Mich.
Blatnik	Cole, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.
Bloom	Combs	Evins
Boggs, La.	Cooley	Fallon
Bolton	Cooper	Feighan
Bonner	Corbett	Fellows
Boykin	Cotton	Fenton
Bradley	Courtney	Fernandez
Bramblett	Cravens	Fisher
Brehm	Crosser	Flannagan
Brooks	Crow	Fletcher
Brophy	Cunningham	Fogarty
Brown, Ga.	Curtis	Folger
Bryson	Dague	Foote
Buchanan	Davis, Ga.	Forand
Buck	Davis, Tenn.	Fuller
	Davis, Wis.	Fulton
Gamble	Kerr	Potter
Garmatz	Kersten, Wis.	Potts
Gary	Kilburn	Poulson
Gathings	Kilday	Preston
Gavin	King	Price, Fla.
Gearhart	Kirwan	Price, Ill.
Gillette	Klein	Priest
Goff	Kunkel	Rains
Goodwin	Lanham	Ramey
Gordon	Latham	Rayburn
Gore	Lea	Redden
Gorski	LeCompte	Rees
Gossett	LeFevre	Reeves
Graham	Lesinski	Richards
Grant, Ala.	Lichtenwalter	Riehlman
Grant, Ind.	Lodge	Riley
Gregory	Lucas	Rockwell
Gwinn, N. Y.	Lusk	Rogers, Fla.
Gwynne, Iowa	Lynch	Rogers, Mass.
Hagen	McConnell	Rohrbough
Hale	McCormack	Rooney
Hall, Leonard W.	McCulloch	Ross
Halleck	McDonough	Russell
Hand	McDowell	Sadlak
Hardy	McMahon	St. George
Harless, Ariz.	McMillan, S. C.	Sarbacher
Harris	McMillen, Ill.	Sasscer
Harrison	Mack	Scoblick
Hart	MacKinnon	Scott, Hardie
Harvey	Madden	Seely-Brown
Havenner	Mahon	Sheppard
Hébert	Maloney	Sikes
Hedrick	Manasco	Simpson, Ill.
Hendricks	Mansfield	Smathers
Herter	Meade, Ky.	Smith, Va.
Heselton	Meade, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Hess	Merrow	Snyder
Hill	Meyer	Somers
Hinshaw	Michener	Spence
Hobbs	Miller, Calif.	Stanley
Hoeven	Miller, Conn.	Stefan
Holifield	Miller, Md.	Stevenson
Holmes	Mills	Sundstrom
Hope	Mitchell	Taber
Horan	Monroney	Talle
Huber	Morgan	Taylor
Jackson, Calif.	Morrison	Teague
Jackson, Wash.	Morton	Thomas, Tex.
Jarman	Muhlenberg	Thompson
Javits	Multer	Tibbott
Jenkins, Pa.	Mundt	Tollefson
Jennings	Murray, Tenn.	Towe
Jensen	Murray, Wis.	Trimble
Johnson, Calif.	Nicholson	Van Zandt
Jones, Ala.	Nixon	Vinson
Jones, N. C.	Nodar	Vorys
Jones, Wash.	Norblad	Wadsworth
Jonkman	Norrell	Walter
Judd	O'Brien	Weichel
Karsten, Mo.	O'Toole	Wheeler
Kean	Pace	Whitaker
Kearney	Patman	Whitten
Kearns	Patterson	Whittington
Keating	Peterson	Wigglesworth
Kee	Pfeifer	Williams
Keefe	Philbin	Wilson, Tex.
Kefauver	Phillips, Calif.	Winstead
Kelley	Phillips, Tenn.	Wolcott
Kennedy	Pickett	Wolverton
Keogh	Plumley	Worley
	Poage	

NAYS—62

Allen, Ill.	Hoffman	Ploeser
Andresen, August H.	Hull	Rankin
Arnold	Isacson	Reed, Ill.
Banta	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Barden	Jenkins, Ohio	Rich
Bennett, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.	Rizley
Bishop	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Busbey	Landis	Sanborn
Chiperfield	Larcade	Schwabe, Mo.
Church	Lewis, Ohio	Schwabe, Okla.
Clevenger	McCowen	Scrivner
Clippinger	McGregor	Shafer
Cole, Mo.	Marcantonio	Short
Crawford	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Kans.
Doughton	Mason	Smith, Ohio
Ellis	Mathews	Twyman
Gillie	Miller, Nebr.	Vail
Griffiths	Morris	Vursell
Gross	O'Hara	Wilson, Ind.
Harness, Ind.	O'Konski	Wood
	Passman	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—50

Allen, La.	Bulwinkle	Granger
Andrews, N. Y.	Clark	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bender	Colmer	Hartley
Bland	Coudert	Hays
Boggs, Del.	Cox	Heffernan
Brown, Ohio	Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Okla.
Buckley	Eaton	Johnson, Tex.
Buffett	Gallagher	Knutson
	Norton	Smith, Maine
Lane	Peden	Stigler
Lemke	Powell	Stockman
Lewis, Ky.	Regan	Stratton
Love	Rivers	Thomas, N. J.
Ludlow	Robertson	Welch
Lyle	Sabath	West
McGarvey	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Woodruff
Macy	Simpson, Pa.	
Murdock		

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Powell against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Lyle.
Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Lemke with Mr. Regan.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Granger.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Peden.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Dawson, Ill.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Sabath.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report just prior to the motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 17, 29, 40, 50, 51, 58, 74, 75, 85, and 86.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 48, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, and 83, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the citation "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", appearing in the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "deposits in

the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d);" and in lieu of the sum of "$3,500,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"National Institute of Health, operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1949, for 'National Institute of Health, operating expenses', $500,000: *Provided*, That appropriations under said head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for carrying out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; end the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Before the words "passenger motor vehicles" in said amendment, strike out the word "ten" and insert the following: "five" and in lieu of the sum of "$10,000,000" named twice in said amendment insert in each instance the following: "$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$5,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$3,000,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary, fiscal year 1949, to carry out the provisions of H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress, establishing the Selective Service System, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation when specifically authorized by the Director; purchase (not to exceed 94) of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); and purchase of typewriters; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of either H. R. 6401 or S. 2655, Eightieth Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amenment, as follows: After the word "available" where it appears in said amendment, insert the following: "until June 30, 1949,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the words "administrative expenses" where they appear in said amendment, insert "(not to exceed 4 per centum of the total amount of loans made)".

And at the end of the paragraph before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That no such loan shall be made unless no other source of public or private credit is available".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$450,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the citation "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", appearing in said amendment and following the semicolon, strike out the following: "health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150);" and in lieu of the sum of "$2,480,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$150,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$100,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$194,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$192,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "or quantity"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the sum of "$60,000" named in said amendment and the comma, insert the following: "to be reimbursable and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$2,000,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$400,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed, whenever in his judgment the best interests of the United States so require, to direct the insertion of a clause incorporating the Renegotiation Act of 1948 in any contracts for the procurement of ships, aircraft, aircraft parts, and the construction of facilities or installations outside continental United States entered into by or in behalf of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force which obligates any funds made available for obligation in the fiscal year 1949."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1–13: Make appropriations for the United States Senate, as proposed by the Senate, except the payment of a claim is denied.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriate $500,000 for the National Institute of Health instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. The amounts specified in the Senate committee report on such item are also reduced in half.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes out an appropriation of $100,000 for the National Institute of Health, proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $1,000,000 for a working capital fund instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20: Appropriate $275,000 for the Federal Works Agency, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $1,000,000 for improvement of post-office facilities, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Extends availability of an appropriation until June 30, 1949.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $5,000,000 for the national industrial reserve, instead of $10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Inserts a title.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $3,000,000 for maintenance and operation schools, instead of $5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $680,000 for the General Accounting Office, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $450,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $1,000,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Strikes out an appropriation of $2,900 for the National Capital Housing Authority, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $15,000 for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $25,000,000 for the Selective Service System, instead of $31,800,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33: Appropriates $245,000 for soldiers' and sailors' civil relief, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Provides $1,500,000 for purchase of automobiles for disabled veterans, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $150,000 for day care of children, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $12,000 for the Superintendent of Buildings, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $8,400 for settlement of claims, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $1,566.19 for the D. C. Training School, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Corrects a total.

Amendment No. 40: Strikes out an appropriation of $150,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42 appropriate $425,000 for Remount Service instead of $400,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43 appropriates $492,000 for Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45: Appropriates $4,000,000 for Emergency Reconstruction and Repair, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $6,000,000 for loans to farmers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $225,000 for Rural Electrification instead of $450,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 48, 49, 50, and 51: Appropriate $1,800,000 for Bureau of the Census instead of $2,780,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $341,499 for air-navigation facilities, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,600,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 53, 54, 55, and 56: Appropriate $3,500,000 for construction of airports in Alaska instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. In addition provide contract authority for the same purpose of $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates $100,000 for air navigation development, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58: Strikes out an appropriation of $500,000 for the Federal-aid airport program as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Increases the salary of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60 appropriates $100,000 for departmental salaries, Department of Commerce, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates $15,000 for Field office service, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Prohibits the use of funds to enforce any regulation prohibiting the export of flour under certain circumstances.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $2,000,000 for Columbia Basin flood repair, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates $130,000 for Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 65, 66, 67, and 68: Appropriate $1,113,000 for Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate except that one item is required to be reimbursable.

Amendment No. 69: Appropriates $1,000,000 for Flood Control, General instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Corrects general language.

Amendment No. 71: Corrects total.

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates $60,000 for purchase of land as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates $3,294,000 for Naval Radio Station, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 74 and 75: Appropriate $1,250,000 for Foreign Service, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,780,754, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $50,000 for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 77, 78, and 79: Correct formal language.

Amendment No. 80: Provides $12,000 for contingent expenses, public moneys, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 81: Appropriates $300,000 for the Coast Guard, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 82 and 83: Make provision for payment of judgments and claims, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Makes provision for extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1948 to additional types of contracts when determined to be necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86 correct section numbers.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6935 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this have anything to do with CAA?

Mr. TABER. It does.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment number 25: Page 18, line 23, insert the following:

"Disaster relief, public facilities: For expenses necessary to alleviate damage or hardship caused by flood, tornado, fire, or other catastrophe respecting which the President has heretofore made a determination under the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 233), by grants, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Federal Works Administrator, to local public agencies to assist them in defraying the cost of (1) the repair, restoration, replacement, or reconstruction of local public facilities damaged or destroyed by such catastrophe and (2) the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools necessary for children of families from Vanport City, Oreg., including personal services in the District of Columbia, $35,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1950: *Provided*, That no grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that other Federal funds are not available for such facilities and that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 4 percent of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses required in connection with such grants."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 25.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANGELL moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 25.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will give attention to this matter. The Chairman has been very generous in allowing 3 minutes to discuss this amendment to take care of the flood victims, not only in Oregon, but all over the United States. I am particularly interested in it, because Vanport, which is in my district, is mentioned in this particular amendment. There were in Vanport before this flood 18,700 people, 60 percent of them are veterans. Every single stick in the town was owned by the Federal Government—every building and school building and everything else. They were completely wiped out. The whole town was blotted out. There is not a single home left. Eighteen thousand seven hundred people now are without homes and without schools.

The Federal Government owns the schools, and the Federal Government owns the whole town of Vanport. I merely mention Vanport as an example

because I have 3 minutes only to explain this motion, which covers the whole United States. This committee, in its generosity, has said, We cannot give $35,000,000 to the people of America for taking care of those who are in distress, like the people of Vanport, but we have just passed $6,000,000,000 to go overseas for aid of peoples in foreign lands.

My chairman has said there is no precedent for this. I placed in the RECORD recently three or four pages with the citations where we had passed acts covering the moneys that had been appropriated in the past for conditions like this. One of them provided money which went to Russia when they had a poor crop. One of them went to Japan when they had a tornado. Many of them went to various communities in the United States. Here, now, in our own country, not only these 18,000 people but 100,000 people, all up and down the Columbia River valley are in distress by reason of the greatest flood in our history, and, in addition to that, people all over the United States will share in this fund. This merely gives $35,000,000 to be expended under the control of the President and under the Public Works Administration.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that this motion which you are making would also make possible the rehabilitation of the Gulf Coast area which was severely damaged in a hurricane last fall.

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely true.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Would there be sufficient funds to take care of the disaster that has occurred in Oregon, your State, and also on the Gulf coast, if this amendment were adopted?

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely true and it would be available for future disasters.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly it behooves the House to take care of our own people first.

Mr. ANGELL. Yes. We have billions of dollars to send overseas, but if the people of America want a little help, they have to move overseas in order to get it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If we do not take this action, no relief will be had?

Mr. ANGELL. No relief will be had. They do not have a cent for schools in Vanport which were owned by the United States. All of these school children, over 5,000 of them, have no place to go to school. The Federal Government owned the schools and owned the buildings in which they lived.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very much interested in this legislation. Thousands of children have to use school busses to get to school and they do not have any.

Mr. ANGELL. Anyone who votes against this amendment cannot square with their own conscience the vote we have just made for $6,000,000,000 to send overseas.

I hope you will uphold my motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, by a vote of 5 to 1, this Congress appropriated $6,000,000,000 for the damaged communities and suffering people of Europe. We gave money to Ireland, which was not involved in that war. We gave huge sums to Italy, which was our enemy in this last war. Tonight we are asking in this bill for $35,000,000 to restore the facilities in the communities on the Columbia River, where the people suffered $140,000,000 of flood damage.

In the little town of Woodland, in my district, a town of 2,000 people, a typical one of those hit by the floods, the community suffered more than $2,000,000 in damage. These people must rebuild or refurnish their homes; they will have to repaint their homes. In addition to that, they will have to furnish the money to clean out their sewers, clean out their drainage ditches, to rebuild the roads that lead from the farms to the communities, to rebuild their water systems, and rebuild their schools.

It seems to me that the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], should be supported.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to agree with what the gentleman says about the damage in the Northwest.

I hope, too, that we support the motion of the gentleman from Oregon and vote what the Senate allowed, $35,000,000, to help out in these four Western States.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that these funds will be available in any disaster area so that if a disaster occurs down in the Gulf area, funds will be available for relief?

Mr. MACK. Yes, for damage done to publicly owned facilities—done by floods, fires, and tornadoes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. And the money will be available.

Mr. MACK. Yes, for those purposes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. And the entire matter of allocation under the funds here appropriated is under an established Federal agency, the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. MACK. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out two or three facts about this motion and the amendment in the bill to which it refers.

First, let me say that an objection is to be raised that there is no precedent for making this type of appropriation. I submit to the Members of the House that it is high time this type of appropriation should be made in this country in view of the need in so many sections and in view of the fact that these disasters occur from time to time.

Not one cent of this appropriation is to be spent for any individual; not one cent of it is to be spent for any community or public body unless and until the Federal Works Administrator has determined that the community or the local agency is unable to take care of the need because it is virtually bankrupt and cannot raise the necessary funds. It is a justifiable appropriation.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I might say to the gentleman from Oregon that I am in sympathy with his position and shall support the motion of the gentleman from Oregon, for I have had several towns in my own district which have suffered similar disasters.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The funds herein appropriated will be applicable nationally to any disaster area.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LARCADE. Is it not a fact that some years ago we appropriated $100,000,000 for earthquake relief in Japan?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am sure it is.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I hope this motion is adopted, but I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if we had not cut down our flood-control appropriations as we did the other day we would not have these conditions arising, necessitating this appropriation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman has a point there, I believe. We are proceeding with flood control fairly well, but not as speedily as we should.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will vote "aye" on this motion to recede and concur. The money is appropriated for a proper purpose and for a humanitarian need.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that in the floods in the Northwest it is not only the States of Washington and Oregon that have suffered, but also the State of Idaho in the upper reaches of the Columbia River.

I have a telegram from the Governor of Idaho in which he states that in my district alone there has been damage of over $50,000,000. Much as I dislike to oppose anything put forward by the dis-

tinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I hope that the Members of this House will support the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], and give this help to the people in the Pacific Northwest who need it so urgently now.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may have the attention of the Members because we are passing on one of the very important things of this session.

If we concur in the motion of the gentleman from Oregon we are going to open the door to tremendous expenditures in the future which previously we have avoided. Not only that, but we must also go back if we are to be honest with ourselves and make appropriations for every community that has suffered disaster.

I have the greatest sympathy for the people in the flooded areas and for the motives of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] who has offered the motion. I do not see how we can afford to vote for this motion, and I will tell you why and we will have no difficulty in understanding why.

The Texas City disaster was a disaster running into more than $100,000,000. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and other Members from that State, came before the Appropriations Committee and said: "We have suffered an unprecedented disaster involving more than $100,000,000 and we want some relief."

The committee went through the records of the Congress and we found there was no precedent for any such action. What did the Congress do? It said to Texas City, "Not one dime." The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] came before the committee a few months ago and said:

> My city has been swept off the map. Our schools have been destroyed, our public utilities have been put out of order. The situation is desperate.

He asked for funds from the Treasury to rehabilitate his town. Of course, the Federal Government always grants emergency aid, as we did in Oregon and in other areas. The Red Cross, the Army, and the Navy come in and do what they can. In this very bill before us we are providing money for loans to the farmers in stricken areas and we provided all manner of aid that reasonably can be made available. We recently appropriated more than $600,000,000 for river and harbor and flood-control work. All of those things go through the regular procedure.

But if you adopt this amendment, then every Member of Congress who has a disaster, a cyclone, for instance, in his town—and we have them somewhere in the West almost every day—is going to have to be in the House with a bill for relief the next day and he is going to be on the spot to persuade the Congress to make an appropriation to rebuild his town and community as a result of the disaster that has come upon his district. I tell you emphatically that we cannot afford to vote for this amendment. Certainly you cannot afford to vote for it unless you intend to go back and vote $100,000,000 perhaps for Texas City and millions of dollars for Woodward, Okla., and for all sufferers here and there all over the country.

As much as I sympathize with these people, I urge you not to open the door to this sort of legislation which will make every Member of Congress come in and seek an appropriation for every disaster that may sweep away a part of his city.

We should think a long time before we set the dangerous precedent provided for in this motion before us.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas, is it better for the Nation to take care of the entire Nation or else to have those who suffered in the Texas City disaster come over to my city of New Orleans and let us put on a charity bazar to help Texas City?

Mr. MAHON. I think a little giving to the Red Cross is good for America and I hope we do not quit doing that sort of thing.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman feel that when this Nation can afford to give away, like it did tonight, $6,000,000,000 to the other nations of the world, we can take care of our own people?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman asks me if we can afford to spend this money in Europe can we not take care of the flood sufferers? We have given temporary aid to flood sufferers. I have not voted to spend one dime in Europe that I did not think or hope would help the United States of America promote peace and our national defense. I say we cannot afford to enter this field and we will rue the day that we do. I ask that this amendment which provides for an expenditure of $35,000,000 be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon. As I understand his motion, the funds made available would be used for the rehabilitation of public institutions. There was $100,000,000 of damage done in Texas City, but there was not $100,000,000 of damages done to public institutions—to streets, to schools, to the sewer system, to the utility systems.

When communities like these little towns in Oregon, and in other places in this Nation, such as the Mississippi Gulf coast, the Florida Gulf coast, the Louisiana Gulf coast, and the Texas Gulf coast, were stricken by a hurricane last September, these communities did not have the funds to go out and repair the sea walls, the utility plants, the schools, the public installations which have taken years and years to build. I think this is a fair proposition. When disaster strikes today we have no funds to move in and do something about it. Now, I know something about that because we had a hurricane and the only thing that we could get in the way of aid was surplus property and things of that character provided by the Federal Works Agency. But, so far as being of real assistance to many communities which were completely paralyzed, there was nothing provided whatsoever. I think that this is a fair thing. It applies all over the United States. It is a relatively small amount of money, and if a disaster should strike between now and January we would be mighty glad that we had done this.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Lousiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Does not the gentleman think it better practice to start a good precedent now than to have ourselves placed in a situation where we cannot help our own people in the future?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I certainly agree with that.

Mr. HÉBERT. Does not the gentleman agree that we have to start something, and that we have seen the precedent started during the last 10 or 12 years in this country?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the best evidence of that is that if we had something similar to this in existence, that these people in Oregon would not be coming in and asking for relief now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

I suggest to the Committee on Appropriations that you are not establishing any precedent. It is already established. In 1936 there was a flood disaster on the Ohio River, and a similar measure was passed to provide a disaster fund of $25,000,000. Before that measure passed the Senate a cyclone swooped down on my home town, destroyed 600 homes, all the school buildings, killed about 200 people, and wounded 1,000. It swept on across and virtually destroyed Gainesville, Ga. I went before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and explained the situation, and they raised the amount from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 and included cyclone disasters.

That was known as the disaster fund. And I can see no difference here.

As the gentleman has said, that money was used to replace the public buildings and to repair the public highways. This money, if used for that purpose, certainly will not be misspent. You just voted

more than $6,000,000,000 to be given to the people of Europe, Africa, and Asia. Certainly this small amount can be provided to assist our own people, who have suffered unavoidable disasters, along the Columbia River, or along our Gulf Coast.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I wish that there was more time for these last mellow hours of the session when the camaraderie of long and intimate associations is drawing to a close, but even in the press of business I must take time to observe the amenities which ordinarily mark the concluding session of a Congress. I would particularly like to express the appreciation which every Member feels for the able administration by Speaker MARTIN of his high office, of the courtesy and admirable generalship which the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the majority leader, has displayed in a particularly difficult session. But it is late and the House has been patient.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the gavel fall on 46 consecutive sessions of Congress. This is the forty-seventh session of Congress, the close of which I have attended.

In all of these 47 sessions there has never been such confusion and congestion as we have had in the last week of this session. Since the 1st of June half a dozen of the largest and most difficult appropriation bills have been messaged over to the Senate and the Senate has been compelled to hold hearings comprising a few hours on the bills on which the House expended months. Is it to be wondered that hasty and ill-digested conference reports are being rushed through in order to meet the adjournment dead line?

And never has any Congress fallen so far short in the fulfillment of promises and predictions made at its beginning.

For example, at the opening of the Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in a press release said:

> We have now nearly 2,300,000 civilian employees, and we do not need over 500,000 at the most.

He assured the Congress and the country that they would reduce the number of employees. How does fulfillment comport with the promise so emphaticaly made? Notwithstanding the fact that the war peak of Government employment is long past, we had on April 30, 2,048,248 civilian employees and the number is climbing. In brief, we have 118.7 percent more Federal employees on the Government pay roll today than we had in 1940.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOFF. I do not believe the gentleman is speaking on the motion before us. I think he is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CANNON. The chairman of the committee also told us this last January——

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOFF. The gentleman is not in order. He is not speaking on the motion before us.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will kindly address himself to the motion, which relates to the Oregon disaster fund.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman also told us he would reduce appropriations by $6,000,000,000.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will kindly proceed in order. The gentleman should not impose on the House at this hour of the morning. He should proceed in order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am following the precedent which has been followed from time immemorial, of introducing at the close of each session of Congress a summary of the appropriation record for the session.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not hear any request by the gentleman to include that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not made any request yet.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How could he get them in if he has not made that request?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the leave to extend already granted.

Mr. Speaker, free government is founded on the right of the minority to present its side of the case—to have its day in court. We were not granted time on the conference report. We have had no opportunity to present the summary always submitted by the minority at the close of a session of Congress. We have been granted only 5 minutes at this time, and even that is now denied on a technicality.

It is in keeping with the action of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who a little while ago made ridiculous personal charges against me and then refused to yield to me to answer. It is the first time I can recall in the proceedings of the United States Congress when the minority has been denied the right to discuss the appropriation record of the Congress during the debate on the last appropriation bill. The minority have always been accorded an opportunity to make their closing argument. The people and the country are entitled to hear it. And I have never before known it to be denied—the denial of the right to answer.

Likewise, any Member attacked and named personally on the floor has always been afforded opportunity to reply. In both instances it is not only an infringement of our democratic legislative processes but it is, to say the least, lacking in sportsmanship. So far as the gentleman from Wisconsin is concerned, I have since his last personal reference to me on the floor, addressed him in another place and to his face characterized him accurately and appropriately in unmistakable language. So there is no need for further reference to him at this time.

I now take up the record made by the majority in this Congress. The gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, announced that he would cut the number of civilian employees on the Government rolls to 500,000. Today at the end of the session we have more than 2,000,000. He also announced last January that he would cut the President's estimates by $6,000,000,000. He said they could be cut $7,000,000,000 to $7,500,000,000 but that he proposed to cut them $6,000,000,000. The Senate took a more conservative view of the proposed reduction and the legislative budget finally agreed on a programed cut of $2,800,000,000.

As a matter of fact, the actual cut of either $6,000,000,000 or $2,800,000,000 now shows up at an actual cut of less than a billion dollars.

In this fashion the majority in control of this Congress for the past 2 years have kept their solemn pledges of economy and retrenchment to the American people.

Is it to be wondered that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF] does not want me to use even the remainder of 5 minutes to discuss the record and the failure of his party to keep faith with the country?

Before quoting the specific figures let me contrast the record of the Eightieth Congress with the accomplishments of the Seventy-ninth Congress following the cessation of hostilities.

In the fiscal year 1946, the fiscal year in which hostilities ceased, our budget totaled $76,200,000,000. In 1947 we dropped from $76,200,000,000 to $42,500,000,000, a record which has been unequaled in any session of any Congress before or since. We made the greatest reduction in appropriations, the greatest reduction in the budget, the greatest reduction in expenditures. In addition to that, we excised over $64,000,000,000 and were preparing for further rescissions when the stewardship of the Congress changed. At that time there was a potential additional recovery of more than $20,000,000,000, and all the Republicans have done, after 2 years of control, has been to excise about 7 percent of the $20,000,000,000 plus, and the bulk of the 7 percent was money that could not be obligated and would have reverted to the Treasury automatically. Moreover, within 6 months after the close of the fiscal year in which hostilities ceased, the President transmitted to the Congress a balanced budget, the first balanced budget since it went into the red when President Hoover was in the White House, with a majority in both branches of the Congress. When he entered the White House the public debt was $16,604,000,000, resulting from World War I. When he went out of office the debt had soared to $22,539,000,000, and today we are well on the way again to deficit financing, adding to the tremendous existing debt, and at a time when there is no unemployment and

business is at a level never before approached.

Here I append the performance record, in summary fashion, of the second session of the Eightieth Congress on the budget estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year commencing next July 1, and for the current and prior fiscal years:

Comparison of amounts of appropriations carried in appropriation bills, 80th Cong., 2d sess., compared with budget estimates for such bills

Bill	Amount of budget estimate	Amount of appropriation	Increase (+), decrease (−), appropriations compared with estimates
Department of Agriculture	$636,412,090	$577,546,953	−$58,865,137
District of Columbia	101,897,283	99,729,483	−2,167,800
Independent offices:			
Regular bill	1,047,606,864	967,442,551	−80,164,313
Supplemental	6,299,809,600	5,819,659,851	−480,149,749
Interior Department	474,773,835	407,836,974	−66,936,861
Labor-Federal Security:			
Regular bill	931,539,169	890,139,000	−41,400,169
Supplemental	993,708,460	975,914,700	−17,793,760
Legislative branch	61,379,520	56,140,401	−5,329,119
Military	7,216,592,000	6,705,418,163	−511,173,837
Navy	3,936,738,700	3,749,059,250	−187,679,450
State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and judiciary	589,417,230	511,129,662	−78,287,568
Treasury and Post Office Departments:			
Regular bill	2,044,949,200	1,996,313,425	−48,635,775
Supplemental	355,205,375	248,414,255	−106,791,120
Army, civil functions	737,804,200	641,575,666	−96,228,534
Government corporations	49,644,100	38,479,061	−11,165,039
Total, regular annual and bills supplemental thereto	25,477,477,126	23,684,799,395	−1,792,677,731
Urgent deficiency	131,546,901	136,368,385	+4,821,484
First deficiency	1,002,150,316	777,986,045	−224,164,271
Second deficiency	761,135,650	549,774,876	−211,360,774
H. J. Res. 355—foreign aid—tax refunds	555,125,000	555,125,000	
Supplemental national defense	[1] 2,417,100,000	[1] 3,224,000,000	+806,900,000
Foreign aid	6,533,710,228	6,030,710,228	−503,000,000
Total, deficiency and miscellaneous bills	11,400,768,095	11,273,964,534	−126,803,561
Grand total	36,878,245,221	34,958,763,929	−1,919,481,292

[1] Including contractual authority.

NOTE.—The foregoing statement is exclusive of permanent annual appropriations, which occur automatically in consequence of law without further action by Congress.

It shows a net reduction in budget estimates of appropriations of $1,919,481,292, but that excludes funds to finance the pay increases provided at the last minute for Federal employees, including postal employees—creating an added expense of approximately $630,000,000; it excludes deferment until the next Congress of $500,000,000 for the European recovery program; it excludes in line with the misleading procedure resorted to at the last session, numerous other deferments or unjustifiable reductions, including large amounts for national defense, which must be restored at the next session; it excludes contractual authority, other than for the air arm, substituted for immediate appropriations, but which must be provided later; and, it excludes reappropriations which take money from the Treasury equivalent to new appropriations. All in all, the saving to the taxpayers will be well under a billion dollars—possibly no more than $500,000,000, as against the economy goal established by the Republicans in the fore part of the session just closed of $2,800,000,000. As in the first session it presents a sorry and defenseless spending record by a party which faithlessly promised economy and retrenchments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have searched the records, beginning in 1803, for a precedent for anything of this kind. We did it a year ago when the question of the Texas City disaster was up.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. No; not at this point.

Mr. ANGELL. I call the gentleman's attention to one that passed 2 years ago, from my committee, for help to the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. TABER. That was a different proposition. That was temporary relief and not rehabilitation. Those precedents do not apply to this situation. This is a question of repairing damage. The Congress has dealt very generously with the people who have been hurt by this flood. There is in this bill alone $4,000,000 for forest roads, a very large part of $15,000,000 for forest roads and trails, $6,000,000 for dikes, $6,000,000 for loans which may be made, $500,000 for temporary relief, making a total of $16,500,000. In addition, the Committee on Public Works has provided within a few days $10,000,000 for housing in these flooded territories. In addition the power of the Disaster Loan Corporation to lend money was increased from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000 on yesterday. There is such a thing as being reasonable. Here it is proposed that we put up $35,000,000 to be given out as grants at a time when they can go before the Disaster Loan Corporation and get a loan to do all that they need to do. It has never been customary for us to rehabilitate completely these places. We have done a great deal for them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will this be a precedent for us in the Midwest to come to the Congress when a tornado sweeps through one of our villages and ask that the Federal Government take care of that damage?

Mr. TABER. It will be a precedent. There is no question about it. It is a precedent to take care of and repair all damage to all public facilities everywhere whenever there is a disaster. I do not know how far the Congress wants to go. This has never been done before. This has never been asked for. I hope this motion will be rejected, and that the House will follow the practice that we have been following. I do not believe we should establish a precedent by putting up $35,000,000 in a situation of this kind. We have been liberal in connection with taking care of all suffering and to provide the people with loans to help them as this motion seeks to do. I hope the Congress will vote "No" on this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANGELL) there were—ayes 58, noes 143.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twelve Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. (After counting.) Two hundred and ninety-eight Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (H. Rept. 1920) on the Communist Party of the United States as an advocate of overthrow of Government by force and violence; and

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before a special subcommittee of said committee, current Congress, relative to investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating and as to whether there is a necessity for a change in either the procedure or basic law.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 197. Joint resolution to continue the Joint Committee on Housing until June 15, 1948.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2688. An act to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; and

S. 2694. An act to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] be excused as conferee on the bill (H. R. 6841) entitled "An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes," and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be appointed in lieu thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2730. An act to credit, in certain cases, military service and training preparatory thereto performed by employees of the postal service.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6935) entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 25 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) entitled "An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5904. An act to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments; and

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid for the period beginning April 3, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS ON TAXES, SOCIAL SECURITY, TARIFF, AND RECIPROCAL TRADE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress brought the criticism of the public and press that this is a "do-nothing Congress" and the "worst Congress since reconstruction days." The American people wished they had never heard the campaign slogan "Had Enough." The Republican majority pleaded for patience. They asserted that they had worked hard, but that time had been required to organize Congress after their 14 years as the minority party. They assured the people that more action and less talk would be forthcoming during the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

It is only fitting, therefore, as this Congress draws toward adjournment, that the record be reviewed. I have prepared today a summary of the action of the Eightieth Congress in three very important legislative fields—taxes, social security, and reciprocal trade—all of which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means on which I served for a number of years.

Let us examine promise and performance in each of these areas.

TAXES—PROMISE

The Christian Science Monitor of October 21, 1946, reported:

A statement signed by all Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee sets the GOP fiscal goal in the next Congress as a budget trimmed to between $32,000,000,000 and $33,000,000,000, a $5,000,000,000 reduction in the national debt, a reduction in personal income taxes of 20 percent, and downward adjustments in Federal excise taxes. The statement is the work of 27 House Republican Members, including all members of the Ways and Means Committee, and known as the House Republican postwar tax-study committee.

Even after the 1946 election was in the bag, Ways and Means Chairman KNUTSON is reported by the Chicago Tribune of November 7, 1946, as follows:

KNUTSON told the Tribune in a statement telephoned from his home at Wadena, Minn., that the new Republican-controlled Congress will pass the bill immediately and save taxpayers $3,000,000,000 despite President Truman's insistence that taxes can't be lowered.

Moreover, KNUTSON said, his committee will open public hearings in February on another bill to save the taxpayers' money. Its purpose will be to cut back luxury excise taxes to 1942 levels. It will reduce, and in some cases eliminate, excises on a long list of items that includes jewelry, furs, cosmetics, and liquors. The reductions are to be effective next July 1.

"It is our plan to balance the budget and reduce Federal expenditures for the next fiscal year to $32,000,000,000 as against nearly forty billion the Democrats figured would be required," KNUTSON said.

"On that basis I estimated we could make a 20-percent cut in income taxes and begin at once reducing the national debt by paying off four or five billion dollars next year."

Fairly summarized, I think the voters were promised both before and after the 1946 election—

First. A drastically reduced budget.

Second. A $5,000,000,000 annual reduction in the public debt.

Third. A 20 percent across-the-board tax cut.

Fourth. Reduction or repeal of wartime excise taxes. Indeed, on January 18, 1946, the present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had introduced H. R. 5174, a bill to terminate wartime excise tax rates after June 30, 1946.

PERFORMANCE

First. Wartime excise taxes made permanent: In view of such firm assurances that the Republicans would terminate the temporary war excise tax rates, it was indeed a startling prediction of other events to come when the first important tax bill passed by the Eightieth Congress made these war excise taxes permanent.

President Truman asked that the wartime rates be extended for only 1 year, or until July 1, 1948. He asked that this action be taken to enable Congress to review the entire group of excises in connection with excise tax revision.

The Republican response was to fix the excise tax yoke firmly upon the necks even of those people with incomes so low as to be exempt from income taxes. The campaign promise of prompt reduction or repeal of excise taxes changed to clamor for deriving more Federal revenue from excises, or even a general sales tax. In hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means, on May 28, 1947, Chairman KNUTSON announced, in direct contradiction of his expressed desire to reduce excise taxes, that—

It is the hope of the committee to be able to shift much of the burden that is now being carried by the income tax group, which includes almost everyone, over to the excises, at least in part.

And he added:

Obviously, if we are going to extend the excise field we will have to include a great many items that are not now included.

Still another high-ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means introduced a bill for a 10-percent manufacturer's excise tax, and when the committee chairman appointed a special tax-study committee of prominent industrialists, bankers, and tax lawyers, the two major Wall Street financial dailies commented that increasing emphasis upon sales taxes could be expected. The special tax-study group—the so-called Magill committee—fulfilled this prediction far more accurately than did the Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee their commitment to reduce excise taxes. In its report filed on November 4, 1947, the special tax-study group recommended:

A case can certainly be made for strengthening the excise-tax structure.

The record of the Eightieth Congress, therefore, is not merely nonperformance of their campaign pledge to reduce excise taxes but of complete and utter repudiation.

Second. Twenty-percent rich-relief income-tax cut: In reducing surtaxes, Republican purposes and performance can perhaps be most convincingly demonstrated by an item taken from a recent edition of the Republican News, sponsored by the Republican national committee: "Don't throw peanuts to the elephant" is the caption, and here are a few quotations:

Don't delay, contribute today.

Don't count on winning by throwing peanuts to the elephant.

Many of our friends feel that, entirely apart from other important considerations, the least they can do to express their appreciation is to contribute a substantial part of their tax savings for the year to insure the reelection of the Congress which made this possible.

We are going to win only by hard work and by liberal contributions.

To demonstrate that "peanut" pittances of the great masses of the people were not sought, the article included a table clearly suggesting that a $50,000 a year man, whose tax reduction amounted to $7,500, should contribute the entire amount to the Republican cause. The end of the article "gets down to brass tacks" and says: "Make checks payable to Republican National Committee."

Mr. Speaker, never since I came to Congress have I seen such a brazen admission that legislation was enacted as inducement for campaign contributions. Only the well-to-do taxpayers above $5,000, the 2,000,000 people at the top, who received 37 percent of the total income tax reduction, would be able to make substantial contributions out of their tax savings.

The nearly 50,000,000 taxpayers under $5,000, among whom the other 63 percent of the tax-cut melon was divided, obviously received only peanuts. Their share of the tax cut averaged $1.15 a week—which has already been consumed by the Republican NAM inflationary prices. So these millions of low-income taxpayers could not feed peanuts to the elephant, if they wanted to, because the Republican tax reduction will not supply even their families with peanuts.

To illustrate, the average American family of four with a $2,200 net income before personal exemption received a tax cut of 73 cents a week—with a 1.3 percent increase in "take-home" pay. The $2,400 family's taxes were cut $1.46 a week, providing a 3.3 percent increase in "take-home" pay. The "take-home" pay of a $5,000 family was increased by 3.6 percent, as a result of a weekly tax cut of $3. The $10,000 a year man with a wife and two kids has nearly $10 a week more to spend, from a 6.2 percent increase in "take-home" pay.

From here on Mr. Speaker, we have nothing but the sweetest sugar for the elephant. The $25,000 family received a tax cut of $58.50 a week, for a take-home pay increase of 18.5 percent. The $50,000 family now has $145 a week, or 29.1 percent more to spend. The $250,000 family may meet the high cost of living with $668 more per week, and 58.4 percent increase in take-home pay. While the poor millionaire is now able to buy a much-needed extra yacht or country home with his additional $1,337 a week, or 43.1 percent more, and still have substantially more than peanuts for the Republican elephant.

To recapitulate, Mr. Speaker, how does Republican performance compare with the Republican preelection promise of a 20 percent across-the-board income tax cut?

As a result of successive vetoes by the President, the bill that finally became law is admittedly less lopsided in favor of the rich than H. R. 1—the first Knutson tax bill. Even ill-fated H. R. 1, however, abandoned the strict 20 percent across-the-board reduction, because it was found that this Republican campaign slogan actually would have reduced the taxes of the highest-income taxpayers to below the 1939 prewar level. Lower-income taxpayers would still have paid several times their prewar taxes. The result would have been to forgive top-bracket taxpayers entirely from any additional obligation toward retirement of the $260,000,000,000 war debt above their prewar burden, leaving other taxpayers to bear the brunt of the war.

This was somewhat embarrassing to the gentleman from Minnesota, Chairman KNUTSON, so his 20 percent plan became the 10.5—20 percent reduction—the 10.5 percent being the highest cut possible without reducing the upper-bracket taxpayers to the 1939 prewar level. Democratic protests against the heavy concentration of tax relief for the rich brought still another concession to increase to 30 percent the reduction for taxpayers with net income below $1,000. So the 20 percent plan became the 10.5–20–30 plan—which still provided the gross windfalls for the wealthy from which the Republican National Committee expects to extract more than peanuts.

In contrast with this tax-grab bill for the rich was the recommendation of the President of an honest across-the-board individual income-tax cut of the same dollar amount for all taxpayers, regardless of income, to be financed by a modified excess-profits tax on the exorbitant, inflationary profits of corporations. Of course, the Republican apologists for monopoly big business refused to touch the $17,000,000,000 annual corporate profits after taxes, even though they are 67 percent greater than the profits of the peak war-year 1943.

So, we shall have to give Chairman KNUTSON and his Republican colleagues E for effort on their campaign pledge of a 20 percent across-the-board tax-relief bill for the rich. This pledge was amended to provide a small increase in individual income-tax exemptions, and place married couples on the same tax basis, wherever they may reside. But to the extent that the Republican Eightieth Congress was thus impelled toward considerations of equity, and the elimination of discriminations in the tax system, the minority accept full responsibility.

Third. Thirty percent reduction in estate and gift taxes. To compensate the wealthy for the adjustments the Democrats forced in their income-tax cut plan, the majority added a provision to give a $250,000,000 annual reduction in estate and gift taxes to about 12,000 of the Nation's wealthiest families. This amounts to roughly a 30 percent decrease in estate and gift taxes on the average.

Fourth. Effect of the tax cut upon debt reduction and the budget: The Republican promise of a $5,000,000,000 debt retirement and a balanced budget now have vanished like the cotton candy at a circus carnival. Instead of reducing the President's budget of $39,700,000,000, it now appears that the Congress has exceeded this amount.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 18, 1948, just a month ago, contains an estimate by the senior Senator from Ohio—a leading Republican Presidential candidate—that expenditures would approximate $40,600,000,000—or a billion more than the President's budget. The tax cut had left only $42,300,000,000 in revenues for fiscal 1949, according to the report of the Committee on Finance. And to the dismay of the Senator, there would be not $5,000,000,000, but a mere $1,700,000,000 to apply on the public debt.

So, on the performance of the campaign promise of debt retirement of $5,000,000,000, and a budget of $32,000,000,000 or $33,000,000,000, we can chalk up for the Republicans a well-earned zero.

Fifth. Scuttling of tax revision: As late as May 26, 1948, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means acknowledged that "a general tax revision was promised to the American public in the last congressional election." He added that his bill, H. R. 6712, "is the fulfillment of that promise."

Mr. Speaker, the fulfillment of the promise of the Republican majority to revise and eliminate inequities in the internal-revenue laws is on a par with the performance on most of its other pledges. Although this bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on June 2, 1948, at an early hour on June 19, scheduled to be the last day of the session, it was still on the House Calendar.

The bill was finally passed by the House, but not even the most optimistic Member had any hope that it could possibly become law. So the weeks of committee hearings at taxpayers' expense and the report of a Special Tax Study Committee authorized to spend $25,000 have failed of fruition, regardless of whether the result would have been improvement or detriment to the Federal tax laws.

In the field of tax equity, therefore, we can only conclude that the elephant's omnipotent memory has failed him. All that he has been able to remember during the Eightieth Congress is to reduce most the taxes of those best able to pay. And to this favored group he now cries for campaign contributions—"Don't—please don't—feed peanuts to the elephant."

SOCIAL SECURITY—PROMISE

The 1944 Republican platform pledged support of the following:

First. Extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered.

Second. A careful study of Federal-State programs for maternal and child health, dependent children, and assistance to the blind, with a view to strengthening these programs.

PERFORMANCE

The social security planks of the 1944 Republican platform, therefore, promised unqualified support of extending "the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered." This promise sounded to me, Mr. Speaker, pretty much like other Republican campaign pledges intended to be forgotten

after election day, for I could not forget that the entire Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1935, when a Democratic Congress responded to the plea of President Roosevelt to enact social security laws, filed a minority report protesting that the old-age and survivors' insurance titles of the act were unconstitutional, and expressing doubt whether the unemployment insurance provisions would result in a general national benefit at that time. The present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said flatly that the program would not work, but since it was being enacted he recommended that it be made a responsibility and appendix of the Veterans' Administration.

Still it seemed barely possible that the Republican Party by 1944 had gotten to the point of accepting the most fundamental social legislation enacted in the history of this great Nation. So I reserve judgment.

But what has been the record of the Eightieth Congress on social security? During the first session two bills were passed—one to freeze the rate of social security taxes in order to stifle the clamor of people pressed by inflation for more adequate benefits; the second, the Gearhart bill to overrule a court decision which held that certain news vendors employed by Hearst Publications, Inc., on the west coast were entitled to social security protection. The President, however, refused to sign this bill, so it did not become law.

And what is the record of the Republican majority on social security during the second session of the Eightieth Congress?

First, news vendors were deprived of coverage by enactment of a bill over the veto of the President.

Second, House Joint Resolution 296 was passed, to reverse a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court and to take away social-security coverage granted by Congress in 1935 to 750,000 workers and their families. This bill, too, was vetoed by the President. In addition to the 750,000 employees directly affected, the veto message emphasized that the bill would enable employers desiring to avoid the payment of employment taxes to do so by "the establishment of artificial legal arrangements governing their relationship with their employees. I cannot approve legislation which would permit such employers at their own discretion to avoid the payment of social-security taxes and to deny social-security protection to employees and their families." But the Congress overrode the veto.

Finally, in a desperate effort to expunge their consistent record of contracting coverage and curtailing benefits, the Republican leadership called up for consideration H. R. 6777, a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. Although this bill would extend old-age and survivors' insurance coverage to employees of State and local governments and nonprofit institutions on a voluntary basis, it admittedly did nothing or almost nothing about the following major recommendations repeatedly urged by the President:

First. More adequate benefits under old-age and survivors' insurance, to compensate for the 65-percent cost-of-living increase since 1939, when the present benefits were fixed.

Second. Extended coverage for old-age and survivors' insurance.

Third. Extended coverage for unemployment insurance.

Fourth. Insurance against loss of earnings due to illness and disability.

Fifth. Improved public assistance for the needy.

When Democratic Members of the House sought to provide an opportunity to the membership to pass an adequate and comprehensive social security bill, the Republican majority foreclosed them by suspending the rules and precluding any and all amendments. This bill has now been tabled by the Senate Committee on Finance. The only contribution toward a more adequate social security structure by the Eightieth Congress has been two inadequate amendments of the provisions for old-age pensions and pensions for the blind and dependent children.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican record on social security must be engraved in bitter hemlock upon the hearts of all the recipients of old-age and survivors' insurance, all the old people receiving public assistance, all the needy children, and all those unfortunates who cannot see. These people know, as you and I can never know, unless we become similarly afflicted, how complete and utter has been the failure of the Eightieth Congress to live up to the solemn pledges on social security adopted by the Republican National Convention in 1944.

TARIFF AND RECIPROCAL TRADE—PROMISE

In its 1944 platform the Republican Party "pledges that it will join with others in leadership in every cooperative effort to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade. We will always bear in mind that the domestic market is America's greatest market and that tariffs which protect it against foreign competition should be modified only by reciprocal bilateral trade agreements approved by Congress."

Although this plank of the Republican platform was obviously designed as a compromise between Republicans who favored a return to the logrolling, tariff-writing days of the Smoot-Hawley Act, and others who did not desire to return quite so far into the nineteenth century, the promise to cooperate "to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade" afforded some hope that the Republican Party might come out of the isolationist shell incrusting its views on foreign economic policy.

PERFORMANCE

These hopes were short-lived. During the first session of the Eightieth Congress both the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means conducted extensive hearings on the operation of the Reciprocal Trade Program and the proposed negotiation of a Charter for an International Trade Organization. These hearings were generally recognized by the public and the press as a deliberate effort to sabotage the Geneva Trade Conference in which the United States was assuming leadership in the elimination of restrictive barriers to international trade and commerce.

When this failed, high-tariff protectionists then induced the Republican leadership of the House to kill the reciprocal trade program altogether. Although the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was scheduled to expire on June 12, 1948, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tariff and Reciprocal Trade did not begin hearings until May 3. And, Mr. Speaker, it has never been explained why these important hearings had to be behind closed doors with the press and the public barred. The bill reported by the subcommittee and the entire Committee on Ways and Means, in each instance by a strict party vote, would have ended the reciprocal trade agreements program as a major instrument of foreign policy by prescribing preliminary procedures involving interminable delays before the President could negotiate a reciprocal trade agreement. H. R. 6556, as passed by the House, would have made possible the imposition of tariff rates 50 percent higher than the rates of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, which resulted in the stagnation of our trade and commerce. The bill, in fact, was so bad that Secretary of State Marshall advised that it would be better to enact no legislation at all.

Important amendments were made in the other body, but severe limitations have been imposed by the Republican Congress upon the effectiveness of the reciprocal trade program. The unmistakable threat to American leadership in international economic affairs has been recognized both at home and abroad.

In the field of tariff and reciprocal trade, Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress has very convincingly lived up to the ancient and traditional Republican support of tariffs so high as to keep out all competitive imports. In this respect I think we can agree that the Republican Party has kept faith with its implied hostility to the reciprocal trade program contained in its 1944 platform, even though congressional review of each reciprocal trade agreement is not required by the bill now at the White House.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in these closing moments of the Congress, I desire briefly to express my keen disappointment with the failure of several measures in behalf of our beloved veterans. Together with other Members, I have worked earnestly to secure favorable action on these pending measures. I appreciate that the leadership was and is faced with the necessity of balancing the relative merits of consideration of various vital measures and that is not an easy responsibility. There are serious omissions in the program nevertheless;

the high cost of living, housing, and particularly certain veterans' legislation.

Of special and touching omission is that of the bill giving cars to a group of amputees which would cost, it is estimated, about $15,000,000. At a time when we are spending billions for foreign relief and recovery, it is regrettable, if not tragic, that we cannot spend a mere $15,000,000 or $19,000,000 for those who are so seriously afflicted because of their unselfish service to their country.

The failure to pass the secondary loan bill for veterans is also unfortunate, as is the loss of the so-called veterans' homestead bill. Both these measures would facilitate housing for veterans and would improve the housing situation nationally. As a vigorous advocate and worker for these measures, I deplore the fact that they could not have been submitted and passed before we recess or adjourn. But there will be future opportunities to pass these measures. Let us continue our efforts.

I understand now that a secondary loan bill will be reported under the housing bill and the GI bill of rights which is in substance similar to the bill presented by the veterans' committee. This will compensate in part, if it is finally enacted in worth-while form, for other omissions, but I am frank to state that it is very difficult to understand why the bill providing for cars for certain classes of the blind and amputees has been sidetracked. This is perhaps the greatest omission in the veterans program because it affects a group which should receive the most solicitous consideration of this House.

Let me congratulate and commend my friend and beloved colleague, the distinguished gentlelady from Massachusetts for her untiring and effective work for the veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the provision of H. R. 6712 which discriminates against our young Regular officers of the armed services who are retired by reason of physical disability and who, under the provisions of this bill, must pay income tax on their retired pay. It is only proper that they should receive the same benefits available to other Government employees and disabled veterans who receive disability compensation which is tax free.

Of course, we know just who the committee had in mind when they place this provision in the tax bill. However, just because a few high ranking officers of our service are now drawing tax-free disability retirement pay is not reason enough to place an additional burden on the young Regular officers who are also retired because of physical disabilities. The solution to this problem is to have the various services review the retirement proceedings of their general officers and determine whether or not they are still entitled to disability retirement. In the event they are not, then they should be restored to duty or placed on retirement by reasons of their length of service.

I do not favor this provision which will hurt our young Regular officers who are deserving of the tax-free retirement benefits the same as our other veterans drawing disability retirement or compensation from the Veterans' Administration.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

Mr. LANDIS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 6527, an act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national defense-incurred, enrollments, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the House bill and agree to the bill as originally passed by the House.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
WALTER E. BREHM,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
WINGATE H. LUCAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
WAYNE MORSE,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
LISTER HILL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6527) to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate, on the basis of information contained in the House report, receded from its amendment, and accepted the bill as originally passed by the House.

GERALD W. LANDIS,
WALTER E. BREHM,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
WINGATE H. LUCAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 6527.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1322), to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act'.

"SEC. 2. Creation and purposes: For the purpose of stabilizing, supporting, and protecting farm income and prices, of assisting in the maintenance of balanced and adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, products thereof, foods, feeds, and fibers (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'agricultural commodities'), and of facilitating the orderly distribution of agricultural commodities, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as Commodity Credit Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation'), which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States, within the Department of Agriculture, subject to the general direction and control of its Board of Directors.

"SEC. 3. Offices: The Corporation may establish offices in such place or places as it may deem necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business.

"SEC. 4. General powers: The Corporation—

"(a) Shall have succession in its corporate name.

"(b) May adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"(c) May sue and be sued, but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Corporation or its property. The district courts of the United States, including the district courts of the District of Columbia and of any Territory or possession, shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all suits brought by or against the Corporation: *Provided*, That the Corporation may intervene in any court in any suit, action, or proceeding in which it has an interest. Any suit against the Corporation shall be brought in the District of Columbia, or in the district wherein the plaintiff resides or is engaged in business. No suit by or against the Corporation shall be allowed unless it shall have been brought within four years after the right accrued on which suit is brought. All suits against the Corporation shall be tried by the court without a jury. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress) shall be applicable to the Corporation. Any suit by or against the United States as the real party in interest based upon any claim by or against the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this subsection (c) to the same extent as though such suit were by or against the Corporation.

"(d) May adopt, amend, and repeal by-laws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised.

"(e) Shall have all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the United States with respect to the right to priority of payment with respect to debts due from insolvent, deceased, or bankrupt debtors. The Corporation may assert such rights, privileges, and immunities in any suit, action, or proceeding.

"(f) Shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

"(g) May enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary in

the conduct of its business. State and local regulatory laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Corporation or the parties thereto to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable, or to the extent that such laws or rules are inconsistent with such contracts or agreements.

"(h) May contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases or entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(i) May borrow money subject to any provision of law applicable to the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total of all money borrowed by the Corporation, other than trust deposits and advances received on sales, shall not at any time exceed in the aggregate $4,750,000,000. The Corporation shall at all times reserve a sufficient amount of its authorized borrowing power which, together with other funds available to the Corporation, will enable it to purchase, in accordance with its contracts with lending agencies, notes, or other obligations evidencing loans made by such agencies under the Corporation's programs.

"(j) Shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid.

"(k) Shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

"(l) May make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

"(m) Shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers specifically vested in the Corporation, and all such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally; but any research financed by the Corporation shall relate to the conservation or disposal of commodities owned or controlled by the Corporation and shall be conducted in collaboration with research agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

"SEC. 5. Specific powers: In the fulfillment of its purposes and in carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, 841), the Corporation is authorized to use its general powers only to—

"(a) Support the prices of agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

"(b) Make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

"(c) Procure agricultural commodities for sale to other Government agencies, foreign governments, and domestic, foreign, or international relief or rehabilitation agencies, and to meet domestic requirements.

"(d) Remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities.

"(e) Increase the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by expanding or aiding in the expansion of domestic markets or by developing or aiding in the development of new and additional markets, marketing facilities, and uses for such commodities.

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities.

"(g) Carry out such other operations as the Congress may specifically authorize or provide for.

"In the Corporation's purchasing and selling operations with respect to agricultural commodities (except sales to other Government agencies), and in the warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, the Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

"SEC. 6. Existing statutes applicable to the Corporation: The Federal statutes applicable to Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall be applicable to the Corporation. Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall cease to be an agency of the United States as provided in section 7 (a) of the Act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, 713 (a)).

"SEC. 7. Capital Stock: The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $100,000,000 which shall be subscribed by the United States. Such subscription shall be deemed to be fully paid by the transfer of assets to the Corporation pursuant to section 16 of this Act. The Corporation shall pay interest to the United States Treasury on the amount of its capital stock, and on the amount of the obligations of the Corporation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Act of March 8, 1938 (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 713a–4), as amended, at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate in view of the terms for which such amounts are made available to the Corporation.

"SEC. 8. Funds: The Corporation is authorized to use in the conduct of its business all its funds and other assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all funds and other assets which have been or may hereafter be transferred or allocated to, borrowed by, or otherwise acquired by it.

"SEC. 9. Directors: The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture, or his nominee, shall be a member of the Board and the remaining members shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. A majority of the directors shall constitute a quorum of the Board and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present. The appointed directors shall serve for a period of five years, except that the terms of the first Board shall be shortened to provide for replacement or reappointment of its members in number as nearly equal as practicable in each year. The power of removal shall be vested in the President of the United States. The Corporation may provide, by its bylaws, for the compensation to be paid the directors: *Provided*, That the compensation paid any director shall not exceed in the aggregate $10,000 per annum: *And provided further*, That employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not receive additional compensation for their services on the Board. Employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government, if also directors, shall not comprise, in the aggregate, more than three of the members of the Board.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint an interim Board consisting of five members, including the Secretary, who shall serve until October 1, 1948.

"SEC. 10. The Executive Staff: Responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the business of the Corporation shall be vested in a staff of executive officers, headed by a chief executive appointed by the Board and responsible to the Board. Members of the executive staff shall devote their full time to the affairs of the Corporation. The Board shall define the authority and duties of the members of the executive staff, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as it may determine, require that such of them as it may designate be bonded and fix the penalties therefor. The Corporation may pay the premium of any bond or bonds of any officer or employee. With the exception of experts, appointments shall be made pursuant to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (5 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 661).

"SEC. 11. Cooperation With Other Governmental Agencies: The Corporation may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, and of any State, the District of Columbia, any Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof. The Corporation may allot to any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture or transfer to such other agencies as it may request to assist it in the conduct of its business any of the funds available to it for administrative expenses. The personnel and facilities of the Corporation may, with the consent of the Corporation, be utilized on a reimbursable basis by any agency of the Federal Government, including any bureau, office, administration, or other agency of the Department of Agriculture, in the performance of any part or all of the functions of such agency.

"SEC. 12. Utilization of Associations and Trade Facilities: The Corporation may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis, committees or associations of producers, producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations, and trade facilities.

"SEC. 13. Records; Annual Report: The Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall file annually with the Secretary of Agriculture a complete report as to the business of the Corporation, a copy of which shall be forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the President for transmission to the Congress.

"SEC. 14. Interest of Members of the Congress: The provisions of section 1 of the Act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 22), shall apply to all contracts or agreements of the Corporation, except contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

"SEC. 15. Crimes and Offenses:

"FALSE STATEMENTS; OVERVALUATION OF SECURITIES

"(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining for himself or another, money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, or under any other Act applicable to the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment by not more than five years, or both

"EMBEZZLEMENT, AND SO FORTH; FALSE ENTRIES; FRAUDULENT ISSUE OF OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation or any of its programs, (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any money, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to the Corporation or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, or any other body, politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of, or to, the Corporation, or draws any order, or issues, puts forth or assigns any note or other obligation or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (iii) with intent to defraud the Corporation, participates or shares in or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefits through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"LARCENY; CONVERSION OF PROPERTY

"(c) Whoever shall willfully steal, conceal, remove, dispose of, or convert to his own use or to that of another any property owned or held by, or mortgaged or pledged to, the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE

"(d) Whoever conspires with another to accomplish any of the acts made unlawful by the preceding provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to the same fine or imprisonment, or both, as is applicable in the case of conviction for doing such unlawful acts.

"GENERAL STATUTES APPLICABLE

"(e) All the general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States shall apply with respect to the Corporation, its property, money, contracts and agreements, employees, and operations: *Provided*, That such general penal statutes shall not apply to the extent that they relate to crimes and offenses punishable under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided further*, That sections 114 and 115 of the Act of March 4, 1909, as amended (18 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 204, 205) shall not apply to contracts or agreements of a kind which the Corporation may enter into with farmers participating in a program of the Corporation.

"SEC. 16. Transfer of assets of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation: The assets, funds, property, and records of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, are hereby transferred to the Corporation. The rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, in respect to any contract, agreement, loan, account, or other obligation shall become the rights, privileges, and powers, and the duties and liabilities, respectively, of the Corporation. The enforceable claims of or against Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, shall become the claims of or against, and may be enforced by or against, the Corporation: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall limit or extend any period of limitation otherwise applicable to such claims against the Corporation.

"SEC. 17. Dissolution of Delaware corporation: The Secretary of Agriculture, representing the United States as the sole owner of the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, a Delaware corporation, is hereby authorized and directed to institute or cause to be instituted such proceedings as are required for the dissolution of said Corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware. The costs of such dissolution of said Corporation shall be borne by the Corporation.

"SEC. 18. Effective date: This Act shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1948."

And the House agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1322) to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the bill struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment and that the House agree to the same.

In general, the conference substitute follows the language of the House amendment. The major differences between the conference substitute and the House amendment are indicated below.

The Senate bill provided that Commodity Credit Corporation shall have the immunities of the United States from State statutes of limitations. The House amendment did not contain such a provision. Under the conference substitute a four year statute of limitations will apply to suits brought by or against the Corporation.

Under the House amendment not more than two employees of the Corporation or any department or agency of the Federal Government could serve as directors of the Corporation. The conference substitute increases this number to three.

The conference substitute contains a provision not in the House amendment authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an interim Board consisting of five members, including the Secretary, who shall serve until October 1, 1948.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill, S. 1322, to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the adjournment of Congress I may have permission to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Wilson analyzing certain prices. I think this will run slightly beyond the limit, but notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD after the session shall have adjourned.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TRYING TO GET A CUT OUT OF ERP FUNDS

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I want to warn the House and the Economic Cooperation Administration against a scheme to divert funds appropriated for economic recovery abroad into improper channels for personal profit. As a portion of these remarks I include a copy of a letter and so-called service contract originating with a firm known as Federal Trading Co., having its offices at 1406 G Street, suite 306, Washington, D. C. C. G. Caffrey, who signs the contract as a general partner, is registered as a lobbyist for the American Cotton Manufacturers Association. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 5, 1948, page 5354.

Now, Mr. Caffrey wants to convince the ECA to export 100,000 draft animals and livestock as a part of the recovery program, although the participating nations have not asked for them and presumably do not need them. But for $1 per head, or a neat $100,000, Mr. Caffrey and his associates are prepared to bring pressure to bear on the ECA to buy 100,000 livestock for export.

This appears to be one of the bolder attempts to pervert the European recovery program for personal profit. It has been carried on on a very hush-hush basis because the name of the Federal Trading Co. does not even appear on the outside door of Mr. Caffrey's office.

The situation demands that the utmost care be exercised by the ECA and the Appropriations Committee of this

Congress to see that the billions of dollars for foreign aid are not expended unnecessarily just because someone is able to do a good job of convincing for a commission. Specifically, all dealings with regard to the purchase and sale of horses and mules and livestock should be scrutinized with particular care. I intend to keep in touch with the matter for the purpose of determining whether any draft animals and livestock are purchased for ECA export as a result of this kind of convincing.

Copies of this extension and of the letter and contract in question are being furnished to the Director of the Economic Administration, Mr. Hoffman, and to the chairman of each of the Committees on Appropriations, with the urgent recommendation that a full investigation be conducted.

The letter and contract of the Federal Trading Co. are as follows:

FEDERAL TRADING CO.,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1948.

We know that the recent passage of the Marshall plan, now titled Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) has increased your interest in possible livestock and, specifically, draft animal sales to European countries.

There was no provision for the purchase of livestock in the bill, nor was it mentioned in the plan for allocating and spending ECA appropriations. They might be included if a convincing program, with congressional and Departments of Commerce and Agriculture backing, could be presented to the ECA Director, Mr. Hoffman, and his staff. Quite a lot of ECA money is planned for farm machinery. Machinery is in short supply here in the United States and it is questionable if European farmers, especially those in southern Europe, could use mechanical equipment as advantageously as they could use mules and horses.

Here is our proposition. We want to push the livestock program for you. We will endeavor to convince the ECA people that livestock should be included. After this is accomplished we will maintain close contact with the agencies doing the buying to insure that you have an opportunity to bid on each and every purchase made under ECA. This will include representation with the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture, the purchasing missions of foreign countries, the foreign embassies and the consulates both in Washington and New York. Our goal will be 100,000 animals during the first 15 months of the program. To make our proposal doubly fair, we put our service to you on an "if you make money—we make money" basis. One dollar a head for each animal you sell under the ECA program.

We have enclosed a contract which sets forth those items. We will confine our representation only to those dealers who sign contracts. If this proposal meets with your approval, sign the attached contract and mail it to our Washington office. Retain the contract in the blue jacket for your file. We will keep you periodically informed of our progress.

SERVICE CONTRACT

1405 G Street NW.

Washington, D. C., Date _____

I. The undersigned, a resident of _____ does hereby agree to pay to the Federal Trading Co., a limited partnership doing business in the District of Columbia, for good and valuable services rendered, a fee or service charge in the amount of $1 per head on all horses, mules, or cattle which the undersigned is able to purchase and sell to, or through the Economic Cooperation Administration as established pursuant to the act, Foreign Assistance Act of 1948. It is further agreed that the same charge or service fee will also be paid on all business and in the same amount which stems from or has its inception in the European recovery program.

II. The fee, service charge, or consideration as stipulated in paragraph I above is to be made to the Federal Trading Co., for services rendered or to be rendered in connection with the securing of, or having earmarked funds, which have been appropriated, but not allocated for specific projects or programs.

III. It is further agreed and stipulated between the parties to this contract that said contract will continue in full force and effect on the same basis as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 during the continuation of the European recovery program, unless it is mutually agreed between the parties to modify the terms as herein above set forth.

Witnessed and signed:

HELEN SCHLATTER,
Witness.

April 16, 1948.

FEDERAL TRADING CO.,
By C. G. CAFFREY,
General Partner.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WATCH INDUSTRY THREATENED

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to review, for the information and consideration of my colleagues, the serious situation which confronts the jeweled-watch industry of the United States.

The facts will reveal that this industry is handicapped to the advantage of its foreign competitors.

Here is an American industry, employing American labor, paying American wages, and trying to sell American products to the American people. It wishes no special favors. It asks no stifling of competition; it seeks no monopoly in business; it desires to be accorded only the fair treatment it deserves.

At the outset, I want to make clear to you that the American watch-manufacturing industry has never been accused of being inefficient in its manufacturing operations and techniques. It has repeatedly proved that everything possible has been done to meet the difference in cost of manufacturing watch movements here and abroad, and is not trying to hide behind a tariff wall.

The 1930 Tariff Act provided this industry with a schedule of specific dollar-and-cents duties which fairly well reflected, at that time, the difference in the cost of production of watch movements here and abroad. Even if those rates were still in effect, they would not be adequate today because the cost of production has sharply risen in this country. However, the trade agreement of 1936 with Switzerland reduced the rates of the 1930 Tariff Act by about 34 percent on the average. In many classifications, it even carried them below the rates of the 1922 tariff.

The result was that the American industry's share in the American jeweled-watch market dropped from considerably more than half, where it stood during 1930–36, to considerably less than half during the years 1936–41. This loss in position is a very significant thing and reflected itself during the war years in the fact that the American industry was not then large enough to meet, as quickly as was desired, the demands of our armed services. What had happened was that, during 1936–41, as we began to come out of the depression, the reduced rates of the trade agreement with Switzerland prevented the American industry from expanding, by decreasing the percentage of the market it could obtain.

During the war years, of course, their facilities were devoted to the war effort. After the fall of France, Switzerland was entirely surrounded by the Axis Powers, and we became the sole remaining source of precision timing instruments for the Allies. But the Swiss exports of watches of a nonmilitary character were not cut off, and imports of jeweled watches into the commercial channels of this country soared from slightly over 4,000,000 units in 1941 to a high of over 9,000,000 units in 1946, at a time when we were out of the market.

The industry had already been hurt in the prewar year by the Swiss trade agreement, not only to its own detriment, but also to that of the national defense. A flood of importations poured into this country for American customers and so thoroughly saturated the demand for watches that no backlog of demand, after the war, to rebuild the industry, could be anticipated.

For these reasons the watch industry has, for several years, without success, been trying to obtain relief from the reduced rates of the trade agreement.

Finally, in 1946, the State Department called the representatives of the industry to Washington and suggested a course of action. The State Department proposed that the Swiss be asked to impose an export quota on the direct shipment of watches to this country from January 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947. This export quota for the year 1946 was to be based on the direct exports to the United States by Switzerland during 1945, the biggest year, up to that time, in the history of Swiss watch exports to the United States. The Swiss were also to do what they could to curtail indirect shipments so as to prevent the quota being exceeded by importers obtaining watches by way of third countries. They were also to expedite the delivery of watchmaking machinery which the American industry, principally Waltham, then had on order with Swiss machine builders to replace that which could not be made during the war. Although the obvious ineffectualness of this proposal was protested, the State Department went ahead with it in an exchange of notes under date of April 22, 1946.

The figure agreed to with the Swiss provided no protection for the American companies. The significant thing about all of this maneuvering, however, is that

there was a recognition by the trade-agreements organization that the American industry had a good case. The State Department, after 2 years of delay, felt that something had to be done to dispose of the matter, but were unwilling to take direct, effectual action.

As for Swiss compliance with the agreement of the exchange of notes, suffice it to say that 1946 imports exceeded 1945 by over 300,000 jeweled units, although the Tariff Commission, has, by making certain deductions and the use of Swiss classifications, decided that there was compliance with the spirit, if not the letter of the agreement. No one has been able to even technically justify the refusal by the Swiss to deliver the machinery, which has not been done to this day. Instead of expediting delivery, as agreed, the ink was no sooner dry on the notes which were exchanged than the Swiss created a machinery trust known as Machor, to lease the machinery, on terms wholly unacceptable to the American industry.

In December of 1946, by which time it had become apparent that the export quota established by the Swiss, pursuant to the exchange of notes, had afforded no protection to the American industry, the State Department was asked to consider extending the agreement from March 31, 1947, to the end of the year, but on a more realistic basis as to quota. This they flatly refused to do. The State Department was then asked to consider canceling the trade agreement so as to restore the 1930 tariff rates; this they also refused to do. The State Department, under the reciprocal trade-agreements program, is treating this American industry as a static force in a dynamic economy, and, unless we accomplish a reversal of this kind of treatment, we are going to see this important American industry sustain irreparable damage.

What the American watch-manufacturing industry needs is an equality of opportunity in their own market. They are not seeking an unfair advantage, only a balancing of factors over which they have no control, so that a natural growth can be promoted, which is absolutely essential if this industry is to be adequate to the defense of the Nation in times of war, and a preventive to monopoly control during times of peace.

In considering measures to protect and preserve the American jeweled-watch industry, we are not hurting commodities and industrial products that war-torn countries are using to rebuild their export markets. We are not discriminating against the Marshall plan countries. We are dealing with one nation only—Switzerland.

Our State Department has continually ignored the legitimate complaints of the industry that reduction in tariff duties on watch movements and parts, under the Swiss trade agreements, has resulted in almost complete usurpation of the American market by Swiss competition. The State Department has also proved itself unable or unwilling to get this industry desperately needed machinery replacements from Switzerland and has turned a deaf ear to all pleas for establishment of a quota upon the importation of watch movements from Switzerland.

Congress scientifically established in 1930 Tariff Act rates of duty upon imported watches which enable the American watch industry to expand with the growth in consumer demand for watches. But the State Department has misconstrued congressional purpose until today highly skilled American watch makers are in danger of finding their craftsmanship an unsalable item, and America may well lose a vital factor in national defense.

The American watch industry wants no Government subsidy to compete with Swiss watches in the domestic market. It asks, and rightfully should have, the benefit of adequate tariff protection if it is to continue to maintain its highly skilled ranks of workers.

I submit that the jeweled-watch industry of the United States is of primary national concern because, in this atomic age, its precision-instrument production is a key point in our national security system. I urge you, my colleagues, to exert every individual and collective effort to afford this vital industry the fair treatment it deserves by granting reasonable tariff protection and by calling upon the State Department to cease and desist its discriminatory tactics.

I am again urging the State Department to review and adjust these oppressive discriminatory rates which are threatening to extinguish not only the great watchmaking industry of our Nation—an industry which has loaned invaluable service to our country in wartime. It is of the utmost importance that the faithful workers and the enterprising management of this great industry should receive the consideration of this Government it is entitled to, if it is to survive.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION SERVICE TO AND WITHIN ALASKA

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 219, continuing until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution of March 7, 1947, entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes," is amended to read as follows: "That it is the intention of the Congress to assist in providing essential water transportation service for the Territory of Alaska pending the determination of a long-range policy with respect to such transportation.

"SEC. 2. (a) The United States Maritime Commission is authorized to enter into contracts, charters, and other arrangements deemed by it to be appropriate, with American citizens, deemed by the Commission to be qualified, to supply ocean transportation service with American-flag vessels to, from, and within Alaska. Such contracts, charters, or arrangements may include provisions for making available to such operators Government-owned vessels made available to the Commission for such purposes and vessels under the control or jurisdiction of the Commission for operation on voyages commencing not later than March 1, 1949. Such provisions may include (1) charter hire at a nominal rate; (2) such marine insurance to be provided by the Commission, as the Commission may determine to be necessary or appropriate as to vessels made available by the Commission and other vessels operated in the Alaska service under contracts, charters, or arrangements with the Commission; (3) requirements that the operators shall operate such vessels to secure the most economical transportation adequate for the Alaska service; and (4) such other requirements, terms, and conditions as the Commission may deem appropriate.

"(b) Each such contract, charter, or arrangement shall provide that, as of the end of each accounting period, the cumulative gross profit, before overhead expenses, from the operation of vessels thereunder, as approved by the Commission, shall be allocated as follows and in the following order:

"(1) To provide for the operator's proportionate share of the expenses of all operators of maintaining a survey of Alaska ocean transportation services and of the costs and methods of operation of operators in said services, in accordance with a program approved by the Commission;

"(2) To allow compensation to the operator for working capital, use of facilities other than operator-owned vessels, and overhead expenses, on such bases as the Commission may determine; and such bases may be fixed in terms of a percentage or percentages, deemed by the Commission to be reasonable, of vessel operating revenues;

"(3) To allow the operator a return at the rate of 10 percent per annum, before Federal income taxes, on the fair value of operator-owned vessels used in the Alaska service;

"(4) Any profit remaining thereafter, at the conclusion of each accounting period, shall be held in a special account. At the end of the second and each succeeding accounting period, if any, such account shall be available for paying any then cumulative deficiency (covering the period from the commencement of operations hereunder) with respect to any amounts which, if earned, would have theretofore been allocated pursuant to the previous paragraphs of this subsection;

"(5) At the conclusion of operations under any such contract, charter, or other arrangement, any balance in said special account shall be promptly divided and paid 75 percent to the Commission and 25 percent to the operator.

"(c) The Commission may incorporate in each such contract, charter, or arrangement such definitions and formulas for the determinations of vessel-operating revenue, gross profit before overhead expenses, overhead expenses, accounting periods, fair value, and depreciation, as it may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the other provisions of this subsection and of this joint resolution. The Commission's determination of the value of operator-owned vessels, for the purposes of such contract, charter, or other arrangement, shall be for the purposes of this joint resolution only and shall not be relevant evidence in any regulatory proceeding before the Commission.

"SEC. 3. (a) Every contract, charter, or arrangement made under this joint resolution shall expressly reserve to the Commission, after reasonable notice to the operator and affording him opportunity for hearing if the Commission determines that it is in the public interest so to do, the right to cancel the same upon reasonable notice of such cancellation but not less than 90 days. Such contract, charter, or arrangement shall also reserve to the operator the right to request the Commission to modify or cancel

the same for good cause shown, and if the Commission shall determine that the operator's claim is justified, it may make such modification or shall permit such cancellation at such time thereafter as it may consider reasonable but not more than 90 days after such determination.

"(b) Whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President, the Commission may terminate any contract, charter, or arrangement hereunder, without cost to the United States, upon such notice to the operator as the President shall determine.

"(c) Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to limit the right of the Commission to enter into other contracts, charters, or arrangements with new or other operators, if after such notice, investigation, or consultation as the Commission may deem necessary or appropriate in the particular case, but without the necessity of hearings, the Commission shall determine such action to be in the interest of the economy of the Territory of Alaska or of the national defense.

"SEC. 4. The word 'vessels' as used in the joint resolution shall include such passenger vessels, freight vessels, combination freight and passenger vessels, tugs, barges, and other watercraft, as shall, in the discretion of the Commission, be deemed suitable for use in ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska.

"SEC. 5. The provisions of this joint resolution, as amended, shall not, prior to July 1, 1948, affect the operation of contracts, charters, or other arrangements in accordance with their terms in effect on the date of enactment of this amendatory section, unless superseded before July 1, 1948, by contracts, charters, or arrangements entered into under this joint resolution, as amended."

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m.

PENSACOLA NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3416) to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "and directed to acquire on" and insert "to receive on."

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "by transfer, gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."

Page 1, line 9, after "Department", insert "and transferred in accordance with existing law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. CRAWFORD submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) making provision for the continuation of the Virgin Islands Company until June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

F. L. CRAWFORD,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
JAY LEFEVRE,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HUGH BUTLER,
CARL A. HATCH,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5904) making provision for the continuation of the Virgin Islands Company until June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely: The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted the following:

"That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Virgin Islands Company shall continue as an agency of the United States until the close of business June 30, 1949. It is authorized to borrow from the Treasury of the United States, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall loan to it upon the request of its president, such sums as may be required to carry out its operations until such date, not exceeding in the aggregate $500,000. Each loan shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States."

The House recedes.

FRED L. CRAWFORD,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
JAY LEFEVRE,
A. FERNANDEZ,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5904) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this act shall be cited as the "Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948".

"TITLE I—ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTMASTERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

"SEC. 101. All postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal service whose rates of compensation are prescribed by the Act entitled "An Act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945, as amended, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $450 per annum: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 25 cents per hour: *Provided further*, That postmasters at post offices of the fourth class shall receive additional compensation at the rate of a sum per annum equal to 25 per centum of their basic annual compensation.

"SEC. 102. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis.

"SEC. 103. (a) Sections 17 (e) and 22 (d) of such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, are each amended by striking out '6 cents per mile' and inserting in lieu thereof '7 cents per mile.'

"(b) Section 22 (d) of such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is further amended by striking out '75 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '90 cents.'

"(c) The Act entitled 'An Act to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of two years, and for other purposes' (Public Law 467, Eightieth Congress), is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 104. This title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after June 30, 1948.

"TITLE II—POSTAL RATE REVISION

"AIR MAIL

"SEC. 201. The rate of postage on all domestic air mail as defined in Public Law 730, Seventy-ninth Congress, shall, except in the case of postal cards and private mailing or post cards, be 6 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof. The rate of postage on postal cards and private mailing or post cards (conforming to the conditions prescribed by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the postal laws relating to use of postal cards', approved May 19, 1898 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 39, sec. 281)), when sent by air mail, shall be 4 cents each.

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 202. The rate of postage on third-class matter shall be 2 cents for the first two ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including eight ounces in weight, except that the rate of postage on books and catalogs of twenty-four pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants not exceeding eight ounces in weight shall be 1½ cents for each two ounces or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That upon payment of a fee of $10 for each calendar year or portion thereof and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails, separately addressed identical pieces of third-class matter in quantities of not less than twenty pounds, or of not less than two hundred pieces, subject to pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time: *Provided further*, That the rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under the foregoing provision shall be 14 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent, except that in the case of books and catalogs of twenty-four pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants the rate shall be 10 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1 cent: *And provided further*, That pieces or packages of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing troughout shall be subject to a minimum charge of 3 cents each.

"CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

"SEC. 203. Publications containing twenty-four pages or more issued at regular intervals of four or more times a year, 25 per centum or more of whose pages are devoted to text or reading matter and not more than 75 per centum to advertising matter, which are circulated free or mainly free, may, upon authorization by the Postmaster General and under such regulations as he may prescribe, be accepted for mailing at the postage rate of 10 cents a pound or fraction thereof, computed on the entire bulk mailed at one time, but not less than 1 cent per piece, provided the copies of such publications are presented for mailing made up according to States, cities, and routes as directed by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That publications owned and controlled by one or several individuals or business concerns and conducted as an auxiliary to and essential for the advancement of the main business or calling of those who own or control them shall not be accepted under this section.

"FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL POST) MAIL

"SEC. 204. (a) On fourth-class matter (limit of weight over eight ounces to seventy pounds) the rate of postage except as herein provided for catalogs (limit of weight over eight ounces up to and including ten pounds), books, and library books, shall be by the pound as hereinafter provided, the postage in all cases to be prepaid by stamps affixed thereto or as otherwise prescribed by the Postmaster General.

"(b) The rate of postage on matter of the fourth class shall be as follows:

"(1) On all matter mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and on all matter mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and ¾ cent for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is three hundred miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 2$\frac{1}{10}$ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 2 cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(3) For delivery within the third zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 2$\frac{9}{10}$ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 4½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 4¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 5½ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 16 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 7½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 7¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 17 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 9½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 9¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 18 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof, 11½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including ten pounds, and 11¼ cents for each pound or fraction thereof exceeding ten pounds.

"(9) On parcels measuring more than 84 inches but not more than one hundred inches in length and girth combined the minimum postage charge shall be the zone charge applicable to a ten-pound parcel.

"(c) Catalogs and similar printed advertising matter in bound form weighing more than eight ounces but not exceeding ten pounds shall be subject to postage rates based on the eight parcel-post zones as follows:

"(1) When mailed at the post office from which a rural route starts, for delivery on such route, or mailed at any point on such route for delivery at any other point thereon, or at the office from which the route starts, or on any rural route starting therefrom, and when mailed at a city-carrier office, or at any point within its delivery limits, for delivery by carriers from that office, or at any office for local delivery, the postage shall be 7½ cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound.

"(2) For delivery within the first and second zones, except as provided for in paragraph (1), and except when the distance by the shortest regular mail route from the office of origin to the office of delivery is three hundred miles or more in which case the rates of postage shall be the same as for delivery within the third zone, 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(3) For delivery within the third zone, 9 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(4) For delivery within the fourth zone, 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 2½ cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(5) For delivery within the fifth zone, 12 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 3 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(6) For delivery within the sixth zone, 13 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(7) For delivery within the seventh zone, 14 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(8) For delivery within the eighth zone, 15 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 6 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(d) Books, permanently bound for preservation consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for student's notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books and when in parcels not exceeding seventy pounds in weight, may be sent at the postage rate of 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof.

"(e) Books, consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when sent by public libraries, organizations, or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, as a service to county or other unit libraries or as a loan to readers or when returned by the latter libraries or readers to such public libraries, organizations, or associations shall be charged with postage at the rate of 4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection for books under this classification: *Provided*, that this rate shall apply only to such books as are addressed for local delivery, for delivery in the first, second, or third zone, or within the State in which mailed. Public libraries, organizations, or associations before being entitled to the foregoing rates shall furnish to the Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of their net income inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

"(f) To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable of mail matter of the fourth class, special-handling stamps shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than two pounds, 15 cents; matter weighing more than two but not more than ten pounds, 20 cents; matter weighing more than ten pounds, 25 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-handling stamps herein specified.

"SPECIAL DELIVERY

"SEC. 205. To procure the most expeditious handling and transportation practicable and the immediate delivery of mail matter at the office of address, special-delivery stamps

shall be affixed thereto, in addition to the regular postage, in accordance with the following schedule: Matter weighing not more than two pounds, if of the first class, 15 cents; if of any other class, 25 cents. Matter weighing more than two but not more than ten pounds, if of the first class, 25 cents; if of any other class, 35 cents. Matter weighing more than ten pounds, if of the first class, 35 cents; if of any other class, 45 cents: *Provided*, That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, ordinary postage stamps of equivalent value may be accepted in lieu of the special-delivery stamps.

"MONEY ORDERS

"SEC. 206. A money order shall not be issued for more than $100, and the fees for domestic money orders shall be as follows: For orders less than $5 and 1 cent, 10 cents; for orders from $5 and 1 cent up to and including $10, 15 cents; for orders from $10 and 1 cent up to and including $50, 25 cents; for orders from $50 and 1 cent up to and including $100, 35 cents.

"POSTAL NOTES

"SEC. 207. (a) The Postmaster General may authorize postmasters at such offices as he shall designate, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to issue and pay money orders not exceeding $10, to be known as postal notes. The fee for issuance thereof shall be 8 cents each.

"(b) Postal notes shall be valid for two calendar months from the last day of the month of their issue, but thereafter may be paid by the Postmaster General, or refund may be made in case of loss, upon evidence satisfactory to him, under such regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no claim for the amount of a postal note will be considered unless filed within one year from the last day of the month of issue. Postal notes shall not be negotiable or transferable through endorsement.

"REGISTERED MAIL

"SEC. 208. (a) Mail matter shall be registered on the application of the party posting the same. The registry fees, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this subsection, shall be as follows: For registry indemnity not exceeding $5, 25 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25, 35 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50, 40 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $75, 45 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $75 but not exceeding $100, 50 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200, 60 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300, 70 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400, 85 cents; for registry indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500, $1; for registry indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600, $1.10; for registry indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700, $1.20; for registry indemnity exceeding $700 but not exceeding $800, $1.30; for registry indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $900, $1.40; for registry indemnity exceeding $900 but not exceeding $1,000, $1.50.

"(b) For registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as "surcharges") as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid by not more than $50, 2 cents; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 3 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 4 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 6 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 7 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 8 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 10 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the registry fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fees for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 14 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 15 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 16 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 18 cents.

"(c) For insured mail treated as registered mail having a declared value in excess of the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid, there shall be charged additional fees (known as 'surcharges') as follows: When the declared value exceeds the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid by not more than $50, 1 cent; by more than $50 but not more than $100, 2 cents; by more than $100 but not more than $200, 3 cents; by more than $200 but not more than $400, 4 cents; by more than $400 but not more than $600, 5 cents; by more than $600 but not more than $800, 6 cents; by more than $800 but less than $1,000, 7 cents. If the excess of the declared value over the maximum indemnity covered by the insurance fee paid is $1,000 or more, the additional fee for each $1,000 or part of $1,000 on articles destined to points within the several zones applicable to fourth-class matter shall be as follows: For local delivery or for delivery within the first zone, 8 cents; for delivery within the second zone, 9 cents; for delivery within the third zone, 10 cents; for delivery within the fourth zone, 11 cents; for delivery within the fifth or sixth zone, 12 cents; for delivery within the seventh or eighth zone, 13 cents.

"(d) All such fees shall be accounted for in such manner as the Postmaster General shall direct. Mail matter for the official business of the Post Office Department which requires registering shall be registered free of charge, and pass through the mails free of charge.

"RETURN RECEIPTS FOR REGISTERED MAIL

"SEC. 209. Whenever the sender of any registered mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such registered mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such registered mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for registered mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

"FEES FOR INSURED MAIL

"SEC. 210. The fees for insurance, which shall be in addition to the regular postage, and the limits of indemnity therefor within the maximum indemnity provided by this section, shall be as follows: 5 cents for indemnification not exceeding $5; 10 cents for indemnification exceeding $5 but not exceeding $10; 15 cents for indemnification exceeding $10 but not exceeding $25; 20 cents for indemnification exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 25 cents for indemnification exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 30 cents for indemnification exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. Whenever the sender of an insured article of mail shall so request, and upon payment of a fee of 5 cents at the time of mailing or of 10 cents subsequent to the time of mailing, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom and when the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided*, That upon payment of the additional sum of 26 cents at the time of mailing of any such insured article of mail, a receipt shall be obtained for such insured mail, showing to whom, when, and the address where the same was delivered, which receipt shall be returned to the sender, and be received in the courts as prima facie evidence of such delivery: *Provided further*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for return receipts for insured mail where the failure to furnish the sender a return receipt or the equivalent is not due to the fault of the postal service.

"FEES FOR COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

"SEC. 211. The fees for collect-on-delivery service for sealed domestic mail matter of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate and for domestic third- or fourth-class mail matter shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be as follows: 20 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $2.50; 25 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $2.50 but not exceeding $5; 35 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $5 but not exceeding $25; 45 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $25 but not exceeding $50; 55 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; 60 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $150; and 65 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $150 but not exceeding $200. The fee for notifying the sender or his representative of inability to deliver a collect-on-delivery article shall be 5 cents.

"RESTRICTION IN DELIVERY

"SEC. 212. The Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to collect an additional fee of 20 cents for effecting the delivery by carrier or otherwise of domestic registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, the delivery of which is restricted to the addressee only, or to the addressee or order: *Provided*, That no refund shall be made of fees paid for this service unless request for refund is made and erroneous delivery of the article or articles was made by the postal service or nondelivery of the article or articles was due to some fault of the postal service.

"REGISTERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY MAIL

"SEC. 213. (a) The fee for collect-on-delivery service for registered sealed domestic mail of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be 55 cents for collections and indemnity not exceeding $10; 70 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $10 but not exceeding $50; 90 cents for collections and indemnity exceeding $50 but not exceeding $100; and $1.15 for collections and indemnity exceeding $100 but not exceeding $200. The maximum amount of charges collectible on any registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery article shall be $200.

"(b) When indemnity in excess of $200 is desired, the fee for such registered sealed domestic collect-on-delivery mail shall, in addition to the regular postage and any other required fees, be $1.20 for indemnity exceeding $200 but not exceeding $300; $1.25 for indemnity exceeding $300 but not exceeding $400; $1.30 for indemnity exceeding $400 but not exceeding $500; $1.35 for indemnity exceeding $500 but not exceeding $600; $1.40 for indemnity exceeding $600 but not exceeding $700; $1.45 for indemnity ex-

ceeding $700 but not exceeding $800; and $1.55 for indemnity exceeding $800 but not exceeding $1,000.

"SEC. 214. This title shall take effect on January 1, 1949.

"TITLE III—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY INCREASES

"SEC. 301. Except as provided in section 303, each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $330 per annum: *Provided*, That any employee paid on an hourly or part-time basis shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 20 cents per hour.

"SEC. 302. The additional compensation provided by this Act in the case of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, shall not be construed to be an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of such Act, as amended.

"SEC. 303. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out '$10,000' where it first appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,330'.

"(b) Section 7 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 is amended by striking out '$10,000' and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,330'.

"(c) No officer or employee shall, by reason of any provision of this title be paid with respect to any pay period, basic compensation, or basic compensation plus any additional compensation provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, at a rate in excess of $10,330 per annum.

"SEC. 304. The provisions of this Act granting an increase in compensation to employees of the United States and of the District of Columbia shall not apply to any employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia prior to the time that legislation providing adequate revenues to meet the obligation in the District of Columbia is enacted by the Congress and becomes effective.

"SEC. 305. This title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after June 30, 1948."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended title proposed by the Senate amendment, amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees."

EDWARD H. REES,
WM. H. STEVENSON,
C. W. VURSELL,
TOM MURRAY,
JOHN LYLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM LANGER,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6916) to provide for permanent postal rates and additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the field service in the Post Office Department submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted a substitute which provided for increases in pay of postal employees, and for revision of the classification schedules of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and for increased pay for Federal employees other than postal employees. The Senate amendment did not provide for postal rate revision. The substitute agreed to in conference follows closely the House bill except as explained below.

With respect to additional compensation for postal employees, title I of the conference substitute is the same as the House bill except that by inclusion of provisions from the Senate amendment the additional 1 cent per mile equipment allowance for rural carriers provided by Public Law 467, Eightieth Congress has been made permanent, and the equipment allowance for special delivery messengers has been increased from 75 cents per hour to 90 cents per hour. The increases provided in the Senate amendment were eight cents and one dollar, respectively. The increases provided by this title are made effective beginning with the first pay period following June 30, 1948.

The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to the revision of the compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1923 have not been included in the conference substitute but there are included provisions substantially similar to H. R. 6917 as reported to the House. There are, however, the following differences from H. R. 6917: It is provided that each officer and employee whose rate of compensation is increased by section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $330 per annum. This title of the conference substitute also raises the present ceiling on salaries from $10,000 per annum to $10,330 per annum. It is provided that the increases in compensation shall take effect beginning with the first pay period following June 30, 1948. The provision of H. R. 6917 which provided that these increases should continue only until July 1, 1949, is not included in the conference substitute.

The conference substitute contains the provisions of title II of the House bill, relating to postal rate revision, without change except that the changes in postal rates provided for are to be effective beginning January 1, 1949.

The conference substitute includes a provision, taken from the Senate amendment, providing that the pay increase provided for shall not apply to any employee in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia prior to the time that legislation providing adequate revenues to meet the obligation in the District of Columbia is enacted by the Congress and becomes effective.

The committee of conference recommends a modification of the title of the bill to conform to the provisions of the bill as agreed to in conference.

EDWARD H. REES,
WM. H. STEVENSON,
C. W. VURSELL,
TOM MURRAY,
JOHN LYLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill, H. R. 6916, and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FEDERAL PAY RAISE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have recognized the need for a wage increase for Federal employees and who have fought for such legislation were greatly heartened by the action taken by the Congress today.

It is unthinkable that we should forget our Federal employees at a time when there have been so many increases in the cost of living. Many of this group, often referred to as the white collar workers, entered the Federal service when the Government appealed for workers in connection with various Government bureaus and departments having to do with our war effort. These people responded to the call and many of them sacrificed their jobs in private industry, which are lost to them now, in order to aid their country in time of war. Now it is our duty to aid them in time of peace.

Every problem which faces the postal worker, for whom both the House and Senate have passed salary increases, also faces all other Federal employees. It would have been a gross discrimination to provide a pay raise for one group and to completely ignore the needs of the other.

We have generally recognized the great importance of maintaining not only high employment but also high consumption in order to stimulate the recovery of production and distribution of consumer goods of all kinds. For this reason too we must take care to see that the substantial number of workers who are employed by the Federal Government are able to maintain their share of the high consumption necessary if we are to enjoy business prosperity and a high standard of living.

I know that the postal employees are entitled to the $450 raise they have received. I am glad other Federal employees have at least gotten the $330 annual raise provided for in the conference report. Both amounts should have been larger to bring their income up to 1948 living costs. However, the increases provided will help greatly.

RESIGNATION FROM CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE BILL

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to resign as a conferee on the bill, H. R. 2648, an act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities, to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act re-enacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON AGRICULTURE BILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] to serve in place of the gentleman

from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] on the bill, H. R. 2648, an act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities, to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and for other purposes.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

JUNE 19, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully,

EARL WILSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 699):

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EARL WILSON, of Indiana, be and he is hereby elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have to announce that my colleague and friend JOHN FLANNAGAN, of the Ninth District of Virginia, has announced that he will retire from the Congress at the close of this session.

As this is the last occasion upon which the House will meet this session I think it only proper that I should announce this fact to the House. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] has served here for 18 years with distinction and honor and has endeared himself not only to the Virginia delegation but to the Members generally of this Congress and previous Congresses. For many years he has served upon the Committee on Agriculture, and during the Seventy-ninth Congress he was the chairman of that committee. He has rendered great service to the farming industry of this country.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN is the author of much legislation. He has a record here of liberal, forward-looking progressiveness; and I know this House and the Nation will regret his leaving this body when this session ends.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN, enjoys the respect, the confidence, and the friendship of everyone who has served with him; a man whose nobility of character is an inspiration to all of us. I consider him without exception the most courageous man that I have ever served with in any legislative body. Coming from the district he does, with that forward outlook of his, it took indomitable courage for him to vote the way he did on many occasions; and I consider him as I have termed him in the past to many friends of mine, and I am proud to publicly state it now, as the most courageous man I have ever served with in public life.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, no one in the House of Representatives could regret the retirement of the gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN, more than I do. He has been my intimate personal friend and supporter for many years. He is a man of courage, he is a man of vision. He may be classed as a real, sensible liberal.

I trust that for him and his their path in the years that are allotted to them, may lie through green fields and by still waters.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that I have had the pleasure and the honor of serving with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] ever since I have been a Member of Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, no man could be any more fair. His word is just as good as his bond. The gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN, is one of the great friends any man ever had.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I desire to take this opportunity to express my deep regret that this House is to lose the very valuable services of JOHN FLANNAGAN. We have lost too many good men from the Virginia delegation within the last 2 or 3 years. In fact, we have suffered the largest number of changes in a like period of time within my memory. None of those who have departed will be missed more than Mr. FLANNAGAN.

As former chairman of the important Commitee on Agriculture, he has rendered an outstanding service to the farmers of the Nation. Agriculture was a potent factor in winning the recent world war and JOHN FLANNAGAN, by the part he played in helping to frame the agricultural war program, made a substantial contribution to the cause of victory. In war and in peace his services have been outstanding and he leaves behind him an enviable record.

During my association with him in the House I have come to admire JOHN FLANNAGAN greatly. I have recognized his many high qualities and have enjoyed his keen sense of humor and his genial personality. Mr. Speaker, I entertain for JOHN FLANNAGAN a genuine affection, and it is with deep personal regret that I bid him farewell and wish him Godspeed in his future undertakings.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Although the gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN was elected by the people of the Ninth District of Virginia he has represented not only the people of his district, not only the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Virginia but he has been truly a representative of the people of the United States. The farm people in particular throughout this Nation are going to miss him from the Congress. I have enjoyed my service with him not only as a colleague in the House of Representatives but as a friend. I really feel that my life has been greatly enriched by this brief association with him.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. It has been my high privilege to serve with the gentleman from Virginia, JOHN FLANNAGAN, for 10 years as a Member of the House Committee on Agriculture. Certainly there is no man who has a better understanding of our agricultural problems and is more devoted to the welfare of those who till the soil than JOHN FLANNAGAN. We all regret seeing him go and wish him many happy years of comfort and contentment at home.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. I think that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is one of the outstanding Members of this House. I have consulted him on many occasions in regard to legislation and with reference to other matters. Although I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I found him one of the most liberal members of the Democratic Party. Now, that to my mind means something when you consider the fact that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is not, like myself, one of those Democrats from north of the Mason-Dixon line. But he has a broad concept. He has demonstrated time after time his courage insofar as legislation is concerned. I sincerely say that I regret he has made the decision that he will not again become a Member of the House.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Virginia and the other Members who have paid tribute

and spoken with reference to the outstanding service JOHN FLANNAGAN has rendered his district, State, and Nation and in expressing deep regret on account of his leaving the Congress. He could continue to come to Congress from his district as long as he would choose to, and his decision to not seek reelection is a distinct loss to this body.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Virginia. It is true that I have only been here a short while, but the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] has been ever helpful to me and he has been a true friend of mine. It is with deep sorrow that I see him leave this House. The farmers of Virginia and all over the country will suffer a great loss. It is with heartfelt sorrow that we realize he is leaving.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to pay my tribute to JOHN FLANNAGAN. JOHN FLANNAGAN and I have served on the Committee on Agriculture for 18 years. During a part of that time he was chairman; during part of the time I have been chairman. During all of that time our relationships have been the most pleasant that could possibly exist between two members of a committee. JOHN FLANNAGAN is broadminded; he is cooperative. He is unselfish. His character is unassailable. He is a man of great ability. During all of the period that he has served on the committee either as a member or as chairman I have never known him to let the slightest tinge of partisanship govern his action on the committee. He is a sincere friend of American agriculture and of the men and women who live and toil on the farms of this country. His loss to agriculture will be a severe one. He will leave behind him as a memorial to his work on the committee many outstanding pieces of legislation which will be of benefit to the agricultural interests of this country for many years to come. I can only say that I wish for JOHN FLANNAGAN the very best that a man can possibly have in the years to come.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, that I am not too sorry to see a Democrat leave the committee or the House. Nevertheless, if we have to have them there, I would like to see more of JOHN FLANNAGAN'S kind. JOHN FLANNAGAN is one of those fellows that has been loyal to his party and loyal to the South. To say that there is no partisanship in the Committee on Agriculture is not altogether the case. But, whenever that bobs up, he is loyal to where he belongs, and I want to say that the closer you get to JOHN FLANNAGAN, the better you like him. He is just a grand man, and I hope that in the years to come he will live to enjoy the friends that he has so well served and the fruits of his labor.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture in paying our respects to two fine gentlemen, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON]. I have learned to love them. They have done very fine work on the Committee on Agriculture. In saying farewell to two fine gentlemen I recall Robert Burns' farewell to Bonnie Prince Charles, who was leaving for the Indias, when he said:

Bonnie Charlie noo awa'
Sailing o'er the bounding main.
Many a stormy wind shall blow
Should he ne'er come back again

Will ye no come back again
Will ye no come back again
Better loved ye canna be
Will ye no come back again.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress loses one of its ablest and most lovable Members in the retirement of JOHN FLANNAGAN. A real liberal, JOHN FLANNAGAN has always worked for the little man. His contribution to the farm program of the Nation will give him a place in history as the foremost farm leader. The gentleman from Virginia leaves a place that will be difficult to fill. He is a real friend and a real man.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, in the retirement of JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., of Virginia, I feel the Nation is losing an outstanding public servant. As a longtime member of the Committee on Agriculture his wisdom, his diligent and untiring efforts for the cause of agriculture has redounded to the benefit of every agricultural home in America. We who represent agricultural districts feel that there has been no member of this body throughout many years who has contributed more to the cause of agriculture than JOHN FLANNAGAN. Although his efforts have been most helpful to us of the tobacco sections, his work has by no means been confined to one particular group of agriculture.

JOHN FLANNAGAN is a true and typical Virginia gentleman and in his retirement we wish him peace, contentment, and prosperity as a just reward for a long life of outstanding public service.

EVERETT DIRKSEN

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 years EVERETT DIRKSEN has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He is one of the ablest speakers I have ever known. He has been diligent in his work. He has carried more than his share of the load. I think that in debate here on the floor he has been as forceful and as effective as any man who has ever stood in the well of this House. He is retiring because of his health. The thing that pleases me most about that situation is that since he announced his retirement his health has begun to mend, and it now looks as though he is on the road to a permarent recovery.

EVERETT DIRKSEN, I have no hesitation in saying, is the peer of any man who has stood in this well. He will be remembered long after he retires, not only as a great orator but a fine, honest, sincere fellow. If he had a fault, it was that he worked so many hours of the day that it seems to have impaired his health. I wish him the best of luck in the days that are to come. I regret that he is leaving us, but I am glad that his health is such that at the present time he can look forward to years and years of great usefulness to the public of this great country.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I, too, would like to add my word with respect to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is going to leave this House of Representatives after 15 years of service. I know of no other man who has been such an able, conscientious legislator, a man who seemed to be filled with energy from early morning until late at night. He finally worked himself into a situation where his health began to fail. Like my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I rejoice that his health is now improving. We hope that in the near future he will again be his old self and will some day be back among us, where he has in public life served so faithfully and well.

At the same time, if the gentleman will permit, I want to pay tribute to three other Members from the State of Illinois who are voluntarily leaving this body. This is their last Congress. I refer to WILLIAM STRATTON, ROY CLIPPINGER, and ANTON JOHNSON. Each and every one in his own right is an able and conscientious legislator. I know the State of Illinois is losing valued and true servants when these men leave. To each and every one, we wish the best of health and prosperity. I am happy that I have had the privilege to associate with each and every one of these outstanding gentlemen.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not wish to minimize the great tributes, and deserved, which have been paid to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, with whom I have served and been closely associated since the Seventy-third Congress.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are other Members of the Congress who deserve the same consideration at the hands of the Congress. There is one, JOE HENDRICKS, of Florida, who comes from the other side of the aisle, a man of very considerable ability, who has faithfully and well served his constituency and the country, who

is leaving us. He served on my committee. I want to pay him my respects and compliment him on the outstanding service he has rendered. I am sorry JOE is not going to be on my committee next year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I, too, would like to join in the commendation that has been spoken for the services of EVERETT DIRKSEN. Every Member of the House of Representatives has had an opportunity to see EVERETT work on the floor. Members of the Committee on Appropriations have had an opportunity to see him work in committee. For a number of years I was on the same Subcommittee on Independent Offices where I saw how he worked in the daily grind of appropriation hearings. There, as well as on the floor, the evidence of real ability was apparent every day. He was a hard worker. He was a brilliant worker. He had an unusual ability to marshal facts and then combine them with a logic that was irresistible on the floor of the House. We will miss him here. We wish him well wherever he goes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member I have found in EVERETT DIRKSEN a friend, a man of calm and lofty mind, with a silver tongue, a man with a large, generous heart. I gladly pay this tribute to him, and I hope that he will be back with us, or perhaps his people will see fit to send him to the other body.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I had the pleasure of serving with EVERETT DIRKSEN on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. I found him a man of diligence and intelligence. Although the time is short, I want to take this moment to pay my respects to EVERETT DIRKSEN. It was a pleasure to have served with him. I wish him well in the future.

Mr. TABER. I wish that he were going to serve longer.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in commendation of EVERETT DIRKSEN. As a new Member of this body, I feel that my life has been very much enriched by my association with him. He is a man of high character, great charm, exceptional ability, and outstanding eloquence. We have lost a brilliant and high-minded colleague who has made significant and vital contributions to the work of this body. We shall miss his wise counsels.

EVERETT DIRKSEN has left a great record in the Congress. It is a monument to distinguished service. It is a noble example of high statesmanship. It must be an inspiration to American youth.

In a prostrate and floundering world we can ill afford to lose the help, the leadership, which EVERETT DIRKSEN gave so modestly, so generously, and so effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I wish him well. I know that he will find useful service for his talents in the years to come. I trust that our Government will not long be deprived of his participation. I count it a privilege to claim him as my friend.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. As one who had the pleasure of serving on the subcommittee with EVERETT DIRKSEN, I think it is significant that we are paying this tribute to one who served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture Appropriations at 3 o'clock in the morning while we are waiting for a farm policy bill to return from the Senate. He loved American farming and agriculture. He wants it to be sound and progressive. His loss to this Congress is something of tremendous moment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to join in all the good things that have been said about EVERETT DIRKSEN. EVERETT has the respect of the entire House membership and in my opinion is probably the most outstanding man in ability who has served here during the 10 years I personally have been a Member. He will go far and our good wishes go with him.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, you will observe that the members of the subcommittee are unanimous in their respect and admiration for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I have already expressed to him my personal regret. I repeat it now. He is a good chairman, a good friend. To know him is to admire and respect him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying tribute to EVERETT DIRKSEN, whom I consider a truly great American and one of our most capable legislators. EVERETT DIRKSEN has made a great contribution to the Congress and he has always been an inspiration to us other Members. Hard-working, thorough, intelligent, and courteous at all times, EVERETT will always be remembered and admired as a top-notch statesman. I am sorry he is retiring. I hope his health will be restored soon and that he may resume public service.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my very special privilege to have served with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Measured by any standards, EVERETT DIRKSEN stands out among men and among Members of this House. His quiet courtesy, his amazing knowledge of the intricate details of a thousand and one things, his sure judgment in management and executive functions, by themselves, would have marked him for distinction.

However, he combines with these qualities a swift, creative imagination, a magnetic personality which impressed itself on his colleagues without apparent effort, and a genuine liking for his fellow men which is unmistakable in its sincerity.

EVERETT DIRKSEN is a natural leader, free of bravado or bluster, but compelling by his obvious competence. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to have served with him and to have known him. His decision to retire from public life, while necessary, is a serious loss to this House and to the Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, EVERETT DIRKSEN has no superior in all-around ability in the House of Representatives. Like all men, I have selected a few persons whom I consider tops in their respective spheres. Ev DIRKSEN is on my list. The story of his life reads like one of the books I read as a boy when I was at the hero-worshipping stage. If ever there was a self-made man, he is one. Completing his education while a Member of Congress, he has developed into one of its best-informed Members, and his vocabulary should make many of us timid in attempting to elaborate upon the nice things which have been said about him. With that in mind, I can only say that the people of the United States are losing a great Congressman.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, is one of the outstanding American statesmen of our day and I deeply regret his decision to leave the House. His loss to this body where he has served with such conspicuous distinction for many years, and to the Nation to which he gave so unselfishly and selflessly of himself, is indeed incalculable.

Of great gifts of personality, mentality, and eloquence, this fine noble son of Illinois, is a dear and loyal friend, a devoted and effective legislator and a diligent and tireless worker for all causes which command his attention. Always warm and humane, moved by evangelical zeal for the truth and principle as he sees them, the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, is a giant figure in our House.

It has always been surprising to me that his party never recognized his marked availability for national office. As a member of the minority party in this House, I would view with genuine apprehension, for example, a national Republican ticket comprised of our beloved distinguished Speaker, the warm friend of every member of this party, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the esteemed, scholarly and talented statesman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It has for some time seemed to me that a national ticket led by the "blacksmith's son" from Massachusetts and the "baker boy" from Illinois might well give us Democrats something to think about.

In any event, I am happy to pay my sincere tribute of respect, admiration, and affection to the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN, and to extend to him my very best wishes for future health, success, and happiness. It is my earnest hope that he may continue his

activities in some sphere of the public service because it would be nothing short of tragic for his great and striking talents and his noble heart to be denied to the American Nation and people which he so profoundly loves and has served so faithfully and well.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great loss to the House to have the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, retire at the end of this session. He has served his country and his constituents faithfully and well for a goodly number of years, and he has made among the Members of both Houses of Congress a vast number of friends on account of his pleasing personality and charm.

He is an efficient legislator and has contributed immeasurably to the best interests of our country. Perhaps he will be remembered most for the excellent work which he has done for the District of Columbia. With unselfish zeal and singleness of heart he devoted a great part of his time to the problems of the Capital City and under his leadership as chairman of the District Committee much sound legislation has been enacted into law. He was a firm believer in home rule for the people of the District of Columbia and for many years advocated their enfranchisement.

No one can speak of EVERETT DIRKSEN without remarking on his eloquence in debate, and I venture to say that there are few people who have even been Members of the House of Representatives with a greater gift of oratory. When he spoke he commanded the attention and respect of all who listened, and it was notable that Members gathered when they knew that he was to address the House.

I personally will miss him more than I can say, because it has been my privilege to work closely with him in the past few years, so I have had an opportunity to measure the full stature of the man. I wish him every success in the days to come, and I hope that his path in the future will lead him back to the Halls of Congress. He is a fine citizen and a great American.

TO AMEND SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2790) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is entitled to 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. My inquiry is whether or not S. 2790, under suspension of the rules, is the same as S. 2790 reported out of committee.

The SPEAKER. The motion is to suspend the rules and pass the bill with an amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that. None of us knows what the amendment contains.

The SPEAKER. The bill has not been read yet.

The Clerk will report the bill and the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was going to suggest that, or that the gentleman from Michigan state what it contains.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appreciates that. The gentleman is well within his rights.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"CREATION AND POWERS OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"SEC. 301. (a) The Administrator is further authorized and empowered to provide for the establishment of a Federal National Mortgage Association (hereinafter referred to as the 'Association') which shall be authorized, subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Association—

"(1) to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided, however*, That—

"(A) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by, or if it covers property held by, Federal, State, or municipal instrumentalities;

"(B) no mortgage may be purchased for an amount exceeding the unpaid principal balance thereof, plus accrued interest, at the time of purchase;

"(C) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase if the original principal obligation of the loan exceeds or exceeded $10,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage or other lien securing the loan;

"(D) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase unless offered by the original mortgagee prior to any other sale thereof;

"(E) no mortgage shall be offered to the Association for purchase by any one mortgagee (1) unless such mortgage is secured by property used, or designed to be used, for residential purposes and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all mortgages purchased by the Association from such mortgagee pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 25 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee which, except for this subparagraph (E), meet the requirements of this section.

"(F) no mortgage shall be purchased by the Association unless the mortgagee certifies that the housing with respect to which the mortgage was made meets the construction standards prescribed for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the National Housing Act, as amended.

"(2) to borrow money for any of the foregoing purposes through the issuance of notes or other such obligations as hereinafter provided.

"(b) The Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and established pursuant to the provisions of this title as in effect prior to June 1, 1948, shall be the Association referred to in subsection (a) of this section The board of directors of the association shall consist of not less than five persons to be appointed by the chairman of the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the acting chairman in the case of a vacancy in the office of chairman, from the directors, officers, or employees of such Corporation and the officers shall be appointed by the board of directors from the directors, officers, or employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(c) The Association created under this section shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by order of the Administrator as hereinafter provided, or by act of Congress, and shall have power—

"(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) to make contracts;

"(3) to sue and be sued; complain and defend, in any court of law or equity, State or Federal;

"(4) to conduct its business in any State of the United States, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, and to have one or more offices in such State, or in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, one of which offices shall be designated at the time of organization as its principal office;

"(5) to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(d) The Association may have a capital stock of not to exceed $20,000,000 and paid-in surplus of $1,000,000, subscribed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"(e) The Association, for the purpose of all actions by or against it, real, personal, or mixed, and all suits in equity, shall be deemed a citizen of the place in which its principal office is located.

"(f) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation, except the Association organized under this section, shall hereafter use the words 'Federal National Mortgage Association' or any combination of such words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding 30 days or both, for each day during which such violation is committed or repeated. The provisions of section 5243 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the Association created under this title.

"OBLIGATIONS

"SEC. 302. The Association is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any time notes or other obligations in an aggregate amount not to exceed (1) 40 times the amount of its capital and surplus, and in no event to exceed (2) the current unpaid principal of mortgages held by it and insured under the provisions of title II and VI of this act and guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, plus the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit and the amortized value of its investments in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 303. Moneys of the Association not invested in mortgages or in operating facilities shall be kept in cash on hand or on deposit, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that the Association shall keep and maintain such reserves as it may deem necessary.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 304. The Association, including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, mortgage loans, income, and stock shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Association shall be subject to State, Territorial county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

"MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

"SEC. 305. The Association shall have power to deal with rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash, with a view to assuring a maximum financial return to the Association, any property acquired by it as a result of foreclosure proceedings or otherwise.

"LIQUIDATION

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall have power to terminate the existence of the Association and order its liquidation and the winding up of its affairs whenever the Administrator determines, in his judgment, that the need therefor no longer exists. The Association shall make a report of its activities to the Administrator in January and July of each year for the preceding 6 months' period, which report shall be transmitted to the Congress, together with the Administrator's recommendations thereon."

SEC. 2. Nothing in the amendment made by the first section of this act shall limit the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to service or sell any mortgage purchased prior to the date of the enactment of this act, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgage with respect to which a commitment to purchase was made prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out $1,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(h) The Corporation may subscribe for the nonassessable stock of the Federal National Mortgage Association: *Provided*, That the total face amount of stock so subscribed for and held by the Corporation shall not exceed at any one time $20,000,000."

SEC. 5. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new section:

"INCONTESTABILITY

"SEC. 511. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and of the amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against the original lender, defenses based on fraud or material misrepresentation, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, by regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, partial defenses to the amount payable on the guaranty or insurance."

SEC. 6. Section 207 (c) (2) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of paragraph numbered (2), inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following new proviso: *"And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph (2), a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation (whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II) organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members, may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 95 per centum of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and".

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be helpful in at least two respects. A great many Members have been interested in a secondary market for GI mortgages. We have provided in this bill a secondary market for GI mortgages.

We have provided that the Federal National Mortgage Association, by an expansion of its capital and the number of times that that capital and its surplus may be multiplied, will be available as a secondary market for the sale and purchase of GI mortgages. In order to create this market, we have increased the lending and borrowing authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by an additional $500,000,000, bringing the total of loaning authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation up to $2,000,000,000, $840,000,000 of which will be available to the Federal National Mortgage Association as a secondary market.

At the present time there is something less than $250,000,000 which has been used in this secondary market. In round figures, we have increased the amount of available secondary-market money by $510,000,000.

We provide that this secondary market is available for new paper, for paper issued after April 30, 1948. We provide that the paper may be discounted at par, not 98 percent, as was contained in the original bill that was before the House yesterday. We provide also that not more than 25 percent of a borrower's portfolio of GI paper may be discounted at any one time. So we have created a secondary market which should be of material benefit to the veterans in financing their homes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. This market, as I understand, differs fundamentally only in one respect from the so-called Brown amendment in the TEW bill, and that is the effective date; is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The effective date, yes, I think that is substantially true. Frankly, I have not the wording and the details of the Brown amendment in mind at present.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Under the terms of the proposed arrangement no papers could be purchased which were unsecured prior to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right. Thereby we prevent the dumping into this market any part of the $7,000,000,000 GI loans which are now outstanding which would result in the drying up of the secondary market. We also provide that veterans' cooperatives may be organized, and when veterans' cooperatives are organized for the purpose of building properties for veterans, that paper is also eligible for FHA financing and discounting or sale in the secondary market. We have provided for the incontestability of this paper, so that when once it has been sold in the secondary market the validity of the paper cannot be contested. I am firmly of the belief, although we do not go as far as we did in the bill which passed the House, that this bill be of great benefit not only to the veterans, but all others who may build. We have set up in this bill adequate funds for all legitimate transactions. It will be an aid, a very important aid, in the construction this year of over 1,000,000 units.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman has stated that 25 percent of the paper in the portfolio in the loaning institutions will be absorbed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is a limit that any one financial institution may sell to FNMA.

Mr. MITCHELL. Can the gentleman tell me how many days must elapse before the loaning institution may be able to present more paper in that portfolio?

Mr. WOLCOTT. As soon as any part of their 25 percent is sold by the Federal National Mortgage Association then, of course, they may sell up to 25 percent of their portfolio to replace that which the Federal National Mortgage Association sold of that paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to state at this point that I feel that this is a great step in the advancement or the potentialities of GI home building. I think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is to be commended upon his great step. I think that the GI's will benefit tremendously by what he contemplates doing here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sure they will, and that is the primary purpose of the legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman tell the House whether this is the totality of the housing legislation that we will have before we adjourn?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I could not say.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. What is the rate of service charge; one-half of 1 percent?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe so.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his endeavors. At one time we did have authority in the RFC to purchase these loans, and that was withdrawn last July, and mighty few veterans in some sections of the country have been able to make loans.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will say that we appreciate the gentleman's efforts in connection with the secondary market. It seemed an almost insurmountable hurdle. The gentleman has been most cooperative in helping us work out this secondary market for GI loans, and we should give the gentleman from Georgia very much credit for the work which he has done on this, making it possible for us finally to set up this worth-while institution and this worth-while practice which will make it possible for so many veterans to get loans that would not get them otherwise.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the proposed bill make any provision for the extension of title VI of FHA?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How does the proposed bill differ from the bill we passed here yesterday?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In respect to the secondary market?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No, in respect to the titles.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It has to do only with the secondary market, with veterans cooperatives, and incontestability clauses. There is nothing else contained in this bill which was contained in the bill we passed yesterday.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How are the veterans' cooperatives financed without title VI?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have made them eligible under title II by this bill.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. In the pending legislation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the pending legislation. We have made it clear that the veterans' cooperatives are eligible under title II. Title VI is not continued in this bill. I am hopeful that title VI will be continued, but if title VI is not continued, then veterans' cooperatives may finance their undertakings through title II, which is permanent legislation.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Are there additional authorizations for title II?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There does not need to be. They have plenty in title II, enough to service all transactions.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Does this contain the provision which was in the bill passed yesterday with reference to the tax bonus or the fast acceleration?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In respect to accelerating the depreciation?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, it does not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to inquire with respect to the 25 percent of the portfolio of the lending institutions. Suppose building and loan association A has $100,000 worth of these loans, and it discounts $25,000 worth to the mortgage association, it would then have $75,000. Then suppose it makes another $100,000 of new loans to veterans, would it not be entitled to step in immediately and discount an additional $25,000?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my understanding of it; yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What is the rate of interest on title II loans?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not positive about this but I think the limit on the interest rate on title II financing is 5 percent. Under title VI, if title VI is restored, under existing law it is 4 percent. It has been recommended that that be increased to 4½ or 5.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. As I understand, title VI is definitely eliminated from the bill now before us.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is not included in this bill.

Mr. SIKES. We all realize that title VI has been of inestimable value in securing housing construction. Is there any way the gentleman foresees that title VI might be added to this bill before its final approval?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I know the way title VI financing could be enacted, but unfortunately the legislation must be brought up in the other body by unanimous consent, and there have been objections to the consideration of the legislation in the other body. If the gentleman in the other body who has made the objection would withdraw his objection, then I am reasonably certain that we would have all the very good provisions in the bill the House passed yesterday enacted before we adjourn. Unless he does withdraw his objection, then I am afraid we are not going to get title VI.

Mr. SIKES. It would be extremely unfortunate if we should allow title VI to lapse.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is there any way, I would like to ask the gentleman, that title 6 can be included, from a parliamentary standpoint, if it leaves the House without being written into the bill (S. 2790) as an amendment. It is not in either the bill from the Senate or the bill of the House, and therefore would not be subject to conference action.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not familiar enough with the rules of the Senate to give the gentleman a correct answer.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not there are any provisions in this bill for either slum clearance or public housing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Decidedly not.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MACK. Are any plywood materials involved in this?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is no secret that the gentleman has been conferring with representatives of the other body. Is the gentleman in a position to tell us whether or not this bill, which is similar to the bill that passed yesterday, will receive the same treatment as the other bill, which the gentleman brought to the Senate?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that this bill is similar in only two respects to the bill passed yesterday. I cannot predict what the other body will do with this bill, any more than I can predict what the other body will do with any legislation. We have a job to do here. If we do our job, then we have met our responsibility. I think we have worries enough of our own without worrying about what the other body will do.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is the same in respect to the lack of public housing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Decidedly the same in that respect.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And from the conference the gentleman has had with the Senator, we are receiving no assurance that we are going to get any different treatment on this bill than on the other.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the only way, as I understand it, that public housing can be considered in the Senate is for a Member of the other body to withdraw his objection to the consideration of the House bill. I understand under their rules a motion could then be made to substitute the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for the House bill. If the gentleman in the other body persists in his objection, then the other body of course is denied the privilege of voting on whether they shall substitute the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for the House bill. We cannot control the action of any individual Member or group of individuals in the other body.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman think that if he had yielded in favor of public housing, we would not be here all night?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I do not think anything of the kind.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman inform me as to this particular case? Several of my little country banks have about $200,000 of this paper today, and have had it for approximately a year. Will this be of any help toward finding a secondary market for that paper?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If they continue to make GI loans under FHA, standards, I understand it will be a decided help to them, but it will be of no help to them in the discounting or sale of any of their existing outstanding GI mortgages.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In other words, it is of no help to them in regard to the present paper which they hold.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I could not say that it would be—no.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the majority party has found itself in a predicament, and this bill is the weak and ineffective substitute for a housing bill that might have met the needs of our veterans and others.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman inform the House as to whether or not he was consulted about this bill which we now have?

Mr. SPENCE. I was not consulted about the bill nor have I any knowledge that any minority member of the committee was consulted. It was not referred to the committee. It was not reported by the committee, and there is no report as to this bill. It is obvious that the Members cannot consider this bill deliberately and with information which it is necessary to have to come to some conclusion.

We have heard a great deal about socialism. The majority has used the cry of socialism as a red herring to cross every trail that leads to progress or to the welfare of the plain people.

When we passed the Federal Reserve Act, it was said that it would socialize our banking system. When we passed the act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which has protected the depositors and stabilized our banking system, the same cry was raised. The same argument was made against the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act. But you cannot say that this bill has any element of socialism in it, according to their theory, because it does nothing for the common man. There was a provision in the bill as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee providing for the stimulation of the construction of rental property. By reason of the inadequate supply of housing facilities and the overwhelming demand, there exists today a seller's market. As the supply of housing increases there will necessarily be a depreciation in the prices of houses, and when the demand is finally met there will be a stabilized price level far below that existing at the present time. Consequently, veterans and others who are compelled to buy now, unless they obtain bargain prices, will necessarily run the danger of sustaining a serious loss on their investment. Hence, the necessity of stimulating the construction of rental housing so that many of those who wish to obtain homes may be enabled to wait until the existing high level of prices is reduced as the result of increased production. No provision for rental housing is contained in the bill now presented for your consideration. There is no rural housing in the bill. There is no provision for slum clearance or the clearance of blighted areas in the bill. There is nothing in the bill which the great majority of the American people need. There is nothing to meet the housing situation as it exists today. It is but a pretense of enacting housing legislation as a result of the arbitrary action of the Rules Committee in refusing to grant a rule for the consideration of the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee.

I hope you will not be beguiled by this late introduction of this bill which will not accomplish any purpose in the interest of the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I understood from the explanation made a moment ago that 25 percent rediscount of secondary mortgages of GI loans was allowed. Will the gentleman explain just how that works?

Mr. MONRONEY. That means, if you have $100,000 of GI loans, you can sell $25,000 worth of them to the RFC. That is all you can sell.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman read that section?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is not the identical language, but it is very close to it——

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Do you know the identical section? Do you have the language before you?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. I believe there is only one copy of this bill available, and I do not have that.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How do you explain the bill? Have you ever seen it?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that I tried to follow it and correct it in lead pencil as the Clerk read it from the original Wolcott bill that was before us yesterday. One section of that bill is very similar.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman have the bill before him?

Mr. MONRONEY. No.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How can the gentleman explain what is in the bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am trying to. There is so little in it that it should not be difficult.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Can the gentleman answer the question that was asked by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER]?

Mr. MONRONEY. After hearing the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] explain this, and after having read what he had in the former bill, and after having listened to the clerk carefully as he read the bill, I think I understand that you are going to allow the RFC to buy 25 percent of the portfolio of mortgages that any single investor holds. That is as clear as I can make it, and I believe the chairman will agree with me that that is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is, which they acquired after April 30.

Mr. MONRONEY. Which they acquired after April 30.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman mean to say to the House that we are about to enact an important housing bill when not even members of the committee have seen nor now have copies of the bill? I am very interested in and concerned about housing, particularly veterans housing, but this is a most remarkable procedure.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. We are however faced with a desperate situation. It is certain that unless the House takes some action now there will be absolutely no money to support any Government-insured mortgage. I do not like this bill. It is 10 times weaker than I want. I would like to see an all-embracing and general housing bill and I have fought for one for several months. The Republican leadership in the House has turned thumbs down. It is now 3:20 a. m. The RFC is almost out of money for supporting the mortgage market. The question now comes: Are you going to enact this little-bitty teeny-weeney piece of housing legislation that might help build housing just a little bit, a very little bit? Or are you going to say, "Well, we are tired, we want to go home, and we are not going to pass even this makeshift microscopic bit of housing aid."

I hope you will pass it, for only by doing so can funds be furnished to the FNMA of the RFC to support Government-insured mortgages that are being issued. I am afraid, however, that the bill is in very bad shape from this standpoint in not bringing in an extension of title 6, and I would like to ask the distinguished chairman how he is going to get to conference with title 6 when it is not under the Senate version of the bill or in his amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This is not a conference report.

Mr. MONRONEY. I realize that, but if I understand the rules of the House a conference is limited to the material that has been passed by the two Houses and you cannot go outside the bounds of what the two Houses have passed and include that in any conference report; it is not possible to do it under our rules.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I doubt very much under the present situation if we could put title 6 on here now. The only way we could get any title 6 financing in this bill would be to have the other body when this bill is sent over there accept the House amendment with an amendment continuing title 6 financing. I do not know whether they will do it or not. If they do it then we can go to conference immediately and then we determine whether we accept the title 6 provision.

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand this is going over under a Senate number. The principal need, as I see it, to make this bill more useful, is to add now the necessary extension of title VI, FHA. This addition, if made, coupled with this support market for GI and FHA loans, would give this bill some degree of substance.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It does.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say here in the closing hours of this session that I have seen about everything happen in this committee in the past few weeks that I could ever conceive could not happen in an illustrious committee of this House. I have had a lot of esteem and respect for our chairman, but at this late hour to come in here and present a proposition for this House to accept when not until a few moments ago when the Clerk took back on the desk a revised copy of what was read erroneously here at this hour, I cannot conceive anything other than that this is a very shallow and shabby trick. Somebody is on a hook. There is a lot of pressure being applied somewhere. Somebody has been left out in the rain and somebody is putting on the heat.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that from the standpoint of the private builders themselves that all of them have considered title 6 to be essential?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That has been the keynote of all private builders.

And that is exactly what they are trying to get into this bill by subterfuge and trickery. There is a demand for an extension of title VI and until this very night I have coincided with the chairman in his opposition to including sections 501 and 502 of the Veterans Readjustment Act. In June of 1947 the secondary market provision was stricken out of the RFC bill in its extension. Then in the hearings on the original Wolcott bill reported out by our committee, H. R. 6841, it included only section 505 loans under the Veterans Readjustment Act. This includes sections 501 and 502 and until this very point the chairman has always been a consistent opponent of including these two titles, until the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] of the committee included those in his amendment and it was reported out by the committee as H. R. 6888. That is the bill on which we tacked four amendments in the committee and it has been bottled up in the Rules Committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. To the gentleman's knowledge, has there been any opposition in the committee to the extension of title VI?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There never has been any opposition; in fact, we have passed two pieces of legislation covering title VI. There was H. R. 5854 for $2,000,000,000, which is on the other side at the present time. The chairman has said this could be tacked on if the other side sees fit. But the point I want to make is that at this late hour somebody is trying to get out of being left out in the rain. They are going to come out and go down to Philadelphia next week to their convention and say: "The House passed a housing bill. The House passed two housing bills. The House passed three housing bills." And they are going to blame it on somebody somewhere for not going along with what has been passed on this side.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a very strong rumor floating around here that the committee on platform of the Republican convention sent word up here that the Republicans should not adjourn until some bill with the word "housing" in it is passed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is that rumor, which I have heard. I also am reminded to check a housing plank in the 1944 Republican platform. It contained this statement:

> We pledge our support of a stimulation of State and local plans to provide decent low-cost housing, properly financed by the Federal Housing Administration or otherwise when such housing cannot be supplied or financed by private sources.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, if that is what we are going to expect, a breach of promise, a breach of faith, a breach of a statement, I think this gesture we are going into at this very late hour is a futile, shallow gesture.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman have the bill we are considering before him?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not, and just a few moments ago I walked to the Clerk's desk and asked to see a copy of it. I wanted to read again what is in section 2. I am familiar with what is in section 1.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I wonder if the gentleman would mind if I called his attention to one very significant thing. This bill is S. 2790. It was reported by the Committee on Labor and Education of the Senate. Has the Committee on Labor and Education of the Senate ever considered housing legislation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If we pass this legislation and have to go to conference, would we have a conference between the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Committee on Labor and Education on this bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is a puzzle I cannot answer. I do not think anybody else can unravel that riddle at this late hour either.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The section the gentleman just read from the Republican platform is so interesting. I would like to ask a question. Would the gentleman call it, in the terms of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], socialistic?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Very much so, if the testimony that he offered before the Committee on Rules is taken as a basis for comparison. The platform plank in the Republican platform of 1944 is clearly the very feature that our chairman has objected to so strenuously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, let me say just this: We are presented here at 3:30 in the morning with what is proposed to be an important housing bill that no committee worked out and nobody can now read because there is no such printed bill in existence. We have found out enough about it to know that it provides no slum clearance or housing of that nature. There is no title VI insurance which has produced most of the housing that we have, and there is no GI loan discount provision that is worth anything. In short, this bill is nothing; it is a phony.

Farm people and ex-soldiers living in rural areas have never received the benefit of loans to build homes and improve their farms. The difficulty in the small communities and the rural areas, in particular, is this: the financial institutions that make GI loans, the little country banks and small financial institutions, cannot carry this long-time paper in any quantity. They need a secondary market through RFC. The bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency would have taken care of that. Now then, under this phony bill the little bank will have to carry 75 percent of every loan it makes permanently. It cannot do that. It cannot put its depositors' money into that kind of long-time paper. Hence, this bill offers no relief at all to the rural GI's and people in the communities where they can only finance through these institutions. We have repeatedly offered an amendment authorizing—not compelling—the RFC to make these rediscounts. The bank then could make arrangements with the RFC to carry the loans and thus get some housing built for people in the rural areas. Under this bill they cannot do it because, as I have said, the small institutions cannot handle the paper. You might as well refuse all aid to farm-home buildings as to make the banks carry 75 percent of it. This bill ought to be defeated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to divide this housing question into three phases which I think are most important from a legislative point of view.

Private housing, which has been going at a record pace; public housing, which is in reality political housing; and, veterans' housing, which we are considering at this moment in the amended Senate bill S. 2790. If the public housing advocates had not tried to shove down our throats political housing in order to get private housing, we would have had both phases of housing stand on their own merits and we could have passed one or the other or both. If we pass this veterans' housing bill, it will be a great help to the veterans, and we have a moral obligation to take care of veterans' housing promised under the GI bill of rights. I strongly urge the House to pass this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is the most unusual procedure that I have ever witnessed in my 20 years as a Member of the House to have a bill submitted under these conditions at this time in a mad effort to deceive the people in the coming campaign that they put through some kind of legislation relating to housing. This bill illustrates what should have been done the other day. If the gentleman from Michigan was sincere in trying to bring about legislation of some kind, he would have called the Senate bill from the Speaker's table and moved to strike out all after the enacting clause and sent it to conference. Then the conferees could have worked and agreed on a bill, or agreed to strike out certain parts of either bill, if there was a majority of the conferees of both branches that agreed to striking them out. This is nothing but an effort to try to bail out this Republican Party in its convention and to support the Committee on Resolutions and Platform in its effort to put something in with regard to housing. They are not going to deceive the public.

There are jeers from the Republican side. They have been trying to deceive the public the same as they did in 1946, but this time they cannot do it. That is the spirit; that is the spirit of defiance of the will of the people, the spirit of arrogance in relation to representing the people. That is all they have been having for 2 years in this body, complete defiance of the will of the people. The Republicans applaud that statement that they have been defying the will of the people. Not one piece of legislation has passed this body that has been in the best interest of the people. The real estate lobby has not only controlled the preparation of legislation but has prevented the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill from coming up in this body. This is one of the big issues of the coming campaign.

The more noise you make, the more music it is to my ears.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make clear to the Members one point, namely, title VI of the FHA act has been passed twice by this House and sent to the Senate. If you want to scold somebody for not passing title VI, do not scold Members of the lower House, scold those of the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON].

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is understandable that in the closing minutes of this Congress, with the time now reading 20 minutes to 4, there is a tendency on the part of the Members who are addressing the House to confuse the issue which is before us. The statement has been made concerning this bill that it represents an attempt to convince the people that it is an effective housing bill when actually it is not.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I trust that my side of the House does not make a spectacle of themselves while the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] is speaking, like the other side did when the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was speaking.

Mr. NIXON. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the statement has also been made that the purpose of this bill is to save face for the Republican Party in developing its platform in Philadelphia.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is the gentleman a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. NIXON. No; but the gentleman will see in a moment why I am speaking on this bill.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Has the gentleman read this bill?

Mr. NIXON. Yes; I might explain to the gentleman that I have a particular interest in this bill because I introduced a similar bill in the House providing a secondary market for GI loans.

Mr. Speaker, the statement has even been made that this bill is unimportant and that it would be useless in meeting the housing problem.

Let us analyze this problem to see whether these changes have any merit. The real reason Members have made these derogatory statements in regard to this bill is that they would rather have had the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, with its slum-clearance and other public-housing provisions. That is understandable. I realize the resentment Members feel when the particular type of bill they want does not pass and another which they consider inadequate is substituted for it.

In that connection I think it should be pointed out, however, that one of the most publicized features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is that it is primarily in the interest of veterans. As a result a number of veterans' organizations have endorsed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I should like to read to the membership of the House at this time a statement made by Senator TAFT, one of the authors of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, on the floor of the other body yesterday in relation to the bill before us. You will see from hearing this statement why this bill is vitally important to the veterans' housing program.

I quote:

> Mr. TAFT. It seemed wise to have this bill passed. The most serious check on housing today apparently is the piling up of GI loans in the banks. This bill provides a secondary market for GI housing loans. There is such a provision, on a rather more elaborate scale, in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; but we are not certain whether that bill will be enacted.

Now get this:

> I think this particular feature is the most important feature, certainly to veterans, of that bill—

That is the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, Senator TAFT, a coauthor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, has categorically stated that the bill we are considering tonight is, as far as veterans are concerned, the most important feature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I think this statement by the distinguished Senator from Ohio clearly shows the importance of this bill, particularly as it applies to veterans.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is this much to be said about this—shall I call this a housing bill? The term is a misnomer.

But I started to say that there is this to be said about it: Since the Republican Party has refused to raise a roof for America, I certainly hope and expect that America will raise the roof with the Republicans.

I cannot say what I think of the compromise brought back from conference, or of the procedures by which this pathetic decision was arrived at, and stay within the bounds prescribed by comity.

I can, however, repeat what I said yesterday: That this action proves the complete demoralization of majority leadership as between the two Houses.

It proves that the Republican Party is without a head, and without a heart—and the American people without a home.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the RECORD.

HON. ELLSWORTH BUCK

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it requires a great deal of courage to address the House at 5 a. m. I never expected in all my life to stand on the floor of the greatest legislative body in the world to perform a very pleasant task, which I shall discharge in a few moments, at this hour in the day.

There have been some very kind things said here tonight about retiring Members, and I endorse everything that has been said about each of those who have

announced that they are retiring from Congress.

I, for one, and I know others feel the same way, am sorry to see them go.

There is one man retiring from the Congress, however, who has not been mentioned. I want to make this statement, that no man is worth more than he contributes to the social and civic life of the Nation to which he owes allegiance. Measured by that yardstick, the gentleman to whom I shall refer is a very wealthy man. He is one of the New York State Members. I refer to Hon. ELLSWORTH BUCK. He has served in this House two terms, and he has established a name for himself as a fine constructive legislator. The New York delegation, and I believe it is true of the House, are proud of the record of this distinguished gentleman and able statesman.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. We on the Democratic side have had an opportunity to serve on the Labor Committee with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], and we all regret that he is going into retirement, because he was a credit to that great committee.

Mr. REED of New York. There never was a time in the history of this Nation when we needed men in this House of the fine nobility, experience, and character as that of the gentleman from New York, ELLSWORTH BUCK.

Now that he is leaving us, I hope that he and his lovely family will have many happy, pleasant, and prosperous years. I hope, too, that he will return from time to time and give us the inspiration of his presence and his fine character. I speak of him with great personal affection. I shall always cherish the memory of having served with him here in this House.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the Democratic delegation from the city of New York, I wish to say that ELLSWORTH BUCK is one of the finest gentlemen that I have ever met. I have known him for several years, since he came here to Congress. I knew him before by reputation. He has been one of the outstanding men in our community. When I, as a Democrat, praise a Republican, I want you to know that the praise is deep-seated and most sincere.

ELLSWORTH BUCK turned a district that was Democratic for years into, unfortunately, a Republican district. He did that because of his own personality. He did that because of his devotion to public service. That public service began before he became a Member of this Congress.

He was appointed as a member of the board of education in the city of New York and served on that board which has to do with the education of millions of children in our city. After a distinguished service as a member of that board he was finally appointed president of the board of education. I, as a Democrat, want to say that Mr. BUCK discharged the duties of that office faithfully and well and I am sincerely sorry that he has decided to leave us, because although we have differed on almost every vote in this Congress he has represented as he saw fit the people of his district. He has been returned time after time since his first election by reason of his stanch integrity, by reason of the fact that he believed that Staten Island and lower New York had confidence in him. I am sorry to see him retire.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to thank the gentleman. I endorse his remarks. I especially want to thank him for letting us know that ELLSWORTH BUCK had the ability to turn a Democratic district into a Republican district. Now we know what to do with Mr. ELLSWORTH BUCK, we will send him out doing missionary service for the Republican cause in the Democratic districts of the country.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It was my privilege to have served with the distinguished gentleman from New York during the Seventy-ninth Congress as a member of the Merchant Marine Committee. I have never known a more sincere or capable man than ELLSWORTH BUCK. We all wish him well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I want to add my tribute to the others which have been paid so graciously to my fellow townsman, ELLSWORTH BUCK. I have learned one thing about Ellsworth, that he makes very short speeches, and I would like to make a short one about him and I would like it to ring as true as I can make it ring: ELLSWORTH BUCK is an honest man.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve with Mr. BUCK on the Merchant Marine Committee. As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal he accompanied me on an investigation to the Canal. I do not know of anyone who attended to his duties more diligently and more thoroughly than the gentleman from New York. It is a great regret to me personally to hear that he is leaving Congress. He is a fine gentleman, he is an honest statesman, and he is a true friend to any man who may have the privilege of his friendship. I regret his leaving this body.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I heartily endorse the statements of the other gentleman with regard to ELLSWORTH BUCK. It happens that for most of the period of this Congress his office was immediately next to mine and many a time I went into his office for counsel and received good counsel. Many a time I walked over to the Labor Committee where I sat next to him and noticed his wisdom in so many things, and in the most difficult ones, labor relations, he brought a great deal of wisdom. He was able to see both sides of a question.

As I understand it, Mr. BUCK is now going to spend a considerable amount of time in my own State, the State of Wisconsin, where he has a home also. I certainly hope that he will stay there a great deal of the year.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I join with my other colleagues in paying a personal tribute to ELLSWORTH BUCK. I know I am expressing the sentiment of every Member of this House in wishing to him long life and happiness.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse the grand tributes which have been paid to ELLSWORTH BUCK here tonight. I recall when Mr. BUCK won the special election in Staten Island and the lower part of New York. He has rendered most valuable service in his work in the House of Representatives and we are sorry to see him leave. Since coming to the Eightieth Congress I got to know him quite well. I know that in the early days of the first session he was a tremendous help to me, as he was to all the new Members who came down here from New York. I want to thank him and to pay this tribute to a very fine man.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to add a word of commendation for my good friend, ELLSWORTH BUCK. I have not served on any committees with him, but since he first came to the House most every day I have sat next to him in the second row of the middle tier of seats of the House. The Doorkeeper of the House once said to me, "We are always able to find the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] in the center seat on the second row of the middle tier when the House is in session."

The State of New York is losing an excellent Representative. The House is losing an able legislator. We shall miss you, Ellsworth, so I hope you will visit us often.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that it is entirely unjust for the State of New York to take all of the credit for the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]. The fact is that the gentleman, or at least his family, originated in the town of Buckfield, in my district, and it is only by the merest chance that he is not representing my district instead of his own. My association with the gentleman has been so extremely pleasant and my admiration for him has been so hearty that I testify to it on this occasion.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying my respects and appreciation of the fine character of the Honorable ELLSWORTH

B. BUCK, who is retiring from Congress at the end of this session.

It is hard for the Congress to lose a man of his abilities and background because our great Republic needs him. All his life he has been devoted to the service of his fellow citizens and he has brought to his work an attitude and a brilliance of mind which has made a lasting impression on our system of government. His humility and his charm and gentleness are only exceeded by his loyalty and deep-seated affection for the principles of democracy and he has been a constant inspiration to those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him.

He has been brave and courageous in times of deep sorrow and he has shown his courage by always standing for what he thinks is right and just. I trust that the days ahead will be filled with the good things of life for him and his family, but I am selfish enough to hope that he may return from time to time to visit us who may still be in Congress so we may renew our faith in the high principles he stands for.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think any of us would want to leave here tonight without expressing our very real and very deep regret at not having the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] as a Member of the next Congress.

I have enjoyed working with the gentlewoman of New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] very much and I appreciate the real intelligence, sincerity, and dignity she has brought to the Congress of the United States. She has demonstrated her capacity for service in the public interest. This Gold-Star Mother and outstanding Congresswoman from the great State of New Mexico will be missed by the many of her sincere friends and this body.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure this is in order, but since the gentlewoman from California has been so gracious to me, I would like for all of you to know that I certainly have enjoyed my very brief experience here with you. I do not intend for it to be my last visit. I hope to return. And I wish for all of you the compensation you deserve for your untiring perseverance in your work.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. I have had the extreme pleasure of serving on the great Veterans' Affairs Committee of this House with the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK]. I treasure the many contributions that she has made to the committee and I hope sincerely she will come back and give the House the benefit of her knowledge and experience.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to endorse what has been said about the distinguished lady from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK]. She is one of the few, probably the only, Gold-Star Mother in the Congress. She gave a son to this war.

I have served on the committee with her even since she has been in Congress. I want to say that her departure is a great loss to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. We from the neighboring State of Texas are pleased with the kind of representation that the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] has given her State in this body, and we regret exceeding that she is leaving. She has a charming personality, and we will miss her keenly in the next Congress.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I simply want to say of the gentlewoman we all regret to see Mrs. LUSK leave the Congress; she is a very able and distinguished lady and has contributed much to her own State and to this great Nation.

No one in the Congress has done more for veterans then she. She has taken the lead in regard to the passage of a number of veterans' measures. Today the House approved finally legislation to aid a group of veterans, former prisoners of war who suffered inhumane treatment as prisoners of the Japanese and Germans. A number of the POW's are from New Mexico. As one who has worked for almost 3 years in behalf of legislation to aid this group, I can say Mrs. LUSK has worked diligently and constantly and effectively in their behalf. In Mrs. LUSK, the former prisoners of war have had a great champion and leader in behalf of legislation to help them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have served in the House with a lot of gentle people; a lot of fine people; a lot of people of high fundamental character. But, I have never served with one who lived up to all of those high standards more and better than this very gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in all the years of my service in the House of Representatives I have never come in contact with a finer, more personable character than GEORGIA LUSK. She has proved her ability from the outset and has devoted her talents to the benefit of her constituency.

Her service was not limited to her own State, because her vision extended far and beyond the ordinary horizon. She mastered her work and performed more than was expected of her at all times. The House of Representatives will have become impoverished because of her departure. New Mexico will long seek to fill the void caused by her retirement. We wish her Godspeed.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the many fine things which have been said on the floor about my colleague from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK] are well deserved. She is held in just as high esteem throughout our fair State. It has been my privilege to campaign with her and for her on many occasions, and it has been a pleasure to serve with her in this Congress, always in the closest cooperation. My friendship and esteem for her has been increased by the memory of our happy association here in the service of our State, and I look forward to her return again to this House where she has served so well and so faithfully.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with former Speaker RAYBURN in his fitting and touching tribute to Mrs. LUSK. She leaves here with the regret of her colleagues and with the respect of all of us. In leaving, Mrs. LUSK carries with her the kindest regards of all of her colleagues and I hope that her departure from public service will be short.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I speak of the departure from our midst of the Honorable GEORGIA L. LUSK of Santa Fe, N. Mex. Mrs. LUSK came to the Eightieth Congress with a very fine background of public service. She has made a very real contribution quietly and with great dignity. A Gold Star Mother, her service on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been constructive and from her heart. Being of different political faith we have our differences, of course, she and I, but on the fundamental things of life we are in deep agreement.

This is true of women, Mr. Speaker, which makes it possible for us to bring to public service a capacity for understanding that should be of real value not only to our Government but to the perplexing problems of the world of today.

So I would say to my colleague on the Democratic side of the aisle that I shall miss her and that I hope for her all the good things of life. She has brought something fine into this Chamber. I trust that she takes back with her a sense of comradeship of all the House, not just of those of her own political faith.

Good luck to you, Georgia!

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years the House has been privileged to enjoy the fine friendship, the splendid ability and the great services of the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS. On the Committee on Military Affairs, subsequently the Committee on the Armed Services, and in the House of Representatives, he has been a faithful servant of the people; one of the hardest

workers in Congress; and a Member who in his quiet, sincere, and able way has contributed much to the Congress and to the Nation. He is leaving us after this term. I know that all of you join me in wishing him Godspeed in whatever he may undertake in the years ahead. We shall miss him and his good work, but he can take pride in the fact that the fruits of that work will live on long after he has left this great legislative body.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it so happens that I have been privileged to represent a district which is adjacent to the district represented by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. In the decade that he and I have served here together I have had occasion to counsel with him and to discuss problems that have related to our specific area. I certainly concur in what the gentleman from Florida has stated, that there has never been a more diligent worker or a more sincere legislator than the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. As one of the high-ranking members of the Committee on Military Affairs and of the Committee on Armed Services, he as every Member of this House knows, had a commanding part in helping to pass all the legislation that has been designed to strengthen and keep strong this Nation.

Further, he has done a great deal with reference to aiding servicemen and their dependents. Beyond that, also, he has worked diligently for all the projects that have related to the rivers and streams in his area.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. Briefly I have served on the House Committee on Armed Services with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana and have observed him to be a conscientious legislator and a man of such great capacity that I am sure will be utilized by his State in the more embracive field which he has entered.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. When I first came here in 1940, one of the first Members of the House whom I met was the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS. Since that time I have had occasion to confer with him on various matters of legislation. I have been benefited by his sound advice. I am sorry to see him leave the House of Representatives, and I wish him all success in his future life.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I do agree with him that the men about whom he has been speaking have given great service to this House and great service to the Nation. We are all sorry to see them leave.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the services of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, OVERTON BROOKS and I served together on the Military Affairs Committee. It was a distinct privilege working with him on that committee. He was attentive, energetic, and most capable. He was instrumental in the passage of many bills which have assisted in the defense of the Nation.

He worked tirelessly for flood control and river and harbor projects. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the congressional district I have the honor to represent joins the district of Hon. OVERTON BROOKS who represents the Shreveport, La., district. Because of the similarity of our districts and their problems, Representative BROOKS and I have had a very close relationship as fellow Members of Congress and friends in the last decade.

I personally know that Representative BROOKS had diligently, faithfully, and energetically represented the people of his district and area. No Member of the House works harder than he in behalf of his people. Moreover, as one of the high-ranking members of the Military Affairs Committee and now of the Armed Services Committee, he has had a major part in formulating much of the important legislation which has passed the Congress in the last decade, legislation designed to strengthen and keep strong this country and legislation designed to help soldiers and their dependents. Furthermore, he has ever led the fight in behalf of the flood-control projects in his area.

The contributions made by Representative BROOKS to the welfare of his country as an able, conscientious, competent, and constructive legislator will always be recognized.

We his colleagues shall always miss him and we wish for him, his wife and daughter every happiness and success in the future.

HON. JAMES GALLAGHER, HON. E. WALLACE CHADWICK, HON. JAMES P. SCOBLICK, AND HON. MITCHELL JENKINS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania delegation will miss four of our Members who will not be with us after tonight, the Honorable JAMES GALLAGHER, of Philadelphia; the Honorable E. WALLACE CHADWICK, of Chester; the Honorable JAMES P. SCOBLICK, of Scranton; and the Honorable MITCHELL JENKINS, of Wilkes-Barre.

We in Pennsylvania have been remarkably favored in the fact that we have had 28 Members in the Republican delegation from our State. We have had a very friendly contact due to the fact that we hold weekly meetings when we meet to discuss the problems that confront us. In this close association we have come to know, to respect, and to admire these men who are about to leave us. It is true that the tenure of office of some has been very short and rather brief. I refer particularly to the Honorable E. WALLACE CHADWICK, who served with me on the Committee on the Judiciary. I know all of you who were present the few times Mr. CHADWICK has entered the well of this House were impressed with his remarkable ability, his courage, his deep conviction, and his high sense of responsibility to the office which he fills.

The other gentlemen have served on other committees. Therefore, speaking in behalf of the remaining Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, we wish them every success. We trust as they go to their respective vocations, back to their homes, their lives will be filled with every success and that they will treasure and remember their present associations here.

Mr. Speaker, as the Republican Convention opens in Philadelphia Monday morning, we will welcome you there, too, along with these other good people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, so many Members have requested an opportunity to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] I ask unanimous consent that they may have that privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD during the next 5 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I know the Kentucky delegation and his many other friends in the House will learn with profound regret that Hon. VIRGIL CHAPMAN, who is the dean of the Kentucky delegation and who has served in the House of Representatives longer than any Democrat in the history of Kentucky, will voluntarily retire at the end of this session of the Congress. Mr. CHAPMAN is held in the deepest affection by the Members and by the citizens of his district. He could remain here as a Representative in Congress as long as he desires. He represents the old Ashland district of Kentucky which was represented by Henry Clay. It is an historic district. It has produced in a small area in the center of Kentucky, carpeted with bluegrass over a limestone strata for its soil, more fast horses than any other section of the world.

VIRGIL CHAPMAN is a man of fine ability. He is an able legislator, and for many years served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce where he rendered valuable service to State and Nation. I am sure all of the Members who know him and who have a profound respect for him will wish him Godspeed and success and happiness in his retirement from the House.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky and other Members who have expressed a very sincere appreciation of the services of VIRGIL CHAPMAN in the House of Representatives, and in expressing extreme regret that he is leaving this body. It was my pleasure to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with him for some years. I know the very valuable work he has done on that committee, particularly in the field of public health and with reference to the Pure Food and Drug Act. He has rendered very valuable legislative service to the entire Nation in those fields. I am sure we all join with you in wishing him well.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] on the same committee. I also had the further privilege of having him as my next door neighbor. I have never found anyone in the Congress so helpful. He would come in and consult with me on my problems when I was a young man here, and he showed me the way many and many a time. I hope that whatever course he follows will be a course which brings him much happiness. He deserves it. He is a good neighbor, a good Congressman, and a fine friend.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, within the next 24 hours the Eightieth Congress plans to adjourn. When the Speaker's gavel falls upon the conclusion of the second session of this Congress, we shall lose by voluntary retirement our able and distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable VIRGIL CHAPMAN, of the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky, who for more than the past two decades has represented the great blue-grass section of our beloved Commonwealth. VIRGIL CHAPMAN has been the champion of the tobacco farmer, not only in Kentucky but throughout the Nation. His name is synonymous with all tobacco legislation which has been enacted into law; not only has he fought for the passage of tobacco bills which were helpful to our tobacco farmers but he has vigorously and courageously championed all farm legislation. He has worked hard in the interest of REA, soil conservation, the school-lunch program, flood control, FHA, and many, many other types of laws which sought to make farm life more profitable, more enjoyable, a little brighter, and easier.

For me just to say that our colleague has supported legislation in the interest of the farmer and the people of Kentucky would be a misnomer because, by support, I mean that the able Representative from the Sixth Congressional District not only drafted and introduced bills but he appeared before subcommittees of the House and testified in their behalf. He spearheaded the fight before the full committee in order to secure favorable consideration and when the bill was called up before the House on the calendar he would address the House on the floor in its interest and would later talk to individual Members, soliciting their vote and active support. He has worked long hours day after day in meetings made up of farmers, tobacco growers, warehousemen, tobacco Congressmen from various States, and other interested parties, in order that all groups might be unanimous and solidly behind a given tobacco bill. In my opinion, there is no man in the entire House of Representatives who has done more for the farmers of Kentucky and the Nation during his tenure of office.

The voluntary retirement of VIRGIL CHAPMAN from his seat in the House means that we shall lose the most aggressive, the most outstanding, the most capable, and the most learned tobacco Representative in the lower Chamber.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 10 years ago I arrived in Washington to begin my duties as a Member of Congress. My friend and colleague VIRGIL CHAPMAN escorted me down this aisle to be sworn in. He has been my friend continuously throughout the years, and it is with affectionate appreciation of his friendly helpfulness that I speak today. He has been a most valuable Member of Congress serving his constituency well and faithfully. His service to the farmers in Kentucky, especially the tobacco farmers, has been of untold value to the farmers and the State in general. Much of the prosperity existing in the agricultural sections of Kentucky today is due to his farseeing wisdom and untiring efforts. He is leaving the House of Representatives to embark in a larger field of service, and he carries with him the best wishes of his many friends on this side of the Capitol.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, during the time I have had the honor to serve in this House, many Members have come and gone. We have lost many valuable Members through death, the spin of the political wheel of fortune, by promotions to higher office, and by retirement. It has been my pleasure to know many outstanding Members of this body through my tenure of service, but I have never known a Member for whom I have a higher regard than my fellow Kentuckian and warm personal friend, VIRGIL CHAPMAN.

I have known him and watched his record throughout the years, and long before I became a Member of this body. When I became a Member of the Seventy-fifth Congress, he with his long years of valuable experience and his position of influence and leadership in the House took me immediately under his wing, advising and counseling me in the intricate and complex problems of congressional life. Our friendship has ripened throughout these years and my constant association and personal friendship has enabled me to evaluate his true worth, not only to the people of Kentucky but to the Nation. He commands the respect of all who have served with him. He is a man of strong personal convictions and has the courage of his convictions. Never at any time have I known him to waver in a decision which reflected his personal convictions because of pressure from any group. The entire membership of the House has come to know and appreciate his fairness, his honesty, his kindness, and his desire at all times to serve his country first.

As a member of the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his service to his Nation has been outstanding. The Pure Food and Drug Acts on the statute books of the United States today stand as a monument to his untiring efforts and study concerning the problems of the health of the people of this Nation. No man contributed more toward the enactment of this legislation than did my colleague, VIRGIL CHAPMAN.

In addition to his valuable service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he has taken an active interest in all legislation and particularly in the field of agriculture. Throughout Kentucky the name of VIRGIL CHAPMAN is a household word in agricultural sections. He became interested in the problems of the farmer and the tobacco grower long before he came to Congress, and his valuable experience and his study of their problems since becoming a Member of Congress has contributed most materially toward the well-being of the farmers of Kentucky and of the Nation. There is no Member of Congress in either body more conversant with the problems of tobacco growers than VIRGIL CHAPMAN, and no Member who has more diligently worked for their economic well-being, and I am sure that the farmers of Kentucky will never cease to be grateful to him for his long years of service in their behalf.

HON. ROY CLIPPINGER, HON. EVERETT DIRKSEN, HON. ANTON JOHNSON, HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON, AND HON. EVAN HOWELL

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, this House loses five Members from the great State of Illinois, that State which has contributed in the past illustrious Members to this body.

It was our State that was responsible for the recognition of Abraham Lincoln in his service to the State. General Grant reached his success as a result of his residence in the great State of Illinois.

Illinois has contributed in no small measure to the importance of this great body.

Last week we bade farewell to Representatives CLIPPINGER, DIRKSEN, JOHNSON of Illinois, STRATTON, and HOWELL, who will not return to the Eighty-first Congress.

Of course, we know well that Representative HOWELL was elevated to a position on the Federal bench. We all respect and revere Mr. CLIPPINGER. We all know Mr. DIRKSEN for his familiarity with international affairs. We all know the effectiveness of Mr. JOHNSON as a member of that great Committee on Agriculture. We all respect Mr. STRATTON. It is the regret of the Illinois delegation that five great Members will not return to the Eighty-first Congress of their own free will and volition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentlemen from Illinois that Illinois has been a great State for great men from

other States. Abraham Lincoln was from Kentucky. General Grant, I believe, was from Ohio.

Mr. TWYMAN. He came from Ohio. May I say that all seem to be great when they get to the State of Illinois.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to join the distinguished gentleman in paying tribute to these distinguished men in this Congress from his State who are now leaving, and to say to him that I agree with everything he has said concerning them. We bid them farewell with sad hearts and with fond affection.

Mr. TWYMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. For the sake of the RECORD, may I point out that the illustrious gentleman you mentioned, Abraham Lincoln, was born in the great State of Kentucky, but he reached his eminence in the great State of Illinois.

Mr. Grant was born some 75 yards from the Kentucky line. He did reach his eminence as a colonel in the Army in an Illinois regiment.

I, too, regret to see these five eminent men of the Illinois delegation retire from the House.

I wish them all the best of everything.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Ten years ago, when I first came to this House, I became acquainted with another gentleman who entered that year, from the State of Illinois, Mr. ANTON JOHNSON. There has never been a finer gentleman and a truer friend than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] in this House of Representatives.

Mr. TWYMAN. I appreciate those remarks.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have known ANTON JOHNSON as a member of the Committee on Agriculture. I would like to make this my word of testimony: I have never met a finer man, I have never served with a finer man in a group than ANTON JOHNSON. May the Lord bless him in his chosen services, as he leaves the Membership of this House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to subscribe to everything that has been said about ANTON JOHNSON. He is one of the finest characters I have ever met.

I wish also to pay my tribute to the other Members from the gentleman's State who are leaving Congress, for what they have contributed to the welfare and the benefit of the country. When they leave these Halls may they take with them the kindly feelings of their fellow Members and may good health and happiness for many years be their portion in life.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to pay my respects to my dear friend, ANTON JOHNSON, who has rendered such distinguished service as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

To know ANTON JOHNSON is to love him. He is inherently cooperative, and friendly, his character is above reproach, above all he is a great American. I cannot think of anything more inspiring than to hear ANTON JOHNSON tell some of the history of himself and his family and pay the tribute to America that he is capable of paying.

I know it is the hope of all of the members of the Committee on Agriculture that whatever future endeavors he may undertake will be filled with the happiness and joy he so richly deserves.

Mr. TWYMAN. I appreciate those words and I thank the Members for all that has been said about the retiring members of our delegation who will not be back in the Eighty-first Congress. Once again I express my pride and esteem of our delegation for our retiring colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE HONORABLE ESTES KEFAUVER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks procured by our distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, I am more than pleased to express my appreciation of the services rendered to his country and his district by the eminent gentleman from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER.

I deem him one of the best qualified of our public servants. He has acted always for "the greatest good for the greatest number." I talk with authority because I closely watched his work as a comember with me in the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

He is a liberal in the truest and finest sense of the word. Never once did his interest in the welfare of the individual give way before those who advocated swollen privileges. He was most forthright and courageous in his battle to strengthen the antitrust laws which powerful interests sought to weaken. His will to work for the common welfare was matched by his knowledge of government, his clarity of vision, and his indefatigable energy in amassing and digesting the wealth of information to support his statesmanship.

As one who is interested in the aims and aspirations of the Jewish people in Palestine, I made note with a great deal of comfort of his espousal of the cause of Israel. He was among the first to recognize justice and logic of the Zionist position and by word and deed strengthened public opinion in favor of the partition resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations and in favor of the recognition by our Government of the new state of Israel. The Jewish people have a friend in him.

ESTES KEFAUVER takes his place with ease among the able men of good will in our country.

THE HONORABLE FADJO CRAVENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would not impose upon my colleagues at this time of the morning, but as we are pronouncing encomiums and paying tribute to so many of our fine colleagues with whom we have had the pleasure of serving I want to call to your attention the fact that one of the finest, most splendid gentlemen I have ever known, a man whom I have learned to know very intimately and admire and respect is voluntarily retiring from this Congress, our colleague, FADJO CRAVENS.

FADJO CRAVENS came here as the successor to his father, Ben Cravens. I am sure many of you who served in years gone by knew Mr. Ben Cravens and the fine man that he was and the splendid service he performed for the Nation. Also you have observed the fine work of our colleague, Fadjo, with whom I have had the pleasure of serving the 8 years of my membership in this body. He came to Congress in 1939. I am glad to pay tribute to the splendid service he has performed and say to you that there is no finer American in this country or one who has rendered greater service than FADJO CRAVENS.

Mr. HOBBS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama who served on the Judiciary Committee with the distinguished gentleman [Mr. CRAVENS] for so long.

Mr. HOBBS of Alabama. This Congress and the Nation are grateful and will ever be to the gentleman's great State of Arkansas for sending us the Cravens boys. I had the pleasure of knowing and loving his father before him. Both of them merit all of the eulogies that can be paid them. Faithful, skillful, adroit, competent legislative and personal services have characterized them every day. We are grateful to you and your State for the work that these men have done and it will live throughout all time to come.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEVITT. May I join the gentleman in the sentiments he expresses about our friend and colleague on the Judiciary Committee, FADJO CRAVENS. It has been my privilege to serve with him for 2 years and I may say without fear of successful contradiction that I know of no man of finer character or better legal ability than FADJO CRAVENS.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity in praising the services rendered Arkansas and the Nation by Hon. FADJO CRAVENS. His work on the Judiciary Committee of the House has been marked with honor

and distinction. He is a most learned lawyer. It is regretted that he has seen fit to voluntarily retire from this body. I wish for him every happiness, contentment, and success as the years come and go.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The retirement of FADJO CRAVENS from Congress is a great loss to the United States. I have never met a finer American or a more worthy Representative of a great people than FADJO CRAVENS.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. I was personally acquainted with the illustrious father of FADJO CRAVENS. I think Fadjo is one of the most profound men who has ever been a Member of the House of Representatives. I know that the Nation is losing a great man.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. FADJO CRAVENS is a scholarly man, a fine gentleman, and one we shall certainly miss in this House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I know all of you join me in expressing gratitude for having had the intimate association with Fadjo and wish for him much joy and happiness as he continues his life's journey. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD at this point on the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have known FADJO CRAVENS for many years. His keen wit, clear head, and loyalty to his friends has endeared him to all who know him. We know he will enjoy getting back to "God's country" for a rest and a well-earned vacation. We wish for him the best that life affords.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, during the time I have had the honor to serve in this House, many Members have come and gone. We have lost many valuable Members through death, the spin of the political wheel of fortune, by promotions to higher office, and by retirement. It has been my pleasure to know many outstanding Members of this body through my tenure of service, but I have never known a Member for whom I have higher regard than my good friend, FADJO CRAVENS, of Arkansas.

It was with deep regret that I learned some time ago of his intention to return to private life, but regardless of the direction of our paths in years to come, I shall always remember him for his fine character, sincerity of purpose, loyalty and devotion to duty, as well as the personal friendship I have enjoyed which has ripened with the passing years. Industry, integrity, and ability have marked his record of service.

In his departure from public life, the Nation, the State, and his own district will lose a valuable public servant whose place will be hard to fill. May good fortune and happiness attend him all the days of his life.

HON. JOE HENDRICKS AND HON. EMORY H. PRICE

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, we in Florida are losing two of our distinguished Members, Messrs. JOE HENDRICKS and EMORY PRICE, who served with great distinction in the House.

Mr. PRICE served on the Naval Affairs Committee and on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He has served his State and his district exceptionally well. We feel keenly his leaving. It has been very pleasant working with him. The effectiveness of the Florida delegation has been in teamwork and he has been an important part of that team.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to join in all that my distinguished leader of the Florida delegation has said about EMORY PRICE. We shall miss him very keenly. It is great to know a man with such a lovable, sincere character. He is one of the hardest-working Members of Congress I have ever known. He has accomplished a great deal for his district, his State, and the Nation. We genuinely regret his leaving us and wish him well in anything he might undertake.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I want to add a word on the retirement of EMORY PRICE. I think it can be said of him that he is a man who recognizes that public office is a public trust. He possesses the qualifications that are necessary to make a good public servant. I join my colleagues in wishing for him a future successful life. He has done a great work during this Congress and he has been a doer, not a speaker.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my words of tribute to EMORY PRICE. When I came to Congress I did not know the gentleman, but the 2 years that I have been here his warm and charming personality have certainly endeared him to me and to everyone whom he has worked with. As a freshman Congressman I was able to go to him and he gave to me his counsel and his advice generously on all occasions. He has been an excellent Congressman, and I join with my fellow Congressmen from Florida in regretting his leaving.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have come to know EMORY PRICE in the past 6 years that I have been associated with him. I have found him to be one of the most conscientious and one of the hardest-working Members of Congress that I have come in contact with. I know that he will be sorely missed because of his ability and because of the good work that he has done for his native city of Jacksonville, for the State of Florida, and for the country as a whole.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep regret at the going away from this great body of my good friend, EMORY PRICE. He has been my next-door neighbor during the 14 years that I have been here. I regard him not only as a fine, genuine Christian gentleman, but I regard him as an able statesman. We are going to miss him very much.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

HON. PETE JARMAN AND HON. CARTER MANASCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker and friends of the House, 43 faces will be absent from these seats come January, according to the present tabulation; each will be sorely missed. It seems to me that death, defeat, and voluntary withdrawal each "loves a shining mark." These enemies of Congress seem to take toll of our very best.

Alabama will suffer the loss of two of our greatest Representatives, PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO. You all know them and therefore love them, not for the office they have each graced but for what they are.

So often during our primary campaign and since, I have said and said sincerely that I would much rather have been defeated myself than that either of these two outstanding servants of the people should be lost to the service of their districts, their State, and the Nation.

Of course you know the story of their records here and the Congressional Directory gives a brief of some of the high points of their services before coming to Congress. Each of you can testify how well each of them has served in this body. You know how diligent they have been and how, in spite of our crowded days during their service, they have managed somehow to make friends of all their contacts and keep them. I doubt if there are two more popular Members of this body. So it seems to me that the least we Alabamians can do is to invite all those who care to and who can find the time at this late hour of the morning in the dying hours of the Eightieth Congress to extend our remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at his point in the RECORD with reference to the services of Messrs. JARMAN and MANASCO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to endorse everything the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has said about our two colleagues [Mr. MANASCO] and [Mr. JARMAN]. Both of their districts join mine. I am frank to say that Alabama never had two more worthy Representatives than these two distinguished sons of that great State.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always delighted to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I had no idea I would attempt to make a speech at this extremely early hour, 5 o'clock in the morning, here in the closing hours of this session of Congress. However, I could not pass by this opportunity to pay tribute to two of my very best and warmest friends; two eminent and outstanding members of this Congress.

PETE JARMAN has represented the Sixth District of Alabama since 1936. Prior to his election to Congress, PETE JARMAN had an outstanding record of public service as an official of the State of Alabama. He also had a distinguished war record during the First World War. During his service here in the Congress, he has been for many years one of the leaders on the great Foreign Affairs Committee, and has been instrumental in the writing of much of the momentous legislation which has been presented by that great committee and adopted as the foreign policy of our country. I am sure that the Members of the House of Representatives will concur with me in the statement, no Member of Congress has worked harder, labored more diligently, and with a greater sincerity of purpose, than has PETE JARMAN of Alabama. He has many friends here, and in his native State of Alabama, who are grateful to him for the fine and splendid service he has rendered to his country over a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe there is, among the 435 Members of Congress, no Member who has more devoted personal friends here in the Congress than does CARTER MANASCO. Carter came here, as you know, as Secretary to the beloved Speaker Will Bankhead. Carter was elected to Congress from the Seventh District of Alabama, at a special election to fill the vacancy created by the death of Speaker Bankhead. During his service in the House of Representatives, he served with distinction during the Seventy-ninth Congress, as Chairman of Expenditures in Executive Departments, and has served on many notable special investigating Committees. Prior to coming to Congress, CARTER MANASCO was a member of the Alabama legislature and an outstanding lawyer in his home in Pasper, Ala. Among his colleagues here, he is regarded as one who always has the courage of his convictions. His work in the Congress has given ample evidence of his devotion to duty. During his service in Congress, no Member of the Alabama Delegation has contributed more to the welfare of his State and Nation. Carter is my warm personal friend, and I regret exceedingly that he is leaving us.

I wish for both of my colleagues, Pete and Carter, the very best of everything that life can bring.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina with much pleasure.

Mr. BONNER. I am happy to have this opportunity to pay my respects to the splendid character and the fine manhood that CARTER MANASCO has exhibited here in the Congress and before becoming a Member of Congress here in the Capitol. It was my particular pleasure to meet him when he was a secretary in Congress and I was a secretary. He then was congressional timber, and he showed his ability and has demonstrated his ability since he has become a Member of the House. No finer gentleman, no more courageous man, has ever served. Here recently he demonstrated in the cloakroom the most courteous sportsmanship I have ever seen, when he brought his successor in and said to his friends, "This is a fine man. This man will make a fine Congressman, though he defeated me in the primaries in Alabama." My hat is off to Carter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. It is a pleasure, sir.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to pay my highest respects to two of Alabama's greatest Congressmen, PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO, whose services in this body will be terminated at the expiration of the present session. I know you all join me in extending felicitations of good will to them and in expressing appreciation for their fellowship and for the contributions they have made during their service in the Congress.

Both have distinguished themselves, not only as Representatives of their districts, but as loyal public servants, contributing immeasurably to the well-being of the whole Nation by their constant devotion to service which they have manifested during their tenures. Their stewardship has been remarkable in that they have at all times in their attention to duty, been reliable and trustworthy in all their dealings.

I wish to express to them my personal gratitude for their kindness and helpfulness to me as a new Member, and I shall always covet their friendship.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO. They are two of the greatest human beings I have ever known. They are just about everything. If I talked all night I could not tell you how much I love them and respect them. They are really and truly great men. We are going to miss them. I also want to say something about my great friend from Missouri [JASPER BELL]. I do not see him here, at present, but I do see him every day and every night and all the time. JASPER BELL is retiring of his own accord. He is one of the greatest men I have ever known anywhere. I visit at his home out on his ranch, which is right next to that great Jesse James country. JASPER BELL is a great statesman and a great man. With his great energy and brain he has done a great job here. History will record the great work that JASPER BELL and PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO and JOE HENDRICKS and all of these great men who are leaving us have done. We are going to miss them. We love you all. We just wish you could stay right here with us forever and ever. God bless you and good luck.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I have had the pleasure of knowing the gentleman from Alabama, PETE JARMAN, and as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] has said, he is one of the best Members of the House. I hope his life is a long one and a happy and contented one.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Delighted, sir.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to speak here about our two beloved colleagues from Alabama who are leaving us. Everybody knows them as Pete and Carter. Both of them came to the Congress with a background of public service. PETE JARMAN was secretary of state of the State of Alabama before he came to Congress. He has a fine record here. His service in the House and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been outstanding. CARTER MANASCO was a member of the legislature of the State of Alabama and for many years was secretary to our late beloved Speaker, William Bankhead. We will miss them both, and we wish them Godspeed and good luck in their future endeavors.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the leaving of my distinguished friends from Alabama, PETE JARMAN and CARTER MANASCO, the House loses two of its most valuable Members. They have both served with ability and fidelity. I have served on the Committee on Expenditures with CARTER MANASCO during the past 2 years and it has been a great pleasure to me. I regret very much their leaving. I shall always treasure my association with them and I shall always equally treasure their friendship.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as the curtain is rung down on the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the hearts of members of the Alabama delegation in our national legislature are sad. Two of our popular and beloved Members from Alabama will not be with us in the Eighty-first Congress.

PETE JARMAN leaves an important position as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Especially in the past few years has Pete's work and endeavors on this committee been vital. A veteran with distinguished service in World War I, Pete has devoted his time and effort to an extraordinary degree to make a

permanent peace. PETE JARMAN's labors in shaping a firm international policy of the United States Government will stand always as a memorial to an able Congressman and statesman.

As CARTER MANASCO makes his exit from this Hall, Alabama members are aware that our State is losing a most able parliamentarian. A practicing disciple of the Bankhead political school, Carter has given to the seventh district a forceful and aggressive representation. As ranking Democrat on the Committee to Investigate Executive Expenditures he made wholesome contributions to the shaping of important legislation affecting full employment and surplus property. As counselor, adviser, and friend, CARTER MANASCO will remain high in the rank of legislators who have molded governmental policies for the welfare of our people.

Residents of Alabama and citizens of the United States are the real losers in the departure of these two Congressmen.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, those Members who have been here for a number of terms have noted with sorrow the departure of others from among us who have become personal friends and we are somewhat prone to become hardened to the experience. But I am quite sure that practically all Members will feel a special sense of regret at the departure from our midst at the end of this session of one of our most beloved and distinguished Members. I need not point out to you that I refer to PETE JARMAN, of Alabama.

During his 12 years of service among us he has endeared himself to all by his unfailing congeniality, sincerity of motives, and strict devotion to the many tasks confronting a Member; and, above all, he has earned the highest respect for his always competent judgment on matters of critical interest to the Nation.

It is my earnest hope, as I am sure it is of all of us, that this Government may be able to utilize his talents and services in some manner other than purely legislative, because such unselfish devotion as PETE JARMAN has rendered is not easily obtainable. The knowledge and experience he has gained in this Hall will be of inestimable value in almost any capacity in which he is called upon to serve.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I add that all of us know of the fine, arduous, and helpful assistance given to Pete by his charming and devoted wife, Beryl, in the many accomplishments which are now a part of the history of the past six Congresses.

In whatever endeavors the Jarmans undertake we wish them the utmost success and happiness.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, JOE HENDRICKS, who is retiring from Congress. JOE HENDRICKS has been an outstanding member of the House Appropriations Committee where he was respected for his keen discerning mind and his ability to consider all things in a fair and equitable fashion. The House is losing a valuable Member who will always be kindly remembered by all of us who knew him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and to include the speech she intends to make at the Republican Convention on Tuesday morning.

HON. JASPER C. BELL

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the very fine compliments and encomiums paid to various Members who are retiring. With all I have heard, I have a strong feeling of concurrence. I thought that one of the most distinguished Members of this House, one of the finest gentlemen in this House had been overlooked. I was ready to make a little speech about him until my friend from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] had to steal my thunder and mention my very warm and distinguished friend, JASPER BELL, of Missouri.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Is that the same Honorable JASPER BELL who lives in Kansas City, Mo., which is a suburb of Kansas City, Kans.?

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this Congress, I came here with that natural feeling that every newcomer has, wondering, in a sense, just how a State delegation gets along that is divided by parties. I found that in the Missouri delegation, regardless of your party, you always had a friend, you always had fine counsel and a very able counselor and a sincere helper in Judge BELL. The State of Missouri loses a great public servant here when they lose his representation, and this Congress loses a great advocate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur in what the gentleman has said. I may say that it is most gracious of the gentleman to make the remarks he has made. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was going to be recognized to make some remarks.

Judge BELL has the strength and dignity to which the gentleman from Missouri has referred, which has impressed him upon all of his colleagues. A man of great ability, a man of unusual character, a man of great talent, a man who has depth at all times, the highest type of a gentleman. He and his loved ones can well be proud of the great character of service he has rendered to his State and to his country while a Member of this body.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to endorse all that has been said about our good friend and colleague from Missouri, JASPER BELL. So many nice things have been said tonight about him that about all that remains to be said is that he is the cream of the crop. He is one of nature's noblemen. We are going to miss him.

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it has been jocularly said that office holders rarely die, seldom resign, and never retire. Judge BELL is a notable exception to that rule. He served on the circuit bench with distinction and could have occupied that position indefinitely but preferred to enter active practice and resigned before the end of his term. And again, at the close of this session, after a notable service of 14 years, he is once more retiring to engage in active practice, over the protest of his constituency and to the regret of his colleagues here on the floor. JASPER BELL brought to the House an invaluable knowledge of the law, acquired both as a judge and as a practitioner, on the bench and before the bar, and for more than a decade has been exceptionally useful in the formulation of a large part of the statutory law of the land. At the same time he has exercised a commanding influence in both the domestic and foreign relations of the Federal Government. His service in the negotiations which led up to the establishment of Philippine independence were so outstanding that he was sent as a member of the Commission representing the United States at the final ceremonies and was awarded the especial honor of the Distinguished Service Star by the Philippine Government.

Judge BELL's retirement comes at an inopportune time. Never was the Nation in greater need of unselfish and impartial men of wise experience and seasoned judgment, and his retirement will leave a vacancy that cannot be easily filled. But he is entitled to a well-earned vacation—while the sun is yet high and the best of life is still before him. So, regretfully and affectionately we wish him good luck and good fortune and Godspeed.

THE HONORABLE W. J. BRYAN DORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we all join in paying tribute to those Members who are knowingly going out of Congress. I wonder if it would not be worth a little something to throw out a ray of comfort to those Members who are going out unwittingly?

But I rose to pay my tribute to one of the younger Members of this House—a serviceman of the last war, a man who represents the district from which my people originally came. I am speaking of WILLIAM J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina—one of the most energetic, one of the most worthy, and one of the most reliable Members of this House.

Mr. DORN is going out of this House, and he will take with him the love and respect of every Member who really knows him.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would like to share the sentiment of the gentleman from Mississippi in what he has to say of Mr.

DORN. Certainly all the younger Members are extremely sorry that he is going to leave this House. His enthusiasm and devotion to the welfare of this country have made him extremely beloved by all of us on this side and I think also on the Republican side. I wish him success in the years to come.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I, of course, endorse everything my distinguished colleague has said about BRYAN DORN. I have never know a man of more courage than BRYAN DORN. With his ability, character, and courage, I predict for him a long career of public service.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tributes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. I think he has been of great value to this House. He did not serve with stars or bars, as I understand, but was a corporal in the Army. He came back here and gave something to this House which it needs, that was the viewpoint of the enlisted man and also a young man.

I hope he will succeed in his political efforts because America needs that kind of young man today very badly.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, and I agree with what he says about the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], who when he came here brought with him the viewpoint of the rank-and-file in the Army in the recent war.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to join in what my colleagues have said in paying tribute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]. As has been said, he brought to this Congress the viewpoint of the soldier. He represented the enlisted man well. He is vigorous, he is able, as a Member of Congress and I wish him all that he wants in the future.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I join in the fine tributes that have been paid to our colleagues who are leaving the House of Representatives this year. Among those who will leave is the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, dean of the Iowa delegation.

Judge GWYNNE is completing his seventh term of service, a most valuable man on the Committee on the Judiciary, a great constitutional lawyer, a man whose advice was eagerly sought by all those who are interested in legislation that came from that great committee.

Judge GWYNNE is a man of great courage, a man who never had any hesitancy in speaking his honest convictions regardless of the political consequences.

That type of an individual, that kind of a rugged American is the type of man most needed in America today.

I personally regret that my very good friend, Judge GWYNNE, is leaving the House at this time. He has my best wishes for success and happiness in all his endeavors.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. For 10 years it was my privilege to sit beside the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE in the Committee on the Judiciary. On the other side of me sat Raymond Springer, who has passed to the Great Beyond. In sitting between these two outstanding men, it was an inspiration to work with them.

In JOHN GWYNNE we are losing one of the most able men of this House, one of the hardest workers, one of the bravest and most courageous men who dared stand up for what he thought was right. He never sought public favor. All through his career he has been guided by one thing and that is devotion to duty to his country and to his God.

We shall miss him and this country and this Congress will suffer by his departure.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has been said this evening, "I heartily approve." I could not let this occasion pass without expressing my admiration for one of the great, and I think one of the truly distinguished and capable statesmen of Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE is an outstanding lawyer, a very careful student of government, a man of demonstrated courage, and a man of the highest ideals. It seems to me that JOHN GWYNNE, at all times, has demonstrated that he is the soul of honor. He never had any thought of anything except the correct vote as he could analyze the problem confronting the House. It never seemed to me it ever occurred to JOHN GWYNNE to make what might be called a demagogic speech or to ever act as an opportunist. He always believed in his quiet way in making what he thought was a sound vote and a vote in the interest of his country.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I realize the hour is so late that dawn is breaking, but I must nevertheless ask the indulgence of the House for a brief moment to pay tribute to my colleague the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, who will not return to this chamber when the next Congress convenes.

Congressman GWYNNE has been a tower of strength as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. He is equipped with a brilliant legal and judicial mind. Thorough scholarship in the law, facility for precise expression, fairness in dealing with his fellow men, energy in discharging the duties of his office, unfailing gentlemanly conduct, these are the attributes he has so clearly revealed during his service in the House of Representatives.

There is always great demand for the vigor and talents with which he is endowed. He will soon be free to engage in other enterprises, and in these he will continue to serve with credit to himself, his family, and our common country.

JOHN W. GWYNNE will take with him the good will and the wholesome respect of his associates on Capitol Hill. It is my wish for him and his fine family that they may enjoy continued good health and much happiness in all the years that lie ahead.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve on the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of which JOHN GWYNNE was chairman. I have never served with an abler lawyer or a finer gentleman. I shall never forget that close association which will remain as one of the most pleasant and most inspiring of my congressional experiences. His retirement is much more than a loss to his district and the State of Iowa, it is a loss to the country, because JOHN GWYNNE embodies those characteristics which go to make up a statesman.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor indeed to serve in Congress the past 10 years with my distinguished colleague and friend, Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE, of Iowa, a great American and a real leader. Mr. GWYNNE is closing his service in Congress with adjournment and it is with real regret that I must bid him farewell as a colleague and as dean of the Iowa congressional delegation.

It has indeed been a privilege and an inspiration to serve with him and I will always look to him as a great statesman and leader I wish him the continued success I know will be his and I know all of the Members of Congress who have served with him join me in this tribute in recognition of his outstanding service.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, "You can fool some of the people all the time, and all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time" are words of wisdom that have come from one of our greatest statesmen. I have had the great joy of serving with JOHN GWYNNE on the Committee on the Judiciary for 14 years, and on the other side of the political fence, if there was one, which there never has been in that great committee. We on our side all loved him just as intensely and fervently as did his colleagues on the other side. So, I want to pay my tribute by saying a fervent "Amen" to every word that has been said about him, and then I could add a good deal more if I had the time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my words to the sentiments expressed by the gentlemen with reference to our good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the

Committee on the Judiciary for the last 2 years. I have looked up to him for guidance and he has furnished it to me. We think a lot of him. He is a great lawyer, a great jurist, and above all else he has great character, emblematic of a bit of philosophy that is very rare nowadays; a philosophy of good, sound, midwestern Republicanism. I am sure that all of us are going to miss JOHN GWYNNE.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I join in every word that has been said about JOHN GWYNNE. Not only did I have the opportunity to serve with him the first 2 years I served in the Seventy-seventh Congress, but I have watched and have grown to love and admire him as a great American, a great patriot, and a very, very able lawyer. I think the greatest loss that this House has suffered as a result of some of the primaries has been that of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] and I regret exceedingly that he was defeated.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that I feel greatly the loss of JOHN GWYNNE of Iowa. I think it is a great loss to the State of Iowa; it is a great loss to this Congress, and it is a great loss to this Nation. Few men have made the impression of character and ability on me as has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the encomiums that have been paid to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Iowa, JOHN GWYNNE, the dean of our delegation. When I came to Congress I found that he was the unifying force in the Iowa Republican delegation. He gave us leadership, guidance, and inspiration. His record in this House will long remain a challenge to the rest of us to emulate his fine accomplishments. It is with deep regret that we know that he must leave us, and we wish for him the greatest success that can come to anyone. Indeed, he has always accomplished that because of his fine record of public service which we know will continue down through the years.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the country can ill afford to lose men of the stamp and character of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. Having served with him for well over a decade, I shall always consider it a rare privilege and a source of everlasting inspiration to have had the opportunity of working with a man such as he, and of having known him.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I also want to join in the words of tribute paid to our colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. I have had the privilege of serving with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] for 10 years, the last several years of which his office has adjoined mine, and from that close experience I have learned to know JOHN GWYNNE as one of the ablest lawyers and one of the finest men that it has been my privilege to know as a Member of this body. The Nation can ill afford to lose the services of a man of the character and the ability and the integrity of JOHN GWYNNE. We wish for him the vesy best that life can hold.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to join in paying my tribute to JOHN GWYNNE of Iowa, one of the greatest Representatives the people of that State have had in Congress for the last 25 years.

Thomas Jefferson once said there were three questions to ask of a man who is applying for public office: Is he honest? Is he qualified? Is he faithful? JOHN GWYNNE met all those requirements, and in addition to that he had that rare quality that makes a real statesman, that is, the courage of his convictions. His departure from this House will be a great loss to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GORSKI. I want to pay my tribute to JOHN GWYNNE. I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary with JOHN GWYNNE and found him to be a very, very fine lawyer, and an able man. I am sorry to see him leave us and wish him the best of luck. We will miss him on the Judiciary Committee; he was one of the very hard-working members. We have found him very helpful on many of our difficult problems and his judgment and advice was eagerly sought. I hope that he will have many years of happiness in his future life and I wish him good luck and Godspeed.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. It is a privilege to join the other Members of the House in paying tribute to a great legislator, JOHN GWYNNE, a man whom I have known and learned to respect as a friend and as an able legislator. I hope and know that the people of his State when he returns to private life will receive him with the same high regard we in this Congress have for him, for he has proved himself in this legislative body to be a remarkable man.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEFEVRE. I, too, want to pay tribute to my colleague, JOHN GWYNNE. He was a neighbor of mine in the House. Ever since I have been here I have enjoyed knowing him. He has been one of my best advisers. We are all going to miss John.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, it was a source of great regret to me to find that the Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, who was Representative of the Third District of Iowa continuously since his election to the Seventy-fourth Congress, would not return as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress.

It has been my privilege to serve with him as a member of the Judiciary Committee, and also as a member of Subcommittee No. 2, of which he was the chairman.

Judge GWYNNE is possessed with rare legal ability which he has demonstrated throughout the years as a member of the Judiciary Committee. He was fearless in his advocacy of measures which he believed to be for the welfare of the country, although they may have been temporarily unpopular politically. He has a judicial temperament, and if he so desires, I hope he will adorn the bench of a Federal court. On the other hand, if he resumes the practice of law I know that the people will make a beaten path to his door to obtain his wise counsel. Should he desire to return to political life, I am fully satisfied that the voters of his congressional district will in the not too distant future recognize the error of their way and return him to the Congress where he may again take up the work which he so admirably performed, not only for their benefit, but for the welfare of the entire country.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, four members of the Committee on the Judiciary will not return to the Eighty-first Congress.

JOHN GWYNNE, of Iowa, has served 14 years in the House and 12 years on the committee. He has demonstrated that he is a man of unusual attainments. An outstanding lawyer, a fearless and courageous legislator, he thinks for himself at all times. He not only thinks for himself, he acts for himself; that is, he is entirely independent. I have not always agreed with him, but on such occasions I wondered if possibly I was not wrong. There is no harder worker in the Congress. The little things and the big things all receive JOHN GWYNNE'S meticulous attention. Always judicial, he was especially qualified for the important chairmanship of Subcommittee No. 2. He has always shown a keen interest in agriculture. Indeed, because of these activities, many of us have affectionately referred to him as "the farmers' friend."

In short, he has done a grand job and it is regrettable that he is not returning. We will not say farewell to him because I feel sure that he will be called upon in the future to render public service either in the legislative or judicial field.

ESTES KEFAUVER has served 10 years in the House and 9 years on the committee. He is also a splendid lawyer and a man of ability, who takes his work seriously and therefore gets results. He has been a pioneer in a number of legislative fields, and believes that today is better than yesterday and that tomorrow will be better than today. He is retiring of his own volition and, at the moment, is engaged in a primary contest for a seat in the United States Senate. I do not know

who his opponents are but, if we must have a Democrat in the Senate from Tennessee, I feel sure that ESTES KEFAUVER will uphold the tradition of his party.

FADJO CRAVENS has served 10 years in the House and 8 years on the committee, and is retiring to return to the practice of law in his native Arkansas. A perfect gentleman, a lovable friend, a great lawyer, an indefatigable worker, he has given his district and his State the best possible representation in the Congress. Another will come to represent his district, but that individual is going to find that FADJO CRAVENS has left a large pair of shoes to fill in the Halls of Congress.

WALLACE CHADWICK, of Pennsylvania, has served but one term, and it seems too bad that one so well qualified and one who has blazed the way for what promised to be a distinguished career should leave us so soon. Few Members have made the progress in a first term that Judge CHADWICK has made.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that these four Members are leaving us. Each one has the respect, the confidence, and the affection of every member of the committee and, I believe, of every Member of the House. If there was ever a time when experience and sound thinking on the part of the Congress are essential, it is now. These Members will undoubtedly be succeeded by capable successors, but their respective districts will be deprived of the experience, knowledge, and know-how which only service makes possible. I join with the others in wishing each of these colleagues pleasure, enjoyment, and success in all the days that are to come.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, may I join with the many other friends of JOHN GWYNNE in expressing my regrets that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa is leaving Congress. It was my great pleasure to work with JOHN GWYNNE on the House Judiciary Committee where he was one of the most highly respected members. The departure of this great lawyer and statesman is a loss that Congress can ill afford. JOHN leaves behind him many kind and pleasant memories that will linger long in the thoughts of those of us who knew him.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the services of JOHN GWYNNE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

A PRESIDENT FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it has been said tonight that there are three things which might make a man retire from membership here: one, death; another, defeat; and another, a decision to withdraw from the political arena. None of those three will apply to the departure of my able, affable, and eloquent colleague from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT. When he leaves the House at the close of this Congress, he will leave for another reason, but I think he will still be around the Capitol and I predict we will see and hear much of him as a Member of the other body.

So I shall not use this time for further eulogies to Karl since he will be with us, but will say something about another Member of the House of Representatives who may not be with us here next year.

In his case, if he is not here, it will also not be for one of the three reasons enumerated, not death nor defeat nor a decision to withdraw. It will be because of a decision that will be made by others.

This Member of the House of Representatives is a man who today more than any other person, in my opinion, typifies representative government.

Last fall I had the privilege of having this fine Representative stop off a few days in my district. I received a telegram of greetings from a former Member of the House, Frank Horton, in Wyoming. At a public meeting which we had, I read this telegram which said of this man:

> In these days when freedom is on trial, and when people are trying to learn how to govern themselves, he more than any other man in all the world has demonstrated that he knows how to make representative government work.

That is the man I have in mind tonight. He is a man who, if the public appreciates that quality and wants a man of that character to be associated with the Government next year—not in the House of Representatives, not in the Senate of the United States—but in the White House, they will turn to the House of Representatives and pick that Member from this body, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, the delegation to which I have the honor to belong is a small one. Therefore, any gap in it is the more deeply felt. The senior member of our Maine delegation in point of service has elected to seek election to another body. This means that she will leave this body where she will be very much missed. It is my belief that none of our Members is more respected and admired than my colleague, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, a woman of great charm, of great dignity, and of almost incredible efficiency in the performance of her duties. She has been a notably good sportswoman on all the missions, some of them very arduous and dangerous, that it has been her duty as a Member to perform. I repeat that we shall all miss her very much, and I personally shall miss her as a colleague. I take this occasion to pay her this small tribute. I only wish I could do it more worthily.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have for months been committed to a candidate for nomination for the Presidency of the United States. For months I have been campaigning for that candidate.

I wish to state that last week, upon my return to my district, I found that my people are highly in favor of, and will wholeheartedly support, the candidacy of our distinguished Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

I assure you that his nomination will insure my return to Congress.

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, WALTER G. ANDREWS, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, is retiring from Congress this year. He has been with us for 18 years. As chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, he has made a fine record in getting legislation passed, but, more than anything else, in the harmony he has secured in that committee.

Today he has just completed one of the major bills of the session, and he has demonstrated in connection with that operation an ability which we all admire. HAM, as he is very affectionately known to his friends, is a very pleasant fellow socially, and he has been very kind to many of us all through the period here.

I am very sorry that he has felt that his health will not permit him to continue with us. I hope as he goes along in the days to come that he will enjoy the rest that will come to him in his retirement.

I wish him everything good in the days to come.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to even raise my voice in joining the expressions uttered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] with respect to our colleague who has announced his decision to leave us, not because he is not deserving of it, not because his sincerity of purpose has not been recognized and appreciated by those of us who have served with him, not because his devotion to the security of his country has not always been paramount in his thought and effort, but because, if he were here, he would not want me or any of us to make expressions.

HON. PETE JARMAN AND HON. CARTER MANASCO

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my fellow Alabamians in expressing my high esteem for our two coworkers who will not be with us next year, the Honorable PETE JARMAN and the Honorable CARTER MANASCO. They have served their districts capably, honestly, and courageously. The State of Alabama suffered a great loss when those two gentlemen were defeated, a greater

loss than they realize at the present time. Our country also has suffered a great loss.

I want especially to thank them for the services which they have rendered me in suggestions, advice, and kindness during this, my freshman term in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I also want to express my appreciation of and to commend the great service which has been rendered by our good friend from Missouri, the Honorable C. JASPER BELL, who I understand will not be with us in the next Congress. Although these three distinguished gentlemen are leaving us, their influence will be felt in Congress for years to come.

A WORD OF APPRECIATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we are coming to what I hope will shortly be the end of this second session of the Eightieth Congress, but before that adjournment resolution is adopted I just want to say to all of you that I am deeply grateful for the many courtesies that you have shown me in this job of mine and to thank you for your cooperation, your helpfulness, and your friendliness.

THE HONORABLE NOBLE J. JOHNSON

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for just a moment on one of my colleagues who is leaving the Congress after this session. He is going to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. He was here in Congress for a while before he came back on this period of service. He came here the second time in 1938 after I had been here a couple of terms. Then for the first time I got to know him. Since that time he and I have developed a great friendship. I am referring to NOBLE JOHNSON, of the Sixth District of Indiana.

He has labored diligently on the Appropriations Committee, heading up that subcommittee that is near and dear to the heart of everyone of us, the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. He is the gentleman who looked after our wants, who has listened to our pleas, who has sought to provide for us the things that we need in the way of assistance in carrying on our efforts as Members of Congress. He has always been a friendly, kindly, conscientious Member of the House of Representatives. I am sure we are all going to miss him, but, missing him, we shall above everything else wish for him the greatest success and the greatest happiness in his new assignment. In that assignment I am sure he will bring to the service of his Government and our country and its people that same fine character, extreme diligence, and great ability that has marked his service here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. NOBLE JOHNSON has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations since 1938. His work upon the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee has been outstanding. More than all, his courage to meet every situation as it came up, his industry, and his loyalty have been outstanding. We are going to miss him here, but we believe that he will have a fine opportunity for great public service in the days to come in the station to which he has been elevated.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join in the tributes that have been expressed here to our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, NOBLE JOHNSON. It was my privilege to have served with our fellow Hoosier for some 10 years in this body. He is a great legislator, an outstanding lawyer, a distinguished American. In his elevation to this high Court of Customs and Patent Appeals the House of Representatives is losing one of its most able Members and the Federal judiciary is gaining a distinguished jurist.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. I join with the gentleman from Indiana in his tribute to his colleague.

May I say to the gentleman from Indiana on behalf of myself and on behalf of the Democrats that we have a great appreciation of you, Charlie. It is a very difficult thing for two men to stand eye to eye and for one to express appreciation, friendship, and feeling for the other; but in the 2 years you have been here as majority leader you have behaved yourself in a manly way, you have commanded the respect of the minority and we have a genuine affection for you. We have a conviction that Philadelphia will do great things for you and that will not be unpopular with us.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I want to say to you, Charlie, that if you contributed in any way to taking NOBLE JOHNSON off my Subcommittee on Appropriations and making him a judge, you did me no favor. Every member of the committee, as well as myself, has relied upon his judgment. It will be a great loss to the country to have a man who is so well posted, so well informed, with such keen judgment, taken out of the Congress and put in that court where he is going.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to add my word of friendship and tribute to NOBLE JOHNSON. It has been my pleasure since being on the Appropriations Committee to be associated with him, originally on two subcommittees and up until these final days on one.

He is most able and one of the friendships I value most in this Congress.

Before I conclude, may I say that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has just thanked this House for the way it has treated him. I think at least the majority, if not the entire House, should thank you for the fine floor leadership you have given us.

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, if I read the clock right, it is almost daybreak. I feel that despite the unusual hour many of my colleagues have risen in their places and praised those who have been with us, who have done effective work here with us, and have planned deliberately to leave us for other walks of life, that I should be unappreciative to fail to say something about the loss which the State of Arizona will suffer in the departure from this House of my colleague from Arizona.

My young colleague, RICHARD HARLESS, has decided that he will not be a candidate for reelection to Congress. For several years, when I was the sole Member from Arizona, I was very anxious to get the assistance of a young man who would aid me in representing that great State. My wishes were well fulfilled in the election of RICHARD HARLESS in 1942. He has been a very able man, young, energetic, competent.

I greatly regret that DICK has decided not to be a candidate for reelection, but I know whatever he may do he will serve his State and community in some other equally effective way.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I desire to join Representative MURDOCK in paying tribute to our colleague, RICHARD F. HARLESS, of Arizona. Dick was born some 8 miles from where I live in my home county of Upshur. His people were and are highly respected.

For 6 years I have worked side by side with Dick as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I have never known, in my 10 years in Congress, a truer and finer man; he is clean, honest, trustworthy, and wholesome; as a legislator, he is competent, constructive, energetic, and effective. Dick, as many know, is a person of great vision and sound judgment; he is a leader of men. His success and attainments in the past have been and are outstanding. I know he will be successful in his future undertakings. We all wish him the greatest of success and happiness in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE STABILIZATION BILL

Mr. HOPE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Agricultural Act of 1948'."

"TITLE I—1949 PRICE STABILIZATION

"SECTION 1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed through any instrumentality or agency within or under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, by loans, purchases, or other operations—

"(a) To support prices received by producers of cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts marketed before June 30, 1950, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which the crop is harvested. The price support authorized by this subsection shall be made available as follows:

"(1) To cooperators at the rate of 90 per centum of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

"(2) To noncooperators at the rate of 60 per centum of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

"All provisions of law applicable with respect to loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall, insofar as they are consistent with the provisions of this subsection, be applicable with respect to loans or other price-support operations authorized under this subsection, except that for the purpose of computing the parity price for Maryland tobacco the base period shall be the period August 1936 to July 1941 in lieu of the period August 1919 to July 1929.

"(b) To support until January 1, 1950, a price to producers of commodities with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture by public announcement pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 1, 1941, as amended, requested an expansion of production of not less than 60 per centum of the parity or comparable price therefor nor more than the level at which such commodity was supported in 1948, except that Irish potatoes harvested before January 1, 1949, milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 per centum of the parity or comparable price. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this subsection if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for the commodities referred to in (a) hereof. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

"(c) Sections 1 and 3 of the Act approved August 5, 1947 (Public Law 360, Eightieth Congress), are amended by striking out in each section the date of 'December 31, 1948' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1950.'

"(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsections (a), (b), and (c) hereof) shall be carried out until January 1, 1950 so as to bring the price and income of the producers of other agricultural commodities not covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c) to a fair parity relationship with the commodities included under subsections (a), (b), and (c), to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the commodities covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c). In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

"SEC. 2. From any funds available to the Department of Agriculture or any agency operating under its direction for price support operations or for the disposal of agricultural commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to use such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this Act.

"SEC. 3. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as added by section 31 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"'(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 per centum ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 per centum of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"'(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"'(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

"'(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"'(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party.'

"SEC. 4. Section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended (a) by striking out 'January 1, 1949' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1951', and (b) by striking out 'December 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1950'.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Act, the Act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506), shall continue in effect.

"SEC. 6. This title shall take effect on January 1, 1949, except that sections 3 and 4 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

"Definitions of 'parity price', 'carry-over', 'normal supply', and 'total supply'

"SEC. 201. Section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

"(a) By striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(1) (A) The "parity price" for any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be determined by multiplying the adjusted base price of such commodity as of such date by the parity index as of such date.

"'(B) The "adjusted base price" of any agricultural commodity, as of any date, shall be (i) the average of the prices received by farmers for such commodity, at such times as the Secretary may select during each year of the ten-year period ending on the 31st of December last before such date, or during each marketing season beginning in such period if the Secretary determines use of a calendar year basis to be impracticable, divided by (ii) the ratio of the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during such period to the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

"'(C) The "parity index", as of any date, shall be the ratio of (i) the general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy, interest on farm indebtedness secured

by farm real estate, and taxes on farm real estate, for the calendar month ending last before such date to (ii) the general level of such prices, rates, and taxes during the period January 1910 to December 1914, inclusive.

"'(D) The prices and indices provided for herein, and the data used in computing them, shall be determined by the Secretary, whose determination shall be final.

"'(E) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (A), the transitional parity price for any agricultural commodity, computed as provided in this subparagraph, shall be used as the parity price for such commodity until such date after January 1, 1950, as such transitional parity price may be lower than the parity price, computed as provided in subparagraph (A), for such commodity. The transitional parity price for any agicultural commodity as of any date shall be—

"'(i) its parity price determined in the manner used prior to the effective date of the Agricultural Act of 1948, less

"'(ii) five percent of the parity price so determined multiplied by the number of full calendar years which, as of such date, have elapsed after January 1, 1949.

"'(F) Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (E), if the parity price for any agricultural commodity, computed as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (E) appears to be seriously out of line with the parity prices of other agricultural commodities, the Secretary may, and upon the request of a substantial number of interested producers shall, hold public hearings to determine the proper relationship between the parity price of such commodity and the parity prices of other agricultural commodities. Within sixty days after commencing such hearing the Secretary shall complete such hearing, proclaim his findings as to whether the facts require a revision of the method of computing the parity price of such commodity, and put into effect any revision so found to be required.

"'(2) "Parity", as applied to income, shall be that gross income from agriculture which will provide the farm operator and his family with a standard of living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupation. "Parity" as applied to income from any agricultural commodity for any year, shall be that gross income which bears the same relationship to parity income from agriculture for such year as the average gross income from such commodity for the preceding ten calendar years bears to the average gross income from agriculture for such ten calendar years.'

"(b) By amending paragraph (3) (A) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(A) "Carry-over", in the case of corn, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be the quantity of the commodity on hand in the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, not including any quantity which was produced in the United States during the calendar year then current.'

"(c) By amending paragraph (3) (B) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(B) "Carry-over" of cotton for any marketing year shall be the quantity of cotton on hand within the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, which was produced in the United States prior to the beginning of the calendar year then current, plus the quantity on hand within the United States at the beginning of such marketing year which was produced outside the United States.'

"(d) By striking out paragraph (10) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(10) (A) "Normal supply" in the case of corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated domestic consumption of the commodity for the marketing year ending immediately prior to the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (iii) an allowance for carry-over. The allowance for carry-over shall be the following percentage of the sum of the consumption and exports used in computing normal supply: 7 per centum in the case of corn; 30 per centum in the case of cotton; 10 per centum in the case of rice; 15 per centum in the case of wheat; and 15 per centum in the case of peanuts. In determining normal supply the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he may deem necessary.

"'(B) "Normal supply" in the case of tobacco shall be a normal year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 175 per centum of a normal year's domestic consumption and 65 per centum of a normal year's exports as an allowance for a normal carry-over.'

"(e) By amending paragraph (16) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(A) "Total supply" of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be the carry-over of the commodity for such marketing year, plus the estimated production of the commodity in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins and the estimated imports of the commodity into the United States during such marketing year.

"'(B) "Total supply" of tobacco for any marketing year shall be the carry-over at the beginning of such marketing year plus the estimated production thereof in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins, except that the estimated production of type-46 tobacco during the marketing year with respect to which the determination is being made shall be used in lieu of the estimated production of such type during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins in determining the total supply of cigar filler and cigar binder tobacco.'

"Price support

"SEC. 202. (a) Section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary, through the Commodity Credit Corporation (except as provided in subsection (c)) and other means available to him, is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amounts, terms, and conditions of such price support operations, and the extent to which such operations are carried out, shall, in the case of operations carried out by Commodity Credit Corporation, be determined by the Corporation with the approval and subject to the direction of the Secretary, and, in the case of operations carried out by other means, be determined by the Secretary. In making such determinations, consideration shall be given to (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, (3) the availability of funds, (4) the perishability of the commodity, (5) its importance to agriculture and the national economy, (6) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price support operation, (7) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets, and (8) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand. Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support. The Secretary shall in all cases give consideration to the practicability of supporting prices indirectly, as by the development of improved merchandising methods, rather than directly by purchase or loan.

"'(b) (1) Price support shall be made available to producers of any basic agricultural commodity at levels determined as hereinafter provided in this subsection. On the basis of the latest available statistics of the Department of Agriculture as of the beginning of each marketing year for each such basic agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall, with respect to such marketing year and such basic agricultural commodity—

"'(i) estimate the total supply;

"'(ii) determine the normal supply; and

"'(iii) determine the percentage which the estimated total supply is of the normal supply (such percentage being referred to herein as the "supply percentage").

"'(2) The level at which the price of such basic agricultural commodity for such marketing year shall be supported for cooperators (other than cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) shall not exceed 90 per centum of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or be less than the percentage of its parity price as of the beginning of such marketing year determined from the following table:

If the supply percentage is:	The level of support shall be not less than the following percentage of the parity price
Not more than 70	90
More than 70 but not more than 72	89
More than 72 but not more than 74	88
More than 74 but not more than 76	87
More than 76 but not more than 78	86
More than 78 but not more than 80	85
More than 80 but not more than 82	84
More than 82 but not more than 84	83
More than 84 but not more than 86	82
More than 86 but not more than 88	81
More than 88 but not more than 90	80
More than 90 but not more than 92	79
More than 92 but not more than 94	78
More than 94 but not more than 96	77
More than 96 but not more than 98	76
More than 98 but not more than 102	75
More than 102 but not more than 104	74
More than 104 but not more than 106	73
More than 106 but not more than 108	72
More than 108 but not more than 110	71
More than 110 but not more than 112	70
More than 112 but not more than 114	69
More than 114 but not more than 116	68
More than 116 but not more than 118	67
More than 118 but not more than 120	66
More than 120 but not more than 122	65
More than 122 but not more than 124	64
More than 124 but not more than 126	63
More than 126 but not more than 128	62
More than 128 but not more than 130	61
More than 130	60

"'(3) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

"'(A) the minimum level of price support to cooperators for any basic agricultural commodity shall be 120 per centum of the minimum level determined from the foregoing table, if acreage allotments are in effect at the beginning of the planting season for such commodity, or if marketing quotas are in effect at the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity; but in no case shall the level of price support for any commodity be increased thereby above 90 per centum of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year; and

"'(B) the level of price support for any basic agricultural commodity normally marketed in any marketing year with respect to which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers shall be 50 per centum of the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of such marketing year.

"'(4) The level at which the price of corn shall be supported for cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 75 per centum of the level at which the price is supported for cooperators in the commercial corn-producing area with respect to corn.

"'(5) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas are in effect shall be 90 per centum of its parity price as of the beginning of the marketing year.

"'(c) The support price for any nonbasic agricultural commodity shall not exceed 90 per centum of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year or season in the case of a commodity marketed on a marketing year or seasonal basis, and as of January 1 in the case of any other commodity. Any price support operation undertaken with respect to either turkeys or chickens shall be applicable to all chickens, including broilers, appropriate adjustments being made as provided in subsection (e) of this section: *Provided*, That if any price support operation is undertaken with respect to either chickens or turkeys, the same parity price support operation shall be undertaken with respect to ducks and ducklings and other poultry. The price of wool shall be supported at such level, not in excess of 90 per centum nor less than 60 per centum of its parity price as of January 1, as the Secretary may consider necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. The price of any kind of Irish potatoes harvested after December 31, 1949, shall be supported at not less than 60 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price for Irish potatoes as of the beginning of its marketing season. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity (other than Irish potatoes) which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost; but any such operation may be carried out by the Secretary through other means available to him such as those provided by section 32, Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended: *Provided*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from supporting the price of any perishable nonbasic agricultural commodity by a loan, purchase, payment, or other operation undertaken with respect to a storable commodity processed from such perishable nonbasic agricultural commodity: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, in carrying out programs with respect to perishable and nonperishable commodities under section 32 of Public Law Numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, and section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, may utilize the services and facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation (including but not limited to procurement by contract) and make advance payments to it: *And provided further*, That in any fiscal year, if at the end of the preceding fiscal year the sums appropriated under said section 32 and remaining unexpended do not exceed $300,000,000, Commodity Credit Corporation may, as provided in section 302 (a) of this Act, carry out any operation to support the price of any such perishable, nonbasic agricultural commodity to the extent that the reserve for the postwar price support of agriculture established pursuant to the First Supplemental Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 8) and other funds appropriated for agricultural price support are sufficient to cover any losses which may be incurred in connection with such operation.

"'(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, price support operations at levels in excess of the maximum level of price support otherwise prescribed in this section may be undertaken whenever it is determined by the Secretary after reasonable public notice and public hearing with records of said hearing and a finding thereon by said Secretary available to the public that price support at such increased levels is necessary in order to increase or maintain the production of any agricultural commodity in the interest of national security.

"'(e) Appropriate adjustments may be made in the support price for any commodity for differences in grade, type, staple, quality, location, and other factors. Such adjustments shall be made in such manner that the average support price for such commodity in each marketing year will, on the basis of the anticipated incidence of such factors, be equal to the level determined as provided in this section for such marketing year.

"'(f) For the purposes of this section—

"'(1) A "cooperator" with respect to any basic agricultural commodity shall be a producer on whose farm the acreage planted to the commodity does not exceed the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under this title, or, in the case of price support for corn to a producer outside the commercial corn-producing area, a producer who complies with conditions of eligibility prescribed by the Secretary. For the purposes of this subsection a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm acreage allotment unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment.

"'(2) A "basic agriculture commodity" shall mean any of the commodities cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts of a crop harvested after December 31, 1949.

"'(3) A "nonbasic agricultural commodity" shall mean any agricultural commodity other than a basic agricultural commodity.

"'(g) No producer shall be personally liable for any deficiency arising from the sale of the collateral securing any loan made under authority of this section unless such loan was obtained through fraudulent representations by the producer. This provision shall not, however, be construed to prevent Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary from requiring producers to assume liability for deficiencies in the grade, quality, or quantity of commodities stored on the farm or delivered by them, for failure properly to care for and preserve commodities, or for failure or refusal to deliver commodities in accordance with the requirements of the program.

"'(h) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than (1) a price determined on a pricing basis for its stocks of such commodity on hand, which makes due allowance for grade, type, quality, location, and other factors and which is reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred by it with respect to such stocks; (2) a price halfway between the support price, if any, and the parity price of such commodity; or (3) a price equivalent to 90 per centum of the parity price of such commodity, whichever price is the lowest, except that the foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses.'

"(b) Section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is repealed.

"MARKETING QUOTAS

Corn

SEC. 203. (a) The first sentence of section 322 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"'Whenever in any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"'(1) that the total supply of corn for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 per centum; or

"'(2) that the total supply of corn for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending, and that the average farm price for corn for three successive months of the marketing year so ending does not exceed 66 per centum of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than November 15 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and marketing quotas shall be in effect in the commercial corn producing area for the crop of corn grown in such area in the next succeeding calendar year and shall remain in effect until terminated in accordance with the provisions of this title.'

"(b) Sections 322 (b) and 322 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution relating to section 322 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended', approved July 26, 1939 (53 Stat. 1125), are hereby repealed.

"(c) Section 322 (d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended (1) by striking out "(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)", and (2) by striking out "September" and inserting in lieu thereof "March".

"Wheat

"SEC. 204. (a) Section 335 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out the first two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'Whenever in any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"'(1) that the total supply of wheat for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 per centum; or

"'(2) that the total supply of wheat for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending, and that the average farm price for wheat for three successive months of the marketing year so ending does not exceed 66 per centum of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than July 1 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning July 1 of the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in

effect with respect to the marketing of wheat.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out 'June 10' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 25'.

"Cotton

"SEC. 205. The first sentence of section 345 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"'Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"'(1) that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 8 per centum; or

"'(2) that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year, and that the average farm price for cotton for three successive months of such marketing year does not exceed 66 per centum of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than November 15 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and marketing quotas shall be in effect with respect to cotton during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year.'

"Rice

"SEC. 206. The first sentence of section 355 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"'Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines—

"'(1) that the total supply of rice for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 per centum; or

"'(2) that the total supply of rice for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for such marketing year, and that the average farm price for rice for three successive months of such marketing year does not exceed 66 per centum of parity

the Secretary shall, not later than December 31 of such calendar year, proclaim such fact and, during the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year and continuing throughout such marketing year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect with respect to the marketing of rice by producers.'

"SEC. 207. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended—

"(a) By inserting in section 328 after the words 'outside the commercial corn-producing area' the following: 'or imported';

"(b) By inserting in section 333 after 'or such crop' the following: 'and imports';

"(c) By inserting in section 343 (a) after 'August 1 of such succeeding calendar year' the following: 'and imports';

"(d) By striking out sections 359 (d) and 359 (e);

"(e) By striking out of section 385 'or loan' and inserting in lieu thereof 'loan, or price support operation'.

"Tobacco

"SEC. 208. Section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence a colon and the following: *'Provided*, That the Secretary shall proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding marketing year, and shall proclaim a national marketing quota for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for each marketing year for which a quota is proclaimed for fire-cured tobacco, and, beginning on the first day of the marketing year next following and continuing throughout such year, a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the tobacco marketed during such marketing year.'

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"Section 32 funds

"SEC. 301. Section 32, as amended, of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes', approved August 24, 1935 (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 612c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this section until expended; but any excess of the amount remaining unexpended at the end of any fiscal year over $300,000,000 shall, in the same manner as though it had been appropriated for the service of such fiscal year, be subject to the provisions of section 3690 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 712), and section 5 of the act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and seventy-five, and for other purposes" (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 713).'

"'Parity'—other statutes

"SEC. 302. (a) Section 2 (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Through the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture under this title, to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions for agricultural commodities in interstate commerce as will establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices as defined by section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.'

"(b) Section 8c (18) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended to read as follows:

"'(18) The Secretary of Agriculture, prior to prescribing any term in any marketing agreement or order, or amendment thereto, relating to milk or its products, if such term is to fix minimum prices to be paid to producers or associations of producers, or prior to modifying the price fixed in any such term, shall ascertain the parity prices of such commodities. The prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish in section 2 of this title shall, for the purposes of such agreement, order, or amendment, be adjusted to reflect the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk or its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated marketing agreement, order, or amendment relates. Whenever the Secretary finds, upon the basis of the evidence adduced at the hearing required by section 8b or 8c, as the case may be, that the parity prices of such commodities are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk and its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated agreement, order, or amendment relates, he shall fix such prices as he finds will reflect such factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest. Thereafter, as the Secretary finds necessary on account of changed circumstances, he shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, make adjustments in such prices.'

"(c) Section 8c (17) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by striking out 'and section 8e'.

"(d) Section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is repealed.

"(e) Section 4 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after the section designation the subsection designation '(a)' and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(b) Any program in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by this Act, on the effective date of section 302 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 shall continue in effect without the necessity for any amendatory action relative to such program, but any such program shall be continued in operation by the Secretary of Agriculture only to establish and maintain such orderly marketing conditions as will tend to effectuate the declared purpose set out in section 2 or 8c (18) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by this Act.'

"(f) All references in other laws—

"(1) parity,

"(2) parity prices,

"(3) prices comparable to parity prices, or

"(4) prices to be determined in the same manner as provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 prior to its amendment by this Act for the determination of parity prices,

with respect to prices for agricultural commodities and products thereof, shall hereafter be deemed to refer to parity prices as determined in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by this Act.

"Effective date

"SEC. 303. Titles II and III of this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1950."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
GEO. W. GILLIE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ELMER THOMAS,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute which incorporates the substance of the House bill and titles III and IV of the Senate amendment, with modifications. Except for clarifying, clerical, and minor changes the differences between the House amendment and substitute agreed to in conference are explained below.

The House bill is retained with virtually no change except clarifying and clerical amendments to make it conform to the substitute agreed upon by the conferees, and two minor amendments in substance, one changing the base period for the computation of parity on Maryland tobacco and the other making it clear that the act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506) relative to dark tobacco remains unchanged. There was added a provision extending until December 31, 1950, authority to make soil conservation payments.

In the substitute amendment agreed to by the conferees that portion which was the

House bill now provides for interim price supports on agricultural commodities to continue through the calendar year 1949. Titles III and IV of the Senate bill appear vitually without changes as titles II and III of the substitute amendment. In general, these titles provide for a modernization of parity and for a permanent price support program. The effective date of titles II and III of the substitute amendment is January 1, 1950.

Following is a detailed explanation of the provisions of titles II and III:

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Section 201 amends section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 in the following respects:

(1) The method of computing parity prices would be changed to the extent necessary to give appropriate recognition to changes in relationships among the prices of the agricultural commodities themselves occurring since the base period, 1910–1914, such as those resulting from the discovery of new uses or new methods of production. This section would provide a formula which, while preserving the 1910–14 relationship between farm and nonfarm prices, will reflect the developments of recent years. The general level would be based on the differences between the 1910–14 and the present prices of things that farmers buy, the parity prices of some commodities would be reduced while others would be increased. This section also provides for a transition from the present method of computing parity prices and for any corrective action which may become necessary in the future. The section would accomplish these objectives in the following manner:

At present the parity price of any agricultural commodity as of any date is computed by—

(i) Preparing a parity index showing the changes in prices of things that farmers buy since the base period 1910–1914; and

(ii) Multiplying the price of the commodity during the base period by the parity index.

The section would change this formula only by substituting an adjusted or moving base price for the 1910–14 price of the commodity. This adjusted base price for the commodity would be a price bearing the same relationship to—

(i) The price of such commodity during the preceding 10 years—

as the general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during the period 1910–14 bears to—

(ii) The general level of prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities during the same 10 years.

In order to prevent the parity price for any particular commodity from being reduced substantially in any year by reason of this change use of a transitional parity price would limit such reduction to 5 percent per year. The transitional parity price would be the parity price as now computed less 5 percent for each full year elapsed after January 1, 1949. The transitional parity price would be used for a commodity until the first time that the parity price is equal to or above the transitional parity price.

In addition, the Secretary may revise the method of computing any parity price which becomes seriously out of line with the parity prices of other agricultural commodities.

(2) "Parity" as applied to income is redefined for the purpose of establishing a more accurate standard. This change has no substantive effect.

(3) The term "carry over" as applied to cotton, corn, rice, and peanuts is redefined to include imports. Foreign-stored cotton is excluded. This term was not previously applied to peanuts.

(4) The term "normal supply" as applied to corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts is redefined to represent current requirements more accurately than has heretofore been the case. Instead of using 10-year averages of exports and domestic consumption in the computation of normal supply, estimated exports for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined and estimated domestic consumption for the preceding marketing year would be used. The allowance for carry-over provided for in the existing definition of "normal supply" remains the same except in the case of cotton which would be 30 percent in lieu of 40 percent in existing law. The definition in existing law for "normal supply" is not applicable to peanuts but the new definition would be made so. The allowance for carryover in the case of peanuts would be 15 percent. Provision is made for adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions. The term "normal supply" as applied to tobacco would not be changed.

(5) The term "total supply" has been redefined to cover peanuts and in the case of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts to include imports. The term as applied to tobacco has not been changed.

Section 202 would amend section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (which contains the principal permanent price support provisions) to provide as follows:

(1) Price support of any agricultural commodity through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations would be authorized. This authorization provides the necessary flexibility in the choice of methods to be used in supporting prices. Thus it authorizes not only loans and purchases but also direct payments to farmers. The use of indirect methods such as the development of improved merchandising methods is encouraged. In determining the methods to be used, as well as the other terms and conditions of price support operations, the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation are required to give consideration to (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, (3) the availability of funds, (4) the perishability of the commodity, (5) its importance to agriculture and the national economy, (6) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation, (7) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand, and (8) the necessity of offsetting temporary losses of export markets. Compliance with acreage allotments and production goals may be required as a condition of price support.

(2) In the case of the basic commodities price support at from 60 to 90 percent of parity, the minimum level depending upon the relationship of the total supply of each commodity to its normal supply would be required to be made available to cooperators (those who do not exceed farm-acreage allotments); except that if marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers the level of price support would be reduced to 50 percent of parity. If marketing quotas are approved by producers the level of price support which would otherwise be given to the commodity would be increased by 20 percent, but shall not exceed 90 percent. Tobacco would be supported at 90 percent of parity.

(3) Price support for nonbasic commodities is discretionary with the Secretary up to a maximum level of 90 percent of parity. The price of wool, however, is required to be supported at such level between 60 and 90 percent of parity as the Secretary considers necessary in order to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. Potatoes are also supported at 60 to 90 percent of parity.

(4) In case the national interest requires, price support operations at levels in excess of 90 percent of parity are permitted with respect to either basic or nonbasic commodities.

(5) Subject to certain exceptions the Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from using its funds to carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost.

(6) Limitations are imposed upon the price at which Commodity Credit Corporation can sell farm commodities subject to a number of exceptions. These limitations and exceptions are generally comparable to those now in effect and are intended to prevent sales of farm commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation in a manner which would impair price support operations with respect to such commodities.

Marketing quotas

Sections 203, 204, 205, and 206 change the conditions which must be determined by the Secretary to exist before marketing quotas can be imposed upon corn, wheat, cotton, and rice. As reported, the sections would provide that whenever the Secretary determines—

(1) That the total supply of the commodity for the marketing year beginning in the then current calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 20 percent (8 percent in the case of cotton), or

(2) That the total supply of the commodity for the marketing year ending in such calendar year is not less than the normal supply for the marketing year so ending and that the average price for the commodity for three successive months does not exceed 66 percent of parity—

the Secretary shall proclaim marketing quotas for the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year.

Acreage allotments—imports

Section 207 requires the Secretary to take imports into consideration in determining acreage allotments for corn, wheat, and rice for the purposes of marketing quotas.

Amendments

Section 208 would amend section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to require the Secretary, first, to proclaim a national marketing quota for each marketing year for each kind of tobacco for which a national marketing quota was proclaimed for the immediately preceding marketing year, and, second, to proclaim a national marketing quota for Virginia sun-cured tobacco for each marketing year for which a quota is proclaimed for fire-cured tobacco. This would mean that, once the Secretary proclaims a marketing quota for any kind of tobacco, he is required to proclaim a marketing quota for that kind of tobacco for each succeeding year without regard to the supply conditions presently required by the statute.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 32 funds

Section 301 provides for accumulation, up to $300,000,000, of section 32 funds not currently required for program purposes. Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), appropriates for each fiscal year an amount equal to 30 percent of the customs duties for the preceding calendar year, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage exportation and to increase (by means of diversion programs) domestic consumption of agricultural commodities and products and to reestablish farmers' purchasing power. To the extent that funds annually appropriated by section 32 are not fully utilized during any fiscal year, this provision would permit the balance of the funds not utilized to be carried over to subsequent fiscal years and used for the purpose for which such funds were appropriated. This provision would make it possible to formulate long-range surplus disposal programs.

Parity—Other statutes

Section 302 conforms the definitions of "parity" contained in other statutes to the

definition of "parity" contained in section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the bill.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
GEO. W. GILLIE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6248) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the bill H. R. 6248. This bill, in part, passed the House on last Saturday in the form of a measure to extend the present price-support program for 1 year. In the Senate the measure was amended by striking out all after the enacting clause, and there was substituted the provisions of a Senate bill dealing with a long-range farm program. The conferees have agreed upon a measure which contains substantially all of the provisions in the House bill, to be applicable only for the year 1949; in other words, we are bringing back to you the same bill which we passed in the House to extend price supports for 1 year.

In addition, the bill as agreed upon by the conferees contains substantially all of titles 3 and 4 of the Senate long range bill, which provisions deal with a long range price support program. The Senate bill consisted of four titles originally. Two of those titles dealt with the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, and particularly with a reorganization of the Soil Conservation Service, a reorganization which in effect would have eliminated the Soil Conservation Service and turned its functions over to the Extension Service, the land grant colleges, and the Production and Marketing Administration, under a new name, however.

Your conferees did not agree to those two titles in the bill. They have been eliminated and, as already stated, the bill now contains substantially all of the provisions of titles 3 and 4 relating to a price support program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Do the provisions of titles 3 and 4 of the Aiken bill have any application in this coming year?

Mr. HOPE. No. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. As far as the provisions of titles III and IV are concerned, they will go into effect on January 1, 1950, at which time the provisions of that part of the bill which the House passed will go out of effect.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One more question: If we agree to this tonight, will we have the opportunity, if the House so decides next spring, to change some of the provisions of titles III and IV as contained in this bill? I am referring especially to the lack of 90 percent parity guaranties.

Mr. HOPE. The bill will not go into effect until a year from next January 1. It offers approximately 18 months within which the bill may be studied and amendments made if they are necessary. I say that the Committee on Agriculture intends to study the bill carefully in that intervening time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no commitment on the part of this Congress now that we must continue in effect past next year these two titles to which we have reference? Personally, I do not care to agree to any program which would guarantee less than 90 percent of parity in our basic commodities.

Mr. HOPE. The bill if it becomes a law will be subject to amendment, of course, just as any law, and we will have the advantage of having this 18 months' period in which to study it before it actually goes into effect.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think I can safely say as a conferee that the Senate conferees have agreed to a sympathetic consideration of any proposals we in the House may make with reference to changes in this bill.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is a correct statement. I may say that the bill is one which contains a great many intricate and technical provisions.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. May I inquire as to what the necessity is for passing at this time legislation that will not become effective until 1950? What is the reason? What is the cause of it?

Mr. HOPE. The bill, as I know the gentleman understands, passed the Senate in such a form that it became effective next January 1. It was the purpose of the Senate in passing it to put a long-range program in effect on next January 1 at the expiration of the present temporary program which is embodied in the Steagall amendment and other similar legislation. I will say to the gentleman it was the position of the House conferees when we first went to conference that there was no necessity for passing a long-range program at this time. We thought that the conferees from the Senate should accept the provisions of the House bill, which would carry us forward for a year, and we thought that at the end of that time we would be in a better position to work out a long-range program. The Senate conferees took a different view and, as in the case of all conferences of this kind, in the end we worked out a compromise, and this is the result.

Mr. BONNER. That part of the proposal now offered to the House is superfluous and unnecessary. All that is needed is Senate approval of the continuation of the existing law that has been passed in the House. I think there must be some reason why this legislation is so urgently brought here at this late hour.

Mr. HOPE. There are many in this country, including the leaders of all of the great farm organizations, that is, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union, and the Cooperative Council, who have urged that a long-range program be enacted at this time. All four of those organizations have endorsed that part of the Senate bill which we have adopted as a part of this conference report. There is greater unanimity on the part of the farm organizations of this country on this bill than on any important agricultural bill with which I have been familiar.

Mr. BONNER. Yes; but with all the time available in the first session of the next Congress, certainly the proper and intelligent thing to do would be to bring the bill into this House so the House could debate it and study it and know more about it.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is repeating some of the arguments I made in conference.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The fact of the matter is that the House is now in the position of voting on a long-range program when the House Committee on Agriculture did not make any report on this bill or any other bill on the long-range program. Therefore, the Members of the House have not had the benefit of the views of the House committee with respect to this long-range program. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HOPE. That is true in a technical sense, at least. Of course, the Committee on Agriculture of the House has conducted extensive hearings, both in Washington and over the country, on the question of a long-range program.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In all fairness, in addition to it being true in a technical sense, is it not a fact that the Committee on Agriculture of the House announced that they would not report a long-range program bill in this session.

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Therefore, we do not have the benefit of the study and the reports of the House committee in the consideration of this bill. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HOPE. That is true. May I say to my friend that the conferees refused to agree under any circumstances to any long-range program which would become effective at once or as soon as January 1. But we felt under the circumstances that when we would have this time in which to study the measure and make amendments which might be necessary, we were justified in agreeing in the conference to this report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will permit me to say so, I think it is unwise and unsound to pass a bill that will not be put into effect for a year in order to have the privilege of studying it and amending it. With all due deference, I favor the provisions of the House bill. I think the Senate bill discrimi-

nates against the major agricultural commodities, including cotton, wheat, and corn.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman will present his views to the Committee on Agriculture in the next session of the Congress, I am sure the committee will give careful attention to those views.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me half the time, as I have other gentlemen on my side who would like to be heard?

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the committee generally has control of the time. If the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] has Members on his side who desire to address the House, he can give the names of the gentlemen to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have served in this body for 18 years, but I have gone through my strangest and most unusual experience since yesterday at 2 o'clock. I do not believe any Member present ever went through a similar experience in legislative matters. Thursday night about 11 o'clock, the other body passed what is known as the Aiken farm bill. At 2 o'clock on yesterday we were called into conference, and the House conferees to a man turned down the Aiken bill. They turned it down for the reason that they did not know what was in it. I doubt that some of the conferees from the other body knew a bit more about what was in the bill than the conferees from the House, who had not had an opportunity to examine the legislation.

At 5 p. m. on Friday we were called into conference. The House conferees, because they did not know what was in the Aiken bill, turned it down. So the conference adjourned.

At 2 o'clock yesterday, Saturday, we were called back into conference, and the House conferees again stood pat and we adjourned. Then, at 4 o'clock yesterday, we were called back into conference for the third time and the roll was called, and the House committee still stood pat. We were not willing to place our O. K. upon a piece of legislation that no Member of the House conferees knew anything about, and we broke up in a rather heated discussion.

Then a strange thing happened. In order to bring this conference report back, they had to rape the House conferees. When they came back Mr. MURRAY resigned as a conferee and Dr. GILLIE was appointed in his stead; and then we met again. The Democratic members still stood pat, but the Republican members went over to the Aiken bill. Now, that is the way you get this piece of legislation.

Now, why did these things happen? I do not want to inject politics into this discussion, but evidently the Philadelphia Republican Convention had to have a farm program, and in order to give that convention a farm bill, they had to rape the conferees in order to give the convention a program.

Now, I am telling you frankly, no member of the House conferees can tell you what is in the Aiken bill, and yet they bring the bill here and ask you to O. K. it. It is true that the Aiken bill does not go into effect for 18 months. They adopted the House bill, but provided that the House bill should expire December 30, 1949, and thereupon the Aiken bill becomes the farm program.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House bill is a well-considered bill. The House bill continues in effect the program we have developed over the last 15 years.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The fact of the matter is, the House committee has reported no long-range program; they have submitted no long-range bill; and the further fact is that we have a bill of 60 or 65 pages in length, and thus far, with four titles. The only explanation that this House has of the bill is that titles I and II have been stricken from the bill?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right. As I said, the House bill will be the agricultural program during next year. It has proven to be successful. The only redeeming feature about this piece of legislation is this:

That part of the legislation known as the Aiken bill does not go into effect until 18 months from the present time, and during next year I hope—I know—and I confidently believe that the House Committee on Agriculture will work out a long-range farm program to take the place of the Aiken bill. When that is done I will not be here, but I make the prediction that the long-range program that the House committee will present to you next year will not be the Aiken bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not a fact that this Congress cannot bind the next Congress? In other words, cannot the Eighty-first Congress pass legislation that will correct any inequality in the so-called Aiken bill?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that fact because I would hate to think that this Congress would bind the next Congress to anything like the Aiken bill. I believe the House Committee on Agriculture should hold hearings and bring in a farm program that they understand and that they can explain to this House before they ask the House approval.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virgina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, while I realize that the Members of this House are tired and weary and are anxious to go home and get some rest, I do not feel that I should permit this conference report to be adopted without making at least a few comments and observations.

Every Member of this House has a share of responsibility and will be held to account for the actions here taken. I doubt if any man in this House—even the oldest man in point of service in this body—has ever witnessed such a spectacle as this. For long hours the conferees labored and they brought forth a monstrosity. It is neither bird nor beast nor fish nor fowl. It has the head of an elephant, but the heart of the Republican long-range farm program has been torn from the monster's body. In one part you will find provisions which authorize a continuation of the present price-support program—a program which has meant much to the welfare and prosperity of American agriculture. These provisions will continue a vital part of the Democratic farm program only until after the grand November election will be safely behind us and a matter of history. Then another program will go into effect and the agricultural economy of this Nation will be shaken to its foundation.

This is a spectacle of the rarest variety of political pressure. When the conferees were unable to agree on either the House bill or the Senate bill, and after the discussions clearly indicated that the Senate would not accept the House bill or surrender any part of the Senate bill, and after the representatives on the part of the House had indicated that they would not surrender the House bill or accept any part of the Senate bill, we adjourned, and I am sure that everyone considered the adjournment final. The House conferees did not have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the many far-reaching and complicated provisions of the Senate bill. This House was in almost constant session from the very moment the Senate took final action on the much-talked-of Republican long-range farm program. While the bill was introduced by Senator AIKEN many long weeks ago, it was never called up for consideration in the House Committee on Agriculture.

Usually when the Senate passes a bill of importance it comes to the House and is referred to the House committee, but, obviously, this could not be done and when the representatives on the part of the House objected to having the measure rammed down our throats, whether we liked it or not, political pressure went up. As pointed out by my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], when the House conferees, Republicans and Democrats alike, found the Senate bill to be obnoxious and highly objectionable in the form in which it was submitted, politicians were apparently horrified. But something took place during the long and dreary hours, either here in Washington, or perhaps in Philadelphia, or maybe in both of these very important places. After secret meetings, and no doubt because of one Member's unwillingness to surrender his convictions or to compromise his conscientious views, he resigned and another was appointed in his place. Again the conferees conferred and as a result you are now faced with a unique situation. As intelligent Representatives of the people of this country, as weary and as fatigued as you are, you are urged to embrace this monstrosity which has a dual parentage and a dual purpose. There is not one of you who knows what it is or what is in it. You are not even told what is in it and you have no way of knowing about its provisions.

I love and admire the great and noble chairman of my great committee, the

very able and alert and distinguished gentleman from Kansas, and certainly no finer man ever lived than the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFFORD HOPE. I regret that the temper of this House is such, and even that is perhaps easily understood, in view of the lateness of the hour, that when he was undertaking to tell you something about the provisions, yes, the important provisions of this conference report, and while he was talking, we heard cries go out over this House, "Vote! Vote! Vote!" Yes, vote, but vote for what. Certainly you do not even know what you are voting for, yet you must vote because Republican politicians must have something that they can at least call a long-range farm program.

I served in this Congress through the New Deal and many, many times Democrats were called rubber stamps. This is a super duper case of rubber stamp. Take it for TAFT so that he can talk about it. Do it for Dewey so that he can dangle it before the people. Write it into law for Warren, and mark it up for MARTIN. Stay here late for Stassen, and win a victory for VANDENBERG. Whoop it up for the Old Guard, so that you may have a hot time in the old town on Tuesday. Yes, you will have H. R. 6248 with provisions you have never seen and charts and tables you do not understand. Here in this great farm program is written this strange and uncertain language:

> To assist low-income families and school children in maintaining an adequate diet, particularly in periods of underconsumption and unemployment.

Certainly when you think of the Republican Party you must be impressed with the significance of the last two important words in this great provision, "underconsumption" and "unemployment." Some parts of this bill read like a Republican platform and oh how they will read it and wave it at the convention. This is not only a package of promises to the people and a platform on which to run, but it is actually handed to you with a promise that it will be changed before it goes into effect. It embraces the producers of not only basic commodities and the Steagall commodities, but many other commodities have been added, including even the ducks and little ducklings. The Democratic administration was criticized on account of potatoes and putrified eggs, but everything is here included within the four corners of this bill. It must be rubber stamped and approved. But at least there is one Republican here who was unwilling to embrace this monstrous thing. I congratulate and compliment the very distinguished, able, fearless, and courageous Representative, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. REID F. MURRAY, who refused to yield to pressure or to be lashed by the party whip or to be black-jacked into surrendering his honest convictions on this thing the Republicans will call a farm program. Men have a right to change their minds, to alter their positions, and to modify their views. Upon mature consideration no doubt many Members of this House would have modified their views, but at least it is a rather strange thing that the views of so many could be modified so soon.

Certainly we know why this bill is here in its present form. It is here because Congress is about to adjourn and the Republicans are about to convene in convention to be assembled in Philadelphia only a few hours from now. You Republicans came into power on a promise that you would write a long-range farm program, and throughout all of the sessions of the Eightieth Congress you have talked of a long-range farm program for the American farmer, but you have done nothing about writing such a program and now you awaken to the fact that you have been sleeping on the job. Yes, asleep at the switch. Perhaps you were lulled to sleep by the fact that the farmers of America already had written on the statute books a long-range farm program with which they are well satisfied. All you need to do is to continue the price-support program, the soil-conservation payments, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, and you knew this when you came into power, and yet you have put the poor farmer off until the very last thing, and while in a state of utter confusion you insist upon having some sort of a paper writing to call a farm program. Do you not know that the American farmer is well informed and intelligent enough to know, to understand, and to appreciate fully the circumstances under which your political promise was so pitifully performed. Yes, you promised the American farmer you would write a farm program and he knows now that you have not done it.

We sat up with the corpse of the Republican farm program all through the night; Republican leaders were weeping and wailing; finally, about daybreak, the corpse came back to life again. A transfusion was administered and when some signs of life appeared there was great rejoicing. Although the breath of life was breathed again into the dead monster he will not be permitted to move from the place of his curious construction until he is 18 months of age. Yes, that is the ridiculous proposition that is now placed before you. You are asked to enact this thing into law, to write it into the law books and into the United States Code, and to read it and to study it for 12 or 18 months and if you find that it will work you can put it into harness and hitch it to the plow, but if its head is too heavy or its legs are too short, or if its body is too weak, we will subject it to surgery or feed it some strange vitamin that will give it strength enough to support the floor under American agriculture.

Frankly, I have tried to understand the provisions of this bill, but, frankly, I must tell you that I even now do not fully understand it. I do not believe that there is a man on the floor of this House on either side of this aisle who can tell you the far-reaching ramifications of this bill. Shall we place our stamp of approval upon Federal legislation which we do not understand and cannot explain? Shall we have such little regard for the sanctity of Federal law as is now involved in the action this House is about to take? We are told that some of the farm organizations were in favor of the Senate bill, but that was carved to pieces in conference. Go ahead and rubber stamp it and then go back to your constituents and try to explain your conduct. That is what you will do. That is what you must do. The monster is now asleep but when he is awakened and aroused you shall hear from him.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, there were three measures which had to be considered and acted upon this week. One was to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation which would expire on June 30. The Congress has taken appropriate action during the night granting a permanent charter to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The second was extending the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. That extension is contained in the pending conference report.

The third was extending the price-support program, which, under the present law at its level, would expire on December 31. That is the matter now before the House.

This is a rather singular conference report. The House passed a bill, the Senate passed a bill, and the compromise is to enact both of them.

You are about to go home. I am sure those of you who represent agricultural sections will want to report the situation to your constituents. We now have a 90-percent support for this year. Under the conference report we will have a continuation of 90-percent support next year for the basic commodities and a few others and other commodities supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity. Therefore, generally speaking, you will have 90 percent for 1948 and 1949.

On January 1, 1950, titles III and IV of the so-called Aiken bill will go into effect. That will give us two changes I have not been able to give my approval to. It will entirely change the parity formula. It sets up one of those fantastic schemes known as the 10-year moving average. It has two unfavorable features. One entirely abandons the parity principle of comparable purchasing power as to a particular commodity. The second is it reduces the parity prices of practically all of the commodities, except cattle, hogs, milk, rice, and tobacco. Within a short time it will bring about many inequities and discrimination among commodities. As between commodities it does not take into account the respective cost of production, the labor required, or the advancement in mechanization in planting, cultivating, and harvesting.

Then under this report you will reduce the support prices which are on a flexible basis ranging from 60 to 90 percent. The Senate author of the bill admitted that no commodity would ever have 90 percent support under the bill unless it was under a control program, except wool and tobacco. This is all I can say now. When the Aiken bill becomes effective a year and a half hence, the farmer will suffer a reduction in his parity price, and at the same time a reduction in his support price. Therefore he will be hit twice. I think it is unfortunate and not in keep-

ing with our obligation to him. Personally I cannot give my approval to a bill now which I know will take me months to completely analyze, and completely understand, and which is a step backward in providing the farmers with the security and protection they are entitled to. I think it would have been more sensible if we had waited until the next session to enact a long-range program and in the meantime have drafted a simple and understandable bill. But, it is here. It is a so-called long-range program effective a year and a half hence. The Republican leadership says it must pass now. As my distinguished chairman has said, it is hoped that he and the others of us on the committee who will return to Congress will endeavor to correct the serious mistakes we make tonight. It is with regret that I cannot give the conference report my support at this time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 147, noes 70.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECRUITMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2767) to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. HOPE. I shall be glad to explain the bill, Mr. Speaker. This is a bill which has been requested by the United States Employment Service and also by the farmers who are the users of agricultural labor, in order to make the recruitment and distribution of farm labor more effective during this season. This is a measure that is not only in the interest of agricultural producers but certainly in the interest of consumers, because with the current labor shortage, unless we can bring in some farm labor, it is my opinion we are likely to have a loss of food in this country during the current year.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Labor in carrying out his responsibilities to maintain a farm placement service is authorized to recruit foreign workers within the Western Hemisphere and Puerto Rico for temporary work, and to provide for their transportation to and from the United States and to and from different parts of the United States. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administration of the program.

Then there is a further authorization of appropriations for the establishment of a working capital fund, this fund to be used for the payment of expenses for transportation, lodging, and subsistence of the workers. This fund is to be reimbursed by growers who use workers, so that the United States Government will not be out any money on account of the transportation and the lodging and the subsistence of these workers. In other words it is a revolving fund, and with the exception of administrative expenses all expenses will be paid by the growers who use these farm workers.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. This is merely a perpetuation of the same New Deal measure we have had for the last several years. I am surprised the gentleman would present this to our side of the House. I thought we got rid of this last year and were going to get rid of it forever. Now the gentleman brings it out here and asks us to accept it. I certainly hope my side of the House will have the courage of its convictions and get rid of this New Deal measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is not the only New Deal legislation that he has voted for and that his side has voted for. We have converted you right along the line.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Does this bill in any way change the law that was passed with reference to sugar controls and workers and their salaries and so forth?

Mr. HOPE. No; this bill in no way changes or affects the Sugar Act of 1947.

Mr. CARROLL. That is with reference to the protection of agricultural workers in sugar and the workers' salaries and the controls?

Mr. HOPE. These workers are not only under the protection of that act, but they are under the protection of State laws. They are under the protection, in the case of Mexican workers, and most of them are Mexican workers, of the very strict and rigid agreement between the United States and Mexico calling for the protection of the workers. If the gentleman is familiar with that agreement, he knows they are very well taken care of under the agreement.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I just want to say that you have already passed an appropriation bill providing the money for this act. You have appropriated $1,000,000 to carry it out.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I ask the gentleman from Kansas if I am correct in believing that the amendment concerning which I previously spoke to him, has been withdrawn?

Mr. HOPE. May I say to the gentleman from California that it is my purpose to withdraw the amendments. The committee amendments in effect would put administrative expenses under the revolving fund, and would require that the administrative expenses be paid by the employer. I am going to ask unanimous consent to withdraw those amendments. I have spoken to a number of members of the committee who are present at this time, and there is no objection so far as I know to the withdrawal of the amendments. Then I also propose to offer two amendments which are necessary because of the fact that the United States Employment Service is now a part of the Federal Security Agency instead of the Department of Labor. That makes it necessary to offer an amendment on page 1, line 3, and on page 2, line 21.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My sole concern with this legislation is not to injure the farmers who need this type of labor, but to express a word of caution. These people have been exploited and paid cheap wages. In many instances they have been used as strikebreakers. It is one thing to help agriculture and help the farmers when they are short of labor, but it is another matter to have these people used as scabs and as cheap labor. I do hope that the department which will supervise this program will see to it that these people will neither be exploited nor used as strikebreakers and scabs.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think every one of us agrees with the observation made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the Secretary of Labor, in carrying out his responsibilities to maintain a farm placement service under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, is authorized to recruit foreign workers within the Western Hemisphere and workers in Puerto Rico for temporary agricultural employment in the continental United States and to direct, supervise, coordinate, and provide for the transportation of such workers from such places of recruitment to and between places of employment within the continental United States and return to the places of recruitment not later than June 30, 1949. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums for the administration of the program authorized by this section as the Congress may deem necessary.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the establishment of a working capital fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, $2,500,000, such fund to be used only for the payment of expenses for transportation, lodging, and subsistence in connection with the temporary migration of foreign agricultural workers from foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere, and workers from Puerto Rico, to and between places of employment within the continental United States and return to the place of origin. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the employers utilizing such workers shall be required to reimburse

such fund to such extent and in such manner and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may by regulation or otherwise prescribe.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HOPE:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency."

Mr. FOGARTY. The first amendment was to strike out "the Secretary of Labor" and insert "the Federal Security Administrator"; is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. That is made necessary by reason of the act that was passed, the appropriation bill, which transferred the Federal Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUING PATENTS IN ALASKA

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 162, a joint resolution to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. D'EWART. The bill repeals section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936, having to do with the issuing of certain patents in Alaska. Second, it permits the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in Alaska to individual tribes, villages, or individuals, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is now 15 minutes after 6 in the morning. It is almost time to go to church. It seems to me this legislation should be deferred until some other time. I object.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the two Houses adjourn on Sunday, June 20, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 219) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress until Friday, December 31, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REPORTS OF INVESTIGATING COMMISSIONS TO BE DOCUMENTS OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the adjournment of the House until Friday, December 31, 1948, by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S OFFICE TO BE PRINTED AS HOUSE DOCUMENTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 700) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to Congress, pursuant to section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (56 Stat. 6), and the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), after the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, shall be printed as House documents of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 701) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in order that the duties of his office may be discharged in case of his absence or disability or in case his office should become vacant, the Clerk of the House of Representatives on or before June 19, 1948, shall designate a subordinate in his office to perform the duties thereof in any such contingencies until the commencement of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Such designee when acting under this authorization, shall subscribe himself as Acting Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk of the House shall promptly communicate to the Speaker the name of the employee designated hereunder for the information of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 701 adopted by the House today, I have designated Mr. Harry Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to discharge the duties contemplated by said resolution.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include tabular material.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. I just wish to call attention to the fact that this is Father's Day, and, therefore, I say: Good night, good morning, good luck.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many have ever attended a sunrise service before, but you have today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Latta, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948; and

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills following adjournment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (H. R. 6248) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitments; and

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp. of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 1779. An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek drainage district of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to donate and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between

Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 5716. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public park and golf course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationalty Act of 1940;

H. R. 5888. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level-premium-term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia" approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes;

H. R. 6818. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses;

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life-insurance or annuity payments;

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes";

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes;

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents;

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House stands adjourned pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 218.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes a. m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 218, the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1667. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing there-

in, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, the Committee on Ways and Means was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5849) to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6697. A bill to authorize the sale and grant to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., of certain interests in public lands, and repealing a certain act; with amendments (Rept. No. 2429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on the survey and study of the postal service; without amendment (Rept. 2434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Seventeenth intermediate report on investigation as to the manner in which the United States Board of Parole is operating; without amendment (Rept. No. 2441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Senate Joint Resolution 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provisions for certain ocean-transportation service to, from, and within Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 6999. A bill to provide for capital-gain treatment with respect to income received on the redemption of certain United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7000. A bill authorizing municipalities of the Territory of Alaska to enact transaction taxes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 7001. A bill to aid the settlement and development of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 7002. A bill to settle and extinguish land claims to the public domain in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7003. A bill to provide for a cash allowance for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7004. A bill repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 7005. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 7006. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 7007. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 7008. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 7009. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 7010. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain persons who served in the Polish Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 7011. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 7012. A bill to promote a sound monetary system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 7013. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 7014. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 7015. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R 7016. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7017. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 7018. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7019. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7020. A bill to authorize a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7021. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for rescarch and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7022. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7023. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7024. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7025. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 7026. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 7027. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. McMAHON:

H. J. Res. 435. Joint resolution to establish a commission to investigate and study the entire field of educational nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 695 Resolution authorizing an investigation of conditions in Palestine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 696. Resolution authorizing an investigation of conditions in Palestine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. Res. 697. Resolution providing expenses for conducting the investigation incurred by the select committee authorized by House Resolution 691; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr DONOHUE:

H. Res. 698. Resolution calling upon Congress to take effective action against the spread of inflation and the high cost of living; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7028. A bill for the relief of Maria Forbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7029. A bill for the relief of John J. O'Mara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 7030. A bill for the relief of Adalbert (Bela) Juth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2115. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition by the members of Otsego County (N. Y.) Pomona Grange, urging that the Congress of the United States take immediate steps to appropriate money to set up a laboratory for the study and research of the causes, remedies, and final eradication of the hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2116. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, relative to the recognition of the state of Israel and the lifting of the embargo on arms to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.